

18. Constraints on Development and Subdivision

Issue 18.1

Growth and development that creates adverse effects on existing communities and fails to protect natural and physical resources that contribute to the distinctive environments and environmental qualities of the District.

CROSS REFERENCE: Chapter 13: Resource Management Framework, Chapter 14: Rural Zones, Chapter 16: Business Zones and Chapter 17: Residential Zones

Objective 18.1.1

Sustainable management of natural and physical resources that recognises and provides for:

- a. changes in the environment of an area as a result of land use development and subdivision;
- b. changes in the resource management expectations the community holds for the area; and
- c. the actual and potential effects of subdivision, use and development.

Policy 18.1.1.1

Growth and development proposals should provide an assessment of how:

- the use, development, or protection of natural and physical resources affected by the proposal will be managed in a sustainable and integrated way; and
- the adverse effects on those resources and the existing community will be avoided, remedied, or mitigated.

In particular, proposals should not be inconsistent with other objectives and policies in the District Plan, and show how and the extent to which they will:

- a. protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna including vegetation and habitat sites listed in Appendix 25.1;
- b. protect the outstanding landscape area as defined in the District Plan Maps;
- c. avoid or mitigate natural hazards including:
 - flooding as defined in the District Plan Maps,
 - flooding from the Waimakariri or Ashley/Rakahuri Rivers,

2 Constraints on Development and Subdivision

- seismic conditions including the potential for liquefaction and amplification effects,
 - damage from the sea, including erosion, storm and tsunami, and
 - land instability;
- d. protect the life supporting capacity of soils;
 - e. maintain and enhance the environmental characteristics of adjoining zones, and the environment of the zone within which the proposal is located, as set out in Policies 14.1.1.2, 14.1.1.3, 15.1.1.1, 16.1.1.1 and 17.1.1.2;
 - f. retain the rural environment between Residential 4A and 4B Zones, between the Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, Pegasus and Oxford urban areas, and other Residential 3 Zones; and between Kaiapoi and the Christchurch City boundary;
 - g. provide access to and along rivers, open spaces and reserves;
 - h. maintain and enhance the form and function of the District's towns;
 - i. avoid or mitigate significant adverse effects on the form and function of the Business 1 Zones including its role as a dominant community focal point within the four main towns;
 - j. avoid or mitigate the effects of noise within the outer control boundary (55dBA Ldn noise contour) of Christchurch International Airport noise contours as defined in Map 138;
 - k. provide infrastructure for services and roading in a manner consistent with this District Plan;
 - l. ensure the efficient and effective integration of any new infrastructure into the existing network, or ensure the efficient and effective ongoing working of a stand-alone system;
 - m. avoid or mitigate potential adverse effects from sites and facilities using, storing, and/or disposing of hazardous substances;
 - n. protect groundwater quality and quantity;
 - o. protect surface water quality and quantity;
 - p. protect wahi taonga;
 - q. avoid adverse effects on heritage sites and protect those sites listed in Appendix 28.1;
 - r. avoid adverse effects on significant plants and protect those notable plants listed in Appendix 29.1;
 - s. avoid adverse effects on the Business 3 Zone;
 - t. provide for efficiency in energy use;
 - u. enable local communities to be more self-sustaining;
 - v. affect the demand for transport;
 - w. provide choice in transport mode, particularly modes with low adverse environmental effects; and
 - x. avoid or mitigate for adverse impacts on the habitat of trout and salmon.

Explanation

This policy is the basis of determining the effects of any plan change proposal. The environmental quality and community expectations for an area can be the foundation for determining the impact of the proposal and providing for integrated management of the District's resources.

Under the Resource Management Act 1991 any person can request a change to the District Plan (First Schedule, Part 2). A request for a plan change must explain the purpose of, and the reasons for, the change to the District Plan. Where environmental effects are anticipated, the request should describe these taking into account the Fourth Schedule, in such detail as corresponds with the scale and significance of the proposal.

A plan change cannot be notified where it is shown, amongst other things, to be frivolous or vexatious, or that the substance of the request or part of the request has been considered and given effect to or rejected by the local authority or Environment Court within the previous two years (clause 25 First Schedule Resource Management Act 1991).

Policy 18.1.1.1 allows the Council to respond to potential changes in the amenity values, environmental quality, or community expectations of an area brought about by plan changes. Resource issues arising from any change such as an adverse effect on significant sites of indigenous vegetation, or outstanding landscape, can be addressed in a comprehensive way. The policy allows consideration of effects both of the new or extended zone onto adjacent areas, and also existing effects from the adjacent areas onto the new zone.

Growth and development can also be provided for by the granting of resource consent applications. These applications can have similar impacts as plan changes on the growth and development of the District. Where resource consents are preferred by applicants as the mechanism to provide for growth and development, these need to be subject to the same level of assessment as plan changes.

The policy recognises that how the District grows and develops will impact on the choice of mode of transport (eg private car, walking, cycling and passenger transport) and the demand for transport. The mode of transport influences the effects on the environment. Generally cycling, walking, public passenger transport and rail as a passenger and freight mode generally have low adverse effects on the environment relative to motor cars and trucks. Managing the demand for transport has positive benefits on the demand for energy resources, the effects on the environment, and for new physical infrastructure. Both transport demand and mode choice can be influenced by promoting an urban layout that decreases the distance between homes, sources of employment, shops and other frequent destinations.

The policy provides a focus to the circumstances of the District that are particularly important in dealing with growth and development issues. An example is the desire by residents for the retention of the rural environment around the Residential 4A and 4B Zones, and between the towns. This maintains and enhances the form and function of these environments. It also promotes the integrated management of the resources by ensuring infrastructure is provided in an efficient and effective manner.

CROSS REFERENCE: Tables 16.1 and 17.1

Policy 18.1.1.2

Avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effect on the ability to view Mount Grey/Maukatere from Lineside Road.

Explanation

The profile of this hill is an important landmark in the Waimakariri District. It is part of a distinctive skyline that forms a backdrop to large parts of the District. The view from Lineside Road is particularly important as it is a main route in the District and provides a "sense of place". The ability to view Mount Grey/Maukatere while travelling in a northwest direction up the road is not continuous: the view is occasionally broken by vegetation and structures. However, the overall sense that you can see the outline of the ridge is not lost.

Method

Advocacy 18.1.1.2.1

Work with Transit New Zealand and landowners to retain the view of Mount Grey/Maukatere.

Policy 18.1.1.3

Any proposal for extensions to existing zones, or for new zones, should recognise the nature, scale and intensity of effects arising from existing activities adjoining or near to the site of the plan change and show how the proposal will avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effects on the environment arising from those existing activities.

Explanation

This policy recognises that activities in zones surrounding an area subject to a plan change proposal, themselves may have adverse effects in relation to the new environment. These existing effects may be permitted or have gained resource consent in their zone, but may be unreasonable or excessive in the adjacent proposed new zone. Noise, odour or glare may be acceptable and considered part of the existing environment, but may be unacceptable to an urban or residential environment. Mechanisms like setbacks and buffer distances could be used to mitigate these effects on the new adjacent zone. If this was not practical, the new zone or its boundaries may need re-evaluation.

Methods

Plan Changes 18.1.1.3.1

Council or private proposals to amend or change the resource management purpose or outcomes sought for land.

Consultation 18.1.1.3.2

With developers, and the community, about future growth prospects, options and limitations.

Liaison 18.1.1.3.3

With community groups and government agencies about District growth and development.

District Development Strategy 18.1.1.3.4

A non-statutory document setting out the Waimakariri District Council's preferences as service, facility, and utility provider for the location and nature of future development including proposals for the integrated and staged provision of the services, facilities and utilities required by that development. The strategy is drawn around urban design principles and a 20 year planning period.

Asset Management Plans 18.1.1.3.5

Forward plan of services including standards of servicing.

Policy 18.1.1.4

Limit Kaiapoi urban area to within its southern and south western boundaries existing at 20 June 1998.

Policy 18.1.1.5

Avoid urban subdivision and development within the area adjacent to Kaiapoi shown on District Plan Maps 59, 68, 69, 104, 105, 106 and 107.

Explanation

A consistent message that has emerged from community consultation is the desire to keep urban areas separate from one another by a rural environment.

Of most concern was the potential for Kaiapoi to expand south and Christchurch City to expand north to create a continuous urban environment. (See explanation to Policy 15.1.1.1 for an explanation of "urban environments"). If this was to happen there was concern that Kaiapoi would lose its distinctive character and become a suburb of Christchurch. A second concern was the adverse effects arising if the Kaiapoi urban area was to expand south west of the Motorway. The community sees the motorway as a logical barrier to further growth. As the major road in the area it was appropriate that the rural setting of Kaiapoi be enhanced by retaining a rural outlook from the motorway where it was not already compromised. A sustainable future for Kaiapoi lies in its rural setting, and in avoiding future adverse effects from future urban development straddling the motorway. Provision has been made, subject to strict requirements as to flooding, traffic, foundations and exclusion of residential uses within the 50 dBA Ldn aircraft noise contour, by way of a Deferred Residential 2 zone for a limited residential subdivision of

6 Constraints on Development and Subdivision

land in the Island Road area. This would involve a future change to establish a satisfactory Outline Development Plan.

CROSS REFERENCE: Policy 32.1.1.14

The noise contour for Christchurch International Airport encompasses land to the north, west and south of Kaiapoi. The area demarked by the noise contour is one of the main approaches and take-off slopes used by Christchurch International Airport Limited. Within an outer control boundary of 50dBA Ldn there are restrictions on subdivision and development. As the airport develops more flights will occur and the frequency of noise events in this area will also increase. Whilst the noise levels for individual aircraft may decrease, the increasing frequency of aircraft movements in the future may create the potential for adverse environmental effects from noise not presently being experienced by residents in and around Kaiapoi.

CROSS REFERENCE: Policy 12.1.1.9

The area bounded by the existing town, the Kaiapoi River, the Waimakariri River, and a line to the west based on Island Road up to Ohoka Road should be free of urban development. This area would create an area of rural segregation, and promote growth of the town in a more sustainable direction.

The Council supports the community view. In particular, the community has identified the maintenance and enhancement of the form and function of Kaiapoi, and the maintenance and enhancement of open space values of the river and its margins. Further, consideration is also needed of the ability of any urban subdivision and development to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of natural hazards on the future uses of this land.

CROSS REFERENCE: Rule 32.4.2

Policy 18.1.1.6

Limit the Waikuku Beach, Woodend Beach, and Pines/Kairaki Beach settlements to within their Residential 3 boundaries existing at 20 June 1998.

Policy 18.1.1.7

Avoid urban subdivision within the areas adjacent to Waikuku Beach (shown on District Plan Maps 120, 121, 123, 124, 126 and 127), Woodend Beach (shown on District Plan Maps 48 and 133), and Pines/Kairaki Beach (shown on District Plan Maps 59, 69, 108 and 109).

Policy 18.1.1.8

Limit the extent of subdivision within the Residential 3 Zoned land at Allin Drive and Ligget Park, Waikuku Beach (shown on District Plan Maps 120 and 121).

Explanation

Waikuku Beach including the Allin Drive area, Woodend Beach and Pines/Kairaki Beach settlements have limited potential for further urban development. They are all constrained by their coastal setting, and low-lying land that is subject to flooding. Some areas are potentially at a risk from tsunami and earthquake induced ground liquefaction.

Waikuku Beach settlement and Pines/Kairaki settlement are also constrained by the Ashley/Rakahuri and Waimakariri Rivers. In addition, further urban development may be limited by the public ownership of some of the land adjacent to the beach settlements. Limits on growth will help sustain the natural character of the coastal environment.

The beach settlement workshops held in 1995 indicated that these settlements are seen as distinctive small settlement environments. They have different amenity values and environmental qualities. An important element of the environment is their small, compact nature, surrounded by the coastal and rural environment. Expansion and redevelopment of these settlements is not sustainable measured against their present qualities.

Further subdivision and development within the Allin Drive area of Waikuku Beach is constrained by the existing level of infrastructure and services and by the potential for adverse environmental effects to occur. Subdivision constraints have been introduced in order to reduce the pressure on the community to fund upgrades to the existing infrastructure, to avoid adverse environmental effects from occurring and to retain the amenity and character of the area.

Subdivision of land within the Ligget Park area shall be consistent with subdivision consent R940174, granted 21 February 1995. This consent includes the requirement for specific measures to be implemented in order to avoid potential environmental effects from occurring as a result of the subdivision of this land.

CROSS REFERENCE: Rules 32.1.1.6, 32.1.1.7, 32.4.2 and Policy 7.1.1.2

Policy 18.1.1.9

Limit the Ohoka settlement to within its Residential 3 and 4B boundaries existing at 20 June 1998.

Explanation

The Council considers the expansion of the Ohoka settlement is undesirable because of the low-lying nature of the area and the difficulty of providing satisfactory drainage and effluent disposal services.

The Ohoka settlement has already experienced considerable growth over recent years with the rural-residential development at Keetly Place and Wilson Drive. The Council supports the argument, however, that further development has the potential for adverse effects that will overwhelm the character, and form and function of the Ohoka settlement (Armstrong vs Waimakariri District Council 1994).

Policy 18.1.1.10

Limit the Ashley settlement to within its Residential 3 boundary existing at 20 June 1998.

Explanation

The Council considers the expansion of the Ashley settlement is undesirable because of the:

- potential flood hazard posed by the Ashley River/Rakahuri;
- physical barriers presented by the road and railway to the north that forms a barrier to the safe access to and from either area;
- low-lying nature of the land to the east making the disposal of effluent and land drainage difficult; and
- settlement's close proximity to Rangiora.

Methods

Methods to give effect to Policies 18.1.1.4 to 18.1.1.10 include:

Asset Management Plans 18.1.1.10.1

Limit the availability or capacity of essential services into areas not preferred for growth and development.

District Plan Zoning 18.1.1.10.2

Setting boundaries to urban areas, or other environments.

District Plan Rules 18.1.1.10.3

Limiting the potential for subdivision (Chapter 32: Subdivision – Rules).

District Development Strategy 18.1.1.10.4

A non-statutory document setting out the Waimakariri District Council's preferences as service, facility, and utility provider for the location and nature of future development including proposals for the integrated and staged provision of the services, facilities and utilities required by that development. The strategy is drawn around urban design principles and a 20 year planning period.

Policy 18.1.1.11

Provide for the development of a new town at Pegasus based on the following principles:

- a. The subdivision and development of Pegasus shall reflect and enhance the land's natural characteristics and topography, natural vegetation, cultural heritage values, rural setting, and views (both to and from the site).
- b. The design, layout and development of Pegasus shall be sensitive to the site's topography, particularly the pattern of dunes and inter-dune hollows.

- c. The design, layout and development of Pegasus shall provide and enhance the visual and ecological connections between the wetland areas and the open space areas adjoining and within the residential areas.
- d. The extent to which the development within the town is visible from the coastal environment, the surrounding roads and neighbouring settlements, shall be limited by retaining open space buffer areas and, as far as practical, the existing screening by way of sand dunes and vegetation.
- e. The residential areas shall meet the diverse needs of the community, with a wide choice in housing, residential allotment size, and associated community and commercial activities.
- f. The creation of attractive streets and open space areas.
- g. A safe pattern of public open space areas that allows for public surveillance of public open spaces and contributes to the legibility and character of neighbourhoods.
- h. Attractive streetscapes which reinforce the functions of streets and enhance the amenity values of neighbourhoods.
- i. Buildings are constructed to reduce energy demand within the building; and residential allotments are large enough and appropriately oriented to enable buildings and outdoor living spaces to take advantage of solar energy.
- j. The potential for adverse effects from air pollution in the town is reduced by discouraging the use of those fuels and methods of home heating which are most likely to result in high levels of air pollution.
- k. The development of an integrated residential community of sufficient size to support a range of commercial and community activities and facilities, as well as a high standard of reticulated water supply, sewage treatment and disposal and stormwater management services.
- l. Development of the town as a compact, cohesive urban community, which remains contained within its rural environment.
- m. Retention of a separation of rural open space between Pegasus and its neighbouring urban areas and settlements.
- n. Higher density residential development locating where the scale and intensity of the development is compatible with the natural and amenity values of the surrounding locality, such as in the vicinity of the town centre.
- o. The development of a convenient and attractive commercial and community centre for the town, which provides the social and business focus for the town.
- p. At least one conveniently and safely located, attractive and spacious primary school located within the town, in order to provide for the children of the growing community and, if necessary, for some of the children of the surrounding area.
- q. The establishment of a wide range of non-residential activities throughout the town, including employment and business opportunities, in order to encourage residents to work within the

town, provided that such activities will not detract from the residential character and the amenity values and quality of the residential areas.

- r. A sense of identity or “place” within the different residential neighbourhoods of the town, through such means as creating identifiable boundaries between neighbourhoods related to the natural characteristics of the site, and grouping of activities such as local shops, playgrounds and schools.
- s. The provision of generous areas of parks and open space throughout the town.
- t. Protection of the significant heritage values of the town, particularly along the western boundary of the site, through the setting aside of a buffer strip of open space along this boundary of the town.
- u. Provision of a buffer of open space and plantings along the southern boundary of the town, to protect the residents of the town from any adverse effects from the operation of the Woodend wastewater treatment and disposal system and to enhance the vegetation and birdlife values of this area of the town.
- v. Subdivision and development of the town results in the provision of a network of walkways and cycleways throughout the town, as follows:
 - i. linking the town with the coastal environment, Pegasus Bay Walkway, and the beach;
 - ii. providing some public access along the margins of lakes and wetlands;
 - iii. linking the lakes and wetlands to the boundary of the site adjoining Tutaepatu lagoon;
 - iv. linking the residential neighbourhoods of the town with Gladstone Park; and
 - v. providing an historical walkway linkage along the western boundary of the town to Kaiapoi Pa.
- w. Pleasant and convenient walking and cycling access between the different residential neighbourhoods of the town and the town centre, primary school(s) and the lake and associated parks.
- x. Neighbourhood reserves within close walking distance of most dwellings, in order to enhance the identity and amenity values of each neighbourhood by acting as local focal points and as locations for local recreational and community activities.
- y. The continued use and development of Gladstone Park as the major location and focus for adult organised sports in the north-eastern part of the District.
- z. The layout and development of the town enables access to the coastal environment and its recreational opportunities.
- aa. The creation of public access to the coast, through the formation of a public road, car parking areas and walkways between the town and the coast.

Explanation

The rapidly increasing urban population in the District results in a need to change the use of some rural areas to residential and other urban uses. The area of the Residential 6 and 6A Zones have the capacity to accommodate urban growth without conflicting with the sustainable management purpose of this District Plan. The District Plan recognises the changed resource management expectations that the community holds for this area and the changes in amenity values and environmental qualities that will result from urban subdivision, use and development. The District Plan encourages the full and comprehensive development of this new urban area to accommodate the expanding population of the District.

The District Plan provides for the town of Pegasus to develop as an important residential centre and community focus within the District. This is based on the following factors:

- Pegasus is well situated with regard to access to arterial roads and to the location of other centres of settlement to provide for some of the substantial population growth anticipated in the District over the next 20 years;
- the land surrounding the site of Pegasus has exceptional natural and cultural values, which will be retained and enhanced as integral features of the town's character and amenity values;
- the land available for the development of the town is of sufficient size to enable the efficient and cost-effective provision of utilities and social services and facilities, in a way that avoids adverse effects on the health, safety and quality of the surrounding communities; and
- the development of an independent, integrated residential community at Pegasus will assist in fulfilling the policies relating to the character and scale of the District's other urban communities, by encouraging some of the District's population growth to be accommodated away from the existing, but rapidly expanding, settlements.

The nature and extent of urban development at Pegasus has been determined by eight main factors:

- the nature of the soils and the groundwater conditions;
- the extent and nature of surface water ponding and flooding conditions on the site and the potential effects on the surrounding area;
- the existing and potential nature conservation values associated with the wetland and dryland ecosystems of the site;
- the cultural values of the site to tangata whenua;
- the qualities and character of the landscape values of the site and its surroundings, including the rural setting of the town and the neighbouring towns;
- the desire to create a quality living environment and townscape with a strong sense of identity and community;
- the ability to create a community where the form and nature of the town and the construction of the buildings emphasises efficiency of energy use; and

12 Constraints on Development and Subdivision

- the desire to focus the town on a compact and identifiable town centre.
- The above policy governing the nature and extent of urban development at Pegasus has been based on these factors.

Methods

District Plan Zoning 18.1.1.11.1

Providing for the Residential 6, 6A and Business 1 (Pegasus) and Pegasus Rural Zone by inclusion in the District Plan Maps.

District Plan Rules 18.1.1.11.2

Standards for subdivision.

Standards for site development and land uses.

Standards limiting the scale and location of the urban development within the town.

Requirements relating to the layout and development of land uses, roads, reserves, community facilities and town centre within the town, based on an Outline Development Plan for the town.

Requirements for the protection of the cultural heritage values of the conservation areas associated with Pegasus, as the town develops.

Requirements for the enhancement and protection of the natural conservation values of the conservation areas associated with Pegasus, as the town develops.

Standards relating to energy conservation measures within buildings and air pollution from fires.

Engineering Code of Practice 18.1.1.11.3

A set of engineering standards developed by the Waimakariri District Council for roads, domestic water supply and sewerage.

Financial and Development Contributions 18.1.1.11.4

Rules requiring money or land for purposes set out in Chapter 20: Financial Contributions and Chapter 34: Financial Contributions – Rules or in Waimakariri District Council's Development Contribution Policy.

Liaison with Developers 18.1.1.11.5

To liaise with the developers of Pegasus regarding the long-term ownership and management of the utility services, reserves, community facilities and conservation areas within the town.

Liaison and Consultation 18.1.1.11.6

With the developers of Pegasus, Ngai Tahu and Ngai Tuahuriri, community groups, government agencies and environmental groups about potential enhancement works and community initiative associated with the development of Pegasus.

Principal Reasons For Adopting Objectives, Policies and Methods 18.1.2

The Council has a function under the Resource Management Act 1991 to prepare resource management proposals to "...achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district" (section 31(a)). As well, the Council has the function to "...control any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land" (section 31(b)). These functions can be carried out to give effect to promoting sustainable management of resources, subject to addressing both matters of national importance and other matters set out in sections 6, 7 and 8 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

For the Council, these responsibilities are to be carried out in a district undergoing significant growth and development. The rate and nature of change brings particular focus to parts of the Regional Policy Statement in relation to the District. The Regional Policy Statement requires District Councils in the preparation of plans to consider making provision for certain regional issues. Issues and outcomes sought at the regional level relevant to this District's growth are particularly related to water, settlement, energy, transport and natural hazards.

This chapter of the District Plan seeks to address some of these regional issues. It also sets out the local circumstances which the community and Council believe should limit choices for future growth and development, particularly in relation to existing settlements.

Over the last 10 years the District has been subject to significant growth and development. This has been based on residential growth, and intensification of land use, in the town and also in the rural areas. Analysis suggests this pattern of continuing change will be a feature for the next planning period.

One feature of the growth has been the desire by many people to create environments, and to provide for their social and economic wellbeing, in a diverse manner. Land use and settlement options set out in Transitional Plans have not provided well for the choices now wishing to be exercised. The demand for choice and flexibility in living, working and social environments is a product of larger demographic, social, economic, and political forces at work in the community. It is flexibility of resource use options, and the management and protection those local matters and circumstances consistent with Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991, that will provide a sustainable future for the District.

Policy 18.1.1.1 provides for change by allowing landowners to identify sites and circumstances where existing plan provisions no longer provide for their resource management expectations for land. The Resource Management Act 1991 allows private requests for changes to plans. The Council considers that this policy is an effective approach to growth and development. It is focused on the promotion of sustainable management. It will allow each plan change proposal to be argued on its individual merits rather than require the District Plan to anticipate the type of development, its location, and effects, for the next 10 years.

The Council has chosen for the District Plan not to allocate choices between landowners in terms of land use. The policy does set out those local environmental matters that proponents of change must address; the choices for environmental outcomes belong to the District Plan, not the landowner. This fits with the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991, and the Council's functions. It ensures that, in relation to the biophysical and social make-up of the District, future resource management options are tested against statutory and local matters that underpin sustainable management of natural and physical resources.

Policy 18.1.1.2 seeks to retain the ability to view Mount Grey/Maukatere from Lineside Road. It is recognised by the community as being a significant view that should be safeguarded. It is recognised that it is not appropriate to require the maintenance of a view shaft to hill along the total length of Lineside Road. Changes in vegetation will mean that there will always be sections of the road from which you cannot see Mount Grey/Maukatere. However, changes to views can be considered as part of assessing the effects of activities and landowners can be encouraged to respect community concerns.

Policy 18.1.1.3 requires specific consideration of effects between zones when a new or extended zone is proposed. It is necessary and appropriate for consideration of effects arising from the creation of new physical, social and economic relationships. Each new proposal will create some effects; the policy requires assessment of inter-zone impacts.

Policy 18.1.1.4 address the effects of the subdivision and development of land to the south and west of Kaiapoi. This policy makes reference to particular values which have been identified as important to the community. The policy anticipates future adverse effects on the form and functioning, and character, of Kaiapoi if no resource management choices are specified. Addressing the community's concerns at the time of any rezoning of this land or at the time of considering any applications for urban use is consistent with the Council's functions. It is appropriate because non-statutory limitations on growth through limiting the provision of services, utilities, and facilities, may not effectively prevent continued south and westward growth. That future may not be sustainable; it would create inefficiencies in service provision, and take development into an area of known flood hazard.

Policies 18.1.1.5 to 18.1.1.9 set limits to the growth of some small rural towns. The policies:

- maintain the settlements at a scale favoured by residents;
- pay particular regard to issues relating to maintaining the natural character of the coastal environment;
- limit new development in areas of coastal and flood hazard;
- maintain an area around each town based on rural environment characteristics; and
- restrict demands on public utilities and retains cost-effective services.

The policies appropriately limit resource management choices in a way consistent with Part 2 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Policy 18.1.1.11 provides for the development of a new town for approximately 5000 people at Pegasus, to the north-east of Woodend. The resource management issues regarding the establishment of this town have been fully considered through statutory planning processes under the Resource Management Act 1991. Providing alternative locations for urban growth within the District enables the landowners to provide for their social and economic wellbeing. It will also enable those people who want to live in a small, cohesive community surrounded

by an exceptional natural and cultural environment, to do so in a way which is consistent with the sustainable management purpose of this District Plan. The zoning and associated development standards will enable the land to be efficiently and effectively used for purposes not provided for previously under the existing District Plan.

Anticipated Environmental Results and Monitoring 18.2

Anticipated Environmental Result	Monitoring Indicator	Information	Monitoring Review
Growth and development that is sustainable and minimises impacts on existing communities	Community acceptance of change	Community survey	5 yearly
Urban growth and development safeguards the life supporting capacity of soils	Location of subdivision, land use and rezoning Extent of different soils under the land use capability classification system	Subdivision and land use consents and plan changes	Annually
Kaiapoi growth is limited	Areas of new urban development	Aerial photos Plan changes	Annually
Kaiapoi and beach settlements are surrounded by rural environments	Character of area within urban development limitation area	Survey Subdivision and land use consents	Biennially
Beach settlements, Ohoka and Ashley remain as small towns within existing boundaries	Changes to zone boundaries	Plan change	Annually

