

## RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT REGULATIONS FORM 6

Further submission in support of, or in opposition to, a submission on the notified Proposed Waimakariri District Plan Clause 8 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act.

To: Waimakariri District Council,

By email only: developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz

### Further Submitter Details

Name: M [REDACTED] Hales

Postal address: C/- Aston Consultants Ltd

Resource Management and Planning

PO Box 1435

Christchurch 8140

Email address: fiona@astonconsultants.co.nz

Phone Number: 03 3322618

Mobile Number: 0275 332213

Contact Person Fiona Aston

I/we made a submission on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan – My submitter ID number is: 246

I am a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has as I am directly affected by the content of a submission. There are potential effects on my property and its development arising from the submission.

Submission details – see attached table.

Hearing options

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

Yes

If others are making a similar submission, would you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing?

Yes



Fiona Aston, Principal Aston Consultants Ltd

.....

(Signature of applicant or person authorized to sign on behalf of the submitter)

Date: 21/11/2022

**FURTHER SUBMISSION ON THE NOTIFIED PROPOSED WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT PLAN**  
**MIRANDA HALES (submission 246)**

This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
<p>407.1-3</p> <p>Anderson Lloyd - Sarah Eveleigh</p>	<p>Delete criterion DEV-WR-S1(a), (c), (e), and (f) from the certification requirements.</p> <p>Such other relief as may be required to give effect to this submission.</p> <p>Amend the introduction to the West Rangiora Development Area provisions, to address the matters raised in this submission.</p> <p>Amend DEV-WR-AN1 to clarify the approach to staging for the West Rangiora Development Area, and to remove the potential that the reference to a staging plan is interpreted as relating to staging plans required under criterion (g).</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>Support to the extent that the relief sought is consistent with the relief sought by Miranda Hales submission, the intent of her submission and her interests.</p>	<p>Accept to the extent specified under 'reasons for my support in part'</p>
<p>62.58</p> <p>Incite - Chris Horne - on behalf of Chorus</p>	<p>Amend the criteria in DEV-WR-S1:</p> <p>"1. The following criteria must be demonstrated to be met for the District Council's Chief Executive</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>Not necessary. Can be addressed at subdivision stage.</p>	<p>Reject submission</p>

This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
New Zealand, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Officer or their delegate to certify to enable urban development (subdivision and land use activities) in the [XYZ] Development Area:  ...  <u>x. all network utility companies providing telecommunications (fibre or mobile networks), electricity distribution and gas reticulation) to the development area have been advised of the expected timing and enabled capacity of development."</u>			
266.13  199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd - Claire McKeever	Amend DEV-WR-S1(2) to resolve issue of the proposed three year lapsing period for certification approval creating a timing anomaly in terms of the subdivision's Section 224(c) certificate.	Support	The proposed three year lapsing period for certification approval is unrealistic and not workable.	Accept submission

This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
277.72  Beca – Hugh Loughman for Ministry of Education	Amend DEV-WR-S1:  "1. The following criteria must be demonstrated to be met for the District Council's Chief Executive Officer or their delegate to certify to enable urban development (subdivision and land use activities) in the West Rangiora Development Area: ... i. <u>There is sufficient capacity in current and/or planned educational facilities for the increase in student population due to development and assessment of any other potential impacts of the development on educational facilities has been undertaken.</u> "	Oppose	Unnecessary and unduly onerous requirement. MoE should be undertaking this work as part their own strategic planning work programme.	Reject submission
316  Environment Canterbury	316.3 SD-04  Amend SD-04 to more explicitly provide for the need to make appropriate use of soil which is valued for existing or foreseeable future primary	Oppose	Any amended wording needs to reflect the NPS-Highly Productive Land but also recognise the circumstances under which urban zoning of HPL is appropriate.	Reject the submission

This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
	production, or through further fragmentation of rural land			
316 Environment Canterbury	<p>316.8 UFD-P2 Amend UFD-P2 to give effect to Chapter 6 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Concerned that clause 2 appears to provide for new Residential Development Areas within Greater Christchurch that are outside of the future development areas identified in Map A of the CRPS.</p> <p>To give effect to Policy 5.3.12 of the CRPS, the need to protect highly productive soils should also be considered when assessing any new development areas.</p>	Oppose	<p>The relief sought is contrary to the RMA and the NPS-UD. The latter provides for unanticipated (in RMA documents) and out of sequence development where this adds significant additional development capacity and contributes to a well-functioning urban environment; as is the case with the rezoning sought by David Cowley.</p> <p>Any amended wording needs to reflect the NPS-Highly Productive Land but also recognise the circumstances under which urban zoning of HPL is appropriate.</p>	Reject submission
316 Environment Canterbury	<p>316.15 To give effect to Policy 5.3.12 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), urban development outside of the identified new development areas should be avoided where highly productive soils are present.</p>	Oppose	The relief sought is contrary to the NRMA and NPS-HPL which specifies circumstances where use of HPL for urban development is appropriate.	Reject submission

This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
360 Christchurch City Council	The submission in its entirety, in relation to matter raised under the submission headings 'Provision for urban activities in Development Areas in accordance with the RPS Greenfield Priority Areas'; 'Alignment with Greater Christchurch partners'; 'Use of highly productive land for urban, rural lifestyle and other activities', including but not limited to the submission points below	Oppose	Inconsistent with RMA, NPS-UD and NPS-HPL	Reject submission
295 Horticulture NZ	295.70 Amend SD-O2: " 11. that avoids versatile soils and avoids creating incompatible activities on rural zone boundaries."	Oppose	Contrary to RMA and NPS-UD, and NPS-HPL	Reject submission
295 Horticulture NZ	295.74, 295,205-212 UFD, P1-P8, P9 – amend to ensure the life supporting capacity of soils are safeguarded. No wording given.	Oppose	Contrary to RMA, NPS-HPL and NPS-UD (depending on wording of amendments sought – none given)	Reject
295	295.99	Oppose	Proposed wording of new policy inconsistent with RMA, NPS-HPL and NPS-UD.	Reject

This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
Horticulture NZ	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision  Insert new policy SUB-PX:  "Within the Rural Zones and in urban areas with an interface with a rural zone ensure that subdivision does not compromise the use of highly productive land and versatile land for rural production."			
414 Federated Farmers	414.53 SD-04 Amend SD-04: "... 1. providing for rural production activities, activities that directly support rural production activities and activities reliant on the natural resources of Rural Zones and limit other activities; 2. limit other activities; 3. ensuring that within rural areas the establishment and operation of rural production activities are not limited by new incompatible sensitive activities; and	Oppose	Inconsistent with RMA, NPS-HPL and NPS-UD.	Reject submission

This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
	4. protecting LUC 1 – 3 class land and other identified versatile soils from subdivision and development in order to maintain the life-supporting capacity of soil. "			
414 Federated Farmers	414.58-66 UFD P 1-9  Add to policies additional wording: "Avoid where practicable any development on LUC 1-3 soils."	Oppose	Inconsistent with RMA, NPS-HPL and NPS-UD. Proposed wording is vague and uncertain.	Reject
414 Federated Farmers	414,67 UFD P10 Reword "3. Minimise reverse sensitivity effects on primary production, including LUC 1-3 soils."	Support in part	Proposed wording is more flexible in terms of implementation options. Words 'including LUC1-3 soils' unnecessary.	Allow in part. Amended wording should be: "3. Minimise reverse sensitivity effects on primary production."
414	414.206	Oppose	Not appropriate. This Objective is about subdivision design – headed	Reject submission



This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
Federated Farmers	SUB O1 Amend SUB-O1(3): "3. supports protection of cultural and heritage values, high class soils and conservation values, and"		SUB-O1 Subdivision design	
169 NZ Pork	169.12 Amend UFD-P2 Identification/location of new Residential Development Areas, to include criteria for considering effects on primary production and highly productive land	Oppose	Not necessary or appropriate.	Reject submission
325 Kāinga Ora	The submission in its entirety, in particular but not limited to parts relating to SD, UFD, SUB, UG, RESZ, GRZ, LLRZ, CMUZ, NCZ, LCZ, Rezoning Maps, NEW, including but not limited to the specific points above.	Oppose in part to the extent that it is inconsistent with, or has implications for the	Opposed / supported to extent inconsistent with my interests and the relief I seek in my submission on the PDP (submission 246)	Reject/accept the submission to the extent that it is inconsistent/c onsistent with or has implications for the relief

This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
		relief sought by Miranda Hales (submission 246)		sought by the Miranda Hales submission and the intent of her submission
325 Kainga Ora	325.3 SD-02 Urban development  "Urban development and infrastructure that: ..4. provides a range <u>and mix</u> of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to achieve at all times <u>at least</u> the housing bottom lines in UFD01;	Support in part	Consistent with RMA and NPS-UD	Accept submission in re SD-02.4 NB consequential changes required to policy when new development areas are rezoned.
325 Kainga Ora	325.7 UFD-O1  Amend UFD-O1: "There is <u>at all times, at least</u> sufficient feasible development capacity for	Support	Consistent with RMA and NPS-UD	Accept submission

This submission is in relation to the submission of: (name & number)	The submission point I/we support or oppose is	I/we oppose in part or in full/support in part or in full	Reasons for my/our support/opposition are:	Decision I/we wish the Council to make:
	residential activity to meet specified housing bottom lines..."			
325 Kainga Ora	325.8 UFD-02 Amend UFD-02: "There is, <u>at all times, at least</u> sufficient feasible development capacity to meet commercial and industrial development demand over the short term, medium term and the long term."	Support	Consistent with RMA and NPS-UD	Accept submission