

BEFORE THE HEARINGS PANEL AND INDEPENDENT HEARINGS PANEL

Under	Schedule 1 and Part 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act
In the matter of	The Proposed Waimakariri District Plan and Variation 1 to the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan
Between	Various submitters
And	Waimakariri District Council (Respondent)

Council Officer's Appendix B for Variation 1.

OVERVIEW

1. My full name is Peter Gordon Wilson. I am employed as a Principal Policy Planner for the Waimakariri District Council.
2. The purpose of this document is to provide a final Appendix B for recommendations on Variation 1. I signaled in my Right of Reply, published on 29 November 2024, that I would provide this by Friday 6 December.
3. This document outlines the final version of the recommendations on all Variation 1 submissions and further submissions. This encapsulates recommendations made in hearing stream 10A (airport noise and FUDA), hearing stream 12E (in the context of Variation 1 rezonings), hearing stream 7B (the substantive content of Variation 1), and the rights of reply for these.
4. For rezoning submissions (highlighted in the document), it includes an additional column that outlines my recommendation in the event the IHP were minded to adopt Mr Fowler's interpretation of the *Clearwater* test.

Appendix B – Recommended Responses to Variation 1 original and further submissions

Submitter_No	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Decision requested	Officer's Recommendation /Mr Carranceja <i>Clearwater</i> test for rezonings	Officer's Recommendation (Mr Fowler <i>Clearwater</i> test for rezonings)	Officers' Reasons/Comments	Recommended Amendments to Proposed Plan?
1.1	Pat Le Lievre and Peter Judkins	Oppose	Opposes lack of right to appeal. Concerned about lack of privacy and the health effects of reduced sunlight. Notes the potential for antisocial behaviour between neighbours. Opposes lack of off-street parking as off-street parking enables electric vehicles to be charged and reduces crimes against cars. Seek the right to object. Variation 1 does not address people's right to have adequate sunlight, could foster hostile relations between neighbours, and does not address concerns about reducing carbon emissions by ensuring off-street parking for charging electric vehicles.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
1.2	Pat Le Lievre and Peter Judkins	Oppose	Concerned about lack of privacy and the health effects of reduced sunlight. Notes the potential for antisocial behaviour between neighbours. Variation 1 does not address people's right to have adequate sunlight, and could foster hostile relations between neighbours.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
1.3	Pat Le Lievre and Peter Judkins	Oppose	Concerned about lack of privacy and the health effects of reduced sunlight. Notes the potential for antisocial behaviour between neighbours. Variation 1 does not address people's right to have adequate sunlight, and could foster hostile relations between neighbours.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
1.4	Pat Le Lievre and Peter Judkins	Oppose	Concerned about lack of privacy and the health effects of reduced sunlight. Notes the potential for antisocial behaviour between neighbours. Variation 1 does not address people's right to have adequate sunlight, and could foster hostile relations between neighbours.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
1.5	Pat Le Lievre and Peter Judkins	Oppose	Concerned about lack of privacy and the health effects of reduced sunlight. Notes the potential for antisocial behaviour between neighbours. Opposes lack of off-street parking as off-street parking enables electric vehicles to be charged and reduces crimes against cars. Variation 1 does not address people's right to have adequate sunlight, could foster hostile relations between neighbours, and does not address concerns about reducing carbon emissions by ensuring off-street parking for charging electric vehicles.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

10.1	Steve Wilkinson	Oppose	<p>Opposes provision for intensification in Rangiora, particularly the permitted three-storey buildings. The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act) had the purpose of supporting major cities yet Waimakariri has been included and therefore will have minimal ability to decline applications for intensification. If Council has control over development fees and levies, such as reserve contributions, it should use this power to make such development financially unviable. Council should lobby the Central Government for amendments to this Amendment Act to exempt the Waimakariri District. Opposed to seeing Rangiora look similar to St Albans, where high rise apartments are adversely affecting character.</p> <p>Lobby Central Government to change Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 to exempt Waimakariri District from their provision applying. Alternatively, if practical and legal, adjust Council development fees to ensure that such developments are unviable, in order to reflect the lack of appetite for such development.</p>	Reject		<p>The Enabling Housing Act applies to all Tier 1 Councils, which includes Waimakariri District. Development fees and levies must be used in a rational and objective manner and cannot and should not be abused to override directive central government legislation, even when that legislative direction is not popular. To do so would be unlawful.</p>	No
10.2	Steve Wilkinson	Oppose	<p>Opposes provision for intensification in Rangiora, particularly the permitted three-storey buildings. The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act) had the purpose of supporting major cities yet Waimakariri has been included and therefore will have minimal ability to decline applications for intensification. If Council has control over development fees and levies, such as reserve contributions, it should use this power to make such development financially unviable. Council should lobby the Central Government for amendments to this Amendment Act to exempt the Waimakariri District. Opposed to seeing Rangiora look similar to St Albans, where high rise apartments are adversely affecting character.</p> <p>Lobby Central Government to change Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 to exempt Waimakariri District from their provision applying. Alternatively, if practical and legal, adjust Council development fees to ensure that such developments are unviable, in order to reflect the lack of appetite for such development.</p>	Reject		<p>The Enabling Housing Act applies to all Tier 1 Councils, which includes Waimakariri District. Development fees and levies must be used in a rational and objective manner and cannot and should not be abused to override directive central government legislation, even when that legislative direction is not popular. To do so would be unlawful.</p>	No

10.3	Steve Wilkinson	Oppose	<p>Opposes provision for intensification in Rangiora, particularly the permitted three-storey buildings. The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act) had the purpose of supporting major cities yet Waimakariri has been included and therefore will have minimal ability to decline applications for intensification. If Council has control over development fees and levies, such as reserve contributions, it should use this power to make such development financially unviable. Council should lobby the Central Government for amendments to this Amendment Act to exempt the Waimakariri District. Opposed to seeing Rangiora look similar to St Albans, where high rise apartments are adversely affecting character.</p> <p>Lobby Central Government to change Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 to exempt Waimakariri District from their provision applying. Alternatively, if practical and legal, adjust Council development fees to ensure that such developments are unviable, in order to reflect the lack of appetite for such development.</p>	Reject		The Enabling Housing Act applies to all Tier 1 Councils, which includes Waimakariri District. Development fees and levies must be used in a rational and objective manner and cannot and should not be abused to override directive central government legislation, even when that legislative direction is not popular. To do so would be unlawful.	No
11.1	Mark Ferguson Phillips	Oppose	<p>Concerned about lack of consideration for the capacity of the access routes with the Waikuku / Woodend State Highway 1 road network. The Woodend, Ravenswood, Pegasus, and Waikuku area has had significant growth, and a significant growth in traffic. The Government has withdrawn its plans for the Woodend Bypass as this land is now developed. Consideration is needed on how the roading network will cope with additional traffic resulting from intensification. Accidents in Woodend already create issues and there are minimal re-routing options. Public transport is ineffective and requires reconsideration. Easy access to and from Christchurch is essential to make this area appealing. Property developers do not live locally and are focused on maximising profits, not mitigating the effects of their developments.</p> <p>Delay intensification decision until Council staff had worked with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency regarding the effects of intensification on the roading network and additional load capacity solutions. The PWC intensification report is incorrect in saying only a few hundred houses will be affected. Variation 1 will result in population growth in the tens of thousands to the region thus a coordinated plan is required to ensure efficient transport networks, which is important for both lifestyle and business.</p>	Reject		Reference Formative study, roading network will cope	No
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Accept			No

12.1	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	Supports inclusion of historic heritage items within Medium Density Residential Zone of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend as qualifying matter. Retain as proposed.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
12.2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Support	Supports SD-O2 as a strategic direction. Retain as proposed.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
12.3	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Notes there are no matters for control for subdivision within the Medium Density Residential Zone, which could impact historic heritage, thus requests Council address this. For example, where a subdivision is in accordance with SUB-R2(3)(a)(i), it may still adversely affect heritage values. While the rules within the Historic Heritage Chapter provide protection within an identified setting, the cumulative impact of intensification within the vicinity of the item could be detrimental. The impact on historic heritage must be identified and controlled at the subdivision stage within the Medium Density Residential Zone as it is in SUB-R2 for other zones. Amend SUB-R2 (Medium Density Residential Zone): Matters of control are restricted to: SUB-MCD8 – Archaeological sites SUB-MCD13 – Historic heritage	Accept		Subdivision provisions amended to ensure that the proposed qualifying matter for historic heritage is added.	Yes
12.4	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	Encourages greater consideration to the physical impact of intensification, in terms of increased density and height, on the values of heritage items. While rules within the Historic Heritage Chapter provide protection within identified settings, cumulative intensification on a site beyond the vicinity of an identified setting could be detrimental. Requests that the impact on historic heritage be identified and assessed at the subdivision consent stage in order to determine the appropriateness of three residential units. Amend MRZ-BFS1: "1. There shall be no more than 3 residential units per site, except where: ... b. Within the qualifying matters – historic heritage area, a heritage impact assessment has been undertaken by a suitably qualified professional, to ascertain the number of residential units per site."	Accept		Subdivision provisions amended to ensure that the proposed qualifying matter for historic heritage is added.	Yes
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			No

12.5	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga		Agrees that more housing is needed and supports Variation 1's direction for intensification. Waimakariri's history plays an important role in promoting identity, wellbeing, and intergenerational connection. Notes need for robust provisions to protect historic heritage via greater consideration that intensification does not adversely affect the District's heritage. Requests relief to strengthen provisions in relation to management and protection of historic heritage. Not specified.	Accept		Subdivision provisions amended to ensure that the proposed qualifying matter for historic heritage is added.	Yes
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
13.1	Mike Greer Homes Ltd	Amend	<p>Rezone the following properties, (located in an area in southern Kaiapoi to the east of Main North Road, west of railway line, and south of the Kaikanui Stream) to Medium Density Residential Zone: - Pt RS 37428 (CB701/7) limited to the land to the west of the Main Trunk Railway Line;</p> <p>- RS 39673; and</p> <p>- Lot 1 DP 19366.</p> <p>The 14ha site is referred to as the South Kaiapoi Development Area. Refer to full submission for Attachment A - location plan, Attachment B - draft chapter provisions, Outline Development Plan and a planning assessment. This site is the subject of submission #332 lodged by Mike Greer Homes Ltd on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>The land area generally satisfies relevant national, regional and district level policy. While the site is outside Kaiapoi's urban limits, it meets the relevant criteria for the residential growth of Kaiapoi as it adjoins the south-eastern boundary. It is a logical and efficient extension of the residential area of southern Kaiapoi, maintaining its compact nature. The proposed South Kaiapoi Outline Development Plan (refer to Attachment B) provides for integration of the development with Kaiapoi with transport links and reserves. The proposed Medium Density Residential Zone development will yield approximately 200 lots, resulting in improved housing choice for Kaiapoi.</p> <p>The proposed development will require upgrades to services and Main North Road access, and mitigation for localised flooding. There are opportunities for open space and it will integrate with Kaiapoi via transport links and reserves. The proposed development will significantly alter the site's rural character however some existing trees could be incorporated into reserves which would retain a connection to the original site's character.</p> <p>Adjoining land uses are currently residential to the north, farming to the east, and industrial to the south; however these will not cause adverse effects on residents of the site. The site is within the 50dBA and 55dBA Christchurch International Airport noise contour, however this contour covers a large proportion of</p>	Reject	Accept	Recommended for rejection for rezoning in s42A and Mr Carracanja test. Recommended for rezoning under Mr Fowler test	No under s42A report, yes under V1 right of reply in respect of rezoning

			<p>Kaiapoi thus would not create additional potential for reverse sensitivity. While the site's versatile soils would not be utilised for rural production, they could still be utilised by the development for reserves and gardens.</p> <p>The planning assessment concludes that the proposed rezoning of the site is generally consistent with relevant high-level policy of the Proposed District Plan. Demand for housing has grown significantly and it is necessary to develop additional blocks of land to enable housing choice and achieves Policy 1, 2, and 8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. The proposal partially aligns with the Draft National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land as the Waimakariri 2048 District Development Strategy identifies the sites for urban growth. In terms of consistency with the provisions of Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, while there is sufficient infrastructure capacity, and it will implement the requirements of consolidation and integration, it is inconsistent with the requirements for future residential development areas to be identified on Map A.</p> <p>Rezone the following properties from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pt RS 37428 (CB701/7) limited to the land to the west of the Main Trunk Railway Line; - RS 39673; and - Lot 1 DP 19366. <p>Refer to Plan A in full submission for map of area above. Refer to Attachment B for Development Area document, Outline Development Plan, and Planning Assessment.</p> <p>Refer to submission #332 lodged on the Proposed District Plan which contains this rezone request and supporting documentation.</p>				
FS 15	Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Accept	Reject		

13.2	Mike Greer Homes Ltd	Amend	<p>Amend to add in the proposed South Kaiapoi Development Area as an additional New Development Area. The site is located in an area in southern Kaiapoi to the east of Main North Road, west of railway line, and south of the Kaikanui Stream containing the following properties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pt RS 37428 (CB701/7) limited to the land to the west of the Main Trunk Railway Line; - RS 39673; and - Lot 1 DP 19366. <p>The 14ha site is referred to as the South Kaiapoi Development Area. Refer to full submission for Attachment A - location plan, Attachment B - draft chapter provisions, Outline Development Plan and a planning assessment. This site is the subject of submission #332 lodged by Mike Greer Homes Ltd on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>The land area generally satisfies relevant national, regional and district level policy. While the site is outside Kaiapoi's urban limits, it meets the relevant criteria for the residential growth of Kaiapoi as it adjoins the south-eastern boundary. It is a logical and efficient extension of the residential area of southern Kaiapoi, maintaining its compact nature. The proposed South Kaiapoi Outline Development Plan (refer to Attachment B) provides for integration of the development with Kaiapoi with transport links and reserves. The proposed Medium Density Residential Zone development will yield approximately 200 lots, resulting in improved housing choice for Kaiapoi.</p> <p>The proposed development will require upgrades to services and Main North Road access, and mitigation for localised flooding. There are opportunities for open space and it will integrate with Kaiapoi via transport links and reserves. The proposed development will significantly alter the site's rural character however some existing trees could be incorporated into reserves which would retain a connection to the original site's character.</p> <p>Adjoining land uses are currently residential to the north, farming to the east, and industrial to the south; however these will not cause adverse effects on residents of the site. The site is within the 50dBA and 55dBA Christchurch International Airport noise contour, however this contour covers a large proportion of Kaiapoi thus would not create additional potential for reverse sensitivity. While the site's versatile soils would not be utilised for rural production, they could still be utilised by the development for reserves and gardens.</p> <p>The planning assessment concludes that the proposed rezoning of the site is generally consistent with relevant high-level policy of the Proposed District Plan. Demand for housing has grown significantly and it is necessary to develop additional blocks of</p>	Reject	Accept	<p>Recommended for rejection for rezoning in s42A and Mr Carracanja test. Recommended for rezoning under Mr Fowler test</p>	<p>No under s42A report, yes under V1 right of reply in respect of rezoning</p>
------	----------------------	-------	---	--------	--------	---	---

			<p>land to enable housing choice and achieves Policy 1, 2, and 8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development. The proposal partially aligns with the Draft National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land as the Waimakariri 2048 District Development Strategy identifies the sites for urban growth. In terms of consistency with the provisions of Chapter 5 and Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, while there is sufficient infrastructure capacity, and it will implement the requirements of consolidation and integration, it is inconsistent with the requirements for future residential development areas to be identified on Map A.</p> <p>Add a new Residential Development Area (SK – South Kaiapoi Development Area) for South Kaiapoi over the following land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Pt RS 37428 (CB701/7) limited to the land to the west of the Main Trunk Railway Line- RS 39673- Lot 1 DP 19366 <p>Refer to Plan A in full submission for map of area above. Refer to Attachment B for Development Area document, Outline Development Plan, and Planning Assessment.</p> <p>Refer to submission #332 lodged on the Proposed District Plan which contains this rezone request and supporting documentation.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

14.1	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	<p>Opposes mandatory adoption of Medium Density Residential Standards [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] due to loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of current lifestyle, increased demand on infrastructure, and adverse effects on the environment and fauna.</p> <p>Council requires any development of this section of Kaiapoi [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] to include factors outlined in submitters submission on the Proposed District Plan, including an environmental corridor between the boundary of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive and the development.</p> <p>Council recognises that the land [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] being developed is part of the run-off from Sovereign Lakes and requires significant development to raise flooding/floor levels above sea level.</p> <p>Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.</p>	Reject		Variation 1 proposes that a qualifying matter - natural hazards (flooding) will address concerns of housing intensification in the Lees Rd, Kaiapoi area	No
14.2	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	<p>Opposes mandatory adoption of Medium Density Residential Standards [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] due to loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of current lifestyle, increased demand on infrastructure, and adverse effects on the environment and fauna.</p> <p>Council requires any development of this section of Kaiapoi [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] to include factors outlined in submitters submission on the Proposed District Plan, including an environmental corridor between the boundary of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive and the development.</p> <p>Council recognises that the land [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] being developed is part of the run-off from Sovereign Lakes and requires significant development to raise flooding/floor levels above sea level.</p> <p>Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.</p>	Reject		Variation 1 proposes that a qualifying matter - natural hazards (flooding) will address concerns of housing intensification in the Lees Rd, Kaiapoi area	No

14.3	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	<p>Opposes mandatory adoption of Medium Density Residential Standards [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] due to loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of current lifestyle, increased demand on infrastructure, and adverse effects on the environment and fauna.</p> <p>Council requires any development of this section of Kaiapoi [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] to include factors outlined in submitters submission on the Proposed District Plan, including an environmental corridor between the boundary of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive and the development.</p> <p>Council recognises that the land [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] being developed is part of the run-off from Sovereign Lakes and requires significant development to raise flooding/floor levels above sea level.</p> <p>Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.</p>	Reject		Variation 1 proposes that a qualifying matter - natural hazards (flooding) will address concerns of housing intensification in the Lees Rd, Kaiapoi area	No
14.4	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	<p>Opposes mandatory adoption of Medium Density Residential Standards [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] due to loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of current lifestyle, increased demand on infrastructure, and adverse effects on the environment and fauna.</p> <p>Council requires any development of this section of Kaiapoi [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] to include factors outlined in submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, including an environmental corridor between the boundary of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive and the development.</p> <p>Council recognises that the land [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] being developed is part of the run-off from Sovereign Lakes and requires significant development to raise flooding/floor levels above sea level.</p> <p>Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.</p>	Reject		Variation 1 proposes that a qualifying matter - natural hazards (flooding) will address concerns of housing intensification in the Lees Rd, Kaiapoi area	No

14.5	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	<p>Opposes mandatory adoption of Medium Density Residential Standards [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] due to loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of current lifestyle, increased demand on infrastructure, and adverse effects on the environment and fauna.</p> <p>Council requires any development of this section of Kaiapoi [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] to include factors outlined in submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, including an environmental corridor between the boundary of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive and the development.</p> <p>Council recognises that the land [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] being developed is part of the run-off from Sovereign Lakes and requires significant development to raise flooding/floor levels above sea level.</p> <p>Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.</p>	Reject		Variation 1 proposes that a qualifying matter - natural hazards (flooding) will address concerns of housing intensification in the Lees Rd, Kaiapoi area	No
14.6	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	<p>Opposes mandatory adoption of Medium Density Residential Standards [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] due to loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of current lifestyle, increased demand on infrastructure, and adverse effects on the environment and fauna.</p> <p>Council requires any development of this section of Kaiapoi [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] to include factors outlined in submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, including an environmental corridor between the boundary of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive and the development.</p> <p>Council recognises that the land [Lees Rd area, Kaiapoi, east of Sutherland Drive and Brockelbank Drive] being developed is part of the run-off from Sovereign Lakes and requires significant development to raise flooding/floor levels above sea level.</p> <p>Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.</p>	Reject		Variation 1 proposes that a qualifying matter - natural hazards (flooding) will address concerns of housing intensification in the Lees Rd, Kaiapoi area	No

15.1	Kaiapoi District Historical Society (KDHS)	Oppose	Concerned that heritage buildings may be demolished to make way for intensification in Kaiapoi, especially in Meadow St and the cottage at 259 Williams Street. Protect heritage buildings.	Reject		Heritage listed buildings are subject to a qualifying matter which limits density on that site, however, the qualifying matter itself does not limit or restrict landowner decisions to demolish or develop. The more appropriate constraints are the Historic Heritage provisions which set non-complying activity standard for demolition of heritage buildings	No
15.2	Kaiapoi District Historical Society (KDHS)	Oppose	Concerned that heritage buildings may be demolished to make way for intensification in Kaiapoi, especially in Meadow St and the cottage at 259 Williams Street. Protect heritage buildings.	Reject		Heritage listed buildings are subject to a qualifying matter which limits density on that site, however, the qualifying matter itself does not limit or restrict landowner decisions to demolish or develop. The more appropriate constraints are the Historic Heritage provisions which set non-complying activity standard for demolition of heritage buildings	No
16.1	Kerry Harbison	Oppose	Considers area near Kaiapoi town centre will be targeted for medium density residential development. Notes that once high density apartments appear in Christchurch, car parking issues result. Concerned about how emergency services can conduct call-outs within high density areas. Concerned about losing sunlight and privacy if a multi-storey development went up at neighbouring property. Notes that they moved to Kaiapoi for its small-town feel. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
16.2	Kerry Harbison	Oppose	Considers area near Kaiapoi town centre will be targeted for medium density residential development. Notes that once high density apartments appear in Christchurch, car parking issues result. Concerned about how emergency services can conduct call-outs within high density areas. Concerned about losing sunlight and privacy if a multi-storey development went up at neighbouring property. Notes that they moved to Kaiapoi for its small-town feel. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

16.3	Kerry Harbison	Oppose	Considers area near Kaiapoi town centre will be targeted for medium density residential development. Notes that once high density apartments appear in Christchurch, car parking issues result. Concerned about how emergency services can conduct call-outs within high density areas. Concerned about losing sunlight and privacy if a multi-storey development went up at neighbouring property. Notes that they moved to Kaiapoi for its small-town feel. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
16.4	Kerry Harbison	Oppose	Considers area near Kaiapoi town centre will be targeted for medium density residential development. Notes that once high density apartments appear in Christchurch, car parking issues result. Concerned about how emergency services can conduct call-outs within high density areas. Concerned about losing sunlight and privacy if a multi-storey development went up at neighbouring property. Notes that they moved to Kaiapoi for its small-town feel. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
16.5	Kerry Harbison	Oppose	Considers area near Kaiapoi town centre will be targeted for medium density residential development. Notes that once high density apartments appear in Christchurch, car parking issues result. Concerned about how emergency services can conduct call-outs within high density areas. Concerned about losing sunlight and privacy if a multi-storey development went up at neighbouring property. Notes that they moved to Kaiapoi for its small-town feel. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
17.1	Domett Properties Limited	Support	Supports Variation 1 in its entirety. Retain Variation 1 provisions as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			
18.1	Clampett Investments Limited	Support	Supports Variation 1 in its entirety. Retain Variation 1 provisions as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			

19.1	David Anthony and Coleen Jean White	Oppose	Opposes Variation 1 provisions. Considers the provisions should only apply to Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Town Centre Zones. Enabling the Medium Density Residential Standards within existing residential zones will degrade the existing social and environmental benefits of these areas. The community will not accept that greater housing or population density is necessary within their residential areas and that such development can occur uncontested. Infrastructure upgrades will be required to accommodate intensification. While developers pay financial contributions, it will ultimately be the ratepayer / Council that covers the area-wide infrastructure upgrade costs. Amend Variation 1 so the Medium Density Residential Standards only apply to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, and Town Centre Zones.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
FS 18	FS Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Oppose		Accept			
19.2	David Anthony and Coleen Jean White	Oppose	Opposes Variation 1 provisions. Considers the provisions should only apply to Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Town Centre Zones. Enabling the Medium Density Residential Standards within existing residential zones will degrade the existing social and environmental benefits of these areas. The community will not accept that greater housing or population density is necessary within their residential areas and that such development can occur uncontested. Infrastructure upgrades will be required to accommodate intensification. While developers pay financial contributions, it will ultimately be the ratepayer / Council that covers the area-wide infrastructure upgrade costs. Amend Variation 1 so the Medium Density Residential Standards only apply to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, and Town Centre Zones.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
19.3	David Anthony and Coleen Jean White	Oppose	Opposes Variation 1 provisions. Considers the provisions should only apply to Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Town Centre Zones. Enabling the Medium Density Residential Standards within existing residential zones will degrade the existing social and environmental benefits of these areas. The community will not accept that greater housing or population density is necessary within their residential areas and that such development can occur uncontested. Infrastructure upgrades will be required to accommodate intensification. While developers pay financial contributions, it will ultimately be the ratepayer / Council that covers the area-wide infrastructure upgrade costs. Amend Variation 1 so the Medium Density Residential Standards only apply to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, and Town Centre Zones.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No

19.4	David Anthony and Coleen Jean White	Oppose	Opposes Variation 1 provisions. Considers the provisions should only apply to Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Town Centre Zones. Enabling the Medium Density Residential Standards within existing residential zones will degrade the existing social and environmental benefits of these areas. The community will not accept that greater housing or population density is necessary within their residential areas and that such development can occur uncontested. Infrastructure upgrades will be required to accommodate intensification. While developers pay financial contributions, it will ultimately be the ratepayer / Council that covers the area-wide infrastructure upgrade costs. Amend Variation 1 so the Medium Density Residential Standards only apply to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, and Town Centre Zones.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specificzones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
19.5	David Anthony and Coleen Jean White	Oppose	Opposes Variation 1 provisions. Considers the provisions should only apply to Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, Town Centre Zones. Enabling the Medium Density Residential Standards within existing residential zones will degrade the existing social and environmental benefits of these areas. The community will not accept that greater housing or population density is necessary within their residential areas and that such development can occur uncontested. Infrastructure upgrades will be required to accommodate intensification. While developers pay financial contributions, it will ultimately be the ratepayer / Council that covers the area-wide infrastructure upgrade costs. Amend Variation 1 so the Medium Density Residential Standards only apply to the Neighbourhood Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone, and Town Centre Zones.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specificzones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No

2.2	Sara Raudsepp	Oppose	Opposes applicability of Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) to Meadow St, Kaiapoi as this area is Technical Category 3, has liquefaction susceptibility, high flood hazard and orange tsunami risk. Opposes how currently their neighbours can build a 2.5m internal fence that blocks sunlight to half their house, or cause light spill into their backyard, without obtaining their written approval to do so. Opposes MDRS allowance for 11m buildings that can be built without neighbour approval. Do not rezone an area of Kaiapoi prone to earthquake damage, liquefaction, flooding and tsunami. The existing infrastructure would not cope with intensification as this year our area's wastewater pipes have been blocked, there's been flooding, and the water supply has been chlorinated twice. Council are not listening. Landowners should not be forced to move to protect their sunlight and privacy due to the implementation of Medium Density Residential Standards.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
2.3	Sara Raudsepp	Oppose	Opposes MDRS allowance for 11m buildings that can be built without neighbour approval. Landowners should not be forced to move to protect their sunlight and privacy due to the implementation of Medium Density Residential Standards.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
2.4	Sara Raudsepp	Oppose	Opposes applicability of Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) to Meadow St, Kaiapoi as this area is Technical Category 3, has liquefaction susceptibility, high flood hazard and orange tsunami risk. Opposes how currently their neighbours can build a 2.5m internal fence that blocks sunlight to half their house, or cause light spill into their backyard, without obtaining their written approval to do so. Opposes MDRS allowance for 11m buildings that can be built without neighbour approval. Do not rezone an area of Kaiapoi prone to earthquake damage, liquefaction, flooding and tsunami. The existing infrastructure would not cope with intensification as this year our area's wastewater pipes have been blocked, there's been flooding, and the water supply has been chlorinated twice. Council are not listening. Landowners should not be forced to move to protect their sunlight and privacy due to the implementation of Medium Density Residential Standards.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

3.1	Waikura Community Development Trust - Heather Woods	Oppose	Requests amendment to allow the Medium Density Residential Standards that provide for three houses per property to apply to Oxford. Notes a shortage of accommodation in Oxford, Oxford's larger sized properties would accommodate three houses well, and Oxford's existing infrastructure. Single storey houses would be a good start. Alternatively, reduce the minimum lot size to enable subdivision of larger sections that are not well utilised.?Amend Variation 1 to allow the Medium Density Residential Standards that provide for three houses per property to apply to Oxford, in line with the Greater Urban Development Plan.	Reject		Oxford does not meet the definition of relevant residential zone as set out in s2 RMA, as it has less than 5000 people.	No
3.2	Waikura Community Development Trust - Heather Woods	Amend	Requests amendment to allow the Medium Density Residential Standards that provide for three houses per property to apply to Oxford. Notes a shortage of accommodation in Oxford, Oxford's larger sized properties would accommodate three houses well, and Oxford's existing infrastructure. Single storey houses would be a good start. Alternatively, reduce the minimum lot size to enable subdivision of larger sections that are not well utilised.?Amend Variation 1 to allow the Medium Density Residential Standards that provide for three houses per property to apply to Oxford, in line with the Greater Urban Development Plan.	Reject		Oxford does not meet the definition of relevant residential zone as set out in s2 RMA, as it has less than 5000 people.	No
3.3	Waikura Community Development Trust - Heather Woods	Amend	Requests amendment to allow the Medium Density Residential Standards that provide for three houses per property to apply to Oxford. Notes a shortage of accommodation in Oxford, Oxford's larger sized properties would accommodate three houses well, and Oxford's existing infrastructure. Single storey houses would be a good start. Alternatively, reduce the minimum lot size to enable subdivision of larger sections that are not well utilised.?Amend Variation 1 to allow the Medium Density Residential Standards that provide for three houses per property to apply to Oxford, in line with the Greater Urban Development Plan.	Reject		Oxford does not meet the definition of relevant residential zone as set out in s2 RMA, as it has less than 5000 people.	No

20.1	Kelvin Ashby	Amend	Providing for housing intensification within Woodend, Ravenswood, and Pegasus is outcome based and lacks common sense. Woodend, Ravenswood, and Pegasus are not one area; considering them as one area is just for the purpose of exceeding the population threshold for the intensification provisions. The population of Woodend is <2,800 and properties in Pegasus and Ravenswood has covenants limiting one residential unit per property. Thus the populations of Pegasus and Ravenswood are being used to legitimise intensification within Woodend. Amend Variation 1 to remove the areas of Woodend, Pegasus and Ravenswood.	Reject		Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.	No
FS 20	FS Woodend-Sefton Community Board	Support		Reject			
20.2	Kelvin Ashby	Oppose	Providing for housing intensification within Woodend, Ravenswood, and Pegasus is outcome based and lacks common sense. Woodend, Ravenswood, and Pegasus are not one area; considering them as one area is just for the purpose of exceeding the population threshold for the intensification provisions. The population of Woodend is <2,800 and properties in Pegasus and Ravenswood has covenants limiting one residential unit per property. Thus the populations of Pegasus and Ravenswood are being used to legitimise intensification within Woodend. Amend Variation 1 to remove the areas of Woodend, Pegasus, and Ravenswood.	Reject		Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.	No
21.1	Rae Wakefield-Jones	Oppose	Notes Pegasus' amenity and character in terms of open space and low rise development. Notes that the Medium Density Residential Standards may be suitable for central city areas. Not specified.	Reject		Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.	No
21.2	Rae Wakefield-Jones	Oppose	Notes Pegasus' amenity and character in terms of open space and low rise development. Notes that the Medium Density Residential Standards may be suitable for central city areas. Not specified.	Reject		Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.	No

21.3	Rae Wakefield-Jones		Notes Pegasus' amenity and character in terms of open space and low rise development. Notes that the Medium Density Residential Standards may be suitable for central city areas. Not specified.	Reject		Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.	No
21.4	Rae Wakefield-Jones		Notes Pegasus' amenity and character in terms of open space and low rise development. Notes that the Medium Density Residential Standards may be suitable for central city areas. Not specified.	Reject		Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.	No

22.1	Mark Day	Oppose	<p>Concerned that intensification of existing residential areas is questionable in terms of whether it would enhance an area's livability, and whether it would create distress for landowners both within and adjacent to such developments, and within a town generally. Intensification could create loss of light and privacy, increase noise and vehicle movements, cause parking issues, and affect road use and road safety.</p> <p>Concerned that rate payers will ultimately pay for the 'qualifying matters'. Considers that Councils seek to justify developments by contracting out the justification process to external consultants.</p> <p>Questions who will pay for the upgrade or provision of all types of infrastructure, including schools, to meet demand from the intensification. Questions how Council can produce a feasible Long Term Plan when it can't control impacts on existing infrastructure. Considers the Medium Density Residential Standards could be implemented with controlled impact if within New Development Areas where developers must fund the full extent of infrastructure costs, including both within the development and any external upgrades required.</p> <p>Considers that the Three Waters process showed that many Council's Long Term Plans are produced to meet governance requirements, not guide actual costs. Considers cost overruns are common within New Zealand Councils. Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
------	----------	--------	--	--------	--	--	----

22.2	Mark Day	Oppose	<p>Concerned that intensification of existing residential areas is questionable in terms of whether it would enhance an area's livability, and whether it would create distress for landowners both within and adjacent to such developments, and within a town generally. Intensification could create loss of light and privacy, increase noise and vehicle movements, cause parking issues, and affect road use and road safety. Concerned that rate payers will ultimately pay for the 'qualifying matters'. Considers that Councils seek to justify developments by contracting out the justification process to external consultants. Questions who will pay for the upgrade or provision of all types of infrastructure, including schools, to meet demand from the intensification. Questions how Council can produce a feasible Long Term Plan when it can't control impacts on existing infrastructure. Considers the Medium Density Residential Standards could be implemented with controlled impact if within New Development Areas where developers must fund the full extent of infrastructure costs, including both within the development and any external upgrades required. Considers that the Three Waters process showed how many Council's Long Term Plans are produced to meet governance requirements, not guide actual costs. Considers cost overruns are common within New Zealand Councils.</p> <p>Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
------	----------	--------	---	--------	--	--	----

22.3	Mark Day	Oppose	<p>Concerned that intensification of existing residential areas is questionable in terms of whether it would enhance an area's livability, and whether it would create distress for landowners both within and adjacent to such developments, and within a town generally. Intensification could create loss of light and privacy, increase noise and vehicle movements, cause parking issues, and affect road use and road safety. Concerned that rate payers will ultimately pay for the 'qualifying matters'. Considers that Councils seek to justify developments by contracting out the justification process to external consultants. Questions who will pay for the upgrade or provision of all types of infrastructure, including schools, to meet demand from the intensification. Questions how Council can produce a feasible Long Term Plan when it can't control impacts on existing infrastructure. Considers the Medium Density Residential Standards could be implemented with controlled impact if within New Development Areas where developers must fund the full extent of infrastructure costs, including both within the development and any external upgrades required. Considers that the Three Waters process showed how many Council's Long Term Plans are produced to meet governance requirements, not guide actual costs. Considers cost overruns are common within New Zealand Councils.</p> <p>Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
------	----------	--------	---	--------	--	--	----

22.4	Mark Day	Oppose	<p>Concerned that intensification of existing residential areas is questionable in terms of whether it would enhance an area's livability, and whether it would create distress for landowners both within and adjacent to such developments, and within a town generally. Intensification could create loss of light and privacy, increase noise and vehicle movements, cause parking issues, and affect road use and road safety. Concerned that rate payers will ultimately pay for the 'qualifying matters'. Considers that Councils seek to justify developments by contracting out the justification process to external consultants. Questions who will pay for the upgrade or provision of all types of infrastructure, including schools, to meet demand from the intensification. Questions how Council can produce a feasible Long Term Plan when it can't control impacts on existing infrastructure. Considers the Medium Density Residential Standards could be implemented with controlled impact if within New Development Areas where developers must fund the full extent of infrastructure costs, including both within the development and any external upgrades required. Considers that the Three Waters process showed how many Council's Long Term Plans are produced to meet governance requirements, not guide actual costs. Considers cost overruns are common within New Zealand Councils.</p> <p>Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
------	----------	--------	---	--------	--	--	----

22.5	Mark Day	Oppose	<p>Concerned that intensification of existing residential areas is questionable in terms of whether it would enhance an area's livability, and whether it would create distress for landowners both within and adjacent to such developments, and within a town generally. Intensification could create loss of light and privacy, increase noise and vehicle movements, cause parking issues, and affect road use and road safety. Concerned that rate payers will ultimately pay for the 'qualifying matters'. Considers that Councils seek to justify developments by contracting out the justification process to external consultants. Questions who will pay for the upgrade or provision of all types of infrastructure, including schools, to meet demand from the intensification. Questions how Council can produce a feasible Long Term Plan when it can't control impacts on existing infrastructure. Considers the Medium Density Residential Standards could be implemented with controlled impact if within New Development Areas where developers must fund the full extent of infrastructure costs, including both within the development and any external upgrades required. Considers that the Three Waters process showed how many Council's Long Term Plans are produced to meet governance requirements, not guide actual costs. Considers cost overruns are common within New Zealand Councils.</p> <p>Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.</p>	No
------	----------	--------	---	--------	--	---	----

22.6	Mark Day	Oppose	<p>Concerned that intensification of existing residential areas is questionable in terms of whether it would enhance an area's livability, and whether it would create distress for landowners both within and adjacent to such developments, and within a town generally. Intensification could create loss of light and privacy, increase noise and vehicle movements, cause parking issues, and affect road use and road safety. Concerned that rate payers will ultimately pay for the 'qualifying matters'. Considers that Councils seek to justify developments by contracting out the justification process to external consultants. Questions who will pay for the upgrade or provision of all types of infrastructure, including schools, to meet demand from the intensification. Questions how Council can produce a feasible Long Term Plan when it can't control impacts on existing infrastructure. Considers the Medium Density Residential Standards could be implemented with controlled impact if within New Development Areas where developers must fund the full extent of infrastructure costs, including both within the development and any external upgrades required. Considers that the Three Waters process showed how many Council's Long Term Plans are produced to meet governance requirements, not guide actual costs. Considers cost overruns are common within New Zealand Councils.</p> <p>Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
------	----------	--------	---	--------	--	--	----

23.1	John Colin Sewell	Oppose	Notes that Qualifying matters are the only provision Council has some discretion over within the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act 2021). Considers the Amendment Act 2021 is a reflex reaction to reduce urban sprawl and increase housing affordability specifically in Auckland and other major cities; its application to Waimakariri is inappropriate given its mix of urban and rural. Councils need to have some discretion in applying these nation-wide Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) within their local context. Opposes the MDRS for being insufficient. Specifically, they do not provide a minimum site size for a residential unit, it would be inappropriate to permit residential units on small sites as space is needed for parking and green space. This could result in deprived areas and associated social issues. The MDRS' lack of requirement for off-street parking or garages is unreasonable given each residential unit may have approximately two cars which could mean six or more cars per site. This could cause issues with road congestion, potential for increased vehicle vandalism, and issues for emergency and waste management services access. MRDS development will be out of character for the District's towns. Council oppose the mandatory imposition of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Amend Variation 1 to allow Council to: 1. Specify a minimum site size which is in keeping with the immediate residential area. 2. Require that developers provide for a minimum of one garage or off-street park per residential unit. 3. Apply discretion to modify or impose additional standards in keeping with the District Plan and community wishes, in addition to qualifying matters.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			

23.2	John Colin Sewell	Oppose	Notes that Qualifying matters are the only provision Council has some discretion over within the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act 2021). Considers the Amendment Act 2021 is a reflex reaction to reduce urban sprawl and increase housing affordability specifically in Auckland and other major cities; its application to Waimakariri is inappropriate given its mix of urban and rural. Councils need to have some discretion in applying these nation-wide Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) within their local context. Opposes the MDRS for being insufficient. Specifically, they do not provide a minimum site size for a residential unit, it would be inappropriate to permit residential units on small sites as space is needed for parking and green space. This could result in deprived areas and associated social issues. The MDRS' lack of requirement for off-street parking or garages is unreasonable given each residential unit may have approximately two cars which could mean six or more cars per site. This could cause issues with road congestion, potential for increased vehicle vandalism, and issues for emergency and waste management services access. MDRS development will be out of character for the District's towns. Council oppose the mandatory imposition of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Amend Variation 1 to allow Council to: 1. Specify a minimum site size which is in keeping with the immediate residential area. 2. Require that developers provide for a minimum of one garage or off-street park per residential unit. 3. Apply discretion to modify or impose additional standards in keeping with the District Plan and community wishes, in addition to qualifying matters.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			

23.3	John Colin Sewell	Oppose	Notes that Qualifying matters are the only provision Council has some discretion over within the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act 2021). Considers the Amendment Act 2021 is a reflex reaction to reduce urban sprawl and increase housing affordability specifically in Auckland and other major cities; its application to Waimakariri is inappropriate given its mix of urban and rural. Councils need to have some discretion in applying these nation-wide Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) within their local context. Opposes the MDRS for being insufficient. Specifically, they do not provide a minimum site size for a residential unit, it would be inappropriate to permit residential units on small sites as space is needed for parking and green space. This could result in deprived areas and associated social issues. The MDRS' lack of requirement for off-street parking or garages is unreasonable given each residential unit may have approximately two cars which could mean six or more cars per site. This could cause issues with road congestion, potential for increased vehicle vandalism, and issues for emergency and waste management services access. MDRS development will be out of character for the District's towns. Council oppose the mandatory imposition of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Amend Variation 1 to allow Council to: 1. Specify a minimum site size which is in keeping with the immediate residential area. 2. Require that developers provide for a minimum of one garage or off-street park per residential unit. 3. Apply discretion to modify or impose additional standards in keeping with the District Plan and community wishes, in addition to qualifying matters.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			

23.4	John Colin Sewell	Oppose	Notes that Qualifying matters are the only provision Council has some discretion over within the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act 2021). Considers the Amendment Act 2021 is a reflex reaction to reduce urban sprawl and increase housing affordability specifically in Auckland and other major cities; its application to Waimakariri is inappropriate given its mix of urban and rural. Councils need to have some discretion in applying these nation-wide Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) within their local context. Opposes the MDRS for being insufficient. Specifically, they do not provide a minimum site size for a residential unit, it would be inappropriate to permit residential units on small sites as space is needed for parking and green space. This could result in deprived areas and associated social issues. The MDRS' lack of requirement for off-street parking or garages is unreasonable given each residential unit may have approximately two cars which could mean six or more cars per site. This could cause issues with road congestion, potential for increased vehicle vandalism, and issues for emergency and waste management services access. MDRS development will be out of character for the District's towns. Council oppose the mandatory imposition of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Amend Variation 1 to allow Council to: 1. Specify a minimum site size which is in keeping with the immediate residential area. 2. Require that developers provide for a minimum of one garage or off-street park per residential unit. 3. Apply discretion to modify or impose additional standards in keeping with the District Plan and community wishes, in addition to qualifying matters.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			

23.5	John Colin Sewell	Oppose	<p>Notes that Qualifying matters are the only provision Council has some discretion over within the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act 2021). Considers the Amendment Act 2021 is a reflex reaction to reduce urban sprawl and increase housing affordability specifically in Auckland and other major cities; its application to Waimakariri is inappropriate given its mix of urban and rural. Councils need to have some discretion in applying these nation-wide Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) within their local context. Opposes the MDRS for being insufficient. Specifically, they do not provide a minimum site size for a residential unit, it would be inappropriate to permit residential units on small sites as space is needed for parking and green space. This could result in deprived areas and associated social issues. The MDRS' lack of requirement for off-street parking or garages is unreasonable given each residential unit may have approximately two cars which could mean six or more cars per site. This could cause issues with road congestion, potential for increased vehicle vandalism, and issues for emergency and waste management services access. MDRS development will be out of character for the District's towns. Council oppose the mandatory imposition of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS).</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to allow Council to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Specify a minimum site size which is in keeping with the immediate residential area. 2. Require that developers provide for a minimum of one garage or off-street park per residential unit. 3. Apply discretion to modify or impose additional standards in keeping with the District Plan and community wishes, in addition to qualifying matters. 	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			

23.6	John Colin Sewell	Oppose	Notes that Qualifying matters are the only provision Council has some discretion over within the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act 2021). Considers the Amendment Act 2021 is a reflex reaction to reduce urban sprawl and increase housing affordability specifically in Auckland and other major cities; its application to Waimakariri is inappropriate given its mix of urban and rural. Councils need to have some discretion in applying these nation-wide Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) within their local context. Opposes the MDRS for being insufficient. Specifically, they do not provide a minimum site size for a residential unit, it would be inappropriate to permit residential units on small sites as space is needed for parking and green space. This could result in deprived areas and associated social issues. The MDRS' lack of requirement for off-street parking or garages is unreasonable given each residential unit may have approximately two cars which could mean six or more cars per site. This could cause issues with road congestion, potential for increased vehicle vandalism, and issues for emergency and waste management services access. MDRS development will be out of character for the District's towns. Council oppose the mandatory imposition of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Amend Variation 1 to allow Council to: 1. Specify a minimum site size which is in keeping with the immediate residential area. 2. Require that developers provide for a minimum of one garage or off-street park per residential unit. 3. Apply discretion to modify or impose additional standards in keeping with the District Plan and community wishes, in addition to qualifying matters.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			

23.7	John Colin Sewell	Oppose	Notes that Qualifying matters are the only provision Council has some discretion over within the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Amendment Act 2021). Considers the Amendment Act 2021 is a reflex reaction to reduce urban sprawl and increase housing affordability specifically in Auckland and other major cities; its application to Waimakariri is inappropriate given its mix of urban and rural. Councils need to have some discretion in applying these nation-wide Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) within their local context. Opposes the MDRS for being insufficient. Specifically, they do not provide a minimum site size for a residential unit, it would be inappropriate to permit residential units on small sites as space is needed for parking and green space. This could result in deprived areas and associated social issues. The MDRS' lack of requirement for off-street parking or garages is unreasonable given each residential unit may have approximately two cars which could mean six or more cars per site. This could cause issues with road congestion, potential for increased vehicle vandalism, and issues for emergency and waste management services access. MDRS development will be out of character for the District's towns. Council oppose the mandatory imposition of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Amend Variation 1 to allow Council to: 1. Specify a minimum site size which is in keeping with the immediate residential area. 2. Require that developers provide for a minimum of one garage or off-street park per residential unit. 3. Apply discretion to modify or impose additional standards in keeping with the District Plan and community wishes, in addition to qualifying matters.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			
24.1	Karen May Friedauer	Oppose	Opposes standards relating to height in relation to boundary and setbacks as they do not consider potential loss of sunlight for adjoining properties. Amend qualifying matters to consider the importance of sunlight for new and existing houses in order to recognise its natural heating benefits, and that future conditions and price may limit electricity availability.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

24.2	Karen May Friedauer	Oppose	Opposes standards relating to height in relation to boundary and setbacks as they do not consider potential loss of sunlight for adjoining properties. Amend qualifying matters to consider the importance of sunlight for new and existing houses in order to recognise its natural heating benefits, and that future conditions and price may limit electricity availability.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
24.3	Karen May Friedauer	Oppose	Opposes standards relating to height in relation to boundary and setbacks as they do not consider potential loss of sunlight for adjoining properties. Amend qualifying matters to consider the importance of sunlight for new and existing houses in order to recognise its natural heating benefits, and that future conditions and price may limit electricity availability.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
24.4	Karen May Friedauer	Amend	Opposes standards relating to height in relation to boundary and setbacks as they do not consider potential loss of sunlight for adjoining properties. Amend qualifying matters to consider the importance of sunlight for new and existing houses in order to recognise its natural heating benefits, and that future conditions and price may limit electricity availability.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
25.1	Irene Rodgers	Oppose	Opposes the change enabling high-rise buildings on empty sections on either side of submitter's house. It will affect their enjoyment of life with added noise, loss of sunlight and would be an eyesore. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
25.2	Irene Rodgers	Oppose	Opposes the change enabling high-rise buildings on empty sections on either side of submitter's house. It will affect their enjoyment of life with added noise, loss of sunlight and would be an eyesore. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

26.1	Doncaster Development Ltd	Amend	<p>Requests a more appropriate provision for medium density housing for Rangiora that only applies to parts of the Rangiora located within walking distance, or 800m, from the town centre, and the balance of residential areas, including 260-282 Lehmans Rd and 32 Parrott Road, Rangiora ('the site'), being General Residential Zone. Requests Council identify parts of Rangiora that should remain General Residential Zone as a qualifying matter as a blanket approach to medium density housing is unsuitable in Rangiora's generally low density suburban environment with high standards of residential amenity and urban design. Medium density housing should be clustered in pedestrian proximity to the town centre and public transport hubs. However, if this is not possible, then its requested the site be considered within the scope of Variation 1 as if it was already General Residential Zone, not Large Lot Residential Zone. The submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan requested the site be rezoned General Residential Zone, and further supports this submission on Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 will not provide for Objective 1 and 2, and Policy 1, 3 and 4 of the Medium Density Residential Standards in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management Act 1991. Variation 1 is also inconsistent with the overall provisions of the Resource Management Act, and beyond the needs of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</p> <p>An Outline Development Plan and Zoning Map is provided in Attachment B (refer to full submission). A Infrastructure/Servicing Report is provided in Attachment C (refer to full submission) which outlines proposed earthworks and infrastructure required for the site's development. A Infrastructure Options Report is provided in Attachment D (refer to full submission) and concludes that flood hazard and utility servicing would not be impediments to development of the site to any reasonable density of residential development.</p> <p>Allow in full the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan and include 260-282 Lehmans Rd and 32 Parrott Road, Rangiora in the General Residential Zone, along with adjacent areas of Rangiora, if Variation 1 is appropriately modified to enable that outcome.</p> <p>Alternatively, rezone 260-282 Lehmans Rd and 32 Parrott Road, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone if Variation 1 proceeds in approximately its notified form.</p>	Accept in part, reject in relation to rezoning component	Accept for rezoning component	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
FS 2	FS Transpower	Oppose		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

26.2	Doncaster Development Ltd		<p>Requests a more appropriate provision for medium density housing for Rangiora that only applies to parts of the Rangiora located within walking distance, or 800m, from the town centre, and the balance of residential areas, including 260-282 Lehmans Rd and 32 Parrott Road, Rangiora ('the site'), being General Residential Zone.</p> <p>Requests Council identify parts of Rangiora that should remain General Residential Zone as a qualifying matter as a blanket approach to medium density housing is unsuitable in Rangiora's generally low density suburban environment with high standards of residential amenity and urban design. Medium density housing should be clustered in pedestrian proximity to the town centre and public transport hubs. However, if this is not possible, then its requested the site be considered within the scope of Variation 1 as if it was already General Residential Zone, not Large Lot Residential Zone.</p> <p>The submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan requested the site be rezoned General Residential Zone, and further supports this submission on Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 will not provide for Objective 1 and 2, and Policy 1, 3 and 4 of the Medium Density Residential Standards in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management At 1991. Variation 1 is also inconsistent with the overall provisions of the Resource Management Act, and beyond the needs of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</p> <p>An Outline Development Plan and Zoning Map is provided in Attachment B (refer to full submission). A Infrastructure/Servicing Report is provided in Attachment C (refer to full submission) which outlines proposed earthworks and infrastructure required for the site's development. A Infrastructure Options Report is provided in Attachment D (refer to full submission) and concludes that flood hazard and utility servicing would not be impediments to development of the site to any reasonable density of residential development.</p> <p>Allow in full the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan and include 260-282 Lehmans Rd and 32 Parrott Road, Rangiora in the General Residential Zone, along with adjacent areas of Rangiora, if Variation 1 is appropriately modified to enable that outcome.</p> <p>Alternatively, rezone 260-282 Lehmans Rd and 32 Parrott Road, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone if Variation 1 proceeds in approximately its notified form.</p>	Accept in part, reject in relation to rezoning component	Accept for rezoning component	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
FS 2	FS Transpower	Oppose		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

26.3	Doncaster Development Ltd		<p>Requests a more appropriate provision for medium density housing for Rangiora that only applies to parts of the Rangiora located within walking distance, or 800m, from the town centre, and the balance of residential areas, including 260-282 Lehmans Rd and 32 Parrott Road, Rangiora ('the site'), being General Residential Zone.</p> <p>Requests Council identify parts of Rangiora that should remain General Residential Zone as a qualifying matter as a blanket approach to medium density housing is unsuitable in Rangiora's generally low density suburban environment with high standards of residential amenity and urban design. Medium density housing should be clustered in pedestrian proximity to the town centre and public transport hubs. However, if this is not possible, then its requested the site be considered within the scope of Variation 1 as if it was already General Residential Zone, not Large Lot Residential Zone.</p> <p>The submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan requested the site be rezoned General Residential Zone, and further supports this submission on Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 will not provide for Objective 1 and 2, and Policy 1, 3 and 4 of the Medium Density Residential Standards in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management Act 1991. Variation 1 is also inconsistent with the overall provisions of the Resource Management Act, and beyond the needs of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</p> <p>An Outline Development Plan and Zoning Map is provided in Attachment B (refer to full submission). A Infrastructure/Servicing Report is provided in Attachment C (refer to full submission) which outlines proposed earthworks and infrastructure required for the site's development. A Infrastructure Options Report is provided in Attachment D (refer to full submission) and concludes that flood hazard and utility servicing would not be impediments to development of the site to any reasonable density of residential development.</p> <p>Allow in full the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan and include 260-282 Lehmans Rd and 32 Parrott Road, Rangiora in the General Residential Zone, along with adjacent areas of Rangiora, if Variation 1 is appropriately modified to enable that outcome.</p> <p>Alternatively, rezone 260-282 Lehmans Rd and 32 Parrott Road, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone if Variation 1 proceeds in approximately its notified form.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 2	FS Transpower	Oppose		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

27.1	Rawiri Graeme McKissock	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Government's undemocratic, forced, and mandatory application of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Considers the MDRS's lack of appeal rights undemocratic.</p> <p>Concerned about visual damage of landscapes, social erosion from possible tenement style housing, costs to ratepayers for increased demand on infrastructure services, and parking. Reject Medium Density Residential Standards in total, especially within Pegasus.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. It may apply 'qualifying matters' to limit the application of the MDRS, however, the submitter has requested the total rejection of the MDRS, which is not lawfully possible.	No
27.2	Rawiri Graeme McKissock	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Government's undemocratic, forced, and mandatory application of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Considers the MDRS's lack of appeal rights undemocratic.</p> <p>Concerned about visual damage of landscapes, social erosion from possible tenement style housing, costs to ratepayers for increased demand on infrastructure services, and parking. Reject Medium Density Residential Standards in total, especially within Pegasus.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. It may apply 'qualifying matters' to limit the application of the MDRS, however, the submitter has requested the total rejection of the MDRS, which is not lawfully possible.	No
27.3	Rawiri Graeme McKissock	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Government's undemocratic, forced, and mandatory application of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Considers the MDRS's lack of appeal rights undemocratic.</p> <p>Concerned about visual damage of landscapes, social erosion from possible tenement style housing, costs to ratepayers for increased demand on infrastructure services, and parking. Reject Medium Density Residential Standards in total, especially within Pegasus.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. It may apply 'qualifying matters' to limit the application of the MDRS, however, the submitter has requested the total rejection of the MDRS, which is not lawfully possible.	No

28.1	Rosalie Todd	Oppose	<p>Considers Rangiora a rural town comprising one or two-storey buildings which provides a unique atmosphere for the community landscape compared to an urban/cityscape. This character must be maintained at all costs; 3-storey buildings would not fit well within this rural landscape.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed three-storey buildings would create a loss of sunlight and an associated increased need for heating (which would be an issue for low-income residents), loss of privacy, restrictions on solar heating, and reduce amenity values. Considers off-street parking must be provided as car transport is part of the New Zealand lifestyle, especially in rural areas like Rangiora; also the bus is not easy for all residents, and electric cars need a place to be charged.</p> <p>Considers resource consent should be required to enable consultation with neighbours as these changes affect amenity and therefore property values.</p> <p>Concerned about the intensification affecting the social wellbeing of residents. Considers a two-storey height limit more appropriate, along with controls for such developments to be less encroaching for residents and consider resident well-being.</p> <p>Requests trees be retained within the streetscape to encourage birdlife and maintain amenity.</p> <p>Does not oppose intensification near transport hubs or central city areas allowing mixed commercial, shops and hospitality outlets with residential apartments above providing housing for people on limited outcomes, however this is not the style of a rural township. Suggests an increased required setback between boundaries to provide more privacy and sunlight if 12m buildings are enabled.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			

28.2	Rosalie Todd	Oppose	<p>Considers Rangiora a rural town comprising one or two-storey buildings which provides a unique atmosphere for the community landscape compared to an urban/cityscape. This character must be maintained at all costs; 3-storey buildings would not fit well within this rural landscape.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed three-storey buildings would create a loss of sunlight and an associated increased need for heating (which would be an issue for low-income residents), loss of privacy, restrictions on solar heating, and reduce amenity values. Considers off-street parking must be provided as car transport is part of the New Zealand lifestyle, especially in rural areas like Rangiora; also the bus is not easy for all residents, and electric cars need a place to be charged.</p> <p>Considers resource consent should be required to enable consultation with neighbours as these changes affect amenity and therefore property values.</p> <p>Concerned about the intensification affecting the social wellbeing of residents. Considers a two-storey height limit more appropriate, along with controls for such developments to be less encroaching for residents and consider resident well-being.</p> <p>Requests trees be retained within the streetscape to encourage birdlife and maintain amenity.</p> <p>Does not oppose intensification near transport hubs or central city areas allowing mixed commercial, shops and hospitality outlets with residential apartments above providing housing for people on limited outcomes, however this is not the style of a rural township. Suggests an increased required setback between boundaries to provide more privacy and sunlight if 12m buildings are enabled.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose					

28.3	Rosalie Todd	Oppose	<p>Considers Rangiora a rural town comprising one or two-storey buildings which provides a unique atmosphere for the community landscape compared to an urban/cityscape. This character must be maintained at all costs; 3-storey buildings would not fit well within this rural landscape.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed three-storey buildings would create a loss of sunlight and an associated increased need for heating (which would be an issue for low-income residents), loss of privacy, restrictions on solar heating, and reduce amenity values. Considers off-street parking must be provided as car transport is part of the New Zealand lifestyle, especially in rural areas like Rangiora; also the bus is not easy for all residents, and electric cars need a place to be charged.</p> <p>Considers resource consent should be required to enable consultation with neighbours as these changes affect amenity and therefore property values.</p> <p>Concerned about the intensification affecting the social wellbeing of residents. Considers a two-storey height limit more appropriate, along with controls for such developments to be less encroaching for residents and consider resident well-being.</p> <p>Requests trees be retained within the streetscape to encourage birdlife and maintain amenity.</p> <p>Does not oppose intensification near transport hubs or central city areas allowing mixed commercial, shops and hospitality outlets with residential apartments above providing housing for people on limited outcomes, however this is not the style of a rural township. Suggests an increased required setback between boundaries to provide more privacy and sunlight if 12m buildings are enabled.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose					

28.4	Rosalie Todd	Oppose	<p>Considers Rangiora a rural town comprising one or two-storey buildings which provides a unique atmosphere for the community landscape compared to an urban/cityscape. This character must be maintained at all costs; 3-storey buildings would not fit well within this rural landscape.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed three-storey buildings would create a loss of sunlight and an associated increased need for heating (which would be an issue for low-income residents), loss of privacy, restrictions on solar heating, and reduce amenity values. Considers off-street parking must be provided as car transport is part of the New Zealand lifestyle, especially in rural areas like Rangiora; also the bus is not easy for all residents, and electric cars need a place to be charged.</p> <p>Considers resource consent should be required to enable consultation with neighbours as these changes affect amenity and therefore property values.</p> <p>Concerned about the intensification affecting the social wellbeing of residents. Considers a two-storey height limit more appropriate, along with controls for such developments to be less encroaching for residents and consider resident well-being.</p> <p>Requests trees be retained within the streetscape to encourage birdlife and maintain amenity.</p> <p>Does not oppose intensification near transport hubs or central city areas allowing mixed commercial, shops and hospitality outlets with residential apartments above providing housing for people on limited outcomes, however this is not the style of a rural township. Suggests an increased required setback between boundaries to provide more privacy and sunlight if 12m buildings are enabled.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose					

28.5	Rosalie Todd	Oppose	<p>Considers Rangiora a rural town comprising one or two-storey buildings which provides a unique atmosphere for the community landscape compared to an urban/cityscape. This character must be maintained at all costs; 3-storey buildings would not fit well within this rural landscape.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed three-storey buildings would create a loss of sunlight and an associated increased need for heating (which would be an issue for low-income residents), loss of privacy, restrictions on solar heating, and reduce amenity values. Considers off-street parking must be provided as car transport is part of the New Zealand lifestyle, especially in rural areas like Rangiora; also the bus is not easy for all residents, and electric cars need a place to be charged.</p> <p>Considers resource consent should be required to enable consultation with neighbours as these changes affect amenity and therefore property values.</p> <p>Concerned about the intensification affecting the social wellbeing of residents. Considers a two-storey height limit more appropriate, along with controls for such developments to be less encroaching for residents and consider resident well-being.</p> <p>Requests trees be retained within the streetscape to encourage birdlife and maintain amenity.</p> <p>Does not oppose intensification near transport hubs or central city areas allowing mixed commercial, shops and hospitality outlets with residential apartments above providing housing for people on limited outcomes, however this is not the style of a rural township. Suggests an increased required setback between boundaries to provide more privacy and sunlight if 12m buildings are enabled.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose					

28.6	Rosalie Todd	Oppose	<p>Considers Rangiora a rural town comprising one or two-storey buildings which provides a unique atmosphere for the community landscape compared to an urban/cityscape. This character must be maintained at all costs; 3-storey buildings would not fit well within this rural landscape.</p> <p>Concerned that the proposed three-storey buildings would create a loss of sunlight and an associated increased need for heating (which would be an issue for low-income residents), loss of privacy, restrictions on solar heating, and reduce amenity values. Considers off-street parking must be provided as car transport is part of the New Zealand lifestyle, especially in rural areas like Rangiora; also the bus is not easy for all residents, and electric cars need a place to be charged.</p> <p>Considers resource consent should be required to enable consultation with neighbours as these changes affect amenity and therefore property values.</p> <p>Concerned about the intensification affecting the social wellbeing of residents. Considers a two-storey height limit more appropriate, along with controls for such developments to be less encroaching for residents and consider resident well-being.</p> <p>Requests trees be retained within the streetscape to encourage birdlife and maintain amenity.</p> <p>Does not oppose intensification near transport hubs or central city areas allowing mixed commercial, shops and hospitality outlets with residential apartments above providing housing for people on limited outcomes, however this is not the style of a rural township. Suggests an increased required setback between boundaries to provide more privacy and sunlight if 12m buildings are enabled.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose					
28.7	Rosalie Todd	Oppose	<p>Considers off-street parking must be provided as car transport is part of the New Zealand lifestyle, especially in rural areas like Rangiora; also the bus is not easy for all residents, and electric cars need a place to be charged.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not provide for assessment of car transport and car parking, except as a qualifying matter.	No
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose					

29.1	B and A Stokes	Amend	<p>Requests a more appropriate provision for medium density housing for Woodend/Ravenswood/Waikuku that only applies to parts of these areas located within walking distance, or 800m, from the town centre, and the balance of residential areas, including the approximately 144ha area of Gressons Road, Waikuku shown on page 1 of Attachment B (refer to full submission) ('the site'), being rezoned to General Residential Zone.</p> <p>Requests Council identify parts of Woodend/Ravenswood/Waikuku that should remain General Residential Zone as a qualifying matter as a blanket approach to medium density housing is unsuitable in these generally low-density suburban environments with high standards of residential amenity and urban design. Medium density housing should be clustered in pedestrian proximity to the town centre and public transport hubs. However, if this is not possible, the submitter requests the site be considered within the scope of Variation 1 as if it was already General Residential Zone. The submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan requested the site be rezoned General Residential Zone, and further supports this submission on Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 will not provide for Objective 1 and 2, and Policy 1, 3 and 4 of the Medium Density Residential Standards in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management Act 1991. Variation 1 is also inconsistent with the overall provisions of the Resource Management Act, and beyond the needs of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</p> <p>Refer to full submission for supporting documents including a background on the site's proposed development (Attachment B), which concludes the site's development would make a valuable contribution to the District's medium density residential growth, and is within an area already identified for growth, will consolidate development around Ravenswood's Key Activity Centre, and has no natural hazards that preclude the use of the land. Attachment C provides an Infrastructure Options Report which recommends the best options for water, wastewater, stormwater, power, and telecommunications. A proposed Zoning Map and Outline Development Plan is provided in Attachment D. Attachment E provides a Market Report which examines the site's development prospects. Attachment F provides a Landscape/Urban Design Assessment which examines the site's landscape character, its spatial character, and proposes an Outline Development Plan which integrates these elements. Requests that the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan be allowed in full and the site (the approximately 144ha area of Gressons Road, Waikuku shown on page 1 of Attachment B - refer to full submission), be rezoned General Residential Zone, along with adjacent residential areas of</p>	Accept in part, reject in relation to rezoning component	Accept for rezoning component	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
------	----------------	-------	--	--	-------------------------------	--	---

			<p>Ravenswood/Woodend/Waikuku, if Variation 1 is appropriately modified to enable that outcome.</p> <p>Alternatively, rezone the area of the site identified for General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone if Variation 1 proceeds in approximately its notified form.</p>				
FS 1	Ravenswood Developments Limited	Support	RDL agrees with the reasons set out in the submission, noting that there is a high demand for residentially zoned land at Woodend. Accept the submission for rezoning of land at Gressons Road to General Residential Zone.	Reject			
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Accept			

29.2	B and A Stokes	Amend	<p>Requests a more appropriate provision for medium density housing for Woodend/Ravenswood/Waikuku that only applies to parts of these areas located within walking distance, or 800m, from the town centre, and the balance of residential areas, including the approximately 144ha area of Gressons Road, Waikuku shown on page 1 of Attachment B (refer to full submission) ('the site'), being rezoned to General Residential Zone.</p> <p>Requests Council identify parts of Woodend/Ravenswood/Waikuku that should remain General Residential Zone as a qualifying matter as a blanket approach to medium density housing is unsuitable in these generally low-density suburban environments with high standards of residential amenity and urban design. Medium density housing should be clustered in pedestrian proximity to the town centre and public transport hubs. However, if this is not possible, the submitter requests the site be considered within the scope of Variation 1 as if it was already General Residential Zone. The submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan requested the site be rezoned General Residential Zone, and further supports this submission on Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 will not provide for Objective 1 and 2, and Policy 1, 3 and 4 of the Medium Density Residential Standards in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management Act 1991. Variation 1 is also inconsistent with the overall provisions of the Resource Management Act, and beyond the needs of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</p> <p>Refer to full submission for supporting documents including a background on the site's proposed development (Attachment B), which concludes the site's development would make a valuable contribution to the District's medium density residential growth, and is within an area already identified for growth, will consolidate development around Ravenswood's Key Activity Centre, and has no natural hazards that preclude the use of the land. Attachment C provides an Infrastructure Options Report which recommends the best options for water, wastewater, stormwater, power, and telecommunications. A proposed Zoning Map and Outline Development Plan is provided in Attachment D. Attachment E provides a Market Report which examines the site's development prospects. Attachment F provides a Landscape/Urban Design Assessment which examines the site's landscape character, its spatial character, and proposes an Outline Development Plan which integrates these elements. Requests that the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan be allowed in full and the site (the approximately 144ha area of Gressons Road, Waikuku shown on page 1 of Attachment B - refer to full submission), be rezoned General Residential Zone, along with adjacent residential areas of</p>	Accept in part, reject in relation to rezoning component	Accept for rezoning component	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
------	----------------	-------	--	--	-------------------------------	--	---

			<p>Ravenswood/Woodend/Waikuku, if Variation 1 is appropriately modified to enable that outcome.</p> <p>Alternatively, rezone the area of the site identified for General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone if Variation 1 proceeds in approximately its notified form.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

29.3	B and A Stokes	Amend	<p>Requests a more appropriate provision for medium density housing for Woodend/Ravenswood/Waikuku that only applies to parts of these areas located within walking distance, or 800m, from the town centre, and the balance of residential areas, including the approximately 144ha area of Gressons Road, Waikuku shown on page 1 of Attachment B (refer to full submission) ('the site'), being rezoned to General Residential Zone.</p> <p>Requests Council identify parts of Woodend/Ravenswood/Waikuku that should remain General Residential Zone as a qualifying matter as a blanket approach to medium density housing is unsuitable in these generally low-density suburban environments with high standards of residential amenity and urban design. Medium density housing should be clustered in pedestrian proximity to the town centre and public transport hubs. However, if this is not possible, the submitter requests the site be considered within the scope of Variation 1 as if it was already General Residential Zone. The submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan requested the site be rezoned General Residential Zone, and further supports this submission on Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 will not provide for Objective 1 and 2, and Policy 1, 3 and 4 of the Medium Density Residential Standards in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management Act 1991. Variation 1 is also inconsistent with the overall provisions of the Resource Management Act, and beyond the needs of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.</p> <p>Refer to full submission for supporting documents including a background on the site's proposed development (Attachment B), which concludes the site's development would make a valuable contribution to the District's medium density residential growth, and is within an area already identified for growth, will consolidate development around Ravenswood's Key Activity Centre, and has no natural hazards that preclude the use of the land. Attachment C provides an Infrastructure Options Report which recommends the best options for water, wastewater, stormwater, power, and telecommunications. A proposed Zoning Map and Outline Development Plan is provided in Attachment D. Attachment E provides a Market Report which examines the site's development prospects. Attachment F provides a Landscape/Urban Design Assessment which examines the site's landscape character, its spatial character, and proposes an Outline Development Plan which integrates these elements. Requests that the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan be allowed in full and the site (the approximately 144ha area of Gressons Road, Waikuku shown on page 1 of Attachment B - refer to full submission), be rezoned General Residential Zone, along with adjacent residential areas of</p>	Accept in part, reject in relation to rezoning component	Accept for rezoning component	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
------	----------------	-------	--	--	-------------------------------	--	---

			<p>Ravenswood/Woodend/Waikuku, if Variation 1 is appropriately modified to enable that outcome.</p> <p>Alternatively, rezone the area of the site identified for General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone if Variation 1 proceeds in approximately its notified form.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

30.1	Woolworths New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Considers the Proposed District Plan falls short of its strategic directions towards self-sufficiency, does not address its National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) requirements in relation to housing or business growth, significantly limits opportunity for business activity, and undermines the ability to deliver well-functioning urban environments within Commercial and Mixed Use Zones (CMUZ) at scale and intensity to satisfy demand. Considers Variation 1 exacerbates these concerns through a lack of proportionate intensification in business and employment growth.</p> <p>Supports the building height limit increases in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone however considers this is not sufficient in response to NPS-UD obligations in respect of commercial activity to support a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p>Notes with the introduction of some new objectives and policies affects the numbering of provisions addressed in the submitter's submissions on the Proposed District Plan. Supports SD-02 added via Variation 1 as it supports consistency in delivering well-functioning urban environments through increased and aspirational business growth. Continues to support SD-03 (which was previously SD-02 in the notified Proposed District Plan).</p> <p>Considers that Variation 1 does not provide opportunities for business activities to establish and prosper within a network of business and industrial areas zoned appropriate to their type and scale of activity to support district self-sufficiency (as per SD-03) as it does not release any new commercial land use and supply and the Proposed District Plan continues to direct, limit and control that supply.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 does not give effect to the relevant provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), particularly Policy 6.3.6(4), which seeks to implement a more responsive 'centres plus' approach to commercial activity in Greater Christchurch.</p> <p>Considers that Variation 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD, which seeks well-functioning urban environments (Objective 1) through enabling urban environments to develop and change in a responsive manner (Objective 4) and requires provisions that have particular regard to providing choice (Policy 1). Considers that Variation 1 is not appropriate in terms of sections 32, 74 and 75 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and does not achieve Part 2.</p> <p>Concerned that the District is forecast to fall short in commercial land supply by 17ha over the long term, with potential shortfalls in the short term and medium term of 5ha and 9ha respectively. Thus Variation 1, along with the Proposed District Plan, needs to rezone appropriately to accommodate anticipated commercial growth and to achieve the goal of District self-sufficiency.</p> <p>Seeks consideration of more aspirational zoning provisions for business growth, utilising the strategic process of a District Plan review process to comprehensively and sustainably plan for, and</p>	Accept in part		Mr Willis has recommended commercial and industrial zone rezonings that address the shortfall identified by the submitter.	
------	----------------------------	-------	---	----------------	--	--	--

			<p>enable, growth. Seeks the same relief as that requested on the submitter's submissions on the Proposed District Plan (refer to Appendix 1 of the submission on the Proposed District Plan). Seeks clarification and necessary amendments to Variation 1 to address the matters outlined in this submission.</p>				
FS 4	FS Nicky Cassidy	Support		Accept			

30.2	Woolworths New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Supports the building height limit increases in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone however considers this is not sufficient in response to NPS-UD obligations in respect of commercial activity to support a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p>Considers the Proposed District Plan falls short of its strategic directions towards self-sufficiency, does not address its National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) requirements in relation to housing or business growth, significantly limits opportunity for business activity, and undermines the ability to deliver well-functioning urban environments within Commercial and Mixed Use Zones (CMUZ) at scale and intensity to satisfy demand. Considers Variation 1 exacerbates these concerns through a lack of proportionate intensification in business and employment growth.</p> <p>Notes with the introduction of some new objectives and policies affects the numbering of provisions addressed in the submitter's submissions on the Proposed District Plan. Supports SD-02 added via Variation 1 as it supports consistency in delivering well-functioning urban environments through increased and aspirational business growth. Continues to support SD-03 (which was previously SD-02 in the notified Proposed District Plan). Considers that Variation 1 does not provide opportunities for business activities to establish and prosper within a network of business and industrial areas zoned appropriate to their type and scale of activity to support district self-sufficiency (as per SD-03) as it does not release any new commercial land use and supply and the Proposed District Plan continues to direct, limit and control that supply.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 does not give effect to the relevant provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), particularly Policy 6.3.6(4), which seeks to implement a more responsive 'centres plus' approach to commercial activity in Greater Christchurch.</p> <p>Considers that Variation 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD, which seeks well-functioning urban environments (Objective 1) through enabling urban environments to develop and change in a responsive manner (Objective 4) and requires provisions that have particular regard to providing choice (Policy 1). Considers that Variation 1 is not appropriate in terms of sections 32, 74 and 75 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and does not achieve Part 2.</p> <p>Concerned that the District is forecast to fall short in commercial land supply by 17ha over the long term, with potential shortfalls in the short term and medium term of 5ha and 9ha respectively. Thus Variation 1, along with the Proposed District Plan, needs to rezone appropriately to accommodate anticipated commercial growth and to achieve the goal of District self-sufficiency.</p> <p>Seeks consideration of more aspirational zoning provisions for business growth, utilising the strategic process of a District Plan review process to comprehensively and sustainably plan for, and</p>	Accept in part		Mr Willis has recommended commercial and industrial zone rezonings that address the shortfall identified by the submitter.	
------	----------------------------	-------	--	----------------	--	--	--

			<p>enable, growth. Seeks the same relief as that requested on the submitter's submissions on the Proposed District Plan (refer to Appendix 1 of the submission on the Proposed District Plan). Seeks clarification and necessary amendments to Variation 1 to address the matters outlined in this submission.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

30.3	Woolworths New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Supports the building height limit increases in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone however considers this is not sufficient in response to NPS-UD obligations in respect of commercial activity to support a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p>Considers the Proposed District Plan falls short of its strategic directions towards self-sufficiency, does not address its National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) requirements in relation to housing or business growth, significantly limits opportunity for business activity, and undermines the ability to deliver well-functioning urban environments within Commercial and Mixed Use Zones (CMUZ) at scale and intensity to satisfy demand. Considers Variation 1 exacerbates these concerns through a lack of proportionate intensification in business and employment growth.</p> <p>Notes with the introduction of some new objectives and policies affects the numbering of provisions addressed in the submitter's submissions on the Proposed District Plan. Supports SD-02 added via Variation 1 as it supports consistency in delivering well-functioning urban environments through increased and aspirational business growth. Continues to support SD-03 (which was previously SD-02 in the notified Proposed District Plan). Considers that Variation 1 does not provide opportunities for business activities to establish and prosper within a network of business and industrial areas zoned appropriate to their type and scale of activity to support district self-sufficiency (as per SD-03) as it does not release any new commercial land use and supply and the Proposed District Plan continues to direct, limit and control that supply.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 does not give effect to the relevant provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), particularly Policy 6.3.6(4), which seeks to implement a more responsive 'centres plus' approach to commercial activity in Greater Christchurch.</p> <p>Considers that Variation 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD, which seeks well-functioning urban environments (Objective 1) through enabling urban environments to develop and change in a responsive manner (Objective 4) and requires provisions that have particular regard to providing choice (Policy 1). Considers that Variation 1 is not appropriate in terms of sections 32, 74 and 75 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and does not achieve Part 2.</p> <p>Concerned that the District is forecast to fall short in commercial land supply by 17ha over the long term, with potential shortfalls in the short term and medium term of 5ha and 9ha respectively. Thus Variation 1, along with the Proposed District Plan, needs to rezone appropriately to accommodate anticipated commercial growth and to achieve the goal of District self-sufficiency.</p> <p>Seeks consideration of more aspirational zoning provisions for business growth, utilising the strategic process of a District Plan review process to comprehensively and sustainably plan for, and</p>	Accept in part		Mr Willis has recommended commercial and industrial zone rezonings that address the shortfall identified by the submitter.	
------	----------------------------	-------	--	----------------	--	--	--

			<p>enable, growth. Seeks the same relief as that requested on the submitter's submissions on the Proposed District Plan (refer to Appendix 1 of the submission on the Proposed District Plan). Seeks clarification and necessary amendments to Variation 1 to address the matters outlined in this submission.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

30.4	Woolworths New Zealand Ltd	<p>Considers the Proposed District Plan falls short of its strategic directions towards self-sufficiency, does not address its National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) requirements in relation to housing or business growth, significantly limits opportunity for business activity, and undermines the ability to deliver well-functioning urban environments within Commercial and Mixed Use Zones (CMUZ) at scale and intensity to satisfy demand. Considers Variation 1 exacerbates these concerns through a lack of proportionate intensification in business and employment growth.</p> <p>Supports the building height limit increases in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone and Local Centre Zone however considers this is not sufficient in response to NPS-UD obligations in respect of commercial activity to support a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p>Notes with the introduction of some new objectives and policies affects the numbering of provisions addressed in the submitter's submissions on the Proposed District Plan. Supports SD-02 added via Variation 1 as it supports consistency in delivering well-functioning urban environments through increased and aspirational business growth. Continues to support SD-03 (which was previously SD-02 in the notified Proposed District Plan).</p> <p>Considers that Variation 1 does not provide opportunities for business activities to establish and prosper within a network of business and industrial areas zoned appropriate to their type and scale of activity to support district self-sufficiency (as per SD-03) as it does not release any new commercial land use and supply and the Proposed District Plan continues to direct, limit and control that supply.</p> <p>Considers Variation 1 does not give effect to the relevant provisions of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), particularly Policy 6.3.6(4), which seeks to implement a more responsive 'centres plus' approach to commercial activity in Greater Christchurch.</p> <p>Considers that Variation 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD, which seeks well-functioning urban environments (Objective 1) through enabling urban environments to develop and change in a responsive manner (Objective 4) and requires provisions that have particular regard to providing choice (Policy 1). Considers that Variation 1 is not appropriate in terms of sections 32, 74 and 75 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and does not achieve Part 2.</p> <p>Concerned that the District is forecast to fall short in commercial land supply by 17ha over the long term, with potential shortfalls in the short term and medium term of 5ha and 9ha respectively. Thus Variation 1, along with the Proposed District Plan, needs to rezone appropriately to accommodate anticipated commercial growth and to achieve the goal of District self-sufficiency.</p> <p>Seeks consideration of more aspirational zoning provisions for business growth, utilising the strategic process of a District Plan review process to comprehensively and sustainably plan for, and</p>	Accept in part		Mr Willis has recommended commercial and industrial zone rezonings that address the shortfall identified by the submitter.	
------	----------------------------	---	----------------	--	--	--

			<p>enable, growth. Seeks the same relief as that requested on the submitter's submissions on the Proposed District Plan (refer to Appendix 1 of the submission on the Proposed District Plan). Seeks clarification and necessary amendments to Variation 1 to address the matters outlined in this submission.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

31.1	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Concerned that implementation of the MDRS would exacerbate issues during an emergency evacuation situation, such as a tsunami, given the single road in and out of Pegasus. Also concerned MDRS implementation would exacerbate pressure on roadside parking, create black ice, frost and greasy road hazards, and create wind tunnels due to the tall buildings.</p> <p>Concerned implementation of the MDRS will exacerbate flood hazard given Pegasus' high water table, then compromise infrastructure and create further natural hazards (e.g. Kuta St flooding into Pegasus Main Street).</p> <p>Concerned that the implementation of the MDRS will affect Pegasus' unique character and detract from it being a model provincial town for the future. Medium density housing will detract from Pegasus' beauty and its label of 'a model provincial town for the future'. Pegasus is unique in that it is effectively trapped in its own cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Supports the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) regulations applying to large block of land owned by the developer around Hodgkinsons and Solander Roads and Infinity Drive, however, opposes application of MDRS for any other Pegasus sections.</p> <p>Notes Pegasus was included in the MDRS by virtue of combining its population with the populations of Ravenswood and Woodend in order to exceed the 5000 population threshold for the MDRS to apply. Requests an explanation for this calculation method.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.</p>	No
FS 20	FS Woodend-Sefton Community Board	Support		Reject			

31.2	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Concerned that implementation of the MDRS would exacerbate issues during an emergency evacuation situation, such as a tsunami, given the single road in and out of Pegasus. Also concerned MDRS implementation would exacerbate pressure on roadside parking, create black ice, frost and greasy road hazards, and create wind tunnels due to the tall buildings.</p> <p>Concerned implementation of the MDRS will exacerbate flood hazard given Pegasus' high water table, then compromise infrastructure and create further natural hazards (e.g. Kuta St flooding into Pegasus Main Street).</p> <p>Concerned that the implementation of the MDRS will affect Pegasus' unique character and detract from it being a model provincial town for the future. Medium density housing will detract from Pegasus' beauty and its label of 'a model provincial town for the future'. Pegasus is unique in that it is effectively trapped in its own cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Supports the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) regulations applying to large block of land owned by the developer around Hodgkinsons and Solander Roads and Infinity Drive, however, opposes application of MDRS for any other Pegasus sections.</p> <p>Notes Pegasus was included in the MDRS by virtue of combining its population with the populations of Ravenswood and Woodend in order to exceed the 5000 population threshold for the MDRS to apply. Requests an explanation for this calculation method.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.</p>	No
31.3	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Concerned that the implementation of the MDRS will affect Pegasus' unique character and detract from it being a model provincial town for the future. Medium density housing will detract from Pegasus' beauty and its label of 'a model provincial town for the future'. Pegasus is unique in that it is effectively trapped in its own cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Supports the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) regulations applying to large block of land owned by the developer around Hodgkinsons and Solander Roads and Infinity Drive, however, opposes application of MDRS for any other Pegasus sections.</p> <p>Notes Pegasus was included in the MDRS by virtue of combining its population with the populations of Ravenswood and Woodend in order to exceed the 5000 population threshold for the MDRS to apply. Requests an explanation for this calculation method.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.</p>	No

31.4	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Concerned that implementation of the MDRS would exacerbate issues during an emergency evacuation situation, such as a tsunami, given the single road in and out of Pegasus. Also concerned MDRS implementation would exacerbate pressure on roadside parking, create black ice, frost and greasy road hazards, and create wind tunnels due to the tall buildings.</p> <p>Concerned implementation of the MDRS will exacerbate flood hazard given Pegasus' high water table, then compromise infrastructure and create further natural hazards (e.g. Kuta St flooding into Pegasus Main Street).</p> <p>Medium density housing will detract from Pegasus' beauty and its label of 'a model provincial town for the future'. Pegasus is unique in that it is effectively trapped in its own cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Supports the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) regulations applying to large block of land owned by the developer around Hodgkinsons and Solander Roads and Infinity Drive, however, opposes application of MDRS for any other Pegasus sections.</p> <p>Notes Pegasus was included in the MDRS by virtue of combining its population with the populations of Ravenswood and Woodend in order to exceed the 5000 population threshold for the MDRS to apply. Requests an explanation for this calculation method.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.</p> <p>Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.</p>	No
------	--------------------------------------	--------	---	--------	--	---	----

31.5	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Concerned that implementation of the MDRS would exacerbate issues during an emergency evacuation situation, such as a tsunami, given the single road in and out of Pegasus. Also concerned MDRS implementation would exacerbate pressure on roadside parking, create black ice, frost and greasy road hazards, and create wind tunnels due to the tall buildings.</p> <p>Concerned implementation of the MDRS will exacerbate flood hazard given Pegasus' high water table, then compromise infrastructure and create further natural hazards (e.g. Kuta St flooding into Pegasus Main Street).</p> <p>Concerned that the implementation of the MDRS will affect Pegasus' unique character and detract from it being a model provincial town for the future. Medium density housing will detract from Pegasus' beauty and its label of 'a model provincial town for the future'. Pegasus is unique in that it is effectively trapped in its own cul-de-sac.</p> <p>Supports the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) regulations applying to large block of land owned by the developer around Hodgkinsons and Solander Roads and Infinity Drive, however, opposes application of MDRS for any other Pegasus sections.</p> <p>Notes Pegasus was included in the MDRS by virtue of combining its population with the populations of Ravenswood and Woodend in order to exceed the 5000 population threshold for the MDRS to apply. Requests an explanation for this calculation method.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre.</p>	No
32.1	Margaret Patricia Noonan	Oppose	<p>Opposes Variation 1 due to the adverse effects on neighbouring properties and communities. Concerned that three-storey developments would change the character of areas and adversely affect an adjoining property's sunlight, outlook, and property value.</p> <p>Suggests construction of multiple single-storey houses on larger properties in Specific areas surrounded by green space (to support well-being), would be a better form of intensification for Waimakariri; instead of randomly throughout existing areas and affecting existing communities and infrastructure. Notes that many of Rangiora's residents moved there for its small-town lifestyle.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to restrict Medium Density Residential Zone to Specific areas, and surrounded by green space.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. It may apply 'qualifying matters' to limit the application of the MDRS, however, the submitter has requested the total rejection of the MDRS, which is not lawfully possible.</p>	No

32.2	Margaret Patricia Noonan	Oppose	<p>Opposes Variation 1 due to the adverse effects on neighbouring properties and communities. Concerned that three-storey developments would change the character of areas and adversely affect an adjoining property's sunlight, outlook, and property value.</p> <p>Suggests construction of multiple single-storey houses on larger properties in Specificareas surrounded by green space (to support well-being), would be a better form of intensification for Waimakariri; instead of randomly throughout existing areas and affecting existing communities and infrastructure. Notes that many of Rangiora's residents moved there for its small-town lifestyle.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to restrict Medium Density Residential Zone to Specificareas, and surrounded by green space.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specificzones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. It may apply 'qualifying matters' to limit the application of the MDRS, however, the submitter has requested the total rejection of the MDRS, which is not lawfully possible.</p>	No
32.3	Margaret Patricia Noonan	Oppose	<p>Opposes Variation 1 due to the adverse effects on neighbouring properties and communities. Concerned that three-storey developments would change the character of areas and adversely affect an adjoining property's sunlight, outlook, and property value.</p> <p>Suggests construction of multiple single-storey houses on larger properties in Specificareas surrounded by green space (to support well-being), would be a better form of intensification for Waimakariri; instead of randomly throughout existing areas and affecting existing communities and infrastructure. Notes that many of Rangiora's residents moved there for its small-town lifestyle.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to restrict Medium Density Residential Zone to Specificareas, and surrounded by green space.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specificzones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. It may apply 'qualifying matters' to limit the application of the MDRS, however, the submitter has requested the total rejection of the MDRS, which is not lawfully possible.</p>	No
32.4	Margaret Patricia Noonan	Oppose	<p>Opposes Variation 1 due to the adverse effects on neighbouring properties and communities. Concerned that three-storey developments would change the character of areas and adversely affect an adjoining property's sunlight, outlook, and property value.</p> <p>Suggests construction of multiple single-storey houses on larger properties in Specificareas surrounded by green space (to support well-being), would be a better form of intensification for Waimakariri; instead of randomly throughout existing areas and affecting existing communities and infrastructure. Notes that many of Rangiora's residents moved there for its small-town lifestyle.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to restrict Medium Density Residential Zone to Specificareas, and surrounded by green space.</p>	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specificzones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. It may apply 'qualifying matters' to limit the application of the MDRS, however, the submitter has requested the total rejection of the MDRS, which is not lawfully possible.</p>	No

32.5	Margaret Patricia Noonan	Oppose	<p>Opposes Variation 1 due to the adverse effects on neighbouring properties and communities. Concerned that three-storey developments would change the character of areas and adversely affect an adjoining property's sunlight, outlook, and property value.</p> <p>Suggests construction of multiple single-storey houses on larger properties in Specificareas surrounded by green space (to support well-being), would be a better form of intensification for Waimakariri; instead of randomly throughout existing areas and affecting existing communities and infrastructure. Notes that many of Rangiora's residents moved there for its small-town lifestyle.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to restrict Medium Density Residential Zone to Specificareas, and surrounded by green space.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specificzones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. It may apply 'qualifying matters' to limit the application of the MDRS, however, the submitter has requested the total rejection of the MDRS, which is not lawfully possible.	No
33.1	Rachel Louise Malloch		<p>Requests amendment to Variation 1 that reflects the protection of trees, birds, and insects. Notes how higher buildings have caused travelling bird populations to change their flight paths, and increased traffic from intensification reduced natural nesting. Values, and has been enhancing, natural habitat for owl, herons, and lizards. Notes Te Kohanga infers a nursery of life and the submitter has witnessed the creation of many chicks, new born lizards, rabbits and fish.</p> <p>Supports development potential provided by Variation 1 for property at Te Kohanga Drive, Pegasus however seeks clarity on development requirements and restrictions given context of this property. The submitter underestimated the size of buildings on Te Kohanga Drive and their effect on the neighbourhood rate increases and sale prices.</p> <p>Concerned that 12m buildings would create road corridors that do not provide for natural light, bird migration, and natural habitat. Such matters need to be considered within Variation 1 given the impacts of climate change. Requests the use of trees to mitigate global warming be included in the legislation to allow all citizens, including animal and plant life, protection and cultural heritage recognition.</p> <p>Supports Variation 1 given the benefits of the development potential however requests adequate amendments that consider character and cultural environmental values to increase the strength of Variation 1.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, not for the reasons specified by this submitter, but which may address in part some of the concerns the submitter has about effects of 12m buildings on road corridors	Yes

33.2	Rachel Louise Malloch		<p>Requests amendment to Variation 1 that reflects the protection of trees, birds, and insects. Notes how higher buildings have caused travelling bird populations to change their flight paths, and increased traffic from intensification reduced natural nesting. Values, and has been enhancing, natural habitat for owl, herons, and lizards. Notes Te Kohanga infers a nursery of life and the submitter has witnessed the creation of many chicks, new born lizards, rabbits and fish.</p> <p>Supports development potential provided by Variation 1 for property at Te Kohanga Drive, Pegasus however seeks clarity on development requirements and restrictions given context of this property. The submitter underestimated the size of buildings on Te Kohanga Drive and their effect on the neighbourhood rate increases and sale prices.</p> <p>Concerned that 12m buildings would create road corridors that do not provide for natural light, bird migration, and natural habitat. Such matters need to be considered within Variation 1 given the impacts of climate change. Requests the use of trees to mitigate global warming be included in the legislation to allow all citizens, including animal and plant life, protection and cultural heritage recognition.</p> <p>Supports Variation 1 given the benefits of the development potential however requests adequate amendments that consider character and cultural environmental values to increase the strength of Variation 1.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, not for the reasons specified by this submitter, but which may address in part some of the concerns the submitter has about effects of 12m buildings on road corridors	Yes
------	-----------------------	--	--	----------------	--	---	-----

34.1	Janette Avery	Oppose	<p>Opposes blanket approach of Medium Density Residential Standards applying to a range of areas. Considers Variation 1 is not in accordance with the ideals of planning as it seeks to apply provisions appropriate for a large city, to rural towns. Every area has its unique context which should be the basis of any planning in that area.</p> <p>Opposes rezoning of General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone as this is inappropriate.</p> <p>Notes the region is subject to earthquakes, and flood hazard (which has been exacerbated by climate change). Stormwater infrastructure would not function effectively if additional housing is added and permeable surfaces reduced. Services can be easily disrupted by earthquakes, and an increased population would only increase difficulties with life preservation and sanitation.</p> <p>Notes recent subdivisions have provided for greater housing density with the option of smaller sections and areas for two-to-three-storey apartments appropriately located near public amenity areas.</p> <p>Concerned that multiple 11m high units within an existing subdivision would affect sunlight levels (for providing heat and light) and outlook for neighbouring houses, which could affect the desirability and value of these properties and the neighbourhood. Infill housing could destroy Rangiora's attractive developments that make it a good place to live. Rangiora needs to maintain its rural town character; it is not a city. Reject Variation 1.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
FS 18	FS Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Oppose		Reject			

34.2	Janette Avery	Oppose	<p>Opposes blanket approach of Medium Density Residential Standards applying to a range of areas. Considers Variation 1 is not in accordance with the ideals of planning as it seeks to apply provisions appropriate for a large city, to rural towns. Every area has its unique context which should be the basis of any planning in that area.</p> <p>Opposes rezoning of General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone as this is inappropriate.</p> <p>Notes the region is subject to earthquakes, and flood hazard (which has been exacerbated by climate change). Stormwater infrastructure would not function effectively if additional housing is added and permeable surfaces reduced. Services can be easily disrupted by earthquakes, and an increased population would only increase difficulties with life preservation and sanitation.</p> <p>Notes recent subdivisions have provided for greater housing density with the option of smaller sections and areas for two-to-three-storey apartments appropriately located near public amenity areas.</p> <p>Concerned that multiple 11m high units within an existing subdivision would affect sunlight levels (for providing heat and light) and outlook for neighbouring houses, which could affect the desirability and value of these properties and the neighbourhood. Infill housing could destroy Rangiora's attractive developments that make it a good place to live. Rangiora needs to maintain its rural town character; it is not a city. Reject Variation 1.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
34.3	Janette Avery	Oppose	<p>Concerned that multiple 11m high units within an existing subdivision would affect sunlight levels (for providing heat and light) and outlook for neighbouring houses, which could affect the desirability and value of these properties and the neighbourhood. Infill housing could destroy Rangiora's attractive developments that make it a good place to live. Rangiora needs to maintain its rural town character; it is not a city.</p> <p>Opposes blanket approach of Medium Density Residential Standards applying to a range of areas. Considers Variation 1 is not in accordance with the ideals of planning as it seeks to apply provisions appropriate for a large city, to rural towns. Every area has its unique context which should be the basis of any planning in that area. Reject Variation 1.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

34.4	Janette Avery	Oppose	<p>Opposes blanket approach of Medium Density Residential Standards applying to a range of areas. Considers Variation 1 is not in accordance with the ideals of planning as it seeks to apply provisions appropriate for a large city, to rural towns. Every area has its unique context which should be the basis of any planning in that area.</p> <p>Opposes rezoning of General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone as this is inappropriate.</p> <p>Notes the region is subject to earthquakes, and flood hazard (which has been exacerbated by climate change). Stormwater infrastructure would not function effectively if additional housing is added and permeable surfaces reduced. Services can be easily disrupted by earthquakes, and an increased population would only increase difficulties with life preservation and sanitation.</p> <p>Notes recent subdivisions have provided for greater housing density with the option of smaller sections and areas for two-to-three-storey apartments appropriately located near public amenity areas.</p> <p>Concerned that multiple 11m high units within an existing subdivision would affect sunlight levels (for providing heat and light) and outlook for neighbouring houses, which could affect the desirability and value of these properties and the neighbourhood. Infill housing could destroy Rangiora's attractive developments that make it a good place to live. Rangiora needs to maintain its rural town character; it is not a city. Reject Variation 1.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
35.1	Elisabeth and Alphons Sanders	Oppose	<p>Opposes high density housing on the outskirts of towns; suggests Council direct housing intensification closer to town centres and the amenities there. Reject Variation 1.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS in all relevant residential zones and has no discretion on where to apply it	No
35.2	Elisabeth and Alphons Sanders	Oppose	<p>Opposes high density housing on the outskirts of towns; suggests Council direct housing intensification closer to town centres and the amenities there. Reject Variation 1.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS in all relevant residential zones and has no discretion on where to apply it	No
36.1	Greg and Diane Lowe	Oppose	<p>Concerned about the potential for a three-storey building to be built on the north side of an existing house without approval from the residents/owners of the existing house. Three-storey houses should not be permitted on the north side of an existing residence, or only be allowed on the north side of an east/west street. Considers developers should pay compensation to the neighbouring owner(s) for the consequential reduction in property values, established by an independent property valuer. Amend Variation 1 to reflect submitter's submission.</p>	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

36.2	Greg and Diane Lowe	Oppose	Concerned about the potential for a three-storey building to be built on the north side of an existing house without approval from the residents/owners of the existing house. Three-storey houses should not be permitted on the north side of an existing residence, or only be allowed on the north side of an east/west street. Considers developers should pay compensation to the neighbouring owner(s) for the consequential reduction in property values, established by an independent property valuer. Amend Variation 1 to reflect submitter's submission.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
37.1	Nick and Cilla Taylor	Oppose	Supports the need to facilitate housing intensification to improve the sustainable use of resources and provide a range of housing types. Opposes Variation 1's blanket approach for housing intensification rezoning all General Residential Zone areas in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, and Pegasus to Medium Density Residential Zone as this leaves housing intensification decisions with the market in a piecemeal manner and removes the ability of Council to direct the location. Notes that abundant analysis and experience in Aotearoa New Zealand show that housing intensification is best located considering the provision of supporting infrastructure such as public transport, roading, parking, three waters, commercial centres, recreation facilities, and greenspace. Considers Council needs to decide on housing intensification strategically, as provided for in the Proposed District Plan. Suggests use of a nuanced approach to intensification over time directed by District Plans, including assessment of proposals with public input. Decline Variation 1 and amend the provisions for intensification to have a more Specificstrategic direction.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS in all relevant residential zones and has no discretion on where to apply it	No
FS 18	FS Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Oppose		Reject			

37.2	Nick and Cilla Taylor	Oppose	<p>Supports the need to facilitate housing intensification to improve the sustainable use of resources and provide a range of housing types.</p> <p>Opposes Variation 1's blanket approach for housing intensification rezoning all General Residential Zone areas in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, and Pegasus to Medium Density Residential Zone as this leaves housing intensification decisions with the market in a piecemeal manner and removes the ability of Council to direct the location.</p> <p>Notes that abundant analysis and experience in Aotearoa New Zealand show that housing intensification is best located considering the provision of supporting infrastructure such as public transport, roading, parking, three waters, commercial centres, recreation facilities, and greenspace.</p> <p>Considers Council needs to decide on housing intensification strategically, as provided for in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Suggests use of a nuanced approach to intensification over time directed by District Plans, including assessment of proposals with public input.</p> <p>Decline Variation 1 and amend the provisions for intensification to have a more Specificstrategic direction.</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS in all relevant residential zones and has no discretion on where to apply it	No
38.1	Gavin Court	Oppose	<p>Queried the effect of Variation 1 on subdivision requirements at community consultation session and was told by Council staff that subdivision consents would require the erection of dwellings before approval could be given. Seeks clarification on this as it does not appear to be a reasonable interpretation, or intention, of Variation 1.</p> <p>Seeks assurance from Council that the opinion given by the Council staff member detailed above was incorrect or misunderstood and that subdivisions can be undertaken without the erection of dwellings. It is reasonable to accept that any subdivision consent application should include an at least indicative illustration that the proposed lots can accommodate the dwelling design and location standards included in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p>	Accept in part		Subdivision consents do not require the erection of dwellings before approval can be given. For vacant sites, SUB-R2 requires that subdivision consents are accompanied by a land use application that demonstrates it is practical to construct as a permitted activity, or simply that it is practicable to construct a residential unit there according to the relevant built form standards and with no vacant lots.	No

38.2	Gavin Court		<p>Notes there is currently a continuous reserve or pathway around Lake Pegasus, except for the section north of the 'Good Home' restaurant and up to the main bridge. Seeks that a reserve area is protected to cover this gap, such as via a designation, or by excluding the area from the zone, or by covenant on the title (with owners' approval). Suggest consultation with the owners. Offers to supply sketches or photos if considered helpful. Secure reserve status of identified land [area of Lake Pegasus lake front reserve north of the 'Good Home' restaurant and up to the main bridge].</p>	Reject		<p>This land is currently zoned as a mixture of commercial and residential, and is owned by Templeton Investments Ltd, the primary developer of Pegasus</p>	No
39.1	Foodstuffs South Island Ltd and Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Ltd		<p>Generally supports the housing intensification provisions, and recognises the need for housing intensification to be located around commercial centres. Particularly interested in how Variation 1 affects New World Kaiapoi, New World Rangiora and Pak'n'Save. Rangiora properties as these properties partly adjoin Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). Seeks appropriate recognition for commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and associated effects through the objectives and policies framework to ensure future compatibility between activities; particularly in terms of any effects on residential amenity for new MDRZ developments locating near commercial centres and existing commercial operations to avoid reverse sensitivity issues.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification's increase in density, reduced setbacks, and removal of viewshaft minimums will increase surrounding resident's exposure to the effects of the commercial environment thus making existing, acceptable effects such as noise, light and traffic felt more significantly by newly exposed residents. Concerned that these changes were not anticipated when these areas were zoned for commercial activities and/or where commercial activities were established in commercial areas and existing lawfully established activities may find themselves in situations where breaches occur.</p> <p>Supports the management of zone interfaces and considers this should be managed from both directions to ensure that activities within differing zones are appropriate. Considers appropriate recognition for existing commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and their interaction with the MDRZ has not been properly evaluated in the Variation 1 Section 32 Report, or appropriately provided for in MDRZ provisions to ensure future compatibility. Considers MRZ-P1(4) does not reflect the location of medium-density living close to commercial centres and adjacent to supermarkets and other commercial activities.</p> <p>Supports the objectives and policies of Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ-O1(3) and LFRZ-P1, as they appropriately reflect the intensity and character of the retail development on the surrounding environment. Considers the MDRZ objectives and</p>	Reject		<p>As per pg 26 of Variation 1 Right of Reply. The NPSUD Policy 3 boundary interface has been addressed, however, I consider that the submitters' relief relates primarily to matters of reverse sensitivity and changes in amenity at the boundary, which I consider is inconsistent with Objective 4 and Policy 6 NPSUD</p>	No

			<p>policies are not similarly responsive to the effects of medium-density housing on the adjacent zones. Supermarkets have Specificoperational and functional requirements which include delivery vehicles movements and associated noise (including during night-time hours); large store sizes; generators and other specialised equipment; car park, signs and lighting to ensure the safety and security. Such operations were established in accordance with zone provisions and/or resource consent decisions, and in response to the receiving environment at the time. Providing for future compatibility of the residential zone - commercial zone interface now will manage expectations and reduce future monitoring and compliance costs.</p> <p>Notes that the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) seeks well-functioning urban environments which includes the need to have or enable a variety of sites suitable for different business sectors. Policy 2 of the NPS-UD requires local authorities to provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet the expected demand for business land over the short, medium and long term that meets the demands of a variety of business sectors. Concerned that Variation 1 could have the unintended consequence of constraining the efficient use of business land.</p> <p>Considers there should be express recognition of the effects of residential intensification near existing commercial activities, and cannot be restricted and Opposed in future by new neighbouring MDRZ residents expecting an unrealistic amenity, e.g. "Where new residential activity in the MDRZ locates in close proximity to commercial centres and lawfully established commercial activities it is recognised that this may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people (due to hours of operation, noise, lighting, traffic from commercial activities) but this is not to be considered an adverse effect."</p> <p>Amend to include provisions which explicitly recognise the existing amenity effects of adjacent commercial activities to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); and any other amendments which ensure operational and functional needs of existing lawfully established activities are not hindered or constrained in future by new residential development in the MDRZ.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to reflect the matters raised in submission.</p>				
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

39.2	Foodstuffs South Island Ltd and Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Ltd	<p>Generally supports the housing intensification provisions, and recognises the need for housing intensification to be located around commercial centres. Particularly interested in how Variation 1 affects New World Kaiapoi, New World Rangiora and Pak'n'Save. Rangiora properties as these properties partly adjoin Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). Seeks appropriate recognition for commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and associated effects through the objectives and policies framework to ensure future compatibility between activities; particularly in terms of any effects on residential amenity for new MDRZ developments locating near commercial centres and existing commercial operations to avoid reverse sensitivity issues.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification's increase in density, reduced setbacks, and removal of viewshaft minimums will increase surrounding resident's exposure to the effects of the commercial environment thus making existing, acceptable effects such as noise, light and traffic felt more significantly by newly exposed residents. Concerned that these changes were not anticipated when these areas were zoned for commercial activities and/or where commercial activities were established in commercial areas and existing lawfully established activities may find themselves in situations where breaches occur.</p> <p>Supports the management of zone interfaces and considers this should be managed from both directions to ensure that activities within differing zones are appropriate. Considers appropriate recognition for existing commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and their interaction with the MDRZ has not been properly evaluated in the Variation 1 Section 32 Report, or appropriately provided for in MDRZ provisions to ensure future compatibility. Considers MRZ-P1(4) does not reflect the location of medium-density living close to commercial centres and adjacent to supermarkets and other commercial activities.</p> <p>Supports the objectives and policies of Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ-O1(3) and LFRZ-P1, as they appropriately reflect the intensity and character of the retail development on the surrounding environment. Considers the MDRZ objectives and policies are not similarly responsive to the effects of medium-density housing on the adjacent zones. Supermarkets have Specificoperational and functional requirements which include delivery vehicles movements and associated noise (including during night-time hours); large store sizes; generators and other specialised equipment; car park, signs and lighting to ensure the safety and security. Such operations were established in accordance with zone provisions and/or resource consent decisions, and in response to the receiving environment at the time. Providing for future compatibility of the residential zone - commercial zone interface now will manage expectations and reduce future monitoring and compliance costs.</p>	Reject		As per pg 26 of Variation 1 Right of Reply. The NPSUD Policy 3 boundary interface has been addressed, however, I consider that the submitters' relief relates primarily to matters of reverse sensitivity and changes in amenity at the boundary, which I consider is inconsistent with Objective 4 and Policy 6 NPSUD	No
------	--	---	--------	--	--	----

			<p>Notes that the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) seeks well-functioning urban environments which includes the need to have or enable a variety of sites suitable for different business sectors. Policy 2 of the NPS-UD requires local authorities to provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet the expected demand for business land over the short, medium and long term that meets the demands of a variety of business sectors. Concerned that Variation 1 could have the unintended consequence of constraining the efficient use of business land.</p> <p>Considers there should be express recognition of the effects of residential intensification near existing commercial activities, and cannot be restricted and Opposed in future by new neighbouring MDRZ residents expecting an unrealistic amenity, e.g. "Where new residential activity in the MDRZ locates in close proximity to commercial centres and lawfully established commercial activities it is recognised that this may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people (due to hours of operation, noise, lighting, traffic from commercial activities) but this is not to be considered an adverse effect."</p> <p>Amend to include provisions which explicitly recognise the existing amenity effects of adjacent commercial activities to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); and any other amendments which ensure operational and functional needs of existing lawfully established activities are not hindered or constrained in future by new residential development in the MDRZ.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to reflect the matters raised in submission.</p>				
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

39.3	Foodstuffs South Island Ltd and Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Ltd	<p>Considers MRZ-P1(4) does not reflect the location of medium-density living close to commercial centres and adjacent to supermarkets and other commercial activities. Supports the management of zone interfaces and considers this should be managed from both directions to ensure that activities within differing zones are appropriate. Considers appropriate recognition for existing commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and their interaction with the MDRZ has not been properly evaluated in the Variation 1 Section 32 Report, or appropriately provided for in MDRZ provisions to ensure future compatibility.</p> <p>Supports the objectives and policies of Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ-O1(3) and LFRZ-P1, as they appropriately reflect the intensity and character of the retail development on the surrounding environment. Considers the MDRZ objectives and policies are not similarly responsive to the effects of medium-density housing on the adjacent zones. Supermarkets have Specificoperational and functional requirements which include delivery vehicles movements and associated noise (including during night-time hours); large store sizes; generators and other specialised equipment; car park, signs and lighting to ensure the safety and security. Such operations were established in accordance with zone provisions and/or resource consent decisions, and in response to the receiving environment at the time. Providing for future compatibility of the residential zone - commercial zone interface now will manage expectations and reduce future monitoring and compliance costs.</p> <p>Generally supports the housing intensification provisions, and recognises the need for housing intensification to be located around commercial centres. Particularly interested in how Variation 1 affects New World Kaiapoi, New World Rangiora and Pak'n'Save. Rangiora properties as these properties partly adjoin Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). Seeks appropriate recognition for commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and associated effects through the objectives and policies framework to ensure future compatibility between activities; particularly in terms of any effects on residential amenity for new MDRZ developments locating near commercial centres and existing commercial operations to avoid reverse sensitivity issues.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification's increase in density, reduced setbacks, and removal of viewshaft minimums will increase surrounding resident's exposure to the effects of the commercial environment thus making existing, acceptable effects such as noise, light and traffic felt more significantly by newly exposed residents. Concerned that these changes were not anticipated when these areas were zoned for commercial activities and/or where commercial activities were established in commercial areas and existing lawfully established activities may find</p>	Reject		As per pg 26 of Variation 1 Right of Reply. The NPSUD Policy 3 boundary interface has been addressed, however, I consider that the submitters' relief relates primarily to matters of reverse sensitivity and changes in amenity at the boundary, which I consider is inconsistent with Objective 4 and Policy 6 NPSUD	No
------	--	--	--------	--	--	----

			<p>themselves in situations where breaches occur.</p> <p>Notes that the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) seeks well-functioning urban environments which includes the need to have or enable a variety of sites suitable for different business sectors. Policy 2 of the NPS-UD requires local authorities to provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet the expected demand for business land over the short, medium and long term that meets the demands of a variety of business sectors. Concerned that Variation 1 could have the unintended consequence of constraining the efficient use of business land.</p> <p>Considers there should be express recognition of the effects of residential intensification near existing commercial activities, and cannot be restricted and Opposed in future by new neighbouring MDRZ residents expecting an unrealistic amenity, e.g. "Where new residential activity in the MDRZ locates in close proximity to commercial centres and lawfully established commercial activities it is recognised that this may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people (due to hours of operation, noise, lighting, traffic from commercial activities) but this is not to be considered an adverse effect."</p> <p>Amend to include provisions which explicitly recognise the existing amenity effects of adjacent commercial activities to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); and any other amendments which ensure operational and functional needs of existing lawfully established activities are not hindered or constrained in future by new residential development in the MDRZ.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to reflect the matters raised in submission.</p>				
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
4.1	Phil Harbison	Oppose	Opposes multiple high rise buildings in this location [Hills St, Kaiapoi], which may result in outcomes like the 'projects' seen in European communities. Prefers existing small community. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
4.2	Phil Harbison	Oppose	Opposes multiple high rise buildings in this location [Hills St, Kaiapoi], which may result in outcomes like the 'projects' seen in European communities. Prefers existing small community. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
4.3	Phil Harbison	Oppose	Opposes multiple high rise buildings in this location [Hills St, Kaiapoi], which may result in outcomes like the 'projects' seen in European communities. Prefers existing small community. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
4.4	Phil Harbison	Oppose	Opposes multiple high rise buildings in this location [Hills St, Kaiapoi], which may result in outcomes like the 'projects' seen in European communities. Prefers existing small community. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

40.1	Ben Dormer	Amend	<p>Rezone 70 Oxford Road, Rangiora (0.81ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) to yield 15 residential lots which would contribute towards meeting Rangiora's housing needs. It will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes and will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment. Adverse effects will be minimal and mitigatable.</p> <p>The site is a logical and preferred location for Rangiora's urban growth as it adjoins existing urban development to the north and east and is located within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area (FDA). The FDAs for Rangiora need to be rezoned now give effect to the NPS-UD and address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land. The NPS-UD requires provision of at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected housing demand in the medium term and this must be zoned and infrastructure ready; thus Council must rezone the site to MDRZ.</p> <p>Notes that Variation 1 only proposes to rezone 86ha of FDA land at south-west Rangiora and north-east Rangiora in the ownership of just two developers, with a yield of approximately 1000 households, which favours these developers and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD's direction to promote a competitive land market. It is also inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in both the short and medium term, given there are an estimated 13,500 additional dwellings required for the period up to 2051.</p> <p>Rezoning the site is appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth of Rangiora and to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD), will give effect to Policy 12 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), will be consistent with the objectives and policies of Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development Chapters of the Proposed District Plan, and consistent with, and the most appropriate, efficient, and effective means of achieving the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991. The alternatives of retaining General Rural or Large Lot Residential zones across the site are not an efficient use of land and do not give effect to Change 1 of CRPS, or the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Rezone 70 Oxford Road, Rangiora (0.81ha) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
FS 19	FS R J Paterson Family Trust	Allow		Reject	Accept		

40.2	Ben Dormer	Amend	<p>Amend SD-03 in order to help to enable the submitter's request to rezone 70 Oxford Road, Rangiora (0.81ha) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone, and amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to identify all residential areas as Medium Residential Density and consequential amendments to the ODP narrative and other related provisions.</p> <p>Amend SD-03: "Urban development and infrastructure that:...</p> <p>4. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to as a minimum achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1."</p>	Reject		Amending the SD objective does not assist with the submitters rezoning request as the strategic objectives not not override the relevant chapter provisions, specifically the objectives and policies which set up the zones. This rezoning request will be considered in the rezoning hearings.	No
40.3	Ben Dormer	Amend	<p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan to identify all residential areas as Medium Residential Density and consequential changes to the ODP narrative and other related provisions.</p> <p>Rezone 70 Oxford Road, Rangiora (0.81ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) to yield 15 residential lots which would contribute towards meeting Rangiora's housing needs. It will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes and will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment. Adverse effects will be minimal and mitigatable.</p> <p>The site is a logical and preferred location for Rangiora's urban growth as it adjoins existing urban development to the north and east and is located within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area (FDA). The FDAs for Rangiora need to be rezoned now give effect to the NPS-UD and address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land. The NPS-UD requires provision of at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected housing demand in the medium term and this must be zoned and infrastructure ready; thus Council must rezone the site to MDRZ.</p> <p>Notes that Variation 1 only proposes to rezone 86ha of FDA land at south-west Rangiora and north-east Rangiora in the ownership of just two developers, with a yield of approximately 1000 households, which favours these developers and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD's direction to promote a competitive land market. It is also inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in both the short and medium term, given there are an estimated 13,500 additional dwellings required for the period up to 2051.</p> <p>Rezoning the site is appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth of Rangiora and to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD), will give effect to Policy 12 of the Canterbury Regional Policy</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation

			<p>Statement (CRPS), will be consistent with the objectives and policies of Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development Chapters of the Proposed District Plan, and consistent with, and the most appropriate, efficient, and effective means of achieving the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991. The alternatives of retaining General Rural or Large Lot Residential zones across the site are not an efficient use of land and do not give effect to Change 1 of CRPS, or the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to identify all residential areas as Medium Residential Density and consequential changes to the ODP narrative and other related provisions.</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

41.1	Julie Power	Oppose	<p>This new proposal conflicts with Pegasus Town Covenants which are supposed to protect Pegasus residents from this very thing. Submitter built in Pegasus with confidence that they would be protected by the covenants. If the developers do not enforce them it falls to the private individual to do so which is expensive, time consuming and stressful. New developers and existing landowners could end up in legal battles, and going to arbitration can be a very lengthy and costly process. Covenants are legally binding and Courts in NZ have an obligation to enforce if bought before them. All could be avoided if the Council objects to the governments ruling on these grounds. Statistics NZ describe Pegasus as a small urban area. The population at the 2018 census was 2,637. This new proposal was intended for areas of over 5000 or more as at 2018 census. Questions why Pegasus was included together with Ravenswood and Woodend and thinks Pegasus should be excluded. The medium density residential standards will enable up to three houses up to 3 storeys high, per site for a potential of 12 plus people and cars. Questions where they will park in the narrow streets of Pegasus. There is an abundance of land in the South Island which could be designed for this proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reject the governments Housing Intensification MDRS rules. 2. Eliminate Pegasus from this Variation 1:Housing Intensification. 	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specificzones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre. However, I note that that MDRS provisions do not override covenants.</p>	No
FS 20	FS Woodend-Sefton Community Board	Support		Reject			

41.2	Julie Power	Oppose	<p>This new proposal conflicts with Pegasus Town Covenants which are supposed to protect Pegasus residents from this very thing. Submitter built in Pegasus with confidence that they would be protected by the covenants. If the developers do not enforce them it falls to the private individual to do so which is expensive, time consuming and stressful. New developers and existing landowners could end up in legal battles, and going to arbitration can be a very lengthy and costly process. Covenants are legally binding and Courts in NZ have an obligation to enforce if bought before them. All could be avoided if the Council objects to the governments ruling on these grounds. Statistics NZ describe Pegasus as a small urban area. The population at the 2018 census was 2,637. This new proposal was intended for areas of over 5000 or more as at 2018 census. Questions why Pegasus was included together with Ravenswood and Woodend and thinks Pegasus should be excluded. The medium density residential standards will enable up to three houses up to 3 storeys high, per site for a potential of 12 plus people and cars. Questions where they will park in the narrow streets of Pegasus. There is an abundance of land in the South Island which could be designed for this proposal.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reject the governments Housing Intensification MDRS rules. 2. Eliminate Pegasus from this Variation 1: Housing Intensification. 	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specificzones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre. However, I note that that MDRS provisions do not override covenants.</p>	No
41.3	Julie Power	Oppose	<p>The medium density residential standards will enable up to three houses up to 3 storeys high, per site for a potential of 12 plus people and cars. Questions where they will park in the narrow streets of Pegasus.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Reject the governments Housing Intensification MDRS rules. 2. Eliminate Pegasus from this Variation 1:Housing Intensification. 	Reject		<p>Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specificzones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies. Ravenswood, Woodend, and Pegasus have been included as a single residential area within Variation 1 as a requirement of Map A, Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which defines that area as an urban area with a single Key Activity Centre. However, I note that that MDRS provisions do not override covenants.</p>	No

42.1	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Generally supports introductory text that sets out qualifying matters.</p> <p>Considers the reasoning in Table RSL-1 does not make it clear how reducing minimum lot sizes will protect the National Grid. Considers it is unclear why National Grid subdivision corridor is a qualifying matter, and the National Grid Yard is not. The Medium Density Residential Standards allows intensification that may not require subdivision. The National Grid Yard must be included to manage land use in order to apply the National Grid as a qualifying matter and give effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission (NPSET).</p> <p>Seeks amendments to Table RSL-1 to better reflect the rule and policy framework direction, including the NPSET and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Notes intensification within the National Grid's vicinity could significantly affect Transpower's ability to operate, maintain, upgrade, and develop the National Grid.</p> <p>Notes significance of NPSET in ensuring recognition of the benefits of electricity transmission, while both managing effects both on, and from, the National Grid.</p> <p>Notes the only area where National Grid assets traverse an intensification area is in north-west Rangiora.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to ensure that the nationally consistent rule framework for land use activities addressed within the National Grid Yard provisions are explicitly set out as part of the National Grid qualifying matter to give effect to higher order policy and establish a clear and appropriate expectation of future land use in the vicinity of the National Grid.</p> <p>Amend Table RSL-1 as follows:</p> <p>Qualifying matter and area - Electricity - National grid transmission lines National Grid transmission lines within Medium Density Residential Zone in north-west Rangiora). As mapped in qualifying matter, National Grid Subdivision Corridor and National Grid Yard</p> <p>Reasoning Identifies the location of nationally significant Electricity Distribution transmission Lines within the Medium Density Residential Zones, and avoids potential effects of subdivision and development on the ability to safely and efficiently operate, maintain, develop and upgrade the National Grid. by imposing minimum setbacks and reducing minimum allotment size ensures the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.</p>	Accept in part		<p>Agree that the explanation for the National Grid subdivision corridor qualifying matter should be improved and this should also be extended to land use as well. Intended to be a matter of design to implement the corridor and ensure separation between lines and people. Only affects X properties. National Grid Yard isn't used as this is wider than just the intersection with the MRZ. Could also be relevant on the other side if Lehmans Road subdivision goes ahead</p>	Yes
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Support		Accept			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
42.10	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	<p>Supports MRZ-O1 noting it reflects that required under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991. Retain MRZ-O1 as notified.</p>	Accept		<p>No changes proposed as a result of this submission</p>	No

42.11	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	Notes that within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible. Supports MRZ-P1's direction, and notes it reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, Clause (6)(2)(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991, however requests reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence capacity for intensification. Amend MRZ-P1: MRZ-P1 Housing types Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments., while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as directed by the relevant qualifying matter area provisions.	Accept in part		MRZ-O1 has been recommended to be amended to reference qualifying matters -RESZ-P15 is recommended to be moved to medium density residential chapter to provide policy coverage for qualifying matters	Yes
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Support		Accept			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
42.13	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-R1 to the extent that the immediate legal effect is not limited to situations where qualifying matters do not apply. This may result in situations where the alteration of a residential building breaches rules relating to the National Grid Yard. Amend MRZ-R1: "This rule shall have immediate legal effect in relation to residential activities if no qualifying matter applies."	Reject		Understand Transpower's concern but Variation 1 provisions have immediate legal effect except where qualifying matters apply.	No
42.14	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports clear direction in MRZ-R2 that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain MRZ-R2 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
42.15	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS1 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS1 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
42.16	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS2 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS2 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
42.17	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS4 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS4 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No

42.18	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS4 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS4 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
42.19	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS7 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS7 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
42.2	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	Opposes lack of restrictions relating to structures and activities in the National Grid Yard. Seeks addition of definition of 'National Grid Yard' to improve clarity regarding this qualifying matter. Insert a definition of "NATIONAL GRID YARD": "means: a. the area located 12m in any direction from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid support structure; b. the area located 10m either side of the centreline of an overhead 66kV National Grid transmission line; c. the area located 12m either side of the centreline of any overhead 220kV or 350kV National Grid transmission line."	Accept in principle		Changes to national grid yard definition were made based on Transpower's submissions on the energy and infrastructure topic. These changes could also be made in the context of V1, but given the degree of integration work that has occurred in the EI chapter provisions, I do not recommend that this V1 submission overrides the PDP changes	No
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Support		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
42.20	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS9 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS9 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
42.21	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS10 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS10 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
42.22	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS11 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS11 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
42.23	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS11 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply. Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS11 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No

42.24	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports the Variation 1 Section 32 report's precautionary approach of including the 39m setback. Generally supports the Section 32 report's analysis of the National Grid as a qualifying matter. Not specified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
42.25	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Neutral on extent of the zones and development areas as notified. Suggests that if the extent of the areas be amended within the vicinity of the National Grid, the provisions that manage effects on the National Grid, subject to amendments sought by submitter, are similarly extended to new zones or development areas. Not specified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
42.3	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	Supports the inclusion of 'National Grid subdivision corridor' definition as it provides for the National Grid as a qualifying matter, however seeks minor amendments to improve clarity. Amend 'National Grid subdivision corridor' definition: "a. the area 32m either side of the centreline of an above ground 66kV transmission lines on towers (including tubular steel towerspoles where these replace steel lattice towers); b. the area 37m either side of the centreline of an above ground 220kV transmissions line; c. the area 39m either side of the centreline of an above ground 350kV transmission line."	Accept		My Right of Reply on V1 addresses this at pg 24, and my Right of Reply on PDP medium density residential submissions (which addresses the Transpower relief in the context of the PDP)	No
42.4	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	Supports the inclusion of the 'Qualifying Matters' definition, however seeks additional clarity through a cross reference and hyperlink to Table RSL-1. Amend the 'Qualifying Matters' definition: "QUALIFYING MATTERS' means a matter referred to in section 771 or 770 of the RMA^1^and includes the matters set out in Table RSL-1."	Accept in part		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes
42.5	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports SD-O2, particularly its recognition of wellbeing and health and safety. Notes SD-O2 is required by Section 3A. Retain SD-O2 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No

42.6	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	<p>Opposes lack of inclusion of restrictions that relate to structures and activities in the National Grid Yard. Seeks inclusion of new provisions to provide clarity that land use is also managed as a qualifying matter in the National Grid Yard.</p> <p>Amend the 'Activity Rules - Managing effects of activities and development on the National Grid':</p> <p>EI-R51 Activities and development (other than earthworks) within a National Grid Yard</p> <p>Qualifying matter – National Grid Yard</p> <p>status: PER</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the activity is not a sensitive activity; 2. buildings or structures comply with NZECP34: 2001 and are: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. for a network utility; or b. a fence not exceeding 2.5m in height above ground level; or c. building alterations or additions to an existing building or structure that do not increase the height above ground level or footprint of the building or structure; 3. A building or structure provided for by (2)(a) to (c) must: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. not be used for the handling or storage of hazardous substances with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties in greater than domestic scale quantities; b. not permanently obstruct existing vehicle access to a National Grid support structure; c. be located at least 12m from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid support structure, except where it is a fence not exceeding 2.5m height above ground level that is located at least 6 metres from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid support structure <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: NC</p> <p>Notification</p> <p>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified only to Transpower NZ Ltd where the consent authority considers this is required, absent its written approval.</p>	Reject <u>Accept in part</u>		Rule EI-R51 is outside of scope of variation 1. <u>Qualifying matter has been amended to extend to land use</u>	Yes
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		<u>Accept</u> Reject			

42.7	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Generally supports SUB-R6. Seeks amendment to align Proposed District Plan provisions in respect of notification (notes Clause 5 (Part 1) of Schedule 3A does not apply).</p> <p>Amend SUB-R6: Qualifying matter - National Grid subdivision corridor</p> <p>....</p> <p>Notification An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly and limited notified but may be limited notified only to Transpower New Zealand Limited, where the consent authority considers this is required, absent its written approval.</p>	Reject		<p>Clause 5(1) precludes public notification for the construction and use of 1,2,3 residential units that do not comply with 1 or more of the density standards (except the clause 10 limitation on more than 3 units), and precludes public and limited notification of an application for 4 or more residential units if they comply with the density standards, and (3) precludes public and limited notification for subdivision resource consent if it is associated with the land use activity in (1), and (2). SUB R6 does not specify the number of units, so would apply to all types of units (i.e more than 3), therefore I consider that that restriction on notification in (2), and (3) applies and due to the specificity of the legislation I cannot align the IPI and PDP provisions. Theoretically the Transpower relief could apply for applications for 1,2,3 or three units, but not for the subdivision component. I accept that this part of the legislation is complex and contrary in how it puts a higher notification requirement on activities with lesser effect. The panel could be minded to align the notification clauses however I do not believe the legislation allows for this.</p>	No
------	----------------------------	-------	--	--------	--	--	----

42.8	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	Opposes the 200m2 minimum allotment size for the National Grid Subdivision Corridor qualifying matter as there is no rationale for how this gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, or for how it provides a matter of national significance and ensures the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure. Amend minimum allotment size that applies to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor qualifying matter to reflect the minimum area in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	Accept	200m2 is the minimum allotment size in the proposed District Plan - in the notified medium density residential zone prior to Variation 1, and Transpower have asked for the minimum to apply, which is what Variation 1 applies.	No
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
42.9	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Support	Supports RESZ-P15 as it recognises qualifying matters. Notes it reflects that required under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991. Retain RESZ-P15 as notified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
43.1	Momentum Land Ltd	Amend	Oppose the Rural Lifestyle zoning of Lot 2 DP 83191, Lot 2 DP 4532, Lot 1 DP 5010 and Lot 5 DP 313322. Rezoning Lot 2 DP 83191, Lot 2 DP 4532, Lot 1 DP 5010 and Lot 5 DP 313322 to Medium Density Residential.	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Accept	Reject		
43.2	Momentum Land Ltd	Amend	Oppose the Rural Lifestyle zoning of Lot 2 DP 83191, Lot 2 DP 4532, Lot 1 DP 5010 and Lot 5 DP 313322. Rezoning Lot 2 DP 83191, Lot 2 DP 4532, Lot 1 DP 5010 and Lot 5 DP 313322 to Medium Density Residential.	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
43.3	Momentum Land Ltd	Amend	Oppose the notified Kaiapoi ODP DEV-K-APP1, as it does not reflect submitter's development intentions for development of the site. Amend the notified Kaiapoi Outline Development Plan (ODP) to reflect the ODP prepared by submitter and contained in Appendix 3 (see full submission).	Accept	Accept	Site has been recommended for rezoning under PDP, and also if Mr Fowler's test is applied	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation

43.4	Momentum Land Ltd	Amend	Oppose use of the Operative Airport Noise Contour to define the spatial extent of the airport noise qualifying matter. Amend the spatial extent of the airport noise qualifying matter to apply to the Annual Average Outer Control Boundary.	Reject		As addressed in stream 10A, and stream 12E, airport noise contour is recommended to be retained largely as notified (removing Silverstream), however, as I have stated, I do not consider that the airport noise contour and the policy provisions under it prevent rezonings	No
43.5	Momentum Land Ltd	Amend	Seek that the natural hazards qualifying matter does not apply to any land parcels subject to this submission on the basis that ground levels will be raised to mitigate flood risk. Amend the natural hazards qualifying matter so that upon rezoning the land parcels to Medium Density Residential, the natural hazards qualifying matter does not apply to the parcels.	Reject	Accept	A qualifying matter under Variation 1 cannot anticipate or rely on future works on a site to mitigate natural hazards ahead of those works having occurred. If ground levels are raised then the floor level certificate process would pick this up and ensure that additional floor levels were not required.	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation, as qualifying matter are not recommended to apply to the site
43.6	Momentum Land Ltd	Support	Support in part the minimum allotment area of 200m ² in the Medium Density Residential Zone where the airport noise qualifying matter applies. This is on the proviso that the submitters relief is accepted with regard to use of the Annual Average Outer Control Boundary (AAOCB) as defining the spatial extent of the qualifying matter. As a result, the 200m ² minimum lot area would only apply to Lot 2 DP83191, being the South Block (retirement village). Retain SUB-S1 as notified, insofar as it relates to minimum allotment area in the area covered by airport noise qualifying matter. This relief is sought on the basis that the qualifying matter will only apply to the South Block (retirement village site).	Accept in part		Addressed in stream 10A	No

44.1	David Michael Lawry	Oppose	<p>The 50 dBA Ldn Air noise contour should not be accepted as or come under the classification of a qualifying matter so as to restrict further residential intensification. The current contours are highly inaccurate. In the last review of the contours back in 2007 CIAL projections were found to be so exaggerated that the then contours shrunk by approximately one third of the previous residential development restricting contours, once more accurate data was feed into the process. One outcome result was that residential intensification on Land in Rolleston was allowed as previous 50 dBA Ldn contours shrank. To our knowledge no increased noise complaints resulted certainly this change has had no adverse impact on CIAL operations despite their assertions that it would. There was an agreed requirement that the parties would re-evaluate the contours every 10 years. As a result the contours should have been re-evaluated in 2017. Future air movement growth projections, actual runway capacity and actual noise profiles of the current flying aircraft fleet are critical components of the input data that result in the contour size. This review is now being carried out by an ECAN led panel of experts with the skills and will to objectively review CIAL led inputs. The outcomes of this process and setting of the outer control boundary is expected by the end of this year.</p> <p>It is submitted that as the entire question around the outer control boundary and accuracy of the air noise contours is already the subject Regional Council deliberation, that in the interests of reducing the matters for consideration of Variation 1 and in making decisions based on accurate, up to date information that the issue raised by CIAL regarding the 50 dBA Ldn contour being considered as a qualifying matter, be rejected. This includes Rule MRZ-BFS1, assessment matter RES-MD15 planning Maps and the Supporting section 32 Analysis. Alternatively, if the contours are retained, RES-MD15 should be re-worded as it is difficult to reconcile "managed" with "avoidance", to read as follows: "The extent to which effects, as a result of the sensitivity of activities to current and future noise generation from aircraft are proposed to be managed, in particular through building design."</p>	Reject		Submission 44.2 was addressed in hearing stream 10A report, however, 44.1 should have also been referenced	No
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Accept			

44.2	David Michael Lawry	Oppose	<p>The 50 dBA Ldn Air noise contour should not be accepted as or come under the classification of a qualifying matter so as to restrict further residential intensification. The current contours are highly inaccurate. In the last review of the contours back in 2007 CIAL projections were found to be so exaggerated that the then contours shrunk by approximately one third of the previous residential development restricting contours, once more accurate data was feed into the process. One outcome result was that residential intensification on Land in Rolleston was allowed as previous 50 dBA Ldn contours shrank. To our knowledge no increased noise complaints resulted certainly this change has had no adverse impact on CIAL operations despite their assertions that it would. There was an agreed requirement that the parties would re-evaluate the contours every 10 years. As a result the contours should have been re-evaluated in 2017. Future air movement growth projections, actual runway capacity and actual noise profiles of the current flying aircraft fleet are critical components of the input data that result in the contour size. This review is now being carried out by an ECAN led panel of experts with the skills and will to objectively review CIAL led inputs. The outcomes of this process and setting of the outer control boundary is expected by the end of this year.</p> <p>It is submitted that as the entire question around the outer control boundary and accuracy of the air noise contours is already the subject Regional Council deliberation, that in the interests of reducing the matters for consideration of Variation 1 and in making decisions based on accurate, up to date information that the issue raised by CIAL regarding the 50 dBA Ldn contour being considered as a qualifying matter, be rejected. This includes Rule MRZ-BFS1, assessment matter RES-MD15 planning Maps and the Supporting section 32 Analysis. Alternatively, if the contours are retained, RES-MD15 should be re-worded as it is difficult to reconcile "managed" with "avoidance", to read as follows: "The extent to which effects, as a result of the sensitivity of activities to current and future noise generation from aircraft are proposed to be managed, in particular through building design."</p>	Reject		Submission 44.1 was addressed in hearing stream 10A report	No
45.1	Martin Pinkham	Amend	<p>Generally support the provisions but is concerned that the definition of a Site is unclear and that the proposed Rules will apply to small individual sites whereas the objective of the NPS-UD was to increase density over a wider area.</p> <p>The proposed Objectives, Policies and Rules do not adequately address the need for integrated, safe and efficient Urban Design objectives to be achieved.</p> <p>Amend the Objectives, Policies and Rules to have the required densities be achieved over a wide area, not just at an individual lot level.</p> <p>That proposed developments meet integrated, safe and efficient Urban Design objectives.</p>	Reject		The MDRS, and objectives and policies apply on a site-Specificbasis. The outcomes are specified for an area, but apply to all sites within a relevant residential zone.	No

46.1	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	General	<p>Waka Kotahi is generally supportive of the proposed changes and provisions put forward by the Council. While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone. Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, as Opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone. Waka Kotahi seeks further evidence on why a 6m setback for new buildings on sites bordering a strategic or arterial road (state highways) is considered a qualifying matter and why this setback is more appropriate than the required 1.5m standard. Waka Kotahi does not have an accepted setback, rather, requires any sensitive activity located within 100m of the state highway to be designed and constructed to achieve adequate noise standards. In NOISE-R16, increase the area in which sensitive activities are required to be adequately designed and constructed to the relevant noise standards to address reverse sensitivity, from 80m to 100m. Waka Kotahi consider that if the noise standards requested through the Proposed District Plan submission are accepted then there will be appropriate standards in place to manage the potential health effects on any residents in proximity of the state highway and located within a residential area proposed to be up zoned. Through the Proposed District Plan submission period, Waka Kotahi requested that further consideration be given to increasing the area zoned Medium Density Residential. Variation 1 has provided for this density such that Waka Kotahi consider that their request through the Proposed District Plan submission process has been met. There are adequate ODPs in place such that transportation requirements including cycle/shared path connections are appropriately provided for. Waka Kotahi supports the use of financial contributions as a financial tool to contribute towards public realm improvement projects, and seeks that consideration be given to initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports mode shift.</p> <p>Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town</p>	Reject		<p>Not all strategic and arterial roads are state highways, although some are. The standard setback in GRZ-BFS5 for new buildings other than garages on all roads is 2m (not 1.5m as stated), except for the strategic and arterial roads which require a 6m setback. The IPI does not provide scope to amend NOISE-R16</p>	No
------	---------------------------------	---------	---	--------	--	---	----

			centre. Retain the proposed objectives and policies. Provide further evidence on why a 6m setback for new buildings on sites bordering a strategic or arterial road (state highways) is considered a qualifying matter and why this setback is more appropriate than the required 1.5m standard. Increase the area in which sensitive activities adjacent to strategic and arterial roads are required to be adequately designed and constructed to the relevant noise standards to address reverse sensitivity, from 80m to 100m. Retain the increase in the area zoned Medium Density Residential in the North-East Development Area and South-West Development Area of Rangiora as provided for through Variation 1. Use financial contributions to contribute towards public realm improvement projects, and initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports transport mode shift.				
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Oppose		Accept			
FS 18	FS Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support		Reject			
FS 19	FS R J Paterson Family Trust	Support		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Support		Reject			
46.10	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Amend	Waka Kotahi seeks further evidence on why a 6m setback for new buildings on sites bordering a strategic or arterial road (state highways) is considered a qualifying matter and why this setback is more appropriate than the required 1.5m standard. Waka Kotahi does not have an accepted setback, rather, requires any sensitive activity located within 100m of the state highway to be designed and constructed to achieve adequate noise standards. Provide further evidence on why a 6m setback for new buildings on sites bordering a strategic or arterial road (state highways) is considered a qualifying matter and why this setback is more appropriate than the required 1.5m standard.	Reject		Not all strategic and arterial roads are state highways, although some are. The standard setback in GRZ-BFS5 for new buildings other than garages on all roads is 2m (not 1.5m as stated), except for the strategic and arterial roads which require a 6m setback. The IPI does not provide scope to amend NOISE-R16	No

46.11	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Amend	<p>In NOISE-R16, increase the area in which sensitive activities are required to be adequately designed and constructed to the relevant noise standards to address reverse sensitivity, from 80m to 100m. Waka Kotahi consider that if the noise standards requested through the Proposed District Plan submission are accepted then there will be appropriate standards in place to manage the potential health effects on any residents in proximity of the state highway and located within a residential area proposed to be up zoned.</p> <p>In NOISE-R16, increase the area in which sensitive activities adjacent to strategic and arterial roads are required to be adequately designed and constructed to the relevant noise standards to address reverse sensitivity, from 80m to 100m.</p>	Reject		Not all strategic and arterial roads are state highways, although some are. The standard setback in GRZ-BFS5 for new buildings other than garages on all roads is 2m (not 1.5m as stated), except for the strategic and arterial roads which require a 6m setback. The sunlight and shading qualifying matter applies evenly across the district as sunlight falls equally on the flat terrain of the district. The IPI does not provide scope to amend NOISE-R16	No
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Support		Reject			
46.12	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	<p>Through the Proposed District Plan submission period, Waka Kotahi requested that further consideration be given to increasing the area zoned Medium Density Residential in North-East Development Area (Rangiora). Variation 1 has provided for this density such that Waka Kotahi consider that their request through the Proposed District Plan submission process has been met. There are adequate ODPs in place such that transportation requirements including cycle/shared path connections are appropriately provided for.</p> <p>Retain the increase in the area zoned Medium Density Residential in the North-East Development Area of Rangiora as provided for through Variation 1.</p>	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
46.13	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	<p>Through the Proposed District Plan submission period, Waka Kotahi requested that further consideration be given to increasing the area zoned Medium Density Residential in South-West Development Area (Rangiora). Variation 1 has provided for this density such that Waka Kotahi consider that their request through the Proposed District Plan submission process has been met. There are adequate ODPs in place such that transportation requirements including cycle/shared path connections are appropriately provided for.</p> <p>Retain the increase in the area zoned Medium Density Residential in the South-West Development Area of Rangiora as provided for through Variation 1.</p>	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No

46.14	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the use of financial contributions as a financial tool to contribute towards public realm improvement projects, and seeks that consideration be given to initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports mode shift. Use financial contributions to contribute towards public realm improvement projects, and initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports transport mode shift.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission, but noting that this may be in better scope of Variation 2	No
46.2	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Amend	While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone. Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town centre.	Reject		The sunlight and shading qualifying matter applies evenly across the district as sunlight falls equally on the flat terrain of the district.	No
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Support		Reject			
46.3	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Amend	While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone. Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town centre.	Reject		The sunlight and shading qualifying matter applies evenly across the district as sunlight falls equally on the flat terrain of the district.	No

46.4	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Amend	<p>While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town centre.</p>	Reject		The sunlight and shading qualifying matter applies evenly across the district as sunlight falls equally on the flat terrain of the district.	No
46.5	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Amend	<p>While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town centre.</p>	Reject		The sunlight and shading qualifying matter applies evenly across the district as sunlight falls equally on the flat terrain of the district.	No
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Accept			
46.6	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	<p>Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, as opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone. Retain the proposed objectives and policies.</p>	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No

46.7	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, as opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone. Retain the proposed objectives and policies.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
46.8	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, as opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone. Retain the proposed objectives and policies.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
46.9	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, in particular proposed RESZ-P15, as opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone. Retain the proposed objectives and policies, in particular proposed RESZ-P15.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
47.1	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>Variation 1 was a mandatory direction from Central Government to incorporate the required medium density residential standards from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. Council records that it is currently underway with a proposed district plan that it considers responded to the housing capacity challenges that the Act sought to address.</p> <p>Because of the complexities of incorporating the Act and medium density residential standards into the notified Proposed District Plan, the Council proposes to submit on Variation 1, in order to signal and obtain scope for changes that might be needed to provisions.</p> <p>Council seeks to provide submissions on suggested pathways and issues involved with integrating this plan variation into the proposed district plan as required by law.</p> <p>The points of this submission can be broadly themed into the following categories:</p> <p>a. Drafting and linking matters – where drafting can be amended to improve the consistency and linkages and usability without changing the intent of anything that already has immediate legal effect.</p> <p>b. Consequential amendments – where minor changes to the content of the variation which are outside the scope of the RMA’s Clause 16 minor amendments and s80H ‘identifying mark-up’.</p> <p>c. Other amendments - where planning concepts and issues of implementation have emerged following notification and which may require changes.</p>	Accept in part		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No

			The Council seeks that Variation 1 be amended as set out in Table 1 of the submission.				
47.10	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p> <p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display).</p> <p>Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>	Accept		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes

47.11	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	Table RSL-1 lists the currently proposed qualifying matters – places and areas where the MDRS may not apply or be restricted in its application - that apply across the District. However it could be improved by outlining the exact nature of the qualifying matter in spatial extent and reasoning. Amend Table RSL-1 to directly explain the area, nature and extent of qualifying matters. Link Table RSL-1 to the relevant qualifying layers on map, noting that this may require improvements to the map display (but not content). Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.	Accept		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes
FS 2	FS Transpower	Support		Accept			
47.12	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	It is not clear how to treat garages and other non-living accommodation parts of a building under the MDRS. The Proposed District Plan definitions for 'residential activity' are clearly linked to the living accommodation only, which can be interpreted to exempt a garage from consideration under the MDRS, but this may need to be clarified. Clarify that the non-living parts of a building are not part of assessment under the relevant MDRS built form standards. This includes attached garages, roof cavity/facade, and foundations.	Accept		Amendments are proposed to the definition of 'residential activity' to ensure they apply to the living accommodation only	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Support		Accept			
47.13	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	The notified version of the Proposed District Plan set a discretionary status for activities that do not conform to the built form standards or rules. However, the Enabling Housing provisions require a restricted discretionary status for non-compliance. This was changed by Variation 1 in all relevant activity standards except for MRZ-R18 and MRZBFS4. Note: the restricted discretionary status is in force by way of s77M regardless. Amend activity status for non-compliance to restricted discretionary "RDIS" for MRZ-BFS4.	Accept		MRZ-BFS4 is amended to RDIS	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			

47.14	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	The notified version of the Proposed District Plan set a discretionary status for activities that do not conform to the built form standards or rules. However, the Enabling Housing provisions require a restricted discretionary status for non-compliance. This was changed by Variation 1 in all relevant activity standards except for MRZ-R18 and MRZBFS4. Note: the restricted discretionary status is in force by way of s77M regardless. Amend activity status for non-compliance to restricted discretionary "RDIS" for MRZ-R18.	Accept		MRS-R18 is amended to RDIS	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
47.15	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	The language and wording in the matters of discretion could be refined to make the wording of concepts more objective and rational where subjective terminology is used. Amend to make the wording of concepts to be more objective and rational where subjective terminology is used, for example, where the phrase "visual perception of cramped living conditions" is used in RES-MD12.	Accept		RES-MD12 is amended, noting also the Kainga Ora submission on this matter	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
47.16	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	The proposed plan introduced a medium density residential zone in the centre of Rangiora which was (arguably) more permissive of development than the MDRS and which provided substantial additional development capacity consistent with national directives. Any changes required in the event where the panel determines that variation 1 is not the most effective way of achieving the purpose of the Enabling Housing Amendment Act and MDRS.	Accept in part		Appendix A drafting shows the zone provisions alongside each other, however, this submission also may provide scope for the IHP to recommend integration	No
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			

47.2	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>MRZ-R1, and MRZ-R2 are the main rules that operationalise the medium density residential standards (MDRS) within Variation 1. They are unclear in their scope – as MRZ-R1 applies district wide standards, and MRZ-R2 applies the residential standards (as amended by the MDRS). The activity status on MRZ-R1 requires amendment to ensure that the relevant district wide rule and activity status from elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan is invoked, rather than the rules in the MRZ section.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-R1 as follows:</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. the activity complies with all applicable medium density residential and district-wide built form standards.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</p> <p>for medium density residential provisions, as set out in the relevant built form standard;</p> <p>for district-wide provisions, as set out in the relevant district-wide rule and/or standard;</p>	Accept in part		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
47.3	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>MRZ-R1, and MRZ-R2 are the main rules that operationalise the medium density residential standards (MDRS) within Variation 1. They are unclear in their scope – as MRZ-R1 applies district wide standards, and MRZ-R2 applies the residential standards (as amended by the MDRS).</p> <p>The activity status on MRZ-R1 requires amendment to ensure that the relevant district wide rule and activity status from elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan is invoked, rather than the rules in the MRZ section.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-R1 as follows:</p> <p>Where:1. the activity complies with all applicable medium density residential and district-wide built form standards.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</p> <p>for medium density residential provisions, as set out in the relevant built form standard;</p> <p>for district-wide provisions, as set out in the relevant district-wide rule and/or standard;</p>	Accept in part		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			

47.4	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective. Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p> <p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display).</p> <p>Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>	Accept in part		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Support		Accept			
FS 2	FS Transpower	Support		Accept			
47.5	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p> <p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display). Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>	Accept in part		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes
47.6	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p> <p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display).</p> <p>Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>	Accept in part		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes

47.7	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p> <p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display).</p> <p>Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>	Accept in part		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes
47.8	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p> <p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display).</p> <p>Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>	Accept in part		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes
47.9	Waimakariri District Council	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p> <p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display).</p> <p>Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>	Accept in part		Amendments are proposed to improve the clarity of how the plan implements qualifying matters	Yes

48.1	Woodwater Ltd	Amend	<p>This submission relates to the following land:</p> <p>21 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 2567 and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>320 Woodend Beach Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 75359)</p> <p>1 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 2567)</p> <p>328 Woodend Beach Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 2567)</p> <p>36 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Land 689 and Part Rural Land 689)</p> <p>40 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>46 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>50 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>52 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689, Part Rural Section 689, Part Rural Section 367A and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>60 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Parcel ID: 3401266)</p> <p>62 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>Copper Beech Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 1, 101 Deposited Plan 503969)</p> <p>43 Petries Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 367A and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>In the Proposed Plan the above land is zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ). The surrounding zoning includes General Residential to the north, and Special Purpose Kainga Nohoanga Zone (SPZ-KN) to the west. To the east and south, land has been rezoned as either Open Space Zone (OSZ) or Large Lot Residential Zoning (LLRZ). The net outcome is that the above land will essentially be an island of rural land surrounded by urban land which is undesirable as it is likely to result in significant constraints on any rural activities that can be undertaken and may render it incapable of reasonable use.</p> <p>Seeks that the subject land be rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
------	---------------	-------	---	--------	--------	--	---

48.2	Woodwater Ltd	Amend	<p>This submission relates to the following land:</p> <p>21 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 2567 and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>320 Woodend Beach Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 75359)</p> <p>1 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 2567)</p> <p>328 Woodend Beach Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 2567)</p> <p>36 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Land 689 and Part Rural Land 689)</p> <p>40 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>46 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>50 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>52 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689, Part Rural Section 689, Part Rural Section 367A and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>60 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (ParcelID: 3401266)</p> <p>62 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>Copper Beech Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 1, 101 Deposited Plan 503969)</p> <p>43 Petries Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 367A and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>In the Proposed Plan the above land is zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ). The surrounding zoning includes General Residential to the north, and Special Purpose Kainga Nohoanga Zone (SPZ-KN) to the west. To the east and south, land has been rezoned as either Open Space Zone (OSZ) or Large Lot Residential Zoning (LLRZ). The net outcome is that this land will essentially be an island of rural land surrounded by urban land which is undesirable as it is likely to result in significant constraints on any rural activities that can be undertaken and may render it incapable of reasonable use.</p> <p>Seeks that the subject land be rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
------	---------------	-------	---	--------	--------	--	---

49.1	National Public Health Service / Te Whatu Ora Waitaha	Amend	<p>Supports the Qualifying Matters identified in the Section 32 Report Variation 1: Housing Intensification. Agrees with the information presented in 8.3 Hazards and risks – Natural Hazards (Qualifying matter natural hazards). Notes that the Council is aware of the natural hazard risks, particularly freshwater flooding and sea water inundation and that increased development density in natural hazards areas puts people and property at increased risk. This is exacerbated by increased run-off and displacement of floodwaters.</p> <p>Concerned by Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) being introduced to low-lying areas of Kaiapoi (particularly areas in Figure 2 pg. 39) and Figure 1 Appendix 1. The high flooding risk areas appear to be included within the proposed MDRS zones as per Appendix 3.</p> <p>Believes the use of minimum floor levels is not sufficient as a primary flood risk reduction strategy as it does little to reduce the risk of flooding in the identified high-risk areas. Minimum floor levels fail to consider the pre-existing properties situated in flood risk areas, and the increased run-off and displacement of floodwaters from housing intensification.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure constraints, particularly the wastewater and drainage networks in areas of Kaiapoi (s8.3.1 and s8.3.4) that rely on mechanical pumping, is a public health concern to the submitter. The Proposed Plan recognises the limitations of the wastewater and drainage infrastructure but does not clearly state methods to improve the capacity of infrastructure for flood events.</p> <p>Submitter commends the Council for recognising the flooding risk in areas of Kaiapoi, and for including mitigation measures in the form of minimum floor levels for new properties. However, submitter believes more can be done in terms of increasing the capacity of wastewater infrastructure and drainage networks to help protect people and property from harm.</p> <p>Recommends that all areas identified as having significant flooding risk are clearly exempted from the proposed MDRS zones.</p> <p>Recommends that greater consideration is given to the impact that medium and high density development could have on pre-existing dwellings in and around the proposed MDRS zones.</p> <p>Recommends further assessment of the wastewater and drainage infrastructure is undertaken and further investment and improvements are planned for as a part of the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>This should take into consideration population projections, likely to increase with the proposed MDRS zones in Kaiapoi.</p>	Accept in part		<p>The proposed natural hazards qualifying matter limits density in areas A and B (to 200m2 and 500m2) as well as applying (through the PDP provisions) the minimum floor level processes. A district plan cannot specify additional servicing requirements such as the requested wastewater and drainage infrastructure, but the financial contributions provisions introduced through Variation 2 will assist in funding infrastructure improvements if needed.</p>	No
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

5.1	Roger Webb	Oppose	Variation 1 will put a strain on existing three waters and roading infrastructure, create rundown areas and resultant problems, create an unsafe environment during fire or natural disasters, and create low quality outdoor living spaces. The intensification will cause noise and neighbourhood disputes. It will result in a loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of properties, loss of natural light and associated health issues, loss of property value, and loss of amenity. Medium density housing would not be in keeping with the environment of the existing rural towns. All of these outcomes have occurred in other countries so these impractical policies should not be followed. Exempt this area [Percival St, Rangiora] from Variation 1 provisions as has been done for rural towns and areas of Auckland.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
5.2	Roger Webb	Oppose	Variation 1 will put a strain on existing three waters and roading infrastructure, create rundown areas and resultant problems, create an unsafe environment during fire or natural disasters, and create low quality outdoor living spaces. The intensification will cause noise and neighbourhood disputes. It will result in a loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of properties, loss of natural light and associated health issues, loss of property value, and loss of amenity. Medium density housing would not be in keeping with the environment of the existing rural towns. All of these outcomes have occurred in other countries so these impractical policies should not be followed. Exempt this area [Percival St, Rangiora] from Variation 1 provisions as has been done for rural towns and areas of Auckland.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the Specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
5.3	Roger Webb	Oppose	Variation 1 will put a strain on existing three waters and roading infrastructure, create rundown areas and resultant problems, create an unsafe environment during fire or natural disasters, and create low quality outdoor living spaces. The intensification will cause noise and neighbourhood disputes. It will result in a loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of properties, loss of natural light and associated health issues, loss of property value, and loss of amenity. Medium density housing would not be in keeping with the environment of the existing rural towns. All of these outcomes have occurred in other countries so these impractical policies should not be followed. Exempt this area [Percival St, Rangiora] from Variation 1 provisions as has been done for rural towns and areas of Auckland.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No

5.4	Roger Webb	Oppose	Variation 1 will put a strain on existing three waters and roading infrastructure, create rundown areas and resultant problems, create an unsafe environment during fire or natural disasters, and create low quality outdoor living spaces. The intensification will cause noise and neighbourhood disputes. It will result in a loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of properties, loss of natural light and associated health issues, loss of property value, and loss of amenity. Medium density housing would not be in keeping with the environment of the existing rural towns. All of these outcomes have occurred in other countries so these impractical policies should not be followed. Exempt this area [Percival St, Rangiora] from Variation 1 provisions as has been done for rural towns and areas of Auckland.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
5.5	Roger Webb	Oppose	Variation 1 will put a strain on existing three waters and roading infrastructure, create rundown areas and resultant problems, create an unsafe environment during fire or natural disasters, and create low quality outdoor living spaces. The intensification will cause noise and neighbourhood disputes. It will result in a loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of properties, loss of natural light and associated health issues, loss of property value, and loss of amenity. Medium density housing would not be in keeping with the environment of the existing rural towns. All of these outcomes have occurred in other countries so these impractical policies should not be followed. Exempt this area [Percival St, Rangiora] from Variation 1 provisions as has been done for rural towns and areas of Auckland.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
5.6	Roger Webb	Oppose	Variation 1 will put a strain on existing three waters and roading infrastructure, create rundown areas and resultant problems, create an unsafe environment during fire or natural disasters, and create low quality outdoor living spaces. The intensification will cause noise and neighbourhood disputes. It will result in a loss of privacy, loss of enjoyment of properties, loss of natural light and associated health issues, loss of property value, and loss of amenity. Medium density housing would not be in keeping with the environment of the existing rural towns. All of these outcomes have occurred in other countries so these impractical policies should not be followed. Exempt this area [Percival St, Rangiora] from Variation 1 provisions as has been done for rural towns and areas of Auckland.	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No

50.1	Beverley Waters	Oppose	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) applying to a portion of lots within Stage 7 of Silverstream East as addressed in resource consents RC215144 and RC215145, which was granted consent on 9 December 2021 subject to conditions. Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 (refer to full submission for plan showing location of these lots) be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. These conditions were added to the development's resource consent decision by the Commissioner to address issues relating to the departure from the Outline Development Plan, interface and integration issues between the existing Kaiapoi residential area and the new development - primarily in relation to raising ground levels above that of adjoining residential properties, the form of fencing on Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135, building setbacks, building height, and access arrangements. Considers the effect of this additional qualifying matter will be minor to the implementation of the MDRS given it only relates to 15 lots.</p> <p>Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. Some of the main conditions are:</p> <p>Subdivision resource consent RC215144</p> <p>Condition 14.15 - Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have no vehicle access to Road 8. Condition 14.16 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 14.15 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 128 to 130 and 134 and 135. Condition 28.1 and 28.2 - Any buildings to be single storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m and windows facing existing properties not to be above 3m in height. Condition 28.3 - Pursuant to section 221 of the resource management act 1991, Conditions 28.1 and 28.2 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the record of the title for lots 107 — 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135. Condition 29.4 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A1 as shown on approved plan, stamped RC 215144 and RC 215145. Condition 29.5 - Pursuant to section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 29.4 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lot 128. Condition 30.3 - Area B Allotments — Dwellings erected on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have conditions as set out in the Commissioners Report. Condition 30.4 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 30.3 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135.</p> <p>Land use resource consent RC215145</p> <p>Condition 9.1 - Any buildings to be constructed at any time on</p>	Reject		Council must apply the MDRS to all relevant residential zones, rather than the specific zones requested by the submitter. Council has no discretion as to the zones to which it applies.	No
------	-----------------	--------	---	--------	--	--	----

			<p>Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130 and 134 and 135, shall be single storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m measured from finished ground level. Condition 9.2 - Any dwellinghouse constructed on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall not have any windows above 3m height, facing towards Kynnersley Street, 8, 10, 11 and 12 Murray Place and 31 and 35 Adderley Terrace. Condition 10.1 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within the 10m of the Eastern Boundary. Condition 10.2 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A I as shown on approved plan stamped RC215144/RC215145. Condition 10.3 - No dwellinghouse on Lots 107 to 116 shall be constructed within 11.5m of the eastern boundary.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

51.1	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd	Amend	<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFS5. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFS5.</p> <p>The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line (MNL) passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>The proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFS5 do not include consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. A matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>Retain the rail corridor as a qualifying matter. Retain TRAN-R21 and TRAN-APP7 as notified. Retain MRZ-BFS5. Include a new matter of discretion in MRZ-BFS5.</p>	Accept <u>Reject</u>		<p>The submitter is correct that the notified IPI did not include matters of discretion where the 5m setback/qualifying matter applies. This is a RDIS activity and an additional MD18— Effects from qualifying matters— road and rail setbacks is recommended. As a result of integration, and the lack of underlying s32 and evidential support for this qualifying matter, it is now recommended to be 4m, consistent with other zones</p>	<u>Yes</u> No
------	-----------------------	-------	--	---------------------------------	--	--	--------------------------

51.2	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd	Amend	<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFS5. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFS5. The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>Considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks from the rail corridor in MRZ-BFS5. However, the proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFS5 do not require consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. Considers a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>Retain MRZ-BFS5 and include a new matter of discretion in MRZ-BFS5.</p> <p>"MRZ-BFS5 Building and structure setbacks ... Matters of discretion are restricted to: RES-MD2 - Residential design principles RES-MD5 - Impact on neighbouring property RES-MDX - The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor. ..."</p>	Accept <u>Reject</u>		<p>The submitter is correct that the notified IPI did not include matters of discretion where the 5m setback/qualifying matter applies. This is a RDIS activity and an additional MD18— Effects from qualifying matters— road and rail setbacks is recommended. As a result of integration, and the lack of underlying s32 and evidential support for this qualifying matter, it is now recommended to be 4m, consistent with other zones</p>	<u>Yes</u> No
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

51.3	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd	Support	<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFS5. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFS5. The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>Considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks from the rail corridor in MRZ-BFS5. However, the proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFS5 do not require consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. Considers a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>Retain identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter.</p>	Accept <u>Reject</u>		<p>The submitter is correct that the notified IPI did not include matters of discretion where the 5m setback/qualifying matter applies. This is a RDIS activity and an additional MD18— Effects from qualifying matters— road and rail setbacks is recommended. As a result of integration, and the lack of underlying s32 and evidential support for this qualifying matter, it is now recommended to be 4m, consistent with other zones</p>	<u>Yes</u> No
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

51.4	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd	Support	<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFS5. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFS5. The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>Considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks from the rail corridor in MRZ-BFS5. However, the proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFS5 do not require consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. Considers a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure. Retain TRAN-R21 as notified.</p>	Accept/Reject		<p>The submitter is correct that the notified IPI did not include matters of discretion where the 5m setback/qualifying matter applies. This is a RDIS activity and an additional MD18— Effects from qualifying matters—road and rail setbacks is recommended. As a result of integration, and the lack of underlying s32 and evidential support for this qualifying matter, it is now recommended to be 4m, consistent with other zones</p>	Yes/No
------	-----------------------	---------	---	--------------------------	--	---	-------------------

51.5	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd	Support	<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFS5. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFS5. The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>Considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks from the rail corridor in MRZ-BFS5. However, the proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFS5 do not require consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. Considers a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure. Retain TRAN-APP7 as notified.</p>	Accept <u>Reject</u>		<p>The submitter is correct that the notified IPI did not include matters of discretion where the 5m setback/qualifying matter applies. This is a RDIS activity and an additional MD18— Effects from qualifying matters— road and rail setbacks is recommended. As a result of integration, and the lack of underlying s32 and evidential support for this qualifying matter, it is now recommended to be 4m, consistent with other zones</p>	<u>Yes</u> No
------	-----------------------	---------	--	---------------------------------	--	--	--------------------------

52.1	Helen Mary Sparrow	Oppose	<p>Acknowledges Council’s obligation to adopt Variation 1, however considers mitigation of associated adverse effects on existing built environments of Kaiapoi and Rangiora important. Concerned about s771(j) of Resource Management Act which relates to other matters that make intensification inappropriate. Considers it inappropriate for Woodend (including Ravenswood) and Pegasus to be considered a single residential area and therefore meet the population threshold of 5000 for Variation 1 to apply. Woodend and Pegasus are clearly separate areas when viewed on a map, with the proposed Woodend Bypass, parks, reserves and rural holdings in between them. Woodend and Pegasus had populations of 2784 and 2637 respectively in the 2018 Census, and there is no provision for an increase of Pegasus’ urban area. Pegasus was developed along ‘new urbanist’ principles with more intensive development than the Residential 2 zoning of Kaiapoi and Rangiora. The Pegasus Area Unit bounds the Woodend Area Unit because it includes the large lot area of Mapleham, which is excluded from consideration. Ravenswood already has many smaller lots, which have urban design controls to maintain amenity.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification will result in the removal of mature trees from Kaiapoi and Rangiora that currently would mitigate effects of urban environments heating due to climate change. Protection should not be limited to notable trees listed in the District Plan only.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification’s increase in site coverage will cause issues for the existing stormwater management systems, especially within low-lying areas of Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Notes that Proposed District Plan’s requirement for 30% permeability highlights the importance of the ground disposal of stormwater within urban environments. Notes that while newer developments, particularly of Rangiora, have substantial stormwater retention areas which can delay the transfer of stormwater from older areas during heavy rain, it may become difficult to manage stormwater across the town as a whole with increasingly intensive rainfall episodes projected as the climate changes. This must be taken into account when considering the areas to which Variation 1 will apply.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Reject		Understand the concerns of the submitter, but consider that Map A, Key Activity Centre indicates that the area is proposed to be an urban area in the meaning of a 'relevant residential zone' and it has a combined population of over 5000.	No
FS 20	FS Woodend-Sefton Community Board	Oppose		Reject			

52.10	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that the intensification's increase in site coverage will cause issues for the existing stormwater management systems, especially within low-lying areas of Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Notes that Proposed District Plan's requirement for 30% permeability highlights the importance of the ground disposal of stormwater within urban environments. Notes that while newer developments, particularly of Rangiora, have substantial stormwater retention areas which can delay the transfer of stormwater from older areas during heavy rain, it may become difficult to manage stormwater across the town as a whole with increasingly intensive rainfall episodes projected as the climate changes. This must be taken into account when considering the areas to which Variation 1 will apply. Not specified.	Reject		cl 18, sch 3A requires that a ground floor residential unit must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and which can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them. The notified PDP MRZ-BFS3 also requires a 20% permeable surface area, so I do not consider that there is a conflict. Even if there was, the MDRS provision must prevail.	No
52.3	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that the 50 dBA Ldn Christchurch International Airport Ltd noise contour over Kaiapoi will constrain a comprehensive redevelopment of Kainga Ora properties in North Kaiapoi. Not specified.	Reject		The existence of the contour in itself does not prevent the redevelopment of properties, as the notified plan provisions including the qualifying matter do not stop development, they merely restrict density and other aspects	No
FS 20	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Reject			
52.4	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that the intensification will result in the removal of mature trees from Kaiapoi and Rangiora, which help to mitigate effects of urban environments heating due to climate change. Protection should not be limited to notable trees listed in the District Plan only. Not specified.	Reject		Many of the trees in Rangiora and Kaiapoi are within roads, and as such, outside of sites subject to intensification. There are protected notable trees within sites, contained within TREE-SCHED1	No
52.5	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

52.6	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
52.7	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
52.8	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes
52.9	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments. Not specified.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	Yes

53.1	MainPower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Seeks to maintain, build, operate, and upgrade the critical network infrastructure in a safe, efficient and effective manner. The electricity distribution network in North Canterbury and Kaikoura regions covers Waimakariri, Hurunui and Kaikoura districts. The electricity distribution network is identified as critical infrastructure, regionally significant infrastructure, is an essential lifeline service and is recognised in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (2013).</p> <p>Seeks the Council insert corridor protection rules into the Medium Density Residential zone, or as alternate relief to be clearly cross referenced by rule requirements within the relevant zone chapters. This submission should be read alongside the original submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Grant the relief as set out in Appendix One; and or grant any other consequential or similar relief that is necessary to deal with the concerns and issues raised in this submission.</p>	Reject		Mainpower appear to be requesting a qualifying matter for their electricity lines, however, such a qualifying matter without Specificdirection from the submitter could cover the entire MRZ as they are the lines company for the area.	No
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Support		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
53.2	MainPower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Seeks to insert a new objective and policy to support the introduction of new corridor protection rules for electricity distribution lines within the Medium Density Residential Zone. Insert the following new objective and policy:</p> <p>Objective: The operation and security of critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure is not compromised by other activities.</p> <p>Policy - Separation of incompatible activities Protect critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure by avoiding adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, from incompatible activities by avoiding buildings, structures and any sensitive activities that may compromise the operation of Electricity Distribution Lines within an identified buffer corridor.</p>	Reject		Mainpower appear to be requesting a qualifying matter for their electricity lines, however, such a qualifying matter without Specificdirection from the submitter could cover the entire MRZ as they are the lines company for the area.	No
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Accept			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Accept			

53.3	MainPower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Seeks to insert corridor protection rules relating to Electricity Distribution Lines into the Medium Residential Zone Chapter rules as lines are located within or immediately adjacent to that zone.</p> <p>Provisions relating to corridor protection for Electricity Distribution Lines do not fall easily into the National Planning Standards framework because they restrict land use activities and subdivision, and apply to Specific zones.</p> <p>Corridor protection rules should be located appropriately within the relevant zone chapters. From a usability perspective, it is most logical to include land use constraints associated with Electricity Distribution Lines in the applicable zone chapters where they are clearly visible to landowners who may check the plan to determine rules affecting their property. Insert the following new rule:</p> <p>Earthworks adjacent to a major electricity distribution line Activity Status: PER</p> <p>Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Earthworks shall be setback at least 6m from the centreline of the Major Electricity Distribution Line as shown on the planning maps or; 2. Meet the following requirements: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. be no deeper than 300mm within 2.2m of the foundation of the major electricity distribution line support structure; and b. be no deeper than 0.75m between 2.2m and 6m from the foundation of the major electricity distribution line support structure; and c. earthworks shall not destabilise a major 66kV or 33kV electricity distribution line pole or tower; and d. earthworks shall not result in a reduction in the ground to conductor clearance distances below what is required by Table 4 in NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances, unless the requirements of Clause 2.2.3 of NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances are met. <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: NC</p> <p>Notification An application for a noncomplying activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified only to the relevant electricity distribution line operator where the consent authority considers this is required, absent its written approval.</p> <p>Exemptions This rule does not apply to:</p>	Reject		Mainpower appear to be requesting a qualifying matter for their electricity lines, however, such a qualifying matter without Specific direction from the submitter could cover the entire MRZ as they are the lines company for the area.	No
------	---------------------------	-------	--	--------	--	---	----

		<p>- earthworks undertaken as part of agricultural or domestic cultivation; or repair, sealing or resealing of a road, footpath, driveway or vehicle access track;</p> <p>- earthworks that are undertaken by a network utility operator or their approved contractor on behalf of the network utility operator (other than for the reticulation and storage of water in canals, dams or reservoirs including for irrigation purposes);</p> <p>- earthworks for which prior written consent has been granted by the relevant electricity distribution line operator under the NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances;</p> <p>Advisory Notes</p> <p>- Major electricity distribution lines are shown on the planning maps.</p> <p>- Vegetation to be planted around electricity distribution lines should be selected and managed to ensure that it will not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</p> <p>- The NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances contains restrictions on the location of activities and development in relation to electricity distribution lines. Activities and development in the vicinity of these lines must comply with NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances.</p> <p>Insert the following new rule:</p> <p>Network utilities within 6 of the centre line of a major electricity distribution line Activity status: PER</p> <p>-</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. the network utility complies with the NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: NC</p> <p>Advisory Note</p> <p>- Major electricity distribution lines are shown on the planning map</p> <p>Insert the following new rule:</p> <p>Activities and development (other than earthworks or network utilities) adjacent to a major electricity distribution line Activity status: NC</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. activities and development adjacent to a major electricity distribution line involve the following:</p> <p>a. new sensitive activity and new buildings within 6m of the centreline of a major electricity distribution line or within 6m of</p>				
--	--	---	--	--	--	--

			<p>the foundation of a support structure; or b. complies with the requirements of NZECP34:2001.</p> <p>Notification An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified only to the relevant electricity distribution line operator where the consent authority considers this is required, absent its written approval.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A</p> <p>Advisory Notes - Major electricity distribution lines are shown on the planning map. - Vegetation to be planted around electricity distribution lines should be selected and managed to ensure that it will not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. - The NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances contains restrictions on the location of activities and development in relation to electricity distribution lines. Activities and development in the vicinity of these lines must comply with NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances.</p> <p>Insert the following new rule:</p> <p>Structures near a major electricity distribution line Activity status: NC 1. The establishment of a new, or expansion of an existing structure: Where: 2. The structure is within 6m of the centreline of a major electricity distribution line as shown on the planning maps; or 3. The structure is within 6m of the foundation of a support structure of a major electricity distribution line as shown on the planning maps, or 4. Complies with the requirements of NZECP34:2001</p> <p>Notification An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified only to the relevant electricity distribution line operator where the consent authority considers this is required, absent its written approval. Activity status when compliance not achieved: NC</p>				
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Accept			

54.1	John and Coral Broughton	Amend	<p>Rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora (8.5ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is adjacent to existing residential development, within the West Rangiora Development Area and Future Development Area (FDA), and will accommodate approximately 127 lots. Considers the rezoning will help achieve a compact and efficient urban form, contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, and help address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land.</p> <p>Notes that Variation 1 rezones 86ha of FDA land, with an anticipated yield of approximately 1000 households, and in the ownership of just two major local developers. Concerned that this favours these existing developers and is inconsistent with the direction of the National Policy Statement in Urban Development's (NPS-UD) promotion of a competitive land market, and also that the anticipated yield is inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in the short and medium term.</p> <p>Opposes certification process as it is an uncertain and unproven mechanism for delivering housing; rezoning is quicker and more certain process for addressing acute housing demand and escalating prices due to a supply shortage. Rezoning is also required to meet Council's requirements of the NPS-UD of providing zoned and infrastructure ready development capacity to meet demand, and give effect to Policy 12 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). Notes this submission is supported by a submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora (8.5ha) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
FS 19	FS R J Paterson Family Trust	Allow in part		Reject	Accept		
54.2	John and Coral Broughton	Amend	<p>Amend SD-O3 to require provision of housing to as a minimum achieve housing bottom lines, in order to enable the submitter's request to rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend SD-O3: "Urban development and infrastructure that:...</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to as a minimum achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1." 	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation

54.3	John and Coral Broughton	Amend	<p>Rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora (8.5ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is adjacent to existing residential development, within the West Rangiora Development Area and Future Development Area (FDA), and will accommodate approximately 127 lots. Considers the rezoning will help achieve a compact and efficient urban form, contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, and help address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land.</p> <p>Notes that Variation 1 rezones 86ha of FDA land, with an anticipated yield of approximately 1000 households, and in the ownership of just two major local developers. Concerned that this favours these existing developers and is inconsistent with the direction of the National Policy Statement in Urban Development's (NPS-UD) promotion of a competitive land market, and also that the anticipated yield is inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in the short and medium term. Opposes certification process as it is an uncertain and unproven mechanism for delivering housing; rezoning is quicker and more certain process for addressing acute housing demand and escalating prices due to a supply shortage. Rezoning is also required to meet Council's requirements of the NPS-UD of providing zoned and infrastructure ready development capacity to meet demand, and give effect to Policy 12 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). Notes this submission is supported by a submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Delete, or alternatively amend, the certification provisions to ensure it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and address any future certification concerns.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Development Area provisions to remove references to the certification process, and instead rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to identify all residential areas as Medium Residential Density; and to give effect to the other changes to the ODP sought in the Broughton submission on the Proposed District Plan (refer to full submission for ODP map); and subsequent amendments to the West Rangiora ODP narrative and other provisions to be consistent with these amendments.</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
------	--------------------------	-------	---	--------	--------	--	---

54.4	John and Coral Broughton	Amend	<p>Rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora (8.5ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is adjacent to existing residential development, within the West Rangiora Development Area and Future Development Area (FDA), and will accommodate approximately 127 lots. Considers the rezoning will help achieve a compact and efficient urban form, contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, and help address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land.</p> <p>Notes that Variation 1 rezones 86ha of FDA land, with an anticipated yield of approximately 1000 households, and in the ownership of just two major local developers. Concerned that this favours these existing developers and is inconsistent with the direction of the National Policy Statement in Urban Development's (NPS-UD) promotion of a competitive land market, and also that the anticipated yield is inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in the short and medium term.</p> <p>Opposes certification process as it is an uncertain and unproven mechanism for delivering housing; rezoning is quicker and more certain process for addressing acute housing demand and escalating prices due to a supply shortage. Rezoning is also required to meet Council's requirements of the NPS-UD of providing zoned and infrastructure ready development capacity to meet demand, and give effect to Policy 12 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). Notes this submission is supported by a submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Delete, or alternatively amend, the certification provisions to ensure it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and address any future certification concerns.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Development Area provisions to remove references to the certification process, and instead rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to identify all residential areas as Medium Residential Density; and to give effect to the other changes to the ODP sought in the Broughton submission on the Proposed District Plan (refer to full submission for ODP map); and subsequent amendments to the West Rangiora ODP narrative and other provisions to be consistent with these amendments.</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
------	--------------------------	-------	--	--------	--------	--	---

55.1	Miranda Hales	Amend	<p>Rezone 125 Lehmans Road, Rangiora (5.57ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area thus is recognised for future urban growth and would create at least 84 lots. It will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes, a well-functioning urban environment, and supports the growth direction for Rangiora set down in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan. The rezoning proposed in Variation 1 is insufficient to meet the anticipated demand for housing thus additional land needs to be rezoned urgently.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process given its uncertainty, highly discretionary nature, lack of applicant objection or appeal rights, and potential lack of transparent documentation of its decision-making process. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty. Council needs to meet its requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) of providing sufficient development capacity that is zoned and infrastructure ready to meet expected housing demand for the medium term; certification will not achieve this. Concerned that certification lapses if a Section 224(c) (Resource Management Act 1991) subdivision completion certification is not granted within three years of certification. Rezoning would only occur when the entire development area is rezoned, which may not be within the life of the Proposed District Plan. Concerned that the ability to meet the subdivision 'completion' requirement by completing a smaller subdivision is not suitable as the subdivision would be hardly underway, yet services would be allocated to potentially a significant area indefinitely, which may prejudice other subdividers if there are servicing capacity constraints. Considers there is a lack of clarity about how services will be allocated between different certification applicants (i.e. first come, first served, or priority for favoured areas). Considers Variation 1's s32AA assessment is inadequate for the above reasons.</p> <p>Notes that except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought, this submission should be read alongside and subject to the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Rezone 126 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora (Pt RS 48562) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
------	---------------	-------	--	--------	--------	--	---

55.2	Miranda Hales	Amend	<p>Amend SD-O3 to require provision of housing to as a minimum achieve housing bottom lines, in order to enable the submitter's request to rezone 125 Lehmans Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend SD-O3: "Urban development and infrastructure that: ... 4. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to as a minimum achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1 ..."</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
55.3	Miranda Hales	Amend	<p>Rezone 125 Lehmans Road, Rangiora (5.57ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area thus is recognised for future urban growth and would create at least 84 lots. It will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes, a well-functioning urban environment, and supports the growth direction for Rangiora set down in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan. The rezoning proposed in Variation 1 is insufficient to meet the anticipated demand for housing thus additional land needs to be rezoned urgently.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process given its uncertainty, highly discretionary nature, lack of applicant objection or appeal rights, and potential lack of transparent documentation of its decision-making process. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty. Council needs to meet its requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) of providing sufficient development capacity that is zoned and infrastructure ready to meet expected housing demand for the medium term; certification will not achieve this. Concerned that certification lapses if a Section 224(c) (Resource Management Act 1991) subdivision completion certification is not granted within three years of certification. Rezoning would only occur when the entire development area is rezoned, which may not be within the life of the Proposed District Plan. Concerned that the ability to meet the subdivision 'completion' requirement by completing a smaller subdivision is not suitable as the subdivision would be hardly underway, yet services would be allocated to potentially a significant area indefinitely, which may prejudice other subdividers if there are servicing capacity constraints. Considers there is a lack of clarity about how services will be allocated between different certification applicants (i.e. first come, first served, or priority for favoured areas). Considers Variation 1's s32AA assessment is inadequate for the above reasons.</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation

			<p>Notes that except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought, this submission should be read alongside and subject to the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Delete, or alternatively amend, the certification provisions to ensure it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and address any future certification concerns.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Development Area provisions to delete all references to the certification process, and instead rezone 126 Lehmans Road, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan by identifying all residential areas as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

55.4	Miranda Hales	Amend	<p>Rezone 125 Lehmans Road, Rangiora (5.57ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area thus is recognised for future urban growth and would create at least 84 lots. It will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes, a well-functioning urban environment, and supports the growth direction for Rangiora set down in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan. The rezoning proposed in Variation 1 is insufficient to meet the anticipated demand for housing thus additional land needs to be rezoned urgently.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process given its uncertainty, highly discretionary nature, lack of applicant objection or appeal rights, and potential lack of transparent documentation of its decision-making process. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty. Council needs to meet its requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) of providing sufficient development capacity that is zoned and infrastructure ready to meet expected housing demand for the medium term; certification will not achieve this. Concerned that certification lapses if a Section 224(c) (Resource Management Act 1991) subdivision completion certification is not granted within three years of certification. Rezoning would only occur when the entire development area is rezoned, which may not be within the life of the Proposed District Plan. Concerned that the ability to meet the subdivision 'completion' requirement by completing a smaller subdivision is not suitable as the subdivision would be hardly underway, yet services would be allocated to potentially a significant area indefinitely, which may prejudice other subdividers if there are servicing capacity constraints. Considers there is a lack of clarity about how services will be allocated between different certification applicants (i.e. first come, first served, or priority for favoured areas). Considers Variation 1's s32AA assessment is inadequate for the above reasons.</p> <p>Notes that except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought, this submission should be read alongside and subject to the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Delete, or alternatively amend the certification provisions to ensure it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and to address any other concerns with certification which arise on further investigation.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Development Area provisions to remove all references to the certification process, and instead</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
------	---------------	-------	--	--------	--------	--	---

			<p>rezone 126 Lehmans Road, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan by identifying all residential areas as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

56.1	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections	Amend	<p>Neutral position on the Specificprovisions of the Proposed District Plan (PDP) introduced or amended by Variation 1, subject to the matters raised in the submitters primary submission on the PDP being addressed.</p> <p>Considers intensification enabled by Variation 1: Housing Intensification provides additional justification for the changes it has sought through its primary submission on the Proposed District Plan seeking suitable provision for non-custodial community corrections sites and residential accommodation (with support).</p> <p>The primary submission noted specifically the need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Retention of the Specificdefinitions of “community corrections activity” and “residential activity” consistent with the National Planning Standard definitions. - Amendments to various Strategic Direction and Residential Zone objectives and policies to ensure the provision of a range of residential activities, such as those that involve supervision, assistance, care, and/or treatment support. - Retention of the permitted activity status of “residential activity” in General Residential Zone (GRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ). - Addition of “community corrections activity” as a permitted activity in the Mixed Use Zone (MUZ) and Town Centre Zone (TCZ). - Retention of the permitted activity status of “community corrections activity” in the Light Industrial Zone (LIZ), and General Industrial Zone (GIZ). <p>Intensification and population growth in urban areas creates more demand for non-custodial community correctional facilities.</p> <p>These facilities play a valuable role in reducing reoffending and include service centres and community work facilities. The overall activity of service centres is one of an office. Community work facilities can be large sites with yard-based activities and large equipment and/or vehicle storage. Commonly, sites are located in commercial, business areas, and industrial areas.</p> <p>One non-custodial community corrections site operates in the Waimakariri District. Rangiora Community Corrections is located at 81 Ivory Street, Rangiora, and is designated for “community corrections activity” in the Proposed District Plan reference (MCOR-1), and located within the Town Centre Zone.</p> <p>Make the amendments to the Proposed District Plan sought in the primary submission.</p>	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
------	--	-------	--	--------	--	--	----

57.1	Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Amend	<p>Rezone [212 Johns Rd and 63 Oxford Rd, Rangiora] ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area so is recognised to provide for urban growth and would create at least 297 lots. More land needs to be rezoned to help address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land, and give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requirement of providing zoned and infrastructure ready development capacity to meet expected demand in the short and medium term. The rezoning will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes and will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, and supports the growth direction for Rangiora set down in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan. Notes that Variation 1 rezones 86ha of FDA land, with an anticipated yield of approximately 1000 households, and in the ownership of just two major local developers. Concerned that this favours these existing developers and is inconsistent with the direction of the National Policy Statement in Urban Development's (NPS-UD) promotion of a competitive land market, and also that the anticipated yield is inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in the short and medium term. Considers any adverse effects arising from the proposed rezoning will be minimal, if any, and mitigatable.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process as it is an uncertain and unproven method for delivering land for housing when there is an urgent need to address the supply shortfall. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty.</p> <p>Notes this submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update of the relief sought.</p> <p>Rezone [212 Johns Rd and 63 Oxford Rd, Rangiora] (19.8ha - Pt RS 903, Lot 1 DP 61800, Pt RS 48562) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation
FS 19	FS R J Paterson Family Trust	Allow in part		Reject	Accept		

57.2	Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Amend	<p>Amend SD-O3 to require provision of housing to as a minimum achieve housing bottom lines, in order to enable the submitter's request to rezone [212 Johns Rd and 63 Oxford Rd, Rangiora] from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend SD-O3: "Urban development and infrastructure that: ... 6. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to as a minimum achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1. ..."</p>	Reject		Amendments to SD -O3 are not required for this rezoning to occur, the rezoning is recommended under the PDP and under Mr Fowler's interpretation of the Clearwater test	No
57.3	Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Amend	<p>Rezone [212 Johns Rd and 63 Oxford Rd, Rangiora] ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area so is recognised to provide for urban growth and would create at least 297 lots. More land needs to be rezoned to help address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land, and give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requirement of providing zoned and infrastructure ready development capacity to meet expected demand in the short and medium term. The rezoning will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes and will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, and supports the growth direction for Rangiora set down in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan. Notes that Variation 1 rezones 86ha of FDA land, with an anticipated yield of approximately 1000 households, and in the ownership of just two major local developers. Concerned that this favours these existing developers and is inconsistent with the direction of the National Policy Statement in Urban Development's (NPS-UD) promotion of a competitive land market, and also that the anticipated yield is inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in the short and medium term. Considers any adverse effects arising from the proposed rezoning will be minimal, if any, and mitigatable.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process as it is an uncertain and unproven method for delivering land for housing when there is an urgent need to address the supply shortfall. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty.</p> <p>Notes this submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update of the relief sought.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to identify all residential areas as Medium Density Residential; and</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	No under s42A report, Yes under the Fowler interpretation

			<p>consequential amendments to the West Rangiora ODP narrative and other provisions.</p> <p>Delete, or alternatively amend, the certification provisions so that it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and addresses any other future concerns with certification.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Development Area provisions to delete all references to the certification process, and instead rezone 212 Johns Rd and 63 Oxford Rd, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>				
57.4	Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Amend	<p>Opposes the certification process as it is an uncertain and unproven method for delivering land for housing when there is an urgent need to address the supply shortfall. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty.</p> <p>Notes this submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update of the relief sought.</p> <p>Delete, or alternatively amend, the certification provisions so that it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and addresses any other future concerns with certification.</p>	Accept in part		Certification has been recommended to be removed	No

58.1	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd		<p>Originally submitted on the Proposed District Plan (#266) seeking to rezone the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora from proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) to proposed General Residential Zone (GRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ). The previous submission is still relevant in conjunction with this submission in so far as it demonstrates the site is suitable for residential re-zoning. It is considered that Council accepts this position and now proposed re-zoning for the site as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Support the re-zoning of the site in Variation 1: Housing Intensification through the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process and notes the rezoning of the site has "legal effect". Generally support Variation 1 to the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, the technical reports prepared which contribute to the overall findings outlined in Section 32 Report, and the overall summary which concludes "there is no impediment to rezoning North East and South West Rangiora" as Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) to enable the Medium Density Residential Standards. Request small amendments to proposed rules as outlined in this submission.</p> <p>Supports to the Council proposal to now re-zone the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora from General Residential Zone (GRZ) and Medium Residential Density Zone (MRZ) to Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ –Variation 1) as part of the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process (ISPP).</p> <p>Where the Submitters are neutral or oppose Specificprovisions, these are provided.</p> <p>Specificdetails and reference to provisions within the Proposed District Plan Variation 1 are provided.</p>	Accept	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under PDP, and V1 for rezoning	Yes under both PDP, V1, and Mr Fowler's interpretation
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Reject	Accept		
58.10	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Oppose	<p>Oppose the activity status of Rule DEV-SWR-R1 as a Permitted Activity. Oppose this activity classification on the basis that development is in accordance with an outline development plan and it is typically undertaken at the time of subdivision with road and reserve vesting, and site layout design guided by the outline development plan as a Controlled Activity.</p> <p>A change from Permitted Activity to Controlled Activity status would better align the subdivision amendments requested.</p> <p>Amend DEV-SWR-R1:</p> <p>Activity status: PER CON Where:1. development shall be in accordance with DEV-SWR-APP1. Activity status when compliance not achieved: DIS</p>	Accept in part		Certification has been recommended to be removed	Yes

58.11	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Oppose	<p>- Oppose the inclusion of Fixed outline development plan features that specifically relate to the wider West Rangiora development area which is not being specified as an Existing Development Area.</p> <p>Oppose this on the basis that the location of medium density over the whole site and Specific locations for some required features (E.g Oxford Road, Lehmans Road, stormwater corridor to the east, etc) are outside of the outline development plan area and are not relevant to the subject site.</p> <p>- Oppose the inclusion of the Outline Development Plan for West Rangiora in its current form as it creates an inconsistency with the current South West Rangiora Outline Development Plan. Not specified.</p>	Accept in part		West Rangiora ODP is being adjusted in response to this submitters evidence	Yes
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			
58.12	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Amend	<p>Amend DEV-SWR-APP1 Southwest Rangiora ODP. Amend DEV-SWR-APP1:</p> <p>"Land Use Plan The Outline Development Plan for the South West Rangiora located within Fixed Outline Development Plan Features for the South West Rangiora Development Area: - Location of a concentration of medium density residential activity (meaning a minimum ratio of 70% medium density residential zone density and a maximum 30% general residential zone density) immediately adjoining the new north/south road. - Location of the local/neighbourhood centre at the juncture of Oxford Road and the north/south road - Green link with cycleway adjoining the north/south road - Location of stormwater corridor at eastern edge of the West Rangiora Development Area - Separated shared pedestrian/cycleway at Johns Road and southern part of new north/south road - Cycleways at Oxford Road, the new north/south road, Johns Road, Lehmans Road and southern flow path - Integrated road connections with 77A Acacia Avenue, Beech Drive, Walnut Way and Sequoia Way. - Flow paths and adjoining green links and cycleways, including any required water body setbacks."</p> <p>The Submitter's seek to have the South West Rangiora Outline Development Area included as proposed in Appendix 1 of DEV-SWR-APP1 South West Rangiora Outline Development Plan. The Submitter's request that the West Rangiora Outline</p>	Accept in part		West Rangiora ODP is being adjusted in response to this submitters evidence	

			Development Plan in DEV-WR-APP1 be updated accordingly to be consistent with DEV-SWR-APP1.				
58.2	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Supports the re-zoning of the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora as Medium Density Residential Zone to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards. Specifically, supports the change from 'South West Rangiora Development Area' to Medium Density Residential Zone. Supports rezoning from 'South West Rangiora Development Area' to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under PDP, and V1 for rezoning	Yes under both PDP, V1, and Mr Fowler's interpretation
58.3	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Agrees that the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora should not be subject to any qualifying matters, specifically, those specified in the Amendment Act and those justified via assessment in the Amendment Act (s77G to s77R). Agrees with the assessment of District-Wide Matters as listed on Page 25 of the Variation 1 Section 32 Report and supports the inclusion of District-Wide Matters within the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan. Not specified	Accept in part	Accept in part	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended	No

58.4	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Supports amending SUB-R2 to have immediate legal effect if there is no qualifying matter. Not specified.	Reject		s86BA RMA gives immediate legal effect to rules in an IPI if they meet all of the following criteria: - the rule is in a IPI prepared using the ISPP, the rule authorises as a permitted activity a residential unit in a relevant residential zone in accordance with the density standards set out in Part 2 of Schedule 3A, the rule does not apply to new residential zones or qualifying matter areas. The clauses in part 2 of sch 3A do not relate to subdivision, with subdivision standards being in part 1 of sch 3A instead. For this reason, SUB-R2 and the other subdivision rules do not have immediate legal effect. Even if they met this test, they would not meet the test for the developers' site as it is a 'new residential area'.	No
58.5	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Support the inclusion of South West Rangiora and the Outline Development Plan as an Area Specific Matter in Part 3 as an Existing Development Area. Not specified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
58.6	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Neutral	Neutral on the removal of objectives, policies, standards, and rules to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards. Not specified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
58.7	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Neutral	Neutral on the addition of objectives, policies, standards, and rules to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards. Not specified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No

58.8	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Oppose	<p>Opposes emphasised wording for subdivision within the Medium Density Zone (MRZ) under Rule SUB-R2: "..."</p> <p>(3)(b)(i) the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site, and that no vacant sites will be created; or ..."</p> <p>(ii) (3). no vacant allotments are created."</p> <p>This effectively requires all subdivisions in the zone to be undertaken on a "building commitment" basis and would treat a subdivision seeking vacant allotments in the MRZ as a Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>The submitter intends to provide sections only; not the final housing product that allow the community to invest in housing of their own choice and differentiates their product from other subdivision developments in Rangiora.</p> <p>It is considered unreasonable for the MRZ to only allow controlled subdivision activities where they are in conjunction with residential buildings, particularly given the legislation enables 'up to three houses' on a site which also reasonably includes the provision of one (or two) houses on a vacant site.</p> <p>The creation of a vacant section does not warrant a Discretionary Activity status and should be considered on a Controlled Activity status basis.</p> <p>Opposes emphasised wording for subdivision within the MRZ under Rule SUB-R2: "..."</p> <p>3(b) For every site without an existing residential unit, either; i. the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site, and that no vacant sites will be created; or ..."</p> <p>This specifically requires a land use consent to be applied for and concurrently assessed with a controlled subdivision application in the zone on the basis that land use consents cannot be issued under the RMA for Permitted Activities. This is not an efficient and effective (including cost to the community) consent process, which is meant to be streamlined, more permissive and enabling.</p> <p>Amend SUB-R2:</p> <p>"Medium Density Residential Zone Where: 2. SUB-S1 to SUB18 are met, except where: ..."</p> <p>3(b)(i). the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use</p>	Accept in part		The 'no vacant allotments' requirement is from cl 8, sch 3A RMA. In the context of the wording of the rest of that clause, I consider it means an allotment that will never have a residential unit built on it, as in permanently vacant, rather than requiring the first developer - the subdivider of that land - to develop all sections themselves. I support clarifying what 'vacant allotment' means in this context to address the submitters' concern. <u>This has been addressed in Appendix B changes</u>	Yes
------	---	--------	---	----------------	--	--	-----

			<p>application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that shall demonstrate that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site and that no vacant sites will be created; or ... 3(b)(ii)(3). no vacant allotments are created; ..."</p> <p>Requests that a minimum allotment size be required for any new allotment created by subdivision within the Medium Density Residential Zone. This minimum allotment size should be consistent with that included in the Proposed District Plan in Table SUB-1 – Minimum Allotment Sizes and Dimensions.</p>				
--	--	--	---	--	--	--	--

58.9	199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Oppose	<p>Opposes the removal of minimum allotment sizes under Rule SUB-S1 and table SUB-1 for the “Medium Density Residential Zone (without qualifying matters)”.</p> <p>In the case where a residential unit does not exist on the site, subdivision in the Medium Density Residential Zone to create a vacant allotment will still require a minimum site size to be specified in order to continue to achieve current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement requirements of at least 10 houses per hectare (as a minimum).</p> <p>The proposed minimum of 200m² for the zone has been removed and no minimum site size for the construction of residential units is proposed. This is appropriate with the building commitment model, but is less so when providing some guidance on the minimum size site a house can reasonably be constructed on. Inclusion of minimum site size for vacant site subdivision would maintain existing and future amenity. This would ensure that inappropriate and unanticipated density is avoided and intended amenity outcomes are preserved, especially as the density standards do not provide for urban design discretion to maintain onsite urban amenity.</p> <p>Not specified.</p>	Reject		The MDRS requires any minimum allotment sizes to be removed, except where qualifying matters apply. I understand that this is different from past planning practice, but it is a non-negotiable part of the legislation. Allotment size is now a matter of choice for the developer, down to the limits of practical surveying and buildability. <u>This has been addressed by a minimum building square provision as per this submitters evidence</u>	No
59.1	Samuel Hammond		<p>General support Variation 1: Housing intensification on the basis that small amendments to better implement the District Plan should be made.</p> <p>Specific details and reference to provisions within Variation 1 are provided and where neutral or opposed to Specific provisions, these are also provided.</p> <p>General support. Where the submitter is neutral or oppose Specific provisions, this is provided.</p> <p>Specific details and reference to provisions within the Proposed District Plan Variation 1 are provided (see full submission).</p>	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Accept			

59.10	Samuel Hammond	Oppose	<p>Oppose the activity status of Rule DEV-SWR-R1 as a Permitted Activity. Oppose this activity classification on the basis that development is in accordance with an outline development plan and it is typically undertaken at the time of subdivision with road and reserve vesting, and site layout design guided by the outline development plan as a Controlled Activity.</p> <p>A change from Permitted Activity to Controlled Activity status would better align the subdivision amendments requested.</p> <p>Amend DEV-SWR-R1:</p> <p>Activity status: PER CON Where:1. development shall be in accordance with DEV-SWR-APP1. Activity status when compliance not achieved: DIS</p>	Accept in part		Certification has been removed	Yes
59.11	Samuel Hammond	Oppose	<p>- Oppose the inclusion of Fixed outline development plan features that specifically relate to the wider West Rangiora development area which is not being specified as an Existing Development Area.</p> <p>Oppose this on the basis that the location of medium density over the whole site and Specific locations for some required features (E.g Oxford Road, Lehman's Road, stormwater corridor to the east, etc) are outside of the outline development plan area and are not relevant to the subject site.</p> <p>- Oppose the inclusion of the Outline Development Plan for West Rangiora in its current form as it creates an inconsistency with the current South West Rangiora Outline Development Plan.</p> <p>Not specified</p>	Accept		This ODP has been amended in response to submitters	Yes

59.12	Samuel Hammond	Oppose	<p>Amend DEV-SWR-APP1 Southwest Rangiora ODP. Amend DEV-SWR-APP1:</p> <p>"Land Use Plan The Outline Development Plan for the South West Rangiora located within Fixed Outline Development Plan Features for the South West Rangiora Development Area: - Location of a concentration of medium density residential activity (meaning a minimum ratio of 70% medium density residential zone density and a maximum 30% general residential zone density) immediately adjoining the new north/south road. - Location of the local/neighbourhood centre at the juncture of Oxford Road and the north/south road - Green link with cycleway adjoining the north/south road - Location of stormwater corridor at eastern edge of the West Rangiora Development Area - Separated shared pedestrian/cycleway at Johns Road and southern part of new north/south road - Cycleways at Oxford Road, the new north/south road, Johns Road, Lehmans Road and southern flow path - Integrated road connections with 77A Acacia Avenue, Beech Drive, Walnut Way and Sequoia Way. - Flow paths and adjoining green links and cycleways, including any required water body setbacks."</p> <p>The Submitter seek to have the South West Rangiora Outline Development Area included as proposed in Appendix 1 of DEV-SWR-APP1 South West Rangiora Outline Development Plan. The Submitter request that the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan in DEV-WR-APP1 be updated accordingly to be consistent with DEV-SWR-APP1.</p>	Accept		This ODP has been amended in response to submitters	Yes
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Reject			
59.2	Samuel Hammond	Support	<p>Supports the inclusion of the South West Rangiora site being re-zoned as Medium Density Residential Zone to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards. Specifically, supports the change from 'South West Rangiora Development Area' to Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ). Not specified.</p>	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No

59.3	Samuel Hammond	Support	Agrees that the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora should not be subject to any qualifying matters, specifically, those specified in the Amendment Act and those justified via assessment in the Amendment Act (s77G to s77R). Agrees with the assessment of District-Wide Matters as listed on Page 25 of the Variation 1 Section 32 Report and supports the inclusion of District-Wide Matters within the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan. Not specified	Accept	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under PDP, and V1 for rezoning	Yes under both PDP, V1, and Mr Fowler's interpretation
59.4	Samuel Hammond	Support	Supports amending SUB-R2 to have immediate legal effect if there is no qualifying matter. Not specified	Reject		s86BA RMA gives immediate legal effect to rules in an IPI if they meet all of the following criteria: - the rule is in a IPI prepared using the ISPP, the rule authorises as a permitted activity a residential unit in a relevant residential zone in accordance with the density standards set out in Part 2 of Schedule 3A, the rule does not apply to new residential zones or qualifying matter areas. The clauses in part 2 of sch 3A do not relate to subdivision, with subdivision standards being in part 1 of sch 3A instead. For this reason, SUB-R2 and the other subdivision rules do not have immediate legal effect. Even if they met this test, they would not meet the test for the developers' site as it is a 'new residential area'.	No
59.5	Samuel Hammond	Support	Support the inclusion of South West Rangiora and the Outline Development Plan as an Area Specific Matter in Part 3 as an Existing Development Area. Not specified	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
59.6	Samuel Hammond	Neutral	Neutral on the removal of objectives, policies, standards, and rules to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards. Not specified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No
59.7	Samuel Hammond	Neutral	Neutral on the addition of objectives, policies, standards, and rules to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards. Not specified.	Accept		No changes proposed as a result of this submission	No

59.8	Samuel Hammond	Amend	<p>Opposes emphasised wording for subdivision within the Medium Density Zone under Rule SUB-R2:</p> <p>"... (3)(b)(i). the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site, and that no vacant sites will be created; or ... 3. no vacant allotments are created." This effectively requires all subdivisions in the zone to be undertaken on a "building commitment" basis and would treat a subdivision seeking vacant allotments in the MRZ as a Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>There is significant investment in providing reserves, civil, and roading infrastructure in the construction of a greenfield subdivision. For this reason, not all developers construct housing within their development on finished sections, but instead provide vacant sections to the property market that allow the community to invest in housing of their own choice.</p> <p>There also needs to be an opportunity for a developer to create large 'superlot' sections suitable for comprehensive development. The various types of subdivision development, whether superlot, vacant section or house and land package needs to be able to be catered for within the Proposed District Plan rules.</p> <p>It is considered unreasonable for the MRZ to only allow controlled subdivision activities where they are in conjunction with residential buildings, particularly given the legislation enables 'up to three houses' on a site which also reasonably includes the provision of one (or two) houses on a vacant site. The creation of a vacant section does not warrant a Discretionary Activity status and should be considered on a Controlled Activity status basis.</p> <p>Opposes emphasised wording for subdivision within the MRZ under Rule SUB-R2:</p> <p>"... 3(b) For every site without an existing residential unit, either; i. the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site, and that no vacant sites will be created; or ..."</p> <p>This specifically requires a land use consent to be applied for and</p>	Accept in part		<p>The 'no vacant allotments' requirement is from cl 8, sch 3A RMA. In the context of the wording of the rest of that clause, I consider it means an allotment that will never have a residential unit built on it, as in permanently vacant, rather than requiring the first developer - the subdivider of that land - to develop all sections themselves. I support clarifying what 'vacant allotment' means in this context to address the submitters' concern. <u>This has been clarified in Appendix B in response to submitter evidence.</u></p>	Yes
------	----------------	-------	--	----------------	--	--	-----

		<p>concurrently assessed with a controlled subdivision application in the zone on the basis that land use consents cannot be issued under the RMA for Permitted Activities. This is not an efficient and effective (including cost to the community) consent process, which is meant to be streamlined, more permissive and enabling. Amend SUB-R2:</p> <p>"Medium Density Residential Zone Where: 2. SUB-S1 to SUB18 are met, except where: ... 3(b)(i). the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that shall demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site and that no vacant sites will be created; or ... 3(b)(ii)(3). no vacant allotments are created; ..."</p> <p>Requests that a minimum allotment size be required for any new allotment created by subdivision within the Medium Density Residential Zone. This minimum allotment size should be consistent with that included in the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan in Table SUB-1 – Minimum Allotment Sizes and Dimensions.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

59.9	Samuel Hammond	Oppose	<p>Opposes the removal of minimum allotment sizes under Rule SUB-S1 and table SUB-1 for the "Medium Density Residential Zone (without qualifying matters)".</p> <p>In the case where a residential unit does not exist on the site, subdivision in the Medium Density Residential Zone to create a vacant allotment will still require a minimum site size to be specified in order to continue to achieve current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement requirements of at least 10 houses per hectare (as a minimum).</p> <p>The proposed minimum of 200m² for the zone has been removed and no minimum site size for the construction of residential units is proposed. This is appropriate with the building commitment model, but is less so when providing some guidance on the minimum size site a house can reasonably be constructed on. Inclusion of minimum site size for vacant site subdivision would maintain existing and future amenity. This would ensure that inappropriate and unanticipated density is avoided and intended amenity outcomes are preserved, especially as the density standards do not provide for urban design discretion to maintain onsite urban amenity. Therefore, the minimum allotment size is important to support best practice.</p> <p>Not specified</p>	Reject		The MDRS requires any minimum allotment sizes to be removed, except where qualifying matters apply. I understand that this is different from past planning practice, but it is a non-negotiable part of the legislation. Allotment size is now a matter of choice for the developer, down to the limits of practical surveying and buildability.	No -Yes
6.1	Jackson Davey	Support	<p>Supports Variation 1. Intensification will be for the common benefit by reducing house prices, reducing travel times by limited sprawl, and being more enabling for public transport - thus significantly reducing emissions.</p> <p>Retain Variation 1 as notified, or alternatively amend to further encourage higher density housing and urban areas as this will benefit the average person substantially.</p>	Reject		The support of the submitter for Variation 1 as notified or amended to encourage further high density housing and urban areas is noted, however, the s42A recommendations are to further limit the scope of the MDRS	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Reject			

61.1	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Richard and Geoff Spark	Amend	<p>Rezoning an area of land (approximately 56ha) located north and south of Boys Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to provide approximately 836 lots. This would be a sustainable and efficient use of resources that better provides for Rangiora's social, economic, environmental well-being than continuation of its increasingly problematic use as a dairy farm. Rezoning will help achieve a compact and efficient urban form. The site is within a preferred business growth direction in the District Development Strategy, however residential growth, or both, is more appropriate. The certification process for providing development capacity is uncertain and slower than rezoning. Variation 1 does not rezone a sufficient area of land for residential to meet predicted demand; thus additional land is needed to avoid impacts on housing affordability. Rezoning the site will add further developers to promote a competitive land market, as required by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).</p> <p>The part of the site north of Boys Road is within the South East Rangiora Development Area and is a Future Development Area, thus needs to be rezoned urgently to give effect to Policy 12 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).</p> <p>The part of the site south of Boys Road, to the west of the Eastern Bypass between Boys and Marsh Roads will become isolated and thus difficult to farm so should be rezoned for residential, or BIZ, or large format/mixed use (or a mix). Rezoning this area is provided for in the NPS-UD as it provides significant development capacity, ensures there is 'at least' sufficient capacity to meet housing needs, and contributes to a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p>This submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought. Rezoning all land north and south of Boys Road outlined in red on Figure 1 below (refer to full submission for Figure 1) ('the site') the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). With respect to the land south of Boys Road and west of the eastern bypass, in the alternative, rezone to MDRZ, BIZ, Format Retail/Mixed Use, or a mix. The site is part of the Spark dairy farm, located at 197 Boys Rd, Rangiora. The land north of Boys Road is contained in four titles (19 Spark Lane - Lot 2 DP 418207, Lot 3 DP 418207, Part Rural Section 1436, and 234 Boys Rd - Lot 1 DP 22100). It includes the Rossburn Events Centre and Northbrook Museum at 17 Spark Lane (Lot 1 DP 418207). Land south of Boys Road (approximately 30 ha) is part of the larger Sparks farm title (Lots 1, 3 DP 418207 Lot 1 DP 80780 Lot 1 DP 80781 RURAL SECS 1883 1884 2452 2512 PT RURAL SECS 316 358A 387 1436 1438 BLK VII XI RANGIORA SD 1) (refer to figure 2 of the full submission for map of Spark farm).</p>	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	
------	--	-------	--	--------	--------	--	--

FS 61	FS Bellgrove Rangiora Limited	Allow in part		Reject	Accept		
61.2	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Richard and Geoff Spark	Amend	<p>Supports South East Rangiora Development Area (DEV-SER) in principle, however considers references to the feasibility of development within the DEV-SER narrative are inappropriate and should be removed as nearby developments have been successful with similar ground conditions, and market prices also affect feasibility.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process given its uncertainty, highly discretionary nature, lack of applicant objection or appeal rights, and potential lack of transparent documentation of its decision-making process. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty. Council needs to meet its requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) of providing sufficient development capacity that is zoned and infrastructure ready to meet housing demand for the medium term; certification will not achieve this. Concerned that certification lapses if a Section 224(c) (Resource Management Act 1991) subdivision completion certification is not granted within three years of certification. Rezoning would only occur when the entire development area is rezoned, which may not be within the life of the Proposed District Plan. Concerned that the ability to meet the subdivision 'completion' requirement by completing a smaller subdivision is not suitable as the subdivision would be hardly underway, yet services would be allocated to potentially a significant area indefinitely, which may prejudice other subdividers if there are capacity constraints. Considers there is a lack of clarity about how services will be allocated between different certification applicants.</p> <p>This aligns with the submitter's request to rezone an area of land (approximately 56ha) located north and south of Boys Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to provide approximately 836 lots, which is needed to help provide sufficient development capacity for residential development to meet anticipated demand, and therefore help meet the requirements of the CRPS and NPS-UD.</p> <p>Notes this submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought. Amend the South East Rangiora Outline Development Plan and associated narrative to identify all residential areas as Medium Density Residential; and give effect to the other amendments to the South East Rangiora Outline Development Plan sought in the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan shown in Figure 3 (refer to full submission for Figure 3).</p>	Accept	N/A	Rezoned under hearing stream 12E, also under V1 if Mr Fowler's test is accepted. Certification has been recommended to be removed	

			<p>Delete the certification process, or in the less preferred alternative amend to ensure that it is a lawful, fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters than can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and addresses any other future concerns.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

61.3	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Richard and Geoff Spark	<p>Opposes the certification process given its uncertainty, highly discretionary nature, lack of applicant objection or appeal rights, and potential lack of transparent documentation of its decision-making process. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty. Council needs to meet its requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) of providing sufficient development capacity that is zoned and infrastructure ready to meet housing demand for the medium term; certification will not achieve this. Concerned that certification lapses if a Section 224(c) (Resource Management Act 1991) subdivision completion certification is not granted within three years of certification. Rezoning would only occur when the entire development area is rezoned, which may not be within the life of the Proposed District Plan. Concerned that the ability to meet the subdivision 'completion' requirement by completing a smaller subdivision is not suitable as the subdivision would be hardly underway, yet services would be allocated to potentially a significant area indefinitely, which may prejudice other subdividers if there are capacity constraints. Considers there is a lack of clarity about how services will be allocated between different certification applicants.</p> <p>This aligns with the submitters request to rezone an area of land (approximately 56ha) located north and south of Boys Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to provide approximately 836 lots, which is needed to help provide sufficient development capacity for residential development to meet anticipated demand, and therefore help meet the requirements of the CRPS and NPS-UD.</p> <p>Notes this submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought. Delete the certification process, or as a less preferred alternative amend the certification process to ensure that is a lawful, fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters than can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and addresses any other future concerns.</p>	Accept	N/A	Rezoned under hearing stream 12E, also under V1 if Mr Fowler's test is accepted. Certification has been recommended to be removed	
------	--	--	--------	-----	---	--

61.4	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Richard and Geoff Spark	Amend	<p>Amend SD-O3 to enable the submitter's request to rezone for residential development an area of land located north and south of Boys Road, Rangiora that adjoins a Future Development Area as this is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development's requirement of ensuring there is 'at least' sufficient capacity to meet housing needs.</p> <p>Amend SD-O3: "Urban development and infrastructure that: ... 4. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to as a minimum achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1 ..."</p>	Reject	Reject	Amendments to SD -O3 are not required for this rezoning to occur, the rezoning is recommended under the PDP and under Mr Fowler's interpretation of the Clearwater test	
62.1	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Rick Allaway and Lionel Larsen	Amend	<p>Rezone 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora (Lot 2 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 328154, Lot 2 DP 328154, Lot 3 DP 328154, Lot 4 DP 328154, Lot 5 DP 328154, Lot 6 DP 328154, Lot 7 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 83612, Lot 7 DP 83612, Lot 6 DP 83612, and Lot 5 DP 83612 respectively) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential – SpecificControl Area Density 2, with a minimum net site area 1000m2 and minimum average net site area 1500m2 (or similar); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential (LLR); or a mixed density residential zone which enables a wide range of residential lot sizes from MDRZ to LLRZ sizes.</p> <p>The site adjoins an urban area and its development will help achieve a compact, efficient, and connective urban form. This mix of densities will provide for varying needs, and is therefore consistent with the requirement of National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) to enable housing variety. The rezoning is consistent with the NPS-UD provision for plan changes that add significant additional development capacity and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment. The total area of land rezoned by Variation 1 is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements - as the yield is insufficient to meet Rangiora's housing needs in both the short and medium term; and it favours just two developers thus would not promote a competitive market.</p> <p>Notes that except where this submission provides an update the relief sought, this submission should be read subject to the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Rezone 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora (Lot 2 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 328154, Lot 2 DP 328154, Lot 3 DP 328154, Lot 4 DP 328154, Lot 5 DP 328154, Lot 6 DP 328154, Lot 7 DP</p>	Reject	Reject	Discussed with submitter, MDRZ is not sought for this site under either PDP or V1. Matter addressed by Mr Buckley in stream 12C	No

			328154, Lot 8 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 83612, Lot 7 DP 83612, Lot 6 DP 83612, and Lot 5 DP 83612 respectively) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential – SpecificControl Area Density 2, with a minimum net site area 1000m2 and minimum average net site area 1500m2 (or similar); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential (LLR); or a mixed density residential zone which enables a wide range of residential lot sizes from MDRZ to LLRZ sizes.				
FS 2	FS Transpower	Reject		Accept	Accept		
62.2	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Rick Allaway and Lionel Larsen		Amend SD-O3 to help enable the submitter's request to rezone 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone, or a mix of residential density zones. Amend SD-O3: "Urban development and infrastructure that: ... 6. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to as a minimum achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1 ..."	Reject	Reject	Discussed with submitter, MDRZ is not sought for this site under either PDP or V1. Matter addressed by Mr Buckley in stream 12C. Amendments to SD-O3 would not be required in any respect	

62.3	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Rick Allaway and Lionel Larsen	Amend	<p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan to include 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora as Medium Density Residential or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential – SpecificControl Area Density 2, with a minimum net site area 1000m2 and minimum average net site area 1500m2 (or similar); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential (LLR); or a mixed density residential zone which enables a wide range of residential lot sizes from MDRZ to LLRZ sizes.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to include 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora (Lot 2 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 328154, Lot 2 DP 328154, Lot 3 DP 328154, Lot 4 DP 328154, Lot 5 DP 328154, Lot 6 DP 328154, Lot 7 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 83612, Lot 7 DP 83612, Lot 6 DP 83612, and Lot 5 DP 83612 respectively) as Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential – SpecificControl Area Density 2, with a minimum net site area 1000m2 and minimum average net site area 1500m2 (or similar); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential (LLR); or a mixed density residential zone which enables a wide range of residential lot sizes from MDRZ to LLRZ sizes.</p>	Reject	Reject	Discussed with submitter, MDRZ is not sought for this site under either PDP or V1. Matter addressed by Mr Buckley in stream 12C	
63.1	Stuart Allan	Amend	<p>Concerned that 249 Coldstream Road, Rangiora would not adjoin any Rural Lifestyle Zone land, and any adjoining medium density residential developments could affect the site's rural lifestyle activities.</p> <p>Rezone 249 Coldstream Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Reject	Accept	Rezoned under hearing stream 12E, also under V1 if Mr Fowler's test is accepted. Certification has been recommended to be removed	

64.1	Environment Canterbury Regional Council - Jeff Smith	Amend	<p>Support the inclusion of natural hazards as a qualifying matter under Variation 1 to the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan. However, concerned regarding the density of development provided for within the areas subject to high hazard risk within Kaiapoi. Note that the qualifying matter for Kaiapoi Area A provides for a minimum allotment area of 200m². While Policy 11.3.1 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) provides for development within existing residential areas that may be subject to high hazard risk (provided that the risk is appropriately mitigated), it is considered it would be more appropriate to avoid further intensification in these areas that are subject to high hazard risk (ie. within the High Hazard Flooding Overlay).</p> <p>Appropriately mitigating high hazard risk in these areas will be a difficult process to undertake and assess through the district plan. It could lead to unforeseen consequences on the surrounding areas due to the nature of mitigation that would likely be required. This could be on amenity effects (raised floor levels) and offsite flood displacement.</p> <p>Support inclusion of the operative airport noise contour (specifically 50 dBA) as a qualifying matter in the proposed Waimakariri District Plan as part of Variation 1 and consider this gives effect to Policy 6.3.5 of the CRPS.</p> <p>Request that the Council quantifies the potential number of new dwellings that could be located in high hazard areas and considers the effects that this will have on increasing the risk from a high hazard flood event. Retain the minimum allotment size for sites within Kaiapoi Area A (and in any other areas) that are affected by the High Hazard Flood Overlay, as was notified in the Proposed District Plan. Further assess these provisions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness, to determine whether what is proposed is the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives under section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>Retain the operative airport noise contour (specifically 50 dBA) as a qualifying matter.</p>	Accept in part		<p>The qualifying matters for Area A and Area B in Kaiapoi are recommended to stay as notified. In response to Ms Watt's evidence, in my right of reply on V1, I have explained that the qualifying matters apply to infill and brownfields development where wide-scale land raising and/or mitigation of the flood hazard cannot easily occur, not without potential displacement effects on surrounding properties which ECan have raised in the submission.</p>	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose				Reject	

64.2	Environment Canterbury Regional Council	Amend	Support the inclusion of natural hazards as a qualifying matter under Variation 1 to the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan. However, concerned regarding the density of development provided for within the areas subject to high hazard risk within Kaiapoi. Note that the qualifying matter for Kaiapoi Area A provides for a minimum allotment area of 200m ² . While Policy 11.3.1 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) provides for development within existing residential areas that may be subject to high hazard risk (provided that the risk is appropriately mitigated), it is considered it would be more appropriate to avoid further intensification in these areas that are subject to high hazard risk (i.e. within the High Hazard Flooding Overlay). Appropriately mitigating high hazard risk in these areas will be a difficult process to undertake and assess through the district plan. It could lead to unforeseen consequences on the surrounding areas due to the nature of mitigation that would likely be required. This could be on amenity effects (raised floor levels) and offsite flood displacement. Request that Council quantifies the potential number of new dwellings that could be located in high hazard areas and considers the effects that this will have on increasing the risk from a high hazard flood event. Retain the minimum allotment size for sites within Kaiapoi Area A (and in any other areas) that are affected by the High Hazard Flood Overlay, as was notified in the Proposed District Plan. Further assess these provisions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness, to determine whether what is proposed is the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives under section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Accept in part		The qualifying matters for Area A and Area B in Kaiapoi are recommended to stay as notified. In response to Ms Watt's evidence, in my right of reply on V1, I have explained that the qualifying matters apply to infill and brownfields development where wide-scale land raising and/or mitigation of the flood hazard cannot easily occur, not without potential displacement effects on surrounding properties which ECan have raised in the submission.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose				Reject	
64.3	Environment Canterbury Regional Council	Support	Support inclusion of the operative airport noise contour (specifically 50 dBA) as a qualifying matter in the Proposed District Plan as part of Variation 1 and consider this gives effect to Policy 6.3.5 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Retain the operative airport noise contour (specifically 50 dBA) as a qualifying matter.	Accept in part		Assessed in IPI s42A report for hearing stream 10A. I have recommended to keep the qualifying matter as notified, however I have noted in Rights of Reply that the qualifying matter is now more stringent than that in the decisions version of PC14, which recommend its removal and/or replacement with adherence to acoustic insulation standards	
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Support		Accept			

65.1	Williams Waimak Ltd	Amend	<p>Rezoning the northern portion of 12 Williams St, Kaiapoi from General Industrial Zone (GIZ) to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) so the entire site is MDRZ. This is a more cohesive and efficient use of this largely vacant land adjoining a residential environment, rather than retrospective infill development. This rezoning would benefit residents of the MDRZ properties adjoining the west of the site as they would no longer be adjacent to industrial activities thus reducing the potential for reverse sensitivity. Courtenay Drive and Stone Street will provide a buffer between the MDRZ and adjoining GIZ. The rezoning would allow for additional housing to help alleviate the housing crisis. The current GIZ boundary line goes through existing buildings which could create boundary issues. In terms of Section 32 considerations, the rezoning would be a more efficient and effective method of providing for medium density housing, rather than a non-complying resource consent process.</p> <p>Rezoning the northern portion of 12 Williams St, Kaiapoi from General Industrial Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) so the entire site is MDRZ.</p>	<u>Accept</u>	Accept	<p>I had neglected to consider this submission in my s42A, I have addressed it in the Right of Reply, and recommend that the LIZ zoning on the northern part of the site is removed and replaced with MDRZ. It is a brownfields site in South Kaiapoi, formerly a scout camp. The site was already MDRZ as notified. Applying Mr Fowler's test would result in no change to the recommendation to accept.</p>	
------	---------------------	-------	---	---------------	--------	---	--

66.1	Emma Davey	Amend	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) applying to a portion of lots within Stage 7 of Silverstream East as addressed in resource consents RC215144 and RC215145, which was granted consent on 9 December 2021 subject to conditions. Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 (refer to full submission for plan showing location of these lots) be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. These conditions were added to the development's resource consent decision by the Commissioner to address issues relating to the departure from the Outline Development Plan, interface and integration issues between the existing Kaiapoi residential area and the new development - primarily in relation to raising ground levels above that of adjoining residential properties, the form of fencing on Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135, building setbacks, building height, and access arrangements. Considers the effect of this additional qualifying matter will be minor to the implementation of the MDRS given it only relates to 15 lots.</p> <p>Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. Some of the main conditions are:</p> <p>Subdivision resource consent RC215144</p> <p>Condition 14.15 - Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have no vehicle access to Road 8. Condition 14.16 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 14.15 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 128 to 130 and 134 and 135. Condition 28.1 and 28.2 - Any buildings to be single storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m and windows facing existing properties not to be above 3m in height. Condition 28.3 - Pursuant to section 221 of the resource management act 1991, Conditions 28.1 and 28.2 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the record of the title for lots 107 — 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135. Condition 29.4 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A1 as shown on approved plan, stamped RC 215144 and RC 215145. Condition 29.5 - Pursuant to section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 29.4 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lot 128. Condition 30.3 - Area B Allotments — Dwellings erected on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have conditions as set out in the Commissioners Report. Condition 30.4 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 30.3 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135.</p> <p>Land use resource consent RC215145</p> <p>Condition 9.1 - Any buildings to be constructed at any time on</p>	Reject		I do not consider the scope of qualifying matters to include existing consent conditions	
------	------------	-------	---	--------	--	--	--

			<p>Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130 and 134 and 135, shall be single storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m measured from finished ground level. Condition 9.2 - Any dwellinghouse constructed on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall not have any windows above 3m height, facing towards Kynnersley Street, 8, 10, 11 and 12 Murray Place and 31 and 35 Adderley Terrace. Condition 10.1 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within the 10m of the Eastern Boundary. Condition 10.2 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A I as shown on approved plan stamped RC215144/RC215145. Condition 10.3 - No dwellinghouse on Lots 107 to 116 shall be constructed within 11.5m of the eastern boundary.</p>				
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

67.1	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Variation 1 needs to adequately address the critical need for retirement accommodation and aged care in the District. New Zealand, including Waimakariri District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The ageing population is recognised in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand.</p> <p>The retirement village industry provides appropriate accommodation to address the Specific needs of the older population, including a range of large and smaller scaled retirement villages and aged care homes with differing services, amenities and care. This variety enables differing price points and options, which are vital to enabling choices for the growing ageing population. Retirement villages also combat isolation and loneliness felt by many older people. Appropriately planning for the ageing population will impact on the mental and physical health and wellbeing of some of society's most vulnerable members.</p> <p>What Variation 1 must deliver for retirement villages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better enable housing and care for the ageing population to promote the wellbeing of older persons within our communities. This requires district plans to better enable the construction of new retirement villages instead of cumbersome and uncertain resource management processes. - Recognise that retirement villages are a residential activity as they provide permanent homes for the residents that live there. In line with the Enabling Housing Act, the construction of retirement villages (being four or more residential units on a site) can be regulated as a restricted discretionary activity. - Provide for retirement villages in the Medium Density Residential Zone to enable older people to stay within the communities in which they currently live. - Provide for change to the character and amenity of existing urban environments to enable retirement villages, in accordance with the NPS-UD. - Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites. Given large sites in urban areas are a rare resource, it is important they are developed efficiently to maximise the benefits from their development. - Recognise the unique internal amenity needs of retirement villages compared to typical residential housing. - Provide clear and focused matters of discretion to avoid significant cost and time delays in consenting retirement villages in residential zones. - Provide appropriately focused notification rules. Given the significant costs associated with notification, it should only be required where it will benefit the decision-making process. - Use the MDRS as a guideline. The retirement village- 	Reject		Variation 1 is not specific to retirement villages, and already enables them	
------	---	-------	---	--------	--	--	--

			<p>Specific framework sought in this submission takes a similar approach to the Enabling Housing Act (given that retirement villages are a form of development with four or more residential units) with the standards informing matters of discretion and limited notification presumptions. With some amendments to reflect the Specific nature of retirement villages, the submitter considers the MDRS set a relevant baseline for identifying standards relevant for the construction of retirement villages.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Provide for retirement villages in commercial and mixed use zones. Due to the lack of suitable sites in existing residential areas and the need to respond to the retirement living and care crisis, retirement villages also operate in some commercial and mixed use zones where there is good access to services and amenities. <p>Seeks amendments to Variation 1 to provide a retirement-village Specific framework to address the above issues.</p> <p>Seeks that Variation 1 is amended to provide a retirement-village Specific framework as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The MDRS must be accurately translated into the Proposed Plan. Seek some amendments to the MDRS to ensure they are workable for retirement villages. Seek amendments to other provisions to ensure there is no conflict, overlap or inconsistency with the MDRS. - The objectives and policies of the Plan must enable appropriate accommodation and care for the aging population. - Rules to enable retirement villages in the Medium Density Residential Zone. - Tailored matters of discretion for retirement villages. - Proportionate notification. - Clear, targeted and appropriate development standards. - Providing for retirement villages in commercial, mixed use and other zones. <p>Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</p>				
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Support		Reject			
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Oppose		Accept			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.10	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Acknowledges that RESZ-P8 has been amended to address Policy 4 of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). However, the existing language within Policy RESZ-P8 is inconsistent with Policy 1 of the MDRS. Further, Policy 4 of the MDRS is not a qualification on the direction to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p> <p>Delete or amend RESZ-P8 to ensure there is no overlap or inconsistency with Policy 1 of the MDRS and ensure Policy 4 is not a qualification.</p>	Reject		RESZ-P8 only needs to be consistent with the residential component of Policy 1 of the MDRS (cl 2(a), sch 3A, RMA), however the overall suite of objectives and policies must be consistent with the MDRS	

67.11	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>The retention of RESZ-P10 and its continued application to retirement villages within the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) creates a conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and the relief sought in relation to MRZ-R18. It is therefore not fit for purpose as a general policy and should be deleted or moved to the General Residential Zone policies. Additional policies are needed to provide policy support for MRZ-R18 and the retirement village-specific matters of discretion sought in this submission.</p> <p>Delete RESZ-P10 or relocate to the General Residential Zone, and new policies for the Medium Density Residential Zone:</p> <p>Provision of housing for an ageing population</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services. b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age. <p>Changing communities</p> <p>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p> <p>Larger sites</p> <p>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p>	Reject		RESZ-P10 was not amended by Variation 1, and may be out of scope. If it is within scope then I don't recommend the relief as I cannot see how providing enabling direction on retirement villages is inconsistent with the MDRS. I note that the matters in RESZ-P10 do not directly affect density.	
67.12	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Supports RESZ-P15 as it aligns with Policy 2 of the Medium Density Residential Standards.</p> <p>Retain RESZ-P15 as notified.</p>	Accept in part		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.13	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Paragraph 1 of the introduction refers to the zone comprising of "residential areas predominantly used for residential activity with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings...". The reference to residential activity having a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings does not reflect the expectations for the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) as set out in the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). The introductory text should acknowledge that the amenity and character of the MRZ will substantially change as a result of the MDRS. It should also acknowledge the broad scope of the MRZ.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 1 of the Medium Density Residential Zone Chapter to provide clarity around the level of residential activity anticipated in the zone:</p> <p>"Introduction The purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone is to provide for residential areas predominantly used for residential activity and enables medium density development, including with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as detached, semidetached and terrace housing, low rise apartments and other compatible activities. Such areas are identified close to town and neighbourhood centres, along public transport corridors, or close to public transports. ..."</p>	Reject		I consider that the zone description does need to be amended, however this amendment should reflect the actual description of the zone following qualifying matters...	
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Accept			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.14	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-O1 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the Medium Density Residential Standards. Retain MRZ-O1 as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
67.15	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-P1 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the Medium Density residential Standards. Retain MRZ-P1 as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
67.16	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-P2 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the Medium Density Residential Standards. Retain MRZ-P2 as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

67.17	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Opposes MRZ-P3 as it has not been amended to align with the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). The use of the word “maintain” does not acknowledge the change that is anticipated in the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) in line with the MDRS, and there should not be an expectation to maintain character in the MRZ.</p> <p>MRZ-P3(1) – (8) also introduce requirements that overlap and conflict with MRZ-P1 and P2. For example, (3) requires activities to “provide for” high quality building and landscape design, which overlaps and conflicts with the reference to “encouraging” high-quality developments in MRZ-P2.</p> <p>Delete or amend MRZ-P3 to ensure there is no overlap or inconsistency with Policy 3 of the Medium Density Residential Standards.</p>	Reject		Policy 3 of the MDRS is "encourage development to achieve attractive and safer streets and public open spaces, including by providing for passive surveillance", which does not directly relate to the matters the submitter raises. I do not see an inconsistency between MRZ-P3 and P1 and P2.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.18	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers that it is appropriate for the Medium Density Residential Standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.</p> <p>Insert new policy in the Medium Density Residential Zone Chapter.</p> <p>"MRZ-PX Role of density standards Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments."</p>	Reject		The baseline for development assessments would be the full effect of the plan - including qualifying matters and factors that do not relate to density. See Yeoman 2023...	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose				Accept	

67.19	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Supports MRZ-R1. However, the construction of retirement villages will likely be a restricted discretionary activity under this rule. Retirement villages should be a permitted activity, and that it should only be the construction of a retirement village that is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion should provide for the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities, including providing for the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village. Internal amenity standards applicable to retirement villages should be limited to those controls/standards necessary or appropriate for retirement villages.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-R1 to exclude retirement villages and include a bespoke rule for the construction of retirement villages with a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</p> <p>"MRZ-R1A Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure for a retirement village Activity status: PER Where: 1. the activity complies with MRZ-BFS1-12 (as applicable). Legal Effect This rule will have immediate legal effect. Activity status when compliance is not achieved: RDIS</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to: RES-MDX – Construction of buildings for a retirement village</p> <p>Notification An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified. An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with MRZ-BFS2, MRZ-BFS4, MRZ-BFS5, and MRZ-BFS7 is precluded from being limited notified."</p>	Reject		The MDRS encourages all residential activities within the zone to be treated alike, and not to single out particular activities for special treatment, which is what the submitter is asking for.	
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Accept			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.2	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Considers that a 'retirement unit' definition is required to acknowledge the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs. Add a new definition for 'retirement unit' :</p> <p>"Retirement Unit means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit."</p>	Reject		The MDRS and NPS definitions of residential unit are inclusive of all types of residential unit, including retirement units. Even if it were possible to exclude retirement units from the definition, this would have the perverse effect of potentially excluding retirement units from MDRS standards.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.20	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Supports the inclusion of a specific rule for the establishment of retirement villages, and that resource consent applications are precluded from being publicly notified. However, retirement villages as a land use activity should be classified as a permitted activity - with the construction/establishment of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity. In this regard, the residential use component of a retirement village should be permitted.</p> <p>Consider that the requirement for a design statement and the retention of matters of discretion regarding residential design principles to be inappropriate as those provisions are designed for standard residential development, not retirement villages. The residential design principles also do not align with the expectations for the Medium Density Residential Zone. Retirement villages should be assessed against bespoke matters of discretion.</p> <p>Seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages as an activity to be provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of retirement villages provided for as a restricted discretionary activity (retirement village Specific matters of discretion) as set out in relation to MRZ-R1.</p> <p>Delete the requirement for a design statement to be provided with the application.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-R18 to provide for retirement villages as an activity to be permitted.</p>	Reject		Retirement villages are almost always for developments of more than 3 residential units, along with other mixed use types of services therefore consents are required under the MDRS, in particular, MRZ-R2. I am recommending that MRZ-R18 is deleted as this conflicts with MRZ-R2	
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Accept			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.21	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Supports in part MRZ-BFS1 and the number of residential units per site provisions which reflect the number of residential units per site standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS), with some additions/alternatives relating to qualifying matters. However, amend to refer to "retirement units" with the addition of the definition proposed.</p> <p>In relation to the notification clauses of MRZ-BFS1 which relate to compliance with MRZ-BFS2 to MRZBFS12, considers that the inclusion of additional standards within the notification clause to those provided by the Resource Management Act 1991 (relating to landscaped permeable surface, street interface, and fencing) create a conflict with the MDRS and should be deleted. Amend MRZ-BFS1 to refer to retirement units.</p> <p>Delete those standards that have been included in the notification clauses that conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards:</p> <p>"MRZ-BFS1 Number of residential units per site ... Notification An application for the construction and use of 1, 2 or 3 residential units that does not comply with 1 or more of MRZ-BFS2, 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12MRZ-BFS4, MRZBFS5, MRZ-BFS7, MRZ-BFS9, MRZ-BFS10, MRZ-BFS11 or MRZ-BFS12 is precluded from being publicly notified. Legal Effect This standard has immediate legal effect. Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS ... Notification An application for the construction and use of 4 or more residential units that does comply with the MRZBFS2, 3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12 MRZ-BFS4, MRZ-BFS5, MRZ-BFS7, MRZ-BFS9, MRZ-BFS10, MRZ-BFS11 or MRZ-BFS12 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified."</p>	Reject		The additional standards relate to matters other than density, and as they do not affect density, they do not create a conflict with the MDRS	
67.22	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Supports MRZ-BFS2 and the building coverage provisions which reflects the Medium Density Residential Standards. Retain MRZ-BFS2 as notified.</p>	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

67.23	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-BFS3 as the Medium Density Residential Standards do not include this standard. In particular, considers that that the discretionary status for non-compliance with this standard is inconsistent with the other built form standard provisions of the Medium Density Residential Zone and goes against the Resource Management Act's purpose to enable increased intensification. For example, if a residential development were to comply with all built form standards except MRZ-BFS3 (landscape permeable surface), the activity status would be discretionary. Delete MRZ-BFS3.	Accept in part		cl 18(1), sch 3A, RMA requires a minimum of 20% of a site in a landscaped area. BFS3 implements this, with a calculation standard for decks and path. The only component of the rule that is not consistent with the MDRS is the discretionary status, which is subject to other submissions. It should be restricted discretionary. However the submitter requests the deletion of the whole rule.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
67.24	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-BFS4 in part as it is considered that the discretionary activity status for any exceedance is contrary to Schedule 3A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991. Amend the activity status for noncompliance with MRZ-BFS4 to be restricted, in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 3A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991: "MRZ-BFS4 Height ... Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: The effects of the breach of the height standard"	Accept		This, and other submitters have raised the issue of the incorrect activity status. It should be restricted discretionary	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.25	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Oppose MRZ-BFS5 as it seeks to restrict the provision of residential buildings adjacent to strategic or arterial roads by applying a 6m setback in excess of the Medium Density Residential Standards, when all such roads are not considered to be qualifying matters in accordance with section 771 of the Enabling Housing Act. Opposes the application of residential design principles as a matter of discretion. Amend MRZS-BFS5 so that it only applies to nationally significant infrastructure, and the matters of discretion only relate to the effects of the breach of the standard: "Matters of discretion are restricted to: RES-MD2 - Residential design principles RES-MD5 - Impact on neighbouring property"	Reject		The MDRS does allow such a setback to be applied to strategic and arterial roads, as a qualifying matter.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.26	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-BFS6 as the Medium Density Residential Standards does not include this standard. Delete MRZ-BFS6.	Reject		V1 has amended the PDP standard and these amendments have removed the components of the standard that affect density	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.27	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS7 in principle as it reflects the Medium Density Residential Standards. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones. Opposes the application of residential design principles as a matter of discretion. Amend MRZ-BFS7 to include additional exclusions from the standard: "MRZ-BFS7 Height in relation to boundary ... This standard does not apply to a. a boundary with a road b. existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site c. site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sties or where a common wall is proposed d. boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, commercial and mixed use zones, and special purpose zones. Matters of discretion are restricted to: RES-MD2 - Residential design principles RES-MD5 - Impact on neighbouring property"	Reject		For matters of discretion, the MDRS does not limit what can be considered at a consent stage.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.28	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-BFS8 as the Medium Density Residential Standards do not include this standard. Delete MRZ-BFS8.	Reject		The MDRS affects density and intensification, fencing standards are outside of density and intensification and thus are outside of the scope of the MDRS.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.29	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Acknowledges that MRZ-BFS9 and the outdoor living space provisions reflect the outdoor living space standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards. However, it is considered that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to MRZ-BFS9 that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standard.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-BFS9 to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard:</p> <p>"MRZ-BFS9 Outdoor living space (per unit)</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. For retirement units, clause 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications:</p> <p>a. the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and</p> <p>b. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space."</p>	Reject		The MDRS does provide separate consideration on density and intensification standards for retirement villages, noting that retirement units are a residential unit.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.3	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Supports SD-O2 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the Medium Density Residential Standards.</p> <p>Retain SD-O2 as notified.</p>	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
67.30	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Supports MRZ-BFS10 and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards, however consider that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. Amendments should be made to MRZ-BFS10 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-BFS10 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages:</p> <p>"MRZ-BFS10 Outlook space (per unit)</p> <p>...</p> <p>7. For retirement units, clauses 1 – 9 apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms."</p>	Reject		The plan does not provide separate consideration on density and intensification standards for retirement villages, noting that retirement units are a residential unit.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.31	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS11 and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflect the windows to street standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards, however consider that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units. Amend MRZ-BFS11 to provide for retirement units: "MRZ-BFS11 Windows to street 1. Any residential unit or retirement unit facing the a public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors. ..."	Reject		The plan does not provide separate consideration on density and intensification standards for retirement villages, noting that retirement units are a residential unit.	
67.32	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS12 and the landscaped area provisions in principle which reflect the landscaped area standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards. However, it is considered that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units also. Amend MRZ-BFS12 to provide for retirement units: "MRZ-BFS12 Landscaped area 1. A residential unit or retirement unit at ground floor level must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them. 2. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site, and does not need to be associated with each residential unit or retirement unit.	Reject		The plan does not provide separate consideration on density and intensification standards for retirement villages, noting that retirement units are a residential unit.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.33	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes the residential design principles of RES-MD2 – as they seek design outcomes which are inconsistent with the expectations for development in the Medium Density Residential Zone. Further, the residential design principles reflect matters relevant to standard residential development but are not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages. Delete RES-MD2.	Reject		The relief can only be included if it is more enabling than the MDRS. For matters of discretion, the MDRS does not limit what can be considered at a consent stage.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.34	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes RES-MD5 relating to potential impacts on neighbouring properties as it seeks outcomes which are inconsistent with the expectations for development in the Medium Density Residential Zone. For example, the requirement to consider the “extent to which ... buildings ... do not compromise the amenity values of adjacent properties” is inconsistent with the change anticipated in the Medium Density Residential Zone. Delete RES-MD5.	Reject		The relief can only be included if it is more enabling than the MDRS. For matters of discretion, the MDRS does not limit what can be considered at a consent stage.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.35	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>In accordance with the response to MRZ-R1 and MRZ-R18, a retirement village Specificset of matters of discretion should apply to the construction of retirement villages.</p> <p>In accordance with the relief sought for MRZ-R1 and MRZ-R18, seeks for the following matter of discretion to be integrated into the matters of discretion for all Residential Zones under the District Plan:</p> <p>"RES-MDX Construction of buildings for a retirement village</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards; 2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; 3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; 4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length; 5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. 6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. <p>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village save as specified."</p>	Reject		The plan does not provide separate consideration on density and intensification standards for retirement villages, noting that retirement units are a residential unit.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Accept			

67.36	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Considers NCZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>The activity of a retirement village should be a permitted activity and the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and the construction of retirement villages should have a focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p> <p>Seeks that the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is amended to provide a permitted activity for retirement villages and a restricted discretionary activity for the construction or alternation of retirement village buildings, as per the submissions on the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Reject		Neighbourhood Centre Zones are not part of the MDRS. Potentially an open question about how to apply the MDRS at the boundary interface between NCZ and the MDRZ.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.37	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>A number of the standards in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are inconsistent with the Medium Density Resident Standards (MDRS). Although the Resource Management Act 1991 only requires the MDRS to be applied in relevant residential zones, considers that, to give effect to Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, standards applying in centres zones should not be more restrictive.</p> <p>Amend the Neighbourhood Centre Zone standards as they apply to residential activities (including retirement villages) to achieve consistency with the Medium Density Residential Standards.</p>	Reject		Neighbourhood Centre Zones are not part of the MDRS. Potentially an open question about how to apply the MDRS at the boundary interface between NCZ and the MDRZ.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose				Accept	
67.38	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>A number of the standards in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are inconsistent with the Medium Density Resident Standards (MDRS). Although the Resource Management Act 1991 only requires the MDRS to be applied in relevant residential zones, considers that, to give effect to Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, standards applying in centres zones should not be more restrictive.</p> <p>Amend the Neighbourhood Centre Zone standards as they apply to residential activities (including retirement villages) to achieve consistency with the Medium Density Residential Standards.</p>	Reject		Neighbourhood Centre Zones are not part of the MDRS. Potentially an open question about how to apply the MDRS at the boundary interface between NCZ and the MDRZ.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.39	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Neighbourhood Centre Zone BFS3 – BFS11 are inconsistent with the Medium Density Resident Standards (MDRS). Although the Resource Management Act 1991 only requires the MDRS to be applied in relevant residential zones, considers that, to give effect to Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, standards applying in centres zones should not be more restrictive. Amend the Neighbourhood Centre Zone standards as they apply to residential activities (including retirement villages) to achieve consistency with the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Reject		Neighbourhood Centre Zones are not part of the MDRS. Potentially an open question about how to apply the MDRS at the boundary interface between NCZ and the MDRZ.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.4	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Considers that SD-O3 should recognise and enable the housing and care needs of an ageing population and the Specific housing typologies catering to older persons results in. Amend SD-O3.2 to recognise that existing character and amenity values are anticipated to change. Retain SD-O3.4 but amend to specifically recognise the importance of retirement villages. Amend SD-O3.5 to recognise that retirement villages need to be located in all residential zones, not just in the vicinity of centres.	Reject		SD-O3 is considered to cover all types of residential activity, and is not specific to retirement units.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

67.40	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers LCZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Supports LCZ-R1 and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant built form standards and gross floor area standard; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant standards.</p> <p>The construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p> <p>Amend LCZ-R1 to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</p> <p>"LCZ-R1 Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure Activity status: PER Where: 1. the activity complies with: a. all built form standards (as applicable); and b. the building or addition is less than 450m2 GFA. 2. the activity is not a retirement village.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved with LCZ-R1(1)(a): as set out in the relevant built form standards Activity status when compliance not achieved with LCZ-R1(1)(b): RDIS</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to: CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved with LCZ-R1(2): RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards (as applicable) CMUZ-MDX – Construction of buildings for a retirement village CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design CMUZ-MD11 – Residential development"</p>	Reject		Local Centre Zones are not part of the MDRS. Potentially an open question about how to apply the MDRS at the boundary interface between LCZ and the MDRZ.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.41	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers LCZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers that the Local Centre Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), as the Enabling Housing Act provides for intensification in non-residential zones. This will recognise that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p> <p>Insert new rule in the Local Centre Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities.</p> <p>"LCZ-RX Retirement village Activity status: PER Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A"</p>	Reject		Local Centre Zones are not part of the MDRS. Potentially an open question about how to apply the MDRS at the boundary interface between LCZ and the MDRZ.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.42	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers MUZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Supports MUZ-R1 and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant built form standards and gross floor area standard; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant standards.</p> <p>The construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p> <p>Amend MUZ-R1 to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</p> <p>"MUZ-R1 Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure Activity status: PERWhere: 1. the activity complies with: a. all built form standards (as applicable); and b. the building or addition is less than 450m2 GFA. 2. the activity is not a retirement village.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved with MUZ-R1(1)(a): as set out in the relevant built form standards Activity status when compliance not achieved with MUZ-R1(1)(b): RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved with MUZ-R1(2): RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards (as applicable) CMUZ-MDX – Construction of buildings for a retirement village CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design CMUZ-MD11 – Residential development"</p>	Reject		Mixed Centre Zones are not part of the MDRS. Potentially an open question about how to apply the MDRS at the boundary interface between MUZ and the MDRZ.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.43	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers the Mixed Use Zone is in conflict with the Medium Density residential Standards and needs to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers that the Mixed Use Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), as the Enabling Housing Act provides for intensification in non-residential zones. This will recognise that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p> <p>Insert new rule in the Mixed Use Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities.</p> <p>"MUZ-RX Retirement village Activity status: PER Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A"</p>	Reject		Mixed Centre Zones are not part of the MDRS. Potentially an open question about how to apply the MDRS at the boundary interface between MUZ and the MDRZ.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.44	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers TCZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Supports TCZ-R1 and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant built form standards and gross floor area standard; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant standards.</p> <p>The construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p> <p>Amend TCZ-R1 to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</p> <p>"TCZ-R1 Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure Activity status: PER Where: 1. the activity complies with: a. all built form standards (as applicable); b. the building or addition is less than 450m2 GFA; and c. any new building or addition does not have frontage to a Principal Shopping Street. 2. the activity is not a retirement village.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved with TCZ-R1(1)(a): as set out in the relevant built form standards Activity status when compliance not achieved with TCZ-R1(1)(b) and TCZ-R1(1)(c): RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved with TCZ-R1(2): RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards (as applicable) CMUZ-MDX – Construction of buildings for a retirement village CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design CMUZ-MD11 – Residential development"</p>	Reject		Town Centre Zones are not within scope of the Variation <u>MDRS</u>	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.45	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers the Town Centre Zone is in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Zone and needs to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers that the Town Centre Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), as the Enabling Housing Act provides for intensification in non-residential zones. This will recognise that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p> <p>Insert new rule in the Town Centre Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities.</p> <p>"TCZ-RX Retirement village Activity status: PER Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A"</p>	Reject		Town Centre Zones are not within scope of the Variation <u>MDRS</u>	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

67.46	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>In accordance with the response to NCZ-R1, LCZ-R1, MUZ-R1 and TCZ-R1, considers that a retirement village Specificset of matters of discretion should apply to the construction of retirement villages in the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones.</p> <p>In accordance with the relief sought for NCZ-R1 LCZ-R1, MUZ-R1 and TCZ-R1, seeks that the following matter of discretion be integrated into the Matters of Discretion for the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones of the District Plan:</p> <p>"CMUZ-MDX Construction of buildings for a retirement village</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards; 2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces; 3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces; 4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length; 5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider: 6. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and 7. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village. 8. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village. <p>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village."</p>	Reject		Town Centre Zones are not within scope of the Variation <u>MDRS</u>	
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Oppose		Accept			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.5	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Paragraph 3 of the introduction states that 'the key difference between the General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone is housing density, with the latter located within walkable distance to town centres, schools, open space and transport routes'.</p> <p>Noting that the General Residential Zone applies to Oxford only (in accordance with clause (b)(ii) of the 'relevant residential zone' definition of the Act), this explanation does not align with the proposed variations to the General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Seeks that paragraph 3 of the General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones Chapter be updated to explain the key difference between the General Residential Zone and the Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Accept		Can and will update introduction following finalisation of qualifying matter application <u>Has been updated to reflect qualifying matters and scope of zone</u>	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

67.6	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Considers that RESZ-O3 conflicts with the Medium Density Residential Standards, in that it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act. Seeks that RESZ-O3 not apply to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept Reject		RESZ-O3 is a general objective applying to all residential zones. The specific objectives that apply to the MDRZ are consistent with the MDRS	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
67.7	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	In addition to the current general objectives for all residential zones, an ageing population Specificobjective must be integrated that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population. Add a new objective in the General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones Chapter that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population. RESZ-OX Ageing population Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	Reject		Retirement housing, or any specific types of housing, are outside the scope of the MDRS	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
67.8	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Considers that RESZ-P1 conflicts with the Medium Density Residential Standards, in that it seeks to manage the design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act. Seeks that RESZ-P1 not apply to the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept		Can and will update introduction following finalisation of qualifying matter application <u>Has been updated to reflect qualifying matters and scope of zone</u>	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose				Reject	
67.9	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Acknowledges that RESZ-P3 has been amended to address Policy 3 of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). However, the language from Policy 3 of the MDRS has been added to Policy RESZ-P3 without amendments to the language to reflect the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act. This creates overlap and inconsistency between the existing language in (1) and (2) and the new language in (3). Delete or amend RESZ-P3 to ensure there is no overlap or inconsistency with Policy 3 of the MDRS.	Accept		Can and will update introduction following finalisation of qualifying matter application	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

68.1	Anthony John Page and Carole-Anne Louise Morgan	Amend	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) applying to a portion of lots within Stage 7 of Silverstream East as addressed in resource consents RC215144 and RC215145, which was granted consent on 9 December 2021 subject to conditions. Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place (refer to full submission for plan showing location of these lots). These conditions were added to the development's resource consent decision by the Commissioner to address issues relating to the departure from the Outline Development Plan, interface and integration issues between the existing Kaiapoi residential area and the new development - primarily in relation to raising ground levels above that of adjoining residential properties, the form of fencing on Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135, building setbacks, building height, and access arrangements. Considers the effect of this additional qualifying matter will be minor to the implementation of the MDRS given it only relates to 15 lots.</p> <p>Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. Some of the main conditions are: Subdivision resource consent RC215144</p> <p>Condition 14.15 - Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have no vehicle access to Road 8. Condition 14.16 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 14.15 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 128 to 130 and 134 and 135. Condition 28.1 and 28.2 - Any buildings to be single storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m and windows facing existing properties not to be above 3m in height. Condition 28.3 - Pursuant to section 221 of the resource management act 1991, Conditions 28.1 and 28.2 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the record of the title for lots 107 — 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135. Condition 29.4 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A1 as shown on approved plan, stamped RC 215144 and RC 215145. Condition 29.5 - Pursuant to section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 29.4 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lot 128. Condition 30.3 - Area B Allotments — Dwellings erected on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have conditions as set out in the Commissioners Report. Condition 30.4 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 30.3 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135.</p> <p>Land use resource consent RC215145</p> <p>Condition 9.1 - Any buildings to be constructed at any time on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130 and 134 and 135, shall be single</p>	Reject		Stage 7 of Silverstream East is a relevant residential zone and as such the MDRS apply to this site. I do not consider that qualifying matters can include consent conditions	
------	---	-------	---	--------	--	---	--

			<p>storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m measured from finished ground level. Condition 9.2 - Any dwellinghouse constructed on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall not have any windows above 3m height, facing towards Kynnersley Street, 8, 10, 11 and 12 Murray Place and 31 and 35 Adderley Terrace. Condition 10.1 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within the 10m of the Eastern Boundary. Condition 10.2 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A I as shown on approved plan stamped RC215144/RC215145. Condition 10.3 - No dwellinghouse on Lots 107 to 116 shall be constructed within 11.5m of the eastern boundary.</p>				
68.2	Anthony John Page and Carole-Anne Louise Morgan	Amend	<p>Opposes application of Medium Density Residential Standards to Area B on Figure 2 (refer to full submission), within the West Kaiapoi area (Silverstream), including 35 Adderley Terrace, Kaiapoi. The most significant natural hazards affecting urban areas is flooding, sea water inundations, and earthquakes including liquefaction. Increased density in areas subject to significant natural hazards increases risks to people and property. Increased site coverage also increases stormwater runoff and floodwater displacement, which can overwhelm the design capacity of stormwater infrastructure and exacerbate flood risk. Seeks an additional qualifying matter for where the Outline Development Plan is applied to Area B on Figure 2 (refer to full submission) to mitigate any high hazard flooding and its associated impact on property owners. Seeks an additional qualifying matter for where the Outline Development Plan is applied to Area B on Figure 2 (refer to full submission) within the West Kaiapoi area (Silverstream), including 35 Adderley Terrace, Kaiapoi.</p>	Reject		<p>Stage 7 of Silverstream East is a relevant residential zone and as such the MDRS apply to this site. I do not consider that qualifying matters can include consent conditions</p>	

69.1	Carolyn and Peter Wright	Amend	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) applying to a portion of lots within Stage 7 of Silverstream East as addressed in resource consents RC215144 and RC215145, which was granted consent on 9 December 2021 subject to conditions. Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 (refer to full submission for plan showing location of these lots) be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. These conditions were added to the development's resource consent decision by the Commissioner to address issues relating to the departure from the Outline Development Plan, interface and integration issues between the existing Kaiapoi residential area and the new development - primarily in relation to raising ground levels above that of adjoining residential properties, the form of fencing on Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135, building setbacks, building height, and access arrangements. Considers the effect of this additional qualifying matter will be minor to the implementation of the MDRS given it only relates to 15 lots.</p> <p>Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. Some of the main conditions are:</p> <p>Subdivision resource consent RC215144</p> <p>Condition 14.15 - Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have no vehicle access to Road 8. Condition 14.16 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 14.15 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 128 to 130 and 134 and 135. Condition 28.1 and 28.2 - Any buildings to be single storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m and windows facing existing properties not to be above 3m in height. Condition 28.3 - Pursuant to section 221 of the resource management act 1991, Conditions 28.1 and 28.2 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the record of the title for lots 107 — 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135. Condition 29.4 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A1 as shown on approved plan, stamped RC 215144 and RC 215145. Condition 29.5 - Pursuant to section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 29.4 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lot 128. Condition 30.3 - Area B Allotments — Dwellings erected on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have conditions as set out in the Commissioners Report. Condition 30.4 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 30.3 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135.</p> <p>Land use resource consent RC215145</p> <p>Condition 9.1 - Any buildings to be constructed at any time on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130 and 134 and 135, shall be single</p>	Reject		<p>Stage 7 of Silverstream East is a relevant residential zone and as such the MDRS apply to this site. I do not consider that qualifying matters can include consent conditions</p>	
------	--------------------------	-------	--	--------	--	--	--

			storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m measured from finished ground level. Condition 9.2 - Any dwellinghouse constructed on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall not have any windows above 3m height, facing towards Kynnersley Street, 8, 10, 11 and 12 Murray Place and 31 and 35 Adderley Terrace. Condition 10.1 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within the 10m of the Eastern Boundary. Condition 10.2 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A I as shown on approved plan stamped RC215144/RC215145. Condition 10.3 - No dwellinghouse on Lots 107 to 116 shall be constructed within 11.5m of the eastern boundary.				
7.1	Owen Pritchard	Oppose	Opposes Variation 1 as it does not meet the region's needs due to a lack of infrastructural investment, such as roading, which would be necessary to mitigate its effects. Not specified.	Reject		Council has no jurisdiction to reject Variation 1, it is mandatory to implement it in all relevant residential zones	

70.1	Ryman Healthcare Ltd	Amend	<p>Supports in full the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA) submission on Variation 1. Submitter believes that a quality site, living environment, amenities and the best care maximises the quality of life for retirement village residents.</p> <p>Waimakariri's growing ageing population and the increasing demand for retirement villages is addressed in the RVA's submission and that is adopted by submitter. There is a shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options, which allow older people to "age in place" because appropriate sites in good locations are scarce.</p> <p>The comprehensive care nature of the villages means all of the communal amenities and care rooms need to be located in the Village Centre to allow for safe and convenient access between these areas, resulting in a layout that differs from a typical residential development.</p> <p>Seeks the relief sought by the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated in its submission on Variation 1 is adopted.</p>	Accept in part		Some of the RVANZ submission points have been accepted, but not all	
71.1	Martin Hugh and Robyn Jennifer Pyke	Oppose	<p>The Medium Density Residential Standards are a significant and undemocratic change to planning processes and property rights potentially impacting the traditional New Zealand lifestyle for the majority of the population. Significant potential effect on the character of our towns and cities over time. Giving developers freedom to build up to three storeys a metre from anyone's boundary without recourse is a momentous change.</p> <p>Acknowledge there are climate change aspects to the rules, but do not believe they justify wholesale imposition across entire townships like Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Changes should be limited to city centres and transport hub environs to contain intensification.</p> <p>Requests Council rejects the Medium Density Residential Standards to show that centralised edicts are not appropriate.</p>	Reject		Council has no jurisdiction to reject Variation 1, it is mandatory to implement it in all relevant residential zones	
71.2	Martin Hugh and Robyn Jennifer Pyke	Oppose	<p>To give developers freedom to build up to three storeys a metre from anyone's boundary in most sizeable settlements in New Zealand, with zero recourse, is a momentous change and warrants a national referendum.</p> <p>Requests Council rejects the Medium Density Residential Standards to show that centralised edicts are not appropriate.</p>	Reject		Council has no jurisdiction to reject Variation 1, it is mandatory to implement it in all relevant residential zones	
71.3	Martin Hugh and Robyn Jennifer Pyke	Oppose	<p>To give developers freedom to build up to three storeys a metre from anyone's boundary in most sizeable settlements in New Zealand, with zero recourse, is a momentous change and warrants a national referendum.</p> <p>Requests Council rejects the Medium Density Residential Standards to show that centralised edicts are not appropriate.</p>	Reject		Council has no jurisdiction to reject Variation 1, it is mandatory to implement it in all relevant residential zones	

72.1	Dominic Robert Hassan	Amend	Concerned that previously the visual impact of building bulk was mitigated by reduced permitted height and scale, and vegetation could typically be established by affected neighbours to provide privacy; however the intensification enabled by the Medium Density Residential Standards could create new adverse visual effects from neighbouring structures and there is no controls to mitigate this. Amend to include appearance controls in the Medium Density Residential Standards provisions.	Reject		Council has no ability to impose appearance controls on the MDRS if these standards are less enabling of development.	
72.2	Dominic Robert Hassan	Amend	Notes that Clause 4 of MRZ-BFS5, which related to habitable room windows avoiding direct views into adjacent residential units, has been deleted yet the need for such privacy increases with increased density. Requests this matter is reconsidered and the deleted clause 4 is possibly included, as this makes basic urban design sense. Amend MRZ-BFS5 to include privacy between residential unit provisions.	Reject		Council has no ability to impose privacy standards in BFS5 if these are less enabling of development than the MDRS.	
72.3	Dominic Robert Hassan	Amend	Questions the benefit of MRZ-BFS-11 requirement to glaze 20% of street facade and notes it will create heat loss to homes where these facades face south, and privacy should be considered. Amend to allow reduced glazed areas for south facing street facades.	Reject		Council has no ability to impose additional glazing standards for the south side of the building in BFS11 if these are less enabling of development than the MDRS. I agree that this requirement makes objective sense, however, it may be ultra vires the Act.	
73.1	Summerset Group Holdings Limited		Supports the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand in its entirety. Submitter is a leading retirement village operator, offering a range of independent living options and care, and employing over 1,800 staff members across various sites. Requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Variation 1: Housing Intensification. Requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Variation 1.	Accept in part		Some of the RVANZ submission points have been accepted, but not all	

74.1	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p> <p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not impose a minimum lot size upon subdivision, except where imposed by a qualifying matter. Large Lot Residential developments are outside of the scope of the IPI	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Reject			

74.2	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p> <p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not impose a minimum lot size upon subdivision, except where imposed by a qualifying matter. Large Lot Residential developments are outside of the scope of the IPI	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Reject			

74.3	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p> <p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not impose a minimum lot size upon subdivision, except where imposed by a qualifying matter. Large Lot Residential developments are outside of the scope of the IPI	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Reject			

74.4	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p> <p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not impose a minimum lot size upon subdivision, except where imposed by a qualifying matter. Large Lot Residential developments are outside of the scope of the IPI	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Support		Reject			

74.5	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p> <p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res4a or 4b in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not impose a minimum lot size upon subdivision, except where imposed by a qualifying matter. Large Lot Residential developments are outside of the scope of the IPI	
------	--------------	-------	--	--------	--	---	--

74.6	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p> <p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res4a or 4b in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not impose a minimum lot size upon subdivision, except where imposed by a qualifying matter. Large Lot Residential developments are outside of the scope of the IPI	
------	--------------	-------	--	--------	--	---	--

74.7	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p> <p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not impose a minimum lot size upon subdivision, except where imposed by a qualifying matter. Large Lot Residential developments are outside of the scope of the IPI	
------	--------------	-------	---	--------	--	---	--

74.8	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p> <p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not impose a minimum lot size upon subdivision, except where imposed by a qualifying matter. Large Lot Residential developments are outside of the scope of the IPI	
------	--------------	-------	---	--------	--	---	--

74.9	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p> <p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>	Reject		The MDRS does not impose a minimum lot size upon subdivision, except where imposed by a qualifying matter. Large Lot Residential developments are outside of the scope of the IPI	
75.10	M Magendans	Oppose	<p>Oppose enabling new residential buildings to be built up to 3 storeys high (11 metres plus roof). For many existing properties this could adversely affect sunlight, resulting in unhealthy homes and possible financial burden for additional heating, may look unattractive and may adversely affect privacy and property values.</p> <p>New residential buildings in existing areas should be single storey only and the sunlight and outlook for existing properties should be protected.</p>	Accept in part		Council has no jurisdiction to reject Variation 1, it is mandatory to implement it in all relevant residential zones. However I am recommending in response to submissions an additional qualifying matter for sunlight and shading to ensure access to autumn, winter, and spring sunlight is maintained.	

75.2	M Magendans	Oppose	Oppose enabling new residential buildings to be built up to 3 storeys high (11 metres plus roof). For many existing properties this could adversely affect sunlight, resulting in unhealthy homes and possible financial burden for additional heating, may look unattractive and may adversely affect privacy and property values. New residential buildings in existing areas should be single storey only and the sunlight and outlook for existing properties should be protected.	Accept in part		Council has no jurisdiction to reject Variation 1, it is mandatory to implement it in all relevant residential zones. However I am recommending in response to submissions an additional qualifying matter for sunlight and shading to ensure access to autumn, winter, and spring sunlight is maintained.	
76.1	M and J Schluter	Amend	Land located 237 Johns Road, Rangiora legally described as Lot 3 DP 341829 and part of the West Rangiora Development Area is proposed to be zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone in the proposed Plan. Amendments are sought separately to the provisions of the West Rangiora Development Area. As an alternative, it is sought that this land be rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. Rezoning supports the need for significant additional housing capacity including in West Rangiora which has been identified as an appropriate location for urban growth and there are no impediments to the development of this land including any infrastructure capacity reasons. Land located 237 Johns Road, Rangiora legally described as Lot 3 DP 341829 be rezoned from Rural Lifestyle Zone in the proposed Plan to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	
FS 19	FS RJ Paterson Family Trust	Support		Reject	Accept		
76.2	M and J Schluter	Support	In the proposed 'Activity Rules - if certification has been approved', support the proposed amendments to rule 'DEV-WR-R1 Activities provided for in General Residential Zone'. Retain the proposed amendments to rule 'DEV-WR-R1 Activities provided for in General Residential Zone'.	Accept in part	N/A	Certification has been removed, however the submitters relief relates to the general residential zone and is no longer relevant in the context of the recommended rezoning for their site to MDRZ	
FS 19	FS FJ Paterson Family Trust	Support		Accept			
76.3	M and J Schluter	Support	Support rule 'DEV-WR-R2 Activities provided for in Medium Density Residential Zone' (renumbered as a consequence of proposed amendments to rule 'DEV-WR-R1 Activities provided for in General Residential Zone'). Retain rule 'DEV-WR-R2 Activities provided for in Medium Density Residential Zone'.	Accept in part		Submitters relief relates to the general residential zone and is no longer relevant in the context of the recommended rezoning for their site to MDRZ	
FS 19	FS FJ Paterson Family Trust	Support		Accept			

76.4	M and J Schluter	Amend	In the Outline Development Plan for West Rangiora in DEV-WR-APP1, the majority of the land located at 237 Johns Road, Rangiora legally described as Lot 3 DP 341829 is identified as "General Residential Density", with only a small area to the north identified as "Medium Residential Density". Seek that the Outline Development Plan be amended to identify that Medium Residential Density will be enabled on all residential areas of the Outline Development Plan. Amend the Outline Development Plan for West Rangiora in DEV-WR-APP1 to enable Medium Residential Density on all residential areas of the Outline Development Plan.	Reject	Accept	A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been recommended, and site has been recommended under Mr Fowler test for rezoning as MDRZ	
FS 19	FS FJ Paterson Family Trust	Support		Reject	Accept		
77.1	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Under Fire and Emergency's secondary function responding to medical events, rescues and public assists, support the inclusion of a qualifying matter relating to high hazard flooding areas. Avoiding higher density development in these areas reduces risk to property and life. Retain as notified	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 10	FS Kiwirail	Support		Accept			
77.2	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Support the inclusion of the health and safety of people and communities in the explanation of well-functioning urban environments. This includes the provision of adequate emergency access and sufficient firefighting water supply and pressure. Retain as notified	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
77.3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Support provision for subdivision as a controlled activity provided that the subdivision is able to comply with the relevant standards, which includes water supply for firefighting (SUB-S11). Retain as notified	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
77.4	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Oppose the preclusion of multi-unit residential developments from being limited notified. Multi-unit developments of a greater scale and density can have limited access provisions which raise emergency servicing issues. See also comments in full submission on residential design principles relating to RES-MD2. Delete the clause relating to notification.	Reject		The MDRS sets specific notification requirements which preclude limited notification on certain types of multi unit development.	
FS 13	FS Ryman Healthcare Limited	Oppose		Accept			

77.5	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Support in part, however seek additions to the Residential design principles in RES-MD2 to take into account provision for firefighting. Amend RES-MD2 (5): "... 5 c. provides appropriate emergency access to the site i. any access to on-site alternative firefighting water supply complies with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice. ii. developments give effect to the guidance provided in the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide. iii. pedestrian accessways are clear. unobstructed and well-lit. iv. wayfinding for different properties on a development are clear in day and night. v. pedestrian accessways have a minimum width of: a. 3m on a straight accessway. b. 6.2m on a curved or cornered accessway c. 4.5m space to position the ladder and perform operational tasks. ..."	Accept		Firefighting water standards are unlikely to affect density or intensification and as such I consider that there is scope to include them within the PDP	
FS 13	FS Ryman Healthcare Limited	Oppose		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
77.6	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	Note the importance to maintain firefighting water supply pressure throughout high rise buildings. Seek that Council consider this as a matter of discretion when compliance is not achieved. This relates to FC-S2 financial contribution assessment. Not specified.	Accept		Firefighting water standards are unlikely to affect density or intensification and as such I consider that there is scope to include them within the PDP	
77.7	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Concerned by the risk of fire spreading due to setbacks from boundaries. It can inhibit Fire and Emergency personnel from getting to the fire source. Seek an additional matter of discretion to respond to this. Include an additional matter of discretion: RES-MDX Fire risk mitigation incorporated to avoid horizontal spread of fire across boundaries	Accept		Firefighting water standards are unlikely to affect density or intensification and as such I consider that there is scope to include them within the PDP	
FS 13	FS Ryman Healthcare Limited	Oppose		Reject			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

77.8	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Amend	<p>Seek additions to the Residential design principles to take into account provision for firefighting.</p> <p>Amend RES-MD2(5):</p> <p>"...</p> <p>5 c. provides appropriate emergency access to the site</p> <p>i. any access to on-site alternative firefighting water supply complies with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.</p> <p>ii. developments give effect to the guidance provided in the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide.</p> <p>iii. pedestrian accessways are clear. unobstructed and well-lit.</p> <p>iv. wayfinding for different properties on a development are clear in day and night.</p> <p>v. pedestrian accessways have a minimum width of:</p> <p>a. 3m on a straight accessway.</p> <p>b. 6.2m on a curved or cornered accessway</p> <p>c. 4.5m space to position the ladder and perform operational tasks.</p> <p>..."</p>	Accept		Firefighting water standards are unlikely to affect density or intensification and as such I consider that there is scope to include them within the PDP	
FS 13	FS Ryman Healthcare Limited	Oppose		Reject			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
78.1	Northwest Rangiora Owners Group	Amend	<p>Support Variation 1 insofar as it enacts the incorporation of the relevant intensification planning requirements as required by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. Propose that the land included in this submission (see Table 1 of full submission) is considered for rezoning from Large Lot Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone alongside the South West Rangiora and North East Rangiora development areas identified in the notified Variation. This would avoid the need for the General Residential Zone Overlay and future certification/rezoning process.</p> <p>Rezone the properties identified in Table 1 of the submission from Large Lot Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. Remove the General Residential Zone Overlay. Such further or consequential relief including amendment to other rules, objectives and policies that may be necessary to achieve the outcomes the submitters seek.</p>	Accept in part		<p>Accept the general support for Variation 1. The rezoning components will be considered in hearing stream 12. <u>The area has been recommended for rezoning to GRZ</u></p>	

78.2	Northwest Rangiora Owners Group	Amend	<p>Support Variation 1 insofar as it enacts the incorporation of the relevant intensification planning requirements as required by the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. Propose that the land included in this submission (see Table 1 of full submission) is considered for rezoning from Large Lot Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone alongside the South West Rangiora and North East Rangiora development areas identified in the notified Variation. This would avoid the need for the General Residential Zone Overlay and future certification/rezoning process. Rezone the properties identified in Table 1 of the submission from Large Lot Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. Remove the General Residential Zone Overlay. Such further or consequential relief including amendments to other rules, objectives and policies that may be necessary to achieve the outcomes the submitters seek.</p>	Accept in part		<p>Accept the general support for Variation 1. The rezoning components will be considered in hearing stream 12. <u>The area has been recommended for rezoning to GRZ</u></p>	
79.1	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Oppose	<p>The proposed Plan does not identify the extent of the heritage area associated with HH052 'Belgrove farmhouse' that will be subject to qualifying matter ss77J of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Consider that the extent and relevance of this heritage building/item which is to be exempt from Medium Density Residential Zone should be better defined within Variation 1. The consented layout for Stage 1 (Attachment 3) (see full submission) considers the appropriateness of residential development in the vicinity of the Homestead by providing for the retention of the Homestead on a larger lot and implementing Specific design controls for the development of adjoining lots. In this way, the Stage 1 Consent achieves an appropriate curtilage setting built form that respects the heritage values of the Homestead. Variation 1 should be amended to provide greater certainty as to the extent / applicability of this qualifying matter as it relates to the Homestead. Suggested this could be achieved by exempting the area shown as Lot 1400, and Lots 21 and 22 (refer Attachment 3) (see full submission) of the Stage 1 Consent from the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions. Seek that the extent of the Belgrove Qualifying Matter be modified to clarify that the Medium Density Residential Zone provisions do not apply to Lots 1400 21 and 22 of the Stage 1 Consent (refer to the marked up Outline Development Pplan enclosed at Attachment 5).(see full submission) Similarly, the heritage area notified in the proposed Plan (a circle centred on the heritage item) should be modified to the extent of Lot 1400 for consistency.</p>	Accept in part		<p>Mapping for historic heritage can be improved</p>	

FS 5	FS Richard and Geoff Spark	Oppose		Accept			
79.10	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Oppose	<p>The North-East Rangiora Development Area Chapter needs to be updated to reflect the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone of Bellgrove North and that the remainder of the Outline Development Plan area will assume Medium Density Residential Zone following certification.</p> <p>Amend the North-East Rangiora Development Area Chapter to reflect:</p> <p>(1) Land within the North East Rangiora Outline Development Plan will be rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone (refer Attachment 5)(see full submission), except for land immediately surrounding the homestead (qualifying matter);</p> <p>(2) Amend the North East Rangiora Outline Development Plan layout to reflect the Stage 1 Consent layout;</p> <p>(3) Remove reference to the ratio of medium residential density to general residential density, given this no longer aligns with the changes sought by Variation 1;</p> <p>(4) Remove reference to a 200m2 minimum lot size for the Medium Density Residential Zone given this contradicts proposed Subdivision Standard S-1;</p> <p>(5) Amend the Overall Development Plan, Land Use Plan, Movement Network Plan, Open Space and Stormwater Reserve Plan and Water and Wastewater Network Plan as per Attachment 5 (see full submission); and</p> <p>(6) Remove reference to Option A for this Outline Development Plan area given it is no longer required and should be deleted to reduce confusion and improve readability of the plan.</p>	Reject <u>Accept</u>	Accept	<p>Stage 1 and 2 of Bellgrove received MDRZ through the Covid fast-track consent process and Variation 1. That is not all of the proposed Bellgrove land, the remainder is subject to rezoning and/or FUDA, and is outside of scope of the FUDA chapter, which is a PDP matter. <u>Bellgrove North is recommended for rezoning along with all of the NER development area, under both the PDP and V1. I would also recommend this is rezoned under Mr Fowler's test, however this is not necessary</u></p>	

79.11	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Oppose	<p>There is explanatory wording under each of the rules that begins "For any activity statuses, any activity will need to comply with the following general activity standards:...". This explanatory text should be revised given no North East Rangiora Outline Development Plan land will assume General Residential Zoning following certification. The only area of the North East Rangiora Outline Development Plan that the General Residential Zone provisions will apply to will be the area immediately surrounding the Belgrove homestead (which has been identified as a historic item / building qualifying matter). The area shown as Lot 1400, and Lots 21 and 22 (refer Attachment 3)(see full submission) of the Stage 1 Consent should be rezoned General Residential as part of Variation 1 to give effect to this and align with the Stage 1 consent.</p> <p>Amend DEV-NER-R1: "..."</p> <p>a. The provisions of the General Residential Zone will apply to any part of the Development Area where the District Council's Chief Executive Officer or their delegate (following the receipt of an application) certifies that the criteria in DEV-NER-S1 are met ..."</p> <p>Rezone the Belgrove homestead area as General Residential aligned with the area shown as Lot 1400, and Lots 21 and 22 (refer Attachment 3)(see full submission) of the Stage 1 Consent.</p>	Reject <u>Accept</u>	Accept	<p>Stage 1 and 2 of Bellgrove received MDRZ through the Covid fast-track consent process and Variation 1. That is not all of the proposed Bellgrove land, the remainder is subject to rezoning and/or FUDA, and is outside of scope of the FUDA chapter, which is a PDP matter. <u>Bellgrove North is recommended for rezoning along with all of the NER development area, under both the PDP and V1. I would also recommend this is rezoned under Mr Fowler's test, however this is not necessary</u></p>	
79.12	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Oppose	<p>The text for a discretionary and non-complying activity under this rule incorrectly refers to the General Residential Zone and needs to be reworded to reflect the Medium Density Residential Zone. For discretionary and non-complying activities, delete all references to General Residential Zone and replace with Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>	Accept		Amended as requested	
79.13	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	<p>The amendment is consistent with the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and will enable following certification the Bellgrove South land to assume Medium Density Residential Zone. Retain as notified.</p>	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
79.14	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	<p>The amendment is consistent with the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 and will enable following certification the Bellgrove South land to assume Medium Density Residential Zone. Retain as notified.</p>	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	

79.15	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Oppose	The text for a discretionary and non-complying activity under this rule incorrectly refers to the General Residential Zone and needs to be reworded to reflect the Medium Density Residential Zone. For discretionary and non-complying activities, delete all references to General Residential Zone and replace with Medium Density Residential Zone.	Accept		Amended as requested	
79.16	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Oppose	The South-East Rangiora Development Area Chapter needs to be updated to reflect the Outline Development Plan area will assume Medium Density Residential Zone following certification. Amend Appendix DEV-SER-APP1 to reflect: (1) Land within the South-East Rangiora Outline Development Plan will assume Medium Density Residential Zone (refer Attachment 6)(see full submission) following certification; (2) Remove the wording for the South-East Rangiora Outline Development Plan (Land Use Plan) which contains reference to the General Residential Zone and remove reference to this zone from the Land Use Outline Development Plan; (3) Remove reference to a 200m2 minimum lot size for the Medium Density Residential Zone given this contradicts proposed Subdivision Standard S-1; and (4) Amend the Overall Development Plan, Land Use Plan, Movement Network Plan, Open Space and Stormwater Reserve Plan and Water and Wastewater Network Plan as per Attachment 6 (see full submission).	Reject	Accept	<u>Bellgrove South is recommended for rezoning along with most of the SER development area, under the PDP, and I would also recommend this is rezoned under Mr Fowler's test</u>	
79.2	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	Subdivision Standard S1 removes a minimum allotment area and dimension requirement for the Medium Density Residential Zone. This is consistent with the subdivision requirements specified for the Medium Density Residential Zone by the Enabling Housing Act in Schedule 3A, Part 1, s.8. which requires that there must be "no minimum lot size, shape size, or other size-related subdivision requirements..." Retain as notified	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			
79.3	Aurecon NZ - Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	Applying the Medium Density Residential Standards across all relevant residential zones in the district plan will enable greater flexibility for residential zones to be developed in a way that provides for housing choice and a range of residential unit densities to meet market demand. Retain as notified	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			

79.4	Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	The proposed amendments clarify that Bellgrove South will assume Medium Density Residential Zone following certification. Retain as notified	Accept in part		Accepted, but noting that the question of certification is discussed in the hearing 10 reports. My understanding is that the submitter wishes to obtain Medium Density Residential Zone for Bellgrove South following the end of the process regardless. Submitter put in a late submission seeking rezoning of Bellgrove North and South, certification has been recommended for removal	
79.5	Aurecon NZ - Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	This Objective does not require, but rather enables, a variety of housing types and sizes in the Medium Density Residential Zone, including Medium Density Residential Standards-enabled development outcomes. Retain as notified	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
79.6	Aurecon NZ - Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	This Policy does not require, but rather enables, a variety of housing types and densities in the Medium Density Residential Zone, including Medium Density Residential Standards-enabled development outcomes. Retain as notified	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
79.7	Aurecon NZ - Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	This Policy acknowledges that appropriate development outcomes are possible where permitted activity status is not achieved. Retain as notified	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
79.8	Aurecon NZ - Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	The notified built form provisions are consistent with (Schedule 3A, Part 2 of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Retain as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
79.9	Aurecon NZ - Mark Allan - on behalf of Bellgrove Rangiora Ltd	Support	The notified built form provisions are consistent with (Schedule 3A, Part 2 of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021. Retain as notified	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
8.1	Greg Miller	Support	Supports the proposed housing intensification within Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, and Pegasus. However, has concerns about sea level rise, due to climate change, affecting Kaiapoi and Pegasus. Opposes housing intensification within any other of the District's communities such as Ohoka, Fernside, or rural areas. Not specified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	

80.1	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Support inclusion of the mandatory objectives and policies and rules set out in Schedule 3A of the 'Housing Supply Act'; and support the spatial extent of the Medium Density Residential zones (MRZ) in Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Ravenswood, including the new greenfield area in Rangiora being zoned medium density residential. Support retention of mandatory objectives and policies and rules set out in Schedule 3A of the 'Housing Supply Act', and support the spatial extent of the medium density residential zones in Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus, and Ravenswood, including the new greenfield area in Rangiora.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 5	FS Richard and Geoff Spark	Allow in part		Accept			
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Support	Strategic directions	Accept			
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Support	Table	Accept			
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Oppose	Transport	Reject			
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Oppose	MRZ	Reject			
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Reject			
FS 17	FS Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	Oppose		Reject			
FS 18	FS Bellgrove Rangiora Limited	Support		Accept			
80.10	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Support nationally consistent matters of discretion for MDRS standards, whilst allowing for some evidence based local context nuances. Use consistent 'Urban Design Principle' matters of discretion in District Plans throughout the country. No Specificrelief sought.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
80.11	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	The submission seeks such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this submission above and in Appendix 1. Relief sought as in Appendix 1, in above (general) points.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
80.12	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Make changes to variation 1 to ensure that Kāinga Ora can carry out its statutory obligations, achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, reduce interpretation and process complication for decision-makers, provide clarity for all plan-users, and allow Kāinga Ora to fulfil its urban development functions as required under the Kāinga Ora-Home and Communities Act 2019. No Specificrelief sought.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	

80.13	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Seek deletion of the definition of “multi-unit residential development” as it is not a term used in the ‘NPS-UD’ or ‘Housing Supply Act’ along with consequential changes to the provisions to assist with simplification of plan administration and interpretation. This is consistent with the submission on proposed district plan.</p> <p>Delete the definition of ‘multi-unit residential development’ in its entirety and any reference to the definition or term across the Proposed Plan.</p> <p>MULTI-UNIT RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT: means development involving more than one three residential unit (but excluding any minor residential unit or residential unit in a retirement village)undertaken comprehensively over one or more sites, and may include zero lot development, townhouses, apartments or terrace housing.</p>	Reject		Multi unit residential development may need to exist for zones other than MDRZ.	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Accept			
FS 13	FS Ryman Healthcare Limited	Oppose		Accept			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Oppose		Accept			
80.14	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Express qualifying matters more clearly across variation 1 to assist with simplification of plan administration and interpretation. Table RSL-1 Qualifying Matters should more clearly and comprehensively describe the qualifying matters and how each of these limit intensification. Some of the qualifying matters are listed in the MRZ Built Form Standards, others are contained in the general rules chapters and overlays. Some of the chapters in Part 2 of the PDP (eg: historic heritage and notable trees) have been updated to include a reference to qualifying matters, but again not clearly expressed as a rule or in a way that provides clarity as to how the qualifying matter affects the MRZ provisions. Make it clear whether some of the matters preclude MDRS entirely or limit only density or another of the MDRS built form standards, or limit built form only on Specificparts of sites. Provide greater clarity and certainty as to the nature, extent and implications of qualifying matters proposed under variation 1. Amend provisions relating to qualifying matters to provide additional clarity as to how each of the qualifying matters apply to MDRS and the MRZ standards.</p>	Accept		The plan drafting for qualifying matters and the rules that operationalise them has been improved	

80.5	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities - Mel Rountree	Qualifying	General support for the qualifying matters with minor amendments and clarifications as proposed with the exception of: the Christchurch International Airport noise contour, the high flood hazard overlay in Kaiapoi, National Grid transmission lines and strategic and arterial roads in Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend.No specific relief sought.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
80.15	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Supports inclusion of the setback standards required by Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021's Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). Considers that MRZ-BFS5 contains additional restrictions outside those included in the MDRS's setback standard and in the absence of robust justification in the Section 32 evaluation, the additional setbacks introduced for qualifying matters should be removed. Considers that the matters of discretion in RES-MD2 are inappropriate for addressing setback issues, the list is too broad ranging, and requires a full urban design assessment. Suggests the relevant matters can be found in RES-MD5 and RES-MD6.</p> <p>Delete MRZ-BFS5 and replace to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly express any additional setbacks over and above those contained Schedule 3A, Part 2(13) of Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) as qualifying matters. - Delete the rail corridor setback qualifying matter. - Amend the national grid transmission line setback. - Simplify to reflect Schedule 3A, Part 2(13) of MDRS. - Delete Part 3 of the rule and associated figure MRZ-2. - Delete RES-MD2 Residential Design Principles as a relevant matter of discretion. - Insert RES-MD6 Road Boundary Setbacks as a relevant matter of discretion. <p>Amend MRZ-BFS5 to the matters listed below or amendments with similar effect:</p> <p>MRZ- BFS5 Building and structure setbacks Yard Minimum depth Front 1.5m Side 1m Rear 1m (excluded on corner sites)</p> <p>"(2) Qualifying Matters: (a) All buildings shall be set back a minimum of 5m from any site boundary with the rail corridor."</p> <p>"...Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS - RES-MD2 - Residential design principles - RES-MD5 - Impact on neighbouring property - RES-MD6 Road Boundary Setbacks"</p>	Accept in part		Qualifying matter provisions have been improved through recommended drafting.	
FS 2	FS Transpower	Oppose		Reject			

80.16	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	The 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' qualifying matter with its 39m setback lacks a strong evidence base in its s32 assessment. Delete 39m setback 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' as a qualifying matter. See further comments in SUB-6 and MRZ-BFS5 about improving clarity of the rule.	Reject		The s32 and additional evidence from Transpower supports this qualifying matter	
FS 2	FS Transpower	Oppose		Accept			
80.17	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Oppose the rail corridor being a qualifying matter as the s32 assessment lacks a strong evidence based for the scale of the setback as a qualifying matter. Oppose the Strategic and Arterial Roads qualifying matter as some of the roads covered by this matter are not State Highways and therefore are not considered 'nationally significant infrastructure'. Delete the Railway Corridor qualifying matter. Delete the Strategic and Arterial Roads qualifying matter. See further comments to MRZ-BFS5 in this submission.	Reject		The s32 and additional evidence from Kiwirail supports this qualifying matter	
80.18	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Delete MRZ-BFS6 as it duplicates the outcomes sought by new MRZ-BFS11 that contains the mandatory wording in Schedule 3A, Part 2(18) of the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (Medium Density Residential Standards), and contains additional built form standards controlling front doors and garages that go beyond those included MDRS and that are not qualifying matters. Notes high evidential threshold is needed to justify the inclusion of additional built form standards beyond those specified in the MDRS and in the absence of such justification, MRZ-BFS6 be deleted. Delete MRZ-BFS6.	Accept		MRZ-BFS6 does have standards that relate to density, that are less enabling than the MDRS, and which are not qualifying matters, and these should be deleted. Delete MRZ-BFS3	
80.19	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Support the management of significant risks from natural hazards as a qualifying matter (in appropriate circumstances), noting that it is a matter of national significance in Section 6 Resource Management Act, however, spatial identification of flood hazard areas should be made available through a set of non-statutory flood hazard maps, which would operate as interactive maps on the Council's GIS website – thereby operating as a separate mapping viewer to the statutory district plan maps. Amend the provisions to remove/delete the mapped Natural Hazard Overlays from within the PDP. Instead, the Natural Hazard Overlays should be based on non statutory map layers in the Waimakariri District Natural Hazards Interactive Viewer that sits outside the PDP. Not included in the Proposed Plan and Variation. Specific text amendments are covered below under MRZ- BFS1.	Reject		The natural hazard overlay must be a scheduled map layer with the PDP.	

80.2	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Variation 1 as notified does not sufficiently provide for a range of housing types at a range of intensities to meet the needs of current and future communities. No Specific relief sought	Reject		No specific relief sought	
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Accept			
80.20	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Supports the inclusion of MRZ-BFS7 as required by the Medium Density Residential Standards. Considers that the matters of discretion in RES-MD2 inappropriate for addressing boundary issues, contains a list of matters that is too broad ranging, and requires a full urban design assessment. Suggests the relevant matters for MRZ-BFS7 can be found in RES-MD5 Impacts on Neighbouring Properties. Amend MRZ-BFS7: "....Matters of discretion are restricted to: - RES-MD2 - Residential design principles - RES-MD5 - Impact on neighbouring property"	Reject		I do not consider there are any limitations imposed by the MDRS on the matters of discretion that can apply for RDIS activities. Variation 1 applies the same MDs as the Proposed Plan's MDRZ.	
80.21	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Opposes and seek the deletion of the Aircraft/ Airport noise provisions in full including any mapped noise overlays and contour maps. This includes all relevant airport noise contour provisions in the proposed District Plan including objectives, policies, rules and standards (with any associated tables, figures and overlays). Delete airport noise qualifying matter and any proposed and/or related provisions in the Variation.	Reject		The operative plan contour is retained as the qualifying matter, as set out in section 9.1 of the stream 10A s42A report	
FS 11	FS Momentum Land Limited	Support					

80.22	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	<p>Notes MRZ-BFS8 is not within the Medium Density Residential Standards thus is additional built form standard and would require a high evidential threshold to justify its inclusion. Amend MRZ-BFS8 to simplify it as it is considered unduly restrictive when compared to the potential effects, and should only relate to fencing on a road boundary, not fencing on a walkway and cycleway boundary. Considers that the matters of discretion in RES- MD2 are inappropriate for addressing fence issues, too broad ranging, and require a full urban design assessment. Suggests the relevant matters of discretion are within RES-MD6. Amend MRZ-BFS8:</p> <p>“1. All fencing or walls fronting the road boundary; or within 2m of a site boundary with a public reserve, walkway or cycleway shall be:</p> <p>a. no higher than 1.2m above ground level for solid fences b. where fences exceed 1.2m in height shall be at least 50% visually permeable up to a maximum height of 1.8m. the site is a corner site, on one road boundary the height can be increased to 1.8m above ground level where at least 45% of the fence is visually permeable.</p> <p>2. Any fence greater than 0.9m in height above ground level shall be at least 45%visually permeable as depicted in Figure MRZ-4, within 5m of any accessway, or within the structure and vegetation set back area shown in Figure MRZ-2.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: RES-MD2 - Residential design principles RES-MD6 - Road boundary setback”</p>	Reject		Fencing is not a matter that affects density, therefore is outside of the scope of the MDRS	
80.23	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Support the identification of historic heritage qualifying matters, in appropriate circumstances, noting that heritage is a matter of national significance in Section 6 Resource Management Act. Clarify what this qualifying matter is seeking to limit or be less enabling of. Except where there is site Specificjustification to exclude a site from the MDRS on heritage grounds, the general heritage rules in the District Plan sufficiently recognise and provide for heritage values. Such rules provide a suitable framework for considering new buildings on the site, alterations to heritage buildings, or the demolition/removal of heritage buildings.</p> <p>Retain heritage as a qualifying matter, and amend the rule package to clearly state that the heritage rules in (HH - R1 to HH-R9) apply in addition to the activity rules and built form standards in the MRZ. (Rather than MDRS being precludedon heritage sites generally). (Rather than MDRS being precluded on heritage sites generally).</p>	Reject		Qualifying matters constrain the MDRS, rather than applying in addition. The main feature of the constraint is removing the permitted activity status for subdivision and development of up to 3 residential units on that site.	

80.24	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS9 as it is required by the Medium Density Residential Standards. Retain MRZ-BFS9 as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
80.25	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities		Support the notable tree qualifying matter. Make clear in the variation text what this qualifying matter is seeking to limit or be less enabling of. Does the QM mean that MDRS standards do not apply to sites containing notable trees, or do the tree rules still apply in addition to the MDRS rules. Except where there is site Specificjustification to exclude a site from the MDRS, the general rules in the District Plan sufficiently recognise and provide for the management of notable trees. Retain notable trees as a qualifying matter, and amend the rule package to clearly state that the tree rules in (TREE-R1 to TREE 7) apply in addition to the activity rules and built form standards in the MRZ.(Rather than MDRS being precluded on sites with notable trees generally).	Reject		Qualifying matters constrain the MDRS, rather than applying in addition. The main feature of the constraint is removing the permitted activity status for subdivision and development of up to 3 residential units on that site.	
80.26	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS10 as it is required by the Medium Density Residential Standards. Notes error with naming of associated Figure MRZ-5 which should read 'Outlook space'. Retain MRZ-BFS10 as notified. Amend Figure MRZ-5 to 'Outlook space'.	Accept		Recommend the changes to Figure MRZ-5 to "Outlook space"	
80.27	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Support the Natural Character Waterbody setbacks qualifying matter noting it is a relevant matter of national significance in Section 6 Resource Management Act. Make clear in the Variation text what this qualifying matter is seeking to limit or be less enabling of. Does the qualifying matter mean that MDRS standards do not apply to sites containing waterbodies or is it that the water body setbacks rules still apply in addition to the MDRS rules? Except where there is site Specificjustification to exclude a site from the MDRS, the general rules in the District Plan sufficiently recognise and provide for the management of water body setbacks. Retain the waterbody setbacks as a qualifying matter and amend the rule package to clearly state that the waterway rules (in NATC -R7 to R9 and NATC-S1 to S2) apply in addition to the activity rules and built form standards in the MRZ. (Rather than preclude MDRS on a site with a waterway setback generally).	Accept in part		The qualifying matter rule framework is being redrafted. The qualifying matter will mean that the MDRS does not apply to sites within that overlay.	
80.28	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Amend	Notes error in the naming of Figure MRZ-5, which should read 'Outlook space'. Amend Figure MRZ-5 to read 'Outlook space'.	Accept		Recommend the changes to Figure MRZ-5 to "Outlook space"	
80.29	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS11 as it is required by the Medium Density Residential Standards. Retain MRZ-BFS11 as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	

80.3	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Encourage and enable residential intensification in and around Rangiora Town Centre in accordance with the NPSUD. This is in line with the imperatives of the NPS-UD which notes that compact urban form in the context of existing urban areas requires further intensification. No Specificrelief sought	Reject		This may relate to Kainga Ora's relief for a Height Variation Control Area in and around the Rangiora TCZ. As the submitter has not provided evidence or a drafting package to enable six storeys in this area, I have recommended that this is rejected	
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Accept			
FS 15	FS Christchurch International Airport Limited	Oppose		Accept			
80.30	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Considers this qualifying matter as unnecessary and should be deleted. The use of areas for open space purposes is identified as a qualifying matter under RMA s770(f), the areas zoned Open Space and Recreation Zones (OSRZ) are owned by Council and approximately half of the zoned OSRZ is administered under the Reserves Act 1977. Council ownership, and zoned OSRZ, makes it unlikely that these areas will be developed for medium density housing and such development would also be contrary to the purposes for which these sites were reserved. Further, the Housing Supply Act only requires Council to incorporate MDRS into every relevant residential zone (not Open Space Zone). The PDP open space rules (OSZ-R10 and SARZ-R10) only permit residential activity where it is ancillary park management activity. Delete the Open Space (recreation zone) qualifying matter and any relevant provisions proposed in its entirety.	Accept			
80.31	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS12 as it is required by the Medium Density Residential Standards. Retain MRZ-BFS12 as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
80.32	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Consider this qualifying matter is unnecessary and should be deleted. While the use of areas for open space purposes is identified as a qualifying matter under RMA s770(f), esplanade reserves are vested with/ owned by Waimakariri District Council and are administered under the Reserves Act 1977. Council ownership makes it unlikely that these areas will be developed for medium density housing and such development would also be contrary to the purposes for which these sites were reserved. Delete the Open Space (esplanade reserves) qualifying matter and any relevant proposed provisions in its entirety.	Accept		I have recommended the removal of this qualifying matter	

80.33	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Support the inclusion of objective SD-O2 mandatory objective as per Schedule 3A, Part 1 (6). Retain as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
80.34	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Generally support the rule (SUB-R2) as proposed but amend to introduce the word 'Vacant' to describe the standard to clarify the relationship between the creation of vacant sites through subdivision, and the establishment of reduced site sizes that are deemed acceptable through an approved land use consent for residential development. Amend to state that the standard only applies to the creation of vacant lots.	Accept		The term "vacant" needs to be defined in the context of the rule. It refers to permanent vacant lots following subdivision and development.	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			
80.35	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	The National Grid Transmission Lines (including the proposed 39m setback required in the 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor') should not be qualifying matter, as adequate evidence has not been provided in the S32 analysis to justify this and explain why the setback is required. Delete the qualifying matter for the 'National Grid Subdivision Corridor' including the 39m setback.	Reject		The s32 and Transpower have provided evidence supporting this qualifying matter	
FS 2	FS Transpower	Oppose		Accept			
80.36	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Have no minimum lot size/ area for the MRZ. Minimums (in the rules) should only apply where a subdivision application is accompanied by evidence or an application that demonstrates compliance with MDRS. Instead of a minimum lot size/ area Kāinga Ora support minimum shape/ dimension requirements for vacant lot subdivisions and request that one be added of 8m x 15m. The minimum lot size for the natural hazard qualifying matter is supported if the relevant maps are outside of the District Plan as noted above. Oppose the minimum lot sizes proposed for the airport noise contour and national grid transmission line qualifying matters. Retain subdivision as a controlled activity. Amend the rule/table to delete any reference to the qualifying matter for airport noise and national grid transmission lines and the 200m2 minimum lot size associated with these. Add a minimum shape factor of 8m x 15m for vacant lot subdivisions in the MRZ.	Accept in part		A minimum shape factor, as per the Selwyn plan approach has been recommended. The airport noise matter was traversed in hearing stream 10A, with my recommendation to largely retain it as notified.	
80.37	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Include these mandatory policies as per Schedule 3A, Part 1 (6). Retain as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
80.38	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Include these mandatory policies as per Schedule 3A, Part 1 (6). Retain as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	

80.39	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Include this mandatory policy as per Schedule 3A, Part 1 (6) RMA. Seek inclusion of a greater building height for the MRZ within the area around the Rangiora Town Centre that was identified for a higher density of housing in the Proposed Plan in order to ensure appropriate levels of intensification around centres are encouraged and enabled in accordance with the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Amend policy as follows: Medium Density Residential Standards Apply the Medium Density Residential Standards across all relevant residential zones in the District Plan except in circumstances where greater building height is provided for in an identified area near Rangiora Town Centre and a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga).</p>	Reject		<p>This may relate to Kainga Ora's relief for a Height Variation Control Area in and around the Rangiora TCZ. As the submitter has not provided evidence or a drafting package to enable six storeys in this area, I have recommended that this is rejected</p>	
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support		Reject			
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Accept			
80.4	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>The NPS-UD requires building height and density of urban form adjacent to town centre zones to be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and community services. The Variation as notified does not incorporate the required density uplifts as required by the NPS-UD particularly in the larger Town Centre of Rangiora. Seeks inclusion of a Height Variation Control for the area identified for higher density housing around this town centre in the Proposed District Plan. The Height Variation Control would allow for residential buildings up to 19m in height or five stories. Does not seek an uplift in zoning of this area from medium density to high density residential as the requested height variation control coupled with the density of urban form from the proposed plan is considered to be commensurate with the level of commercial activity and commercial services provided for and enabled within the Town Centre Zone as applied to Rangiora, which is observed as less than other town centre locations within other areas of Christchurch region.</p> <p>Amend variation 1 to include a Height Variation Control for the area identified for higher density housing in the Town Centre Zone of Rangiora to enable residential buildings of up to 19m.</p>	Reject		<p>This may relate to Kainga Ora's relief for a Height Variation Control Area in and around the Rangiora TCZ. As the submitter has not provided evidence or a drafting package to enable six storeys in this area, I have recommended that this is rejected</p>	
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support		Reject			
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support		Reject			

FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Accept			
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Accept			
80.40	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Include this mandatory objective per Schedule 3A, Part 1 (6) RMA, and in order to ensure appropriate levels of intensification around centres are encouraged and enabled in accordance with the NPS-UD seek inclusion of a Height Variation Control Area for the MRZ within the area around the Rangiora Town Centre enabling residential development of up to 19m in height or 5 stories. Amend objective to provide for additional height and intensification around the TCZ.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-O1 Housing types and sizes: "The Medium Density Residential Zone provides for a variety of housing types and sizes that respond to: i. housing needs and demand; and ii. the neighbourhood's planned urban built character, including 3 storey buildings and up to 5 stories where identified."</p>	Reject		This may relate to Kainga Ora's relief for a Height Variation Control Area in and around the Rangiora TCZ. As the submitter has not provided evidence or a drafting package to enable six storeys in this area, I have recommended that this is rejected	
80.41	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Include this mandatory policy per Schedule 3A, Part 1 (6) RMA. Seek a Height Variation Control Area for the MRZ within the area identified around the around the Rangiora Town Centre in order to ensure appropriate levels of intensification around centres are encouraged and enabled in accordance with the NPS-UD. The objective needs to be amended to provide for additional height and intensification around the Rangiora TCZ.. The objective needs to be amended to provide for additional height and intensification around the Rangiora TCZ.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-P1: "Housing types Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low rise apartments, including apartments of up to 5 stories in an in an identified area near Rangiora Town Centre."</p>	Reject		This may relate to Kainga Ora's relief for a Height Variation Control Area in and around the Rangiora TCZ. As the submitter has not provided evidence or a drafting package to enable six storeys in this area, I have recommended that this is rejected	
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support		Reject			
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Accept			
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Accept			
80.42	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Include this mandatory policy per Schedule 3A, Part 1 (6) RMA. Retain MRZ-P2 as notified.</p>	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			

80.43	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Seek wholesale changes to this policy to align with the 'NPS-UD' and 'Housing Supply Act' and better describe the character and amenity anticipated for the zone. Reword to: "Enable development to achieve the character and amenity values anticipated for the zone" (or words of similar effect). Seeks changes to the provisions to focus on achieving the anticipated built form of the proposed zones to be consistent with language used in the NPS-UD. Clarify subjective or vague terms, such as: 'High quality building and landscape design', 'appropriate streetscape landscaping', 'positive contribution to streetscape character' and 'Provides for a peaceful residential environment'. Delete the policy as notified. Amend the policy to reflect the intent of the 'NPS-UD' and 'Housing Supply Act' and remove subjective and vague terminology and provide for Specificoutcomes.	Accept		Reword as submitter requests	
80.44	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Integrate and/or combine rule MRZ R18 with rule MRZ-R2. Delete MRZ-R2 as notified. Amend rule by combining MRZ-R2 and MRZ R18 and removing reference to'multi- unit development'.	Accept		Reference to "multi-unit development" has been removed.	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			
80.45	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Delete this rule as it is no longer necessary. Retain as notified.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
80.46	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Delete the proposed district plan component of density standard MRZ-BFS1 Delete density standard.	Reject		This has been deleted as a result of Variation 1. There is no remaining PDP content within this standard	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose				Accept	

80.47	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Include this mandatory rule as per Schedule 3A, Part 2 (10) of the RMA. Seek amendments to the rules to delete the airport noise qualifying matter and clarify how the natural hazard qualifying matter applies to limit density. Clarify the minimum site size required in the natural hazard qualifying matter, noting that this should be as specified in SUB-S1.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-BFS1, as listed below or changes with similar effect:</p> <p>MRZ-BFS1 Number of residential units per site: 1. There shall be no more than 3 residential units per site, except where: a. Within the qualifying matters - natural hazards area and qualifying matters- airport noise, there must be no more than 1 residential unit per:site - 200m2 for Kaiapoi Area A. - 500m2 for Kaiapoi Area B: ... Matters of discretion are restricted to: - RES-MD2 - Residential design principles - RES-MD15 - Effects from qualifying matters - airport noise - RES-MD16- Effects from qualifying matters - natural hazards.</p> <p>Notification An application for the construction and use of 4 or more residential units that does comply with standards MRZ-BFS- 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified. An application for the construction and use of 4 or more residential units that does not comply with 1 or more of MRZ- BFS- 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p>	Accept in part		The airport noise component of this submission has been discussed in hearing stream 10A. I agree that the drafting for application of qualifying matters needs to be improved and I have made recommendations to that effect.	
80.48	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Include this mandatory rule as per Schedule 3A, Part 2 (14) of the RMA. Retain as notified.</p>	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
80.49	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Delete MRZ-BFS3 as it duplicates new MRZ-BFS12 that contains the mandatory wording in Schedule 3A, Part 2 (18) of the RMA. Delete MRZ-BFS3 noting that MRZ-BFS3 is not within scope of Variation 1.</p>	Accept in part		BFS3 does not limit density, it mainly applies measurement standards. It could be merged with BFS12	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			
80.5	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities		<p>General support for the qualifying matters with minor amendments and clarifications as proposed with the exception of: the Christchurch International Airport noise contour, the high flood hazard overlay in Kaiapoi, National Grid transmission lines and strategic and arterial roads in Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend. No Specificrelief sought.</p>	Accept in part		The airport noise component of this submission will be handled in hearing stream 10A. No changes proposed arising from the rest.	

80.50	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Support the inclusion of this mandatory provision as per Schedule 3A, Part 2(11) of the RMA. Amend activity status as it is not aligned with the requirements of schedule 3A Part 1 (4) of the RMA. The activity status for non-compliance with this rule should be restricted discretionary (RDSI) not discretionary (DIS). Amend standard to include of a Height Variation Control Area for the MRZ within the area around the Rangiora Town Centre that was identified for higher density housing in the Proposed Plan. Amend MRZ-BFS4</p> <p>"1. Buildings must not exceed 11 metres in height, except that 50% of a building's roof in elevation, measured vertically from the junction between wall and roof, may exceed this height by 1 metre, where the entire roof slopes 15° or more, as shown in Figure MRZ-1 except in the Height Variation Control area, buildings must not exceed 19 metres in height.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: DISRDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: RES-MD5 - Impact on neighbouring property."</p> <p>Refer to Appendix 2 of full submission for the maps that outline the area for the proposed height control.</p>	Reject		This may relate to Kainga Ora's relief for a Height Variation Control Area in and around the Rangiora TCZ. As the submitter has not provided evidence or a drafting package to enable six storeys in this area, I have recommended that this is rejected	
80.51	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Include this mandatory rule as per Schedule 3A, Part 2 (18) of the RMA Retain as notified.</p>	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			

80.52	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Oppose RES-MD2 as notified. Seek more concise/ succinct matters of discretion that are clear, easily understood, clearly state the outcomes intended, and provide for design innovation and choice as the proposed assessment matters in rule MRZ - MD2 specify nearly 30 individual matters. These assessment matters provide such broad discretion that they undermine the RMA's intent of a restricted discretionary activity status. Support nationally consistent matters of discretion for MDRS standards, whilst allowing for some evidence based local context nuances. Support the use of consistent 'Urban Design Principles' in District Plans throughout the country. Reword matters of discretion to capture the anticipated context, rather than the receiving environment, and matters of discretion to sufficiently address the likely changes to amenity values while providing for a range of housing typologies. Consolidate the structure of the RES-MD2 Residential Design Principles to remove confusion, by removing the six overarching design principles. Delete RES-MD2 as notified.</p> <p>Amend the matters of discretion to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reflect the intent of the RMA and ' NPS-UD', - Clearly state the outcomes intended, and provide for design innovation and choice, - Achieve nationally consistent urban design principles as matters of discretion. - Apply only to the development of four or more units. - Reflect the anticipated context rather than the receiving environment, - Reduce the number of matters to 5- 6, and - avoid duplication with other matters of discretion applying to MRZ. <p>Seek amendments to the matters of discretion, similar or same, to the matters listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The scale and form of the development is compatible with the planned urban built form of the neighbourhood; 2. The development contributes to a safe and attractive public realm and streetscape; 3. The extent and effects on the three waters infrastructure, achieved by demonstrating that at the point of connection the infrastructure has the capacity to service the development. 4. The degree to which the development delivers quality on-site amenity and occupant privacy that is appropriate for its scale. 	Reject		The MDRS does not prescribe matters of discretion.	
FS 12	FS Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose		Reject			
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Unstated					

80.53	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Assessment matters are confusing and contain subjective terms, such as in point 2 what is 'sense of space' and in point 3 how would one assess a 'visual perception of cramped living conditions. The perception could vary significantly from person to person. Further, the rule is primarily about 'outlook' not access to sunlight. The matters of discretion require consideration of access to natural sunlight on the shortest day of the year. Delete MD12 as notified and amend matters of discretion to remove subjective terms and reference measurable outcomes. Remove reference to receiving natural sunlight and daylight 'especially on the shortest day of the year'.</p> <p>"RES-MD12 Outlook space</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ability of the affected habitable room to receive natural sunlight and daylight especially on the shortest day of the year. 2. The extent to which habitable rooms have an outlook and sense of space. 3. The degree to which a reduction in outlook space would contribute to a visual perception of cramped living conditions. 4. The extent to which visual privacy is provided between habitable rooms of different residential units, on the same or adjacent sites." <p>Seek amendments to the matters of discretion, similar or same, to the matters listed below or changes with similar effect:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The ability of the affected habitable rooms to receive daylight. 2. The visual and landscape quality of the outlook space from the habitable rooms. 3. The extent to which visual privacy is provided between habitable rooms of different residential units, on the same sites. 4. The extent to which the development provides additional outlook spaces from habitable rooms. 	Accept		Replace confusing and subjective terms as requested.	
-------	------------------------------------	--------	--	--------	--	--	--

80.54	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Consolidate RES-MD13 Windows to Street matters with RES – MD6 Road Boundary Setbacks matters. The number of individual matters could also be reduced. Delete RES-MD13 and combine with RES-MD6. Seeks amendments to the matters of discretion, similar or same, to the matters listed below or changes with similar effect:</p> <p>"RES-MD6 Road boundary setback 1 1. The effect of a building's reduced setback on amenity and visual streetscape values. especially where the frontage is to an arterial road or collector road that has a gateway function to a township. 2. The extent to which the reduced setback of the building is opposite any Residential Zones, Rural Zones, or Open Space and Recreation Zones and the effects of a reduced setback on the amenity and outlook of those zones. 3. The extent to which the building presents a visually attractive frontage to the street through the inclusion of glazing, ancillary offices, and showrooms in the front façade. 4. The extent to which the visual effects of a reduced setback are mitigated through site frontage landscaping, the width of the road corridor, and the character of existing building setbacks in the wider streetscape. 5. The extent to which the front façade provides for visual engagement with adjacent streets and any other adjacent public open spaces. 6. The extent to which the development incorporates CPTED principles as required to achieve a safe, secure environment."</p> <p>"RES-MD13 Windows to street 7. The extent to which the development engages with adjacent streets and any other adjacent public open spaces and contributes to them being lively, safe and attractive. 8. The extent to which the development is designed to minimise the visual bulk of the buildings and provide visual interest, when viewed from the street. 9. The extent to which the development incorporates CPTED principles as required to achieve a safe, secure environment."</p>	Accept		Agree with merging MD13 with MD6	
FS 3	FS Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support		Accept			

80.55	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Seek deletion of RES-MD14 (1)(d) relating to heat effects from intensification and impervious surfaces as it is not clear what expert assessment would be required to address this matter and this could be disproportionate the scale of the non-compliance (eg: 1% short of the 20% landscaping requirement). The deletion of RES-MD14 (2) is also sought as it appears to relate more to building design considerations than landscaping.</p> <p>Amend RES-MD14 to delete points 1(d) and 2:</p> <p>"RES-MD14 Landscaped areas</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The extent to which the proposed landscaping enhances residential amenity and is integrated within the site design to: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. define and enhance onsite outdoor living spaces; b. reduce the visual impact of large buildings through screening and planting; c. screen service areas, loading areas, and outdoor storage areas from public vantage points; and d. mitigate the heat effects from intensification and impervious surfaces. 2. The extent to which the development incorporates CPTED principles as required to achieve a safe, secure environment. 3. The effects on the permeability of the site for stormwater runoff and subsequent effects on adjoining sites." 	Reject		The MDRS does not prescribe matters of discretion.	
80.56	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Oppose the airport noise qualifying matter in its entirety including associated matters of discretion.</p> <p>Delete RES-MD15 in its entirety.</p>	Reject		The airport noise matter was traversed in hearing stream 10A, with my recommendation to largely retain it as notified	
80.57	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Oppose the mapping of flooding natural hazards as a qualifying matter. The matters of discretion contain no reference to mapping and are therefore supported.</p> <p>Retain as notified.</p>	Reject		The submitter has supported these qualifying matters elsewhere but opposes them here. I am unsure what the overall relief is for natural hazard qualifying matters.	

80.58	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	Consider that the matters should be reworded to capture the anticipated context rather than the receiving environment in line with the RMA and NPS-UD. Furthermore the provision of adequate outdoor living space is a separate issue covered by another MDRS rule and therefore RES-MD17 should be deleted. Amend RES-MD17 to refer to 'Compatibility of the built form with the anticipated character of the area' and to delete point 2 relating to outdoor living space: "RES-MD14 Building Coverage 1. Effects on visual amenity values, including dominance, and the compatibility of the built form with the anticipated character of the area. With the receiving environment. 2. Provision of adequate outdoor living space on site.	Reject		The MDRS does not prescribe the content of matters of discretion.	
80.59	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Support the new MRZ within the SWR Development Area but note that there are discrepancies between the extent of the MRZ area shown on the ODP and the underlying zone maps. Amend zoning maps or ODP to address inconsistencies.	Accept in part		The ODP was developed before the RMAEHA, and the areas of general residential in the ODPs are now medium density residential. These will be updated prior to final plan publication	
FS 19	FS RJ Paterson Family Trust	Support		Accept			
80.6	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities		Provide more clarify on qualifying matters across variation 1 to assist with plan administration and interpretation. This clarity should include whether some of the matters preclude the MDRS entirely on a site in an overlay, or limit density or limit or override MDRS built form standards (e.g. increased setbacks). No Specificrelief sought	Accept		The package of qualifying matters and their drafting has been amended.	
80.60	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	Support the new MRZ within the NER Development Area but note that there are discrepancies between the extent of MRZ area shown on the ODP and the underlying zone maps. Amend zoning maps or ODP to address inconsistencies.	Accept in part		The ODP was developed before the RMAEHA, and the areas of general residential in the ODPs are now medium density residential. These will be updated prior to final plan publication	

80.61	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Oppose	<p>Seeks changes so that the rule only applies when there are more than three units proposed, that a design statement is not required and that this triggers restricted discretionary status not discretionary status with assessment against RES-MD2 only. This aligns with the changes sought to MRZ-R2. As noted at MRZ-R2 – Oppose “multi-unit residential development” being subject to its own rule and instead seeks its integration with MRZ-R2. Delete MRZ-R18.</p> <p>Delete MRZ-R18 in its entirety and incorporate within MRZ-R2 as per above:</p> <p>MRZ-R187 Multi-unit residential development</p> <p>Activity status: RDIS Where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. any residential unit fronting a road or public open space shall have a habitable room located at the ground level; 2. at least 50% of all residential units within a development shall have a habitable space located at ground level; and 3. 1. a design statement shall be provided with the application. <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</p> <p>RES-MD2 - Residential design principles</p> <p>RES-MD7 - Outdoor storage Notification</p> <p>An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly or limited notified. Activity status when compliance not achieved: DIS</p>	Accept in part		MRZ-R18 has been amended to refer to residential developments of four or more units	
FS 13	FS Ryman Healthcare Limited	Unstated					
FS 14	FS The Retirement Villages Association of NZ Incorporated	Unstated					
80.7	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Change policies, rules and matters of discretion to better reflect the requirements and intent of the ‘the Housing Supply Act’ and the NPS-UD. Variation 1 is still focused on ‘maintaining existing character’ rather than enabling anticipated changes in density of development over time.</p> <p>No Specificrelief sought</p>	Accept		Amended as requested	
80.8	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Change rules to address errors in activity status to align with Schedule 3A of the Housing Supply Act, or to reduce duplication where the standards introduced via Schedule 3A overlap with proposed district plan provisions that are not proposed to be deleted from the MRZ as part of variation 1.</p> <p>No Specificrelief sought</p>	Accept		Amended as requested	
80.9	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities	Support	<p>Seek more concise/ succinct matters of discretion that are easily understood, clearly state the outcomes intended, and provide for design innovation and choice.</p> <p>No Specificrelief sought</p>	Reject			

81.1	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>The planning maps currently show the spatial extent of the Airport Noise Contour qualifying matter. An amendment is required, however, to provide for two density areas beneath the contour; being Area A (600m²) and Area B (300m²), and to recognise the remodelled Annual Average and Outer Envelope contours and the existing operative contour. The densities proposed reflect the density standards of the operative District Plan and are required to ensure appropriate amenity outcomes for residents below the contour and to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the Airport. It is important that the qualifying matter is included on the planning maps with the technically correct label and spatial extent.</p> <p>Amend the Airport Noise Contour qualifying matter on the planning map to show two residential density areas beneath the 50dBA Ldn Air Noise Annual Average, Outer Envelope and Operative Contours, as illustrated on the Plan attached as Appendix B(i) (see full submission). Amend the qualifying matter name so that it is correctly identified on the planning maps as follows: "Qualifying Matter Airport Noise Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour"</p>	Reject <u>Accept in part</u>		<p>The airport noise qualifying matter limits subdivision to 200m². Areas A and B relate to the natural hazards (flood) qualifying matter, which the Variation 1 subdivision provisions state override the default 200m² minimum lot size. Do not amend name of aircraft noise contour as this may cause confusion with the proposed plan contour.</p> <p><u>Accept inclusion of 50 dB operative contour and removal of the small part of additional contour that was proposed for Silverstream under Variation 1.2</u></p>	
FS 10	FS KiwiRail	Support		Accept			
FS 11	FS Momentum Land Limited	Oppose		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

81.10	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>A policy emphasising the importance of protecting infrastructure from reverse sensitivity effects caused by incompatible land use is important and is a matter relevant to the use, development and protection of resources in the zone. If this relief is rejected Christchurch International Airport Ltd seeks that, at a minimum, provisions cross-reference clearly to policies in other parts of the Plan requiring avoidance of adverse reverse sensitivity effects so that it is clear the policy is relevant to activities in the Residential Zones.</p> <p>Insert a new policy as follows or, if Christchurch International Airport Ltd's primary relief is rejected, cross-reference directly and explicitly to relevant policies in other parts of the Plan:</p> <p>"Protect critical infrastructure, regionally significant infrastructure, and strategic infrastructure by avoiding adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, from incompatible activities on residential land, including by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. within the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour for Christchurch International Airport, avoiding residential units on sites under 300m² or 600m² in the areas identified on the planning maps; and <p>...[insert specifics that may be relevant to other strategic infrastructure]"</p>	Reject		The qualifying matters are not implemented through policies, instead they are implemented through rules and standards, and the notified rules and standards have the effect that the submitter desires.	
81.11	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>Support policy but a minor amendment is required to emphasise the importance of protecting infrastructure from adverse reverse sensitivity effects caused by incompatible land use.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-P1:</p> <p>"Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments., except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant."</p>	Reject		RESZ-P15 has been relocated to address this issue.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

81.12	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>The planning maps currently show the spatial extent of the Airport Noise Contour qualifying matter. An amendment is required, however, to provide for two density areas beneath the contour; being Area A (600m²) and Area B (300m²), and to recognise the remodelled Annual Average and Outer Envelope contours and the existing operative contour. The densities proposed reflect the density standards of the operative District Plan and are required to ensure appropriate amenity outcomes for residents below the contour and to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the Airport. It is important that the qualifying matter is included on the planning maps with the technically correct label and spatial extent. Amendments are therefore proposed to the density description in Medium Density Residential Zone rule MRZ-R2.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-R2:</p> <p>"1. Within the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour as shown on the planning maps the minimum net site area is as follows: Kaiapoi Area A 600m² Kaiapoi Area B 300m².</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Within the Christchurch International Airport Air Noise Contour – RDIS; with the Matters of discretion restricted to RES-MD15 Effects from qualifying matters – airport noise 2. as set out in the relevant built form standards. <p>Notification: An application for a residential unit that does not comply with MRZ-R2 clause 1 shall be limited notified at least to Christchurch International Airport (absent its written approval)."</p>	Accept in part		The operative plan contour is retained as the qualifying matter	
-------	--	-------	--	----------------	--	---	--

81.13	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>Support Restricted Discretionary activity status for Medium Density Residential Zone rule MRZ-R18 Multi Unit Residential Development, but seek an additional matter of discretion for proposals that are located within the 50dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour.</p> <p>Amend MRZ-R18:</p> <p>"1. a design statement shall be provided with the application; or 2. where the site is located within the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour."</p> <p>Include an additional matter of discretion: "RES-MD15 – Effects from qualifying matters - airport noise."</p> <p>Amend the notification clause: "An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified or limited notified, except where: 1. the application site is located with the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour, in which case any application shall be limited notified at least to Christchurch International Airport (absent its written approval)."</p>	Reject		MRZ-R17/18 is recommended for deletion in Variation 1	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose					
81.14	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>Support restricted discretionary activity status for applications that do not meet the qualifying restriction under clause 1 of Medium Density Residential Zone built form standard MRZ-BFS1. Given the significance of the resource management issues, and the potential impact on Airport operations and on the amenity of residential activities beneath the noise contour, it is essential that notification of such applications be provided to the Airport. An amendment to the notification provision is required.</p> <p>Amend the notification provisions of Medium Density Residential Zone built form standard MRZ-BFS1 by adding an additional clause as follows: "An application for the construction of residential units that does not comply with MRZ-BFS1 clause 1.a. shall be limited notified at least to Christchurch International Airport (absent its written approval)."</p>	Reject		The qualifying matter drafting has been improved in response to other submissions however which may address some of this relief.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose					

81.15	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	Support restricted discretionary activity status for applications that do not meet the building coverage requirement of Medium Density Residential Zone built form standard MRZ-BFS2. Given the significance of the resource management issues, and the potential impact on Airport operations, it is essential that notification of such applications be provided to the Airport. In Medium Density Residential Zone built form standard MRZ-BFS2, include an additional matter of discretion as follows: "RES-MD15 – Effects from qualifying matters – airport noise". Amend the notification provision as follows: "Refer to notification status in MRZ-BFS1, except where an application for residential units does not comply with MRZ-BFS2 clause 1 shall be limited notified at least to Christchurch International Airport (absent its written approval)."	Reject		Allotment sizes are implemented through the subdivision chapter.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
81.16	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Support	Support Matter of Discretion RES-MD15 for the Residential Zones. Retain Matter of Discretion RES-MD15 for the Residential Zones.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

81.2	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>The planning maps currently show the spatial extent of the Airport Noise Contour qualifying matter. An amendment is required, however, to provide for two density areas beneath the contour; being Area A (600m2) and Area B (300m2), and to recognise the remodelled Annual Average and Outer Envelope contours and the existing operative contour. The densities proposed reflect the density standards of the operative District Plan and are required to ensure appropriate amenity outcomes for residents below the contour and to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the Airport. It is important that the qualifying matter is included on the planning maps with the technically correct label and spatial extent.</p> <p>Retain the "Airport noise" qualifying matter in Table RSL-1. Amend the description and reasoning as follows:</p> <p>"Qualifying Matter and Area: Airport noise -Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour Properties within the Medium Residential Zone of Kaiapoi and within the Christchurch International Airport noise contour.</p> <p>Reasoning: A spatial overlay within Kaiapoi, reducing development within the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour airport noise contour to avoid adverse amenity effects on residents, reduce reverse sensitivity effects on Christchurch Airport, and to ensure the efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure."</p>	Accept in part		Accept in part	
FS 11	FS Momentum Land Limited	Oppose		Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

81.3	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>Support a strategic objective related to infrastructure. This is a key resource management issue for the district and it is essential that direction is given in this chapter to direct all other objectives and policies in other chapters. However, seek that this strategic objective be amended to better recognise and enable important infrastructure and to explicitly require avoidance of adverse effects on important infrastructure.</p> <p>Amend SD-O34:</p> <p>"Across the District:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. improved accessibility and multi-modal connectivity is provided through a safe and efficient transport network that is able to respond to technology changes and contributes to the well-being and liveability of people and communities; 2. the social, economic and environmental and cultural benefits of infrastructure, including strategic infrastructure, critical infrastructure, and regionally significant infrastructure: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. is recognised and provided for, and its safe, efficient and effective development, upgrading, maintenance and operation is enabled is able to operate efficiently and effectively; and b. is enabled, while: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. managing adverse effects on the surrounding environment, having regard to the social, cultural and economic benefit, functional need and operational need of the infrastructure; and ii. managing the adverse effects of other activities on infrastructure, including managing reverse sensitivity; b. strategic infrastructure, critical infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure is protected by avoiding adverse effects from incompatible development and activities, including reverse sensitivity effects. This includes: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. avoiding noise sensitive activities within the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour, except within the existing Kaiapoi residential area where density is to be retained at one unit per 300m² or 600m² in the areas identified on the planning maps; and ii. managing the risk of birdstrike to aircraft using Christchurch International Airport; 3. the adverse effects of strategic infrastructure, critical infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure on the surrounding environment are managed, having regard to the economic benefits and practical, technical and operational needs of that infrastructure; 4.the ..." 	Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

81.4	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	Supports Urban Form and Development policy UFD-P10 "Managing reverse sensitivity effects from new development", particularly the requirement to avoid noise sensitive activities within the Air Noise Contour. Consider the drafting could be further expanded and clarified. Consider that within existing residentially zoned areas in Kaiapoi, further intensification should be avoided, beyond that which is already permitted. Seek that the residential density in this area within the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour is not increased compared to what is presently allowed. Amend UFD-P10 as follows: "Within Residential Zones and new development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi: 1. avoid residential activity that has the potential to limit adverse effects on, or is incompatible with, the efficient and effective operation and upgrade of critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure, and regionally significant infrastructure, including avoiding noise sensitive activities within the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour, unless within an existing Residential Zone in Kaiapoi which was in existence at the time this plan was made operative, where density is to be retained at one unit per 300m2 or 600m2 in the areas identified on the planning maps; ..."	Reject			
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
81.5	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Support	Support Subdivision rule SUB-R2 Retain Subdivision rule SUB-R2.	Accept		No changes are proposed from this submission.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			
81.6	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	Support Subdivision standard SUB-S1 insofar as it specifies minimum allotment standards in Table SUB-1. Amendments are required, however, to (1) the activity status when compliance with the minimum allotment standards within the Medium Density Residential Zone subject to the Airport qualifying matters; and (2) the allotment standards applicable to subdivision within the Medium Density Residential Zone subject to the Airport qualifying matters. In SUB-S1, amend the activity status when compliance not achieved to read as follows: 1. In the Medium Density Residential Zone (except as provided for in 3. below) ... DIS... ...3. within the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour: NC	Reject		No information has been provided to justify the increase in minimum allotment sizes.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			

81.7	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>The planning maps currently show the spatial extent of the Airport Noise Contour qualifying matter. An amendment is required, however, to provide for two density areas beneath the contour; being Area A (600m²) and Area B (300m²), and to recognise the remodelled Annual Average and Outer Envelope contours and the existing operative contour. The densities proposed reflect the density standards of the operative District Plan and are required to ensure appropriate amenity outcomes for residents below the contour and to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the Airport. It is important that the qualifying matter is included on the planning maps with the technically correct label and spatial extent.</p> <p>In SUB-S1, amend the minimum lot sizes in Table SUB-1 applicable to the Medium Density Residential Zone (with qualifying matter airport noise) as follows: 200m² (except if subject to qualifying matter - natural hazards) Within the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour as shown on the planning maps: Kaiapoi Area A 600m² Kaiapoi Area B 300m²</p>	Reject		No information has been provided to justify the increase in minimum allotment sizes.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
81.8	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	<p>Seeks recognition in the Introduction to the Residential Zones Chapter that density controls are important to avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects on the Airport.</p> <p>Amend the Introduction to the Residential Zones Chapter as follows: "Within the Christchurch International Airport 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour residential density is also controlled in order to avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects on Christchurch International the Airport and to avoid adverse amenity effects on residents."</p>	Accept in part		Accept but with "minimise" instead of "avoid"	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Reject			

81.9	Christchurch International Airport Ltd	Amend	Support the policy as proposed in the Variation as it recognises circumstances where the Medium Density Residential Standards should not apply. However, a minor amendment is required to ensure appropriate amenity outcomes for residents below the Airport noise contour and to ensure the effective and efficient operation of the Airport. Amend RESZ-P15: "Apply the Medium Density Residential Standards across all relevant residential zones in the district except in circumstances where a qualifying matter is relevant (including matters of significance such as: 1. historic heritage and the relationship of Māori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, wāhi tapu, and other taonga).; and 2. the avoidance of adverse impacts on the effective and efficient operation of the Christchurch International Airport"	Reject		This gives primary or elevates two qualifying matters above the other qualifying matters.	
FS 23	FS Kainga Ora	Oppose		Accept			
9.1	Philip Ambler	Oppose	Opposes the 11m height limit as such a development next door would block almost all winter sunlight, and substantially limit summer sunlight, into the indoor and outdoor living areas of 30 Nga Tupuna St, Pegasus. The submitter has worked hard to invest in their home and consider such development would make their property unliveable, reduce its value, and upset them economically and emotionally. Amend to remove applicability of Variation 1 provisions for sections on the northern and north-western boundary of an existing dwelling due to the unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been proposed	
9.2	Philip Ambler	Oppose	Opposes the 11m height limit as such a development next door would block almost all winter sunlight, and substantially limit summer sunlight, into the indoor and outdoor living areas of 30 Nga Tupuna St, Pegasus. The submitter has worked hard to invest in their home and consider such development would make their property unliveable, reduce its value, and upset them economically and emotionally. Amend to remove applicability of Variation 1 provisions for sections on the northern and north-western boundary of an existing dwelling due to the unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been proposed	

9.3	Philip Ambler	Oppose	Opposes the 11m height limit as such a development next door would block almost all winter sunlight, and substantially limit summer sunlight, into the indoor and outdoor living areas of 30 Nga Tupuna St, Pegasus. The submitter has worked hard to invest in their home and consider such development would make their property unliveable, reduce its value, and upset them economically and emotionally. Amend to remove applicability of Variation 1 provisions for sections on the northern and north-western boundary of an existing dwelling due to the unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been proposed	
9.4	Philip Ambler	Oppose	Opposes the 11m height limit as such a development next door would block almost all winter sunlight, and substantially limit summer sunlight, into the indoor and outdoor living areas of 30 Nga Tupuna St, Pegasus. The submitter has worked hard to invest in their home and consider such development would make their property unliveable, reduce its value, and upset them economically and emotionally. Amend to remove applicability of Variation 1 provisions for sections on the northern and north-western boundary of an existing dwelling due to the unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been proposed	
9.5	Philip Ambler		Opposes the 11m height limit as such a development next door would block almost all winter sunlight, and substantially limit summer sunlight, into the indoor and outdoor living areas of 30 Nga Tupuna St, Pegasus. The submitter has worked hard to invest in their home and consider such development would make their property unliveable, reduce its value, and upset them economically and emotionally. Amend to remove applicability of Variation 1 provisions for sections on the northern and north-western boundary of an existing dwelling due to the unacceptable impact on the neighbouring property.	Accept in part		A sunlight and shading qualifying matter has been proposed	

