

Variation 1
Housing Intensification
Summary of Submissions

INTRODUCTION

The summary of submissions reports do not replace the original submissions. All submissions and summary of submissions reports can be viewed on our website:

<https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/planning/district-plan/district-plan-review>

What are the summary of submissions reports?

The summary of submissions reports are concise summaries of all decisions requested by submitters. They are not intended to be a summary of the submissions received in their entirety, nor do they include supporting material provided in the submissions. The original submissions should be read in full to understand the issues raised by a submitter. The submissions have been summarised into separate reports to assist people in deciding whether a submission affects them:

Summary of Submissions — By Submitter

To read all submission points on a particular provision (objective, policy, rule), please see the Summary of Submissions - by Submitter. You can view this as a 'full set' in a single pdf document.

Summary of Submissions — Excel Spreadsheet

To undertake a more comprehensive analysis of the submissions, you can use the Excel spreadsheet of all summarised submission points.

How do I use the summary of submissions reports?

The below diagram shows some key parts to each submission summary. In stating their position, many submitters have covered multiple submission points across different parts of the Proposed District Plan. In order to provide greater specificity and extra clarity, each individual submission point has a unique reference number. For example:

Sub No.	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
424.2	Neutral		

This is the submission number. In this case it is 424.

This is the submission point number. In this case it is point 2.

This is whether the submitter wishes to support, amend or oppose the provision. They may also be neutral which means they do not have a sentiment towards the provision, or that it has not been specified.

The submission Point Summary is a concise summary of the submitter's position on the Proposed District Plan provision and their reasons.

The relief sought summary is the action the submitter wants Council to take.

Note that some submission point numbers may not have been used (numbers may be skipped) e.g. point 1 may be followed by point 3. This does not mean content was missed, but is a result of points being deleted due to duplication or as submissions were refined or amended throughout the process of entering into the system.

How have the decisions requested by submitters been shown?

Where a submission requests amendments to the text of the Proposed District Plan, it may be identified with a ~~striketrough~~ for deleted text and underlining for inserted text.

Some submissions quote substantial sections or parts of the Proposed District Plan. Generally only proposed changes to the text are included. Some unchanged text may be included as context for the requested change, otherwise unchanged text is generally not shown, and is indicated with the use of ellipses (...).

I have read the summary of submissions reports, what next?

You may wish to make a further submission, but please note that this is not a call for new submission points and topics. A further submission may only express support or opposition to a matter raised in an original submission, or submission point, and must provide reasons for supporting or opposing the matter in the original submission. It cannot introduce entirely new matters.

Please note that this is for further submissions on variation 1 (housing intensification) only. If you made a submission on the Proposed District Plan in 2021, and want to make a further submission, you should look at the summary of submissions on the proposed district plan.

Your original submission on variation 1 (housing intensification) will stand. However, if someone has made a submission that impacts on you, a further submission gives you the opportunity to comment.

If you did not make a submission when variation 1 (housing intensification) was notified, you will still be able to make a further submission, provided you meet one of the three criteria (a—c) listed below.

You can make a further submission if you are:

- a. A person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest.
- b. A person who has an interest in variation 1 (housing intensification) that is deemed greater than the interest of the general public.
- c. The local authority (e.g. Waimakariri District Council).

How do I make a further submission?

The Further Submission form is available on the District Plan Review page of our website and will help guide your further submission. The form is either printable or can be filled in online. There is also a link to make a submission via the submissions module (see how to guide).

Your further submission will need to clearly identify the parts of submissions you are concerned about or support. This includes stating where you oppose/ support the submission point, the reasons for your support/ opposition, and the decision you would like Council to make in relation to the submission. Don't forget to refer to the unique submission point (e.g. 424.2) when making a

further submission on an original submission. As required by the RMA, the further submissions period is open for 10 working days from the date the summary of submissions were notified. Please refer to the District Plan Review page on our website for more information on lodging your further submission.

Important:

Once your further submission is lodged with Council, you must also send a copy to the person(s) who made the original submission on which you are commenting. Please do this within 5 working days of lodging your submission with Council. A full list of submitter contact addresses/emails is available on our District Plan Review page at <https://www.waimakariri.govt.nz/planning/district-plan/district-plan-review>.

LIST OF SUBMITTERS

Variation 1 - Submitters (by submission Number)

Submission numbers	Submitters details		
	Submitters	Email	Street Address
1	Pat Le Lievre and Peter Judkins	pjtravel67@gmail.com	3A Pearce Place Kaiapoi 7630
2	Sara Raudsepp	sara.rnz@gmail.com	11 Meadow Street Kaiapoi 7630
3	Waikura Community Development Trust Attention: Heather Woods	hjwoods@gmail.com	P O Box 5201 Papanui 8542
4	Phil Harbison	philandkerry@xtra.co.nz	10 Hills Street Kaiapoi 7630
5	Roger Webb	webbroger829@gmail.com	Flat 4 120A Percival Street Rangiora 7400
6	Jackson Davey	Jacksondavey8@gmail.com	1 Buss Street Rangiora 7400

7	Owen Pritchard	owenpritchard@hotmail.com	1 Clemett Place Kaiapoi 7630
8	Greg Miller	gjandldmiller@xtra.co.nz	78 Easterbrook Road Kaiapoi 7691
9	Philip Ambler	phil.ambler.contractor@usap.gov	28 Nga Tupuna St Pegasus 7612
10	Steve Wilkinson	steve@thealternativeboard.co.nz	12 Holcroft Court Rangiora 740
11	Mark Ferguson Phillips	mfphillnz@gmail.com	23 Pahua Street Pegasus 7612
12	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga Attention: Arlene Baird	abaird@heritage.org.nz	PO Box 4403 Christchurch 8140
13	Mike Greer Homes Ltd Davie Lovell-Smith Ltd Attention: Patricia Harte	patricia.harte@dls.co.nz	PO Box 679 Christchurch 8140
14	Cory and Philippa Jarman	jarmancp@gmail.com	96 Sutherland Drive Kaiapoi 7630
15	Kaiapoi District Historical Society (KDHS) Attention: Jean Turvey	jeand.frank@xtra.co.nz	17 Hills St Kaiapoi 7630

16	Kerry Harbison	kerryharbison@xtra.co.nz	10 Hills Street Kaiapoi 7630
17	Domett Properties Limited Novo Group Ltd Attention Helen Pickles	helen@novogroup.co.nz	Level 1, 279 Montreal Street Christchurch 8140
18	Clampett Investments Limited Novo Group Ltd Attention Helen Pickles	helen@novogroup.co.nz	Level 1, 279 Montreal Street Christchurch 8140
19	David Anthony and Coleen Jean White	coleenwhite@actrix.co.nz	10 Chartwell Close Rangiora 7400
20	Kelvin Ashby	w_ashbyfamily@slingshot.co.nz	11 Littles Lane Woodend 7610
21	Rae Wakefield-Jones	rae.wj@xtra.co.nz	57 Tiritiri Moana Drive Pegasus 7612
22	Mark Day	kelso90@xtra.co.nz	28 George Street Rangiora 7400
23	John Colin Sewell	jcsewell@xtra.co.nz	20 Belgrave Drive Rangiora 7400
24	Karen May Friedauer	karen.friedauer@gmail.com	22 Pegasus Main Street Pegasus 7612

25	Irene Rodgers	beaufoxie@gmail.com	46 Ashley Street Rangiora 7400
26	Doncaster Development Attention: Kim McCracken	office@rgmc.co.nz	PO Box 2551 Christchurch 8140
27	Rawiri Graeme McKissock	nola.graeme@gmail.com	2 Kawari Drive Pegasus 7612
28	Rosalie Todd	rosalietodd43@gmail.com	86A Church Street Rangiora 7400
29	B and A Stokes Doncaster Development Attention: Kim McCracken	office@rgmc.co.nz	PO Box 2551 Christchurch 8140
30	Woolworths New Zealand Limited Forme Planning Limited Attention: Kay Panther Knight	kay@formeplanning.co.nz	Forme Planning Limited PO Box 24463, Royal Oak Auckland 1345
31	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated Attention: Roger Rule	prgi@pegasusresidentsgroup.com	8 Tahuna Street Pegasus 7612
32	Margaret Patricia Noonan	marg.noonan3@gmail.com	4/21 Bush Street Rangiora 7400
33	Rachel Louise Malloch	rmecoartist@gmail.com	34 Te Kohanga Drive Pegasus 7612

34	Janette Avery	Janavery22@gmail.com	11 Chesterfield Place Rangiora 7400
35	Elisabeth and Alphons Sanders	ellis.sanders@xtra.co.nz	83 Oxford Road Rangiora 7400
36	Greg and Diane Lowe	greglowesmail@gmail.com	21 George Street Rangiora 7400
37	Nick and Cilla Taylor	n.taylor@tba.co.nz	75 Oxford Road Rangiora 7400
38	Gavin Court	gavin@gavincourt.co.nz	7 Kewai Court Rangiora 7612
39	Foodstuffs South Island Limited and Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited Attention: Alex Booker	alex.booker@al.nz	PO Box 13831 Christchurch 8140
40	Ben Dormer Aston Consultants Ltd Attention: Fiona Aston	fiona@astonconsultants.co.nz	PO Box 1435 Christchurch 8140
41	Julie Power	juliepower@outlook.com	25 The Esplanade Pegasus 7612
42	Transpower New Zealand Limited Attention: Pauline Whitney	environment.policy@transpower.co.nz	PO Box 1021 Wellington 6140

43	Momentum Land Limited Resource Management Group Attention: Teresa Walton	teresa@rmgroup.co.nz	PO Box 908 Christchurch 8140
44	David Michael Lawry	143walk143@gmail.com	500 Yaldhurst Road Christchurch 7676
45	Martin Pinkham	martin@pinkham.co.nz	70 Adderley Terrace Kaiapoi 7691
46	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency Attention: Gemma Kean	gemma.kean@nzta.govt.nz	PO Box 1479 Christchurch 8011
47	Waimakariri District Council Attention: Tracy Tierney	tracy.tierney@wmk.govt.nz	215 High Street Rangiora 7440
48	Woodwater Limited Anthony Harper Lawyers Attention: Gerard Cleary	Gerard.cleary@ah.co.nz	PO Box 2646 Christchurch 8140
49	National Public Health Service Te Whatu Ora Waitaha Attention: Rosa Verkasalo	rosa.verkasalo@cdhb.health.nz	310 Manchester Street Christchurch 8013
50	Beverley Waters	watersbeverley22@yahoo.co.nz	12 Murray Place Kaiapoi 7630
51	Kiwirail Attention: Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	Michelle.Grinlinton-Hancock@kiwirail.co.nz	PO Box 593 Wellington 6140

52	Helen Mary Sparrow	hmsparrow@xtra.co.nz	15 Chesterfield Place Rangiora 7400
53	MainPower New Zealand Limited Resource Management Group Ltd Attention: Melanie Foote	melanie@rmgroup.co.nz	PO Box 908, Christchurch Box Lobby Christchurch 8140
54	John and Coral Broughton Aston Consultants Ltd Attention: Fiona Aston	fiona@astonconsultants.co.nz	PO Box 1435 Christchurch 8140
55	Miranda Hales Aston Consultants Ltd Attention: Fiona Aston	fiona@astonconsultants.co.nz	PO Box 1435 Christchurch 8140
56	Ara Poutama Aotearoa the Department of Corrections Attention: Andrea Millar	andrea.millar@corrections.govt.nz	Private Box 1206 Wellington 6140
57	Dalkeith Holdings Ltd Aston Consultants Ltd Attention: Fiona Aston	fiona@astonconsultants.co.nz	PO Box 1435 Christchurch 8140
58	Eliot Sinclair and Partners Limited 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, and Allan Downs Ltd Attention: Samuel Hammond	samuel.hammond@eliotsinclair.co.nz	20 Troup Drive, Tower Junction Christchurch 8011
59	Eliot Sinclair and Partners Limited Attention: Samuel Hammond	samuel.hammond@eliotsinclair.co.nz	20 Troup Drive, Tower Junction Christchurch 8011

60	Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited Chapman Tripp Attention J Appleyard & L Forrester	Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com	PO Box 2510 Christchurch 8140
61	Richard and Geoff Spark Aston Consultants Ltd Attention: Fiona Aston	fiona@astonconsultants.co.nz	PO Box 1435 Christchurch 8140
62	Rick Allaway and Lionel Larsen Aston Consultants Ltd Attention: Fiona Aston	fiona@astonconsultants.co.nz	PO Box 1435 Christchurch 8140
63	Stuart Allan	stuart.allan@outlook.com	249 Coldstream Road Rangiora 7473
64	Environment Canterbury Regional Council Attention: Jeff Smith	regional.planning@ecan.govt.nz	PO Box 345 Christchurch 8140
65	Williams Waimak Limited Inovo Projects Ltd Attention: Max Stevenson	max@inovo.nz	93 Manchester Street Christchurch 8011
66	Emma Davey	Gravey776@hotmail.com	10 Murray Place Kaiapoi 7630
67	Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated Chapman Tripp Attention: Luke Hinchey	luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com	PO Box 2206 Auckland 1140

68	Anthony John Page and Carole-Anne Louise Morgan	ant.page@xtra.co.nz	35 Adderley Terrace Kaiapoi 7630
69	Carolyn and Peter Wright	fum.gran@gmail.com	8 Kynnersley Street Kaiapoi 7630
70	Ryman Healthcare Limited Chapman Tripp Attention: Luke Hinchey	luke.hinchey@chapmantripp.com	PO Box 2206 Auckland 1140
71	Martin Hugh and Robyn Jennifer Pyke	mpyke@xtra.co.nz	23 Oakwood Drive Rangiora 7400
72	Dominic Robert Hassan	dominic@dha.net.nz	28 Pentecost Road Rangiora 7400
73	Summerset Group Holdings Limited Attention: Stephanie Muller	Stephanie.Muller@summerset.co.nz	PO Box 5187 Wellington 6140
74	Ken Fletcher	kfletcher.mediator@xtra.co.nz	70 Church St, Oxford 7430
75	M Magendans		Flat 2, 80 White Street Rangiora 7400
76	M & J Schluter Anderson Lloyd Attention: Sarah Eveleigh	sarah.eveleigh@al.nz	Level 3, 70 Gloucester Street Christchurch 8141

77	Fire and Emergency New Zealand Attention: Nola Smart	Nola.Smart@beca.com	21 Pitt Street Auckland Central 1010
78	Northwest Rangiora Owners Group Attention: Fred Coughlan	Fred@do.co.nz	PO Box 589 Christchurch 8041
79	Bellgrove Rangiora Limited Aurecon NZ Ltd Attention: Mark Allan	mark.allan@aurecongroup.com	PO Box 1061 Christchurch 8140
80	Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities Attention: Mel Rountree	developmentplanning@kaingaora.govt.nz	PO Box 74598 Auckland 1051
81	Christchurch International Airport Limited Chapman Tripp Attention: Annabelle Lee	Annabelle.Lee@chapmantripp.com	PO Box 2510 Christchurch 8140

SUBMISSION SUMMARY

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
1.1	General	General	General	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.
1.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.
1.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	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.
1.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	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.
1.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.
2.2	General	General	General	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.
2.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.
2.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
3.1	General	General	General	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.
3.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.
3.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	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.
4.1	General	General	General	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.
4.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.
4.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	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.
4.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
5.1	General	General	General	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.
5.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.
5.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	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.
5.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
5.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS9	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.
5.6	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.
6.1	General	General	General	Jackson Davey	Support	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.	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.
7.1	General	General	General	Owen Pritchard	Oppose	Opposes Variation 1 as it does not meet the region's needs due to a lack of infrastructural investment, such a roading, which would be necessary to mitigate its effects.	Not specified.
8.1	General	General	General	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.
9.1	General	General	General	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.
9.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
9.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BF55	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.
9.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BF57	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.
9.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.
10.1	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BF54	Steve Wilkinson	Oppose	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.	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.
10.2	General	General	General	Steve Wilkinson	Oppose	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.	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
10.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	Steve Wilkinson	Oppose	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.	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.
11.1	General	General	General	Mark Ferguson Phillips		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.	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.
12.1	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Table	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Arlene Baird	Support	Supports inclusion of historic heritage items within Medium Density Residential Zone of Rangiora, Kaiapoi and Woodend as qualifying matter.	Retain as proposed.
12.2	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-O2	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Arlene Baird	Support	Supports SD-O2 as a strategic direction.	Retain as proposed.
12.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Arlene Baird	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: ... <u>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."</u>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
12.5	General	General	General	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga - Arlene Baird		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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
13.1	Planning Maps	General	SD-O2	Dovie Lovell-Smith Ltd - Patricia Harte - on behalf of 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>Rezone the following properties from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone:</p> <p>- 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>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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
						<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 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>	

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
13.2	General	General	SD-O2	Dovie Lovell-Smith Ltd - Patricia Harte - on behalf of 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>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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
						<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>	
14.1	General	General	General	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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
14.2	K - Kaiapoi	General	General	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	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.	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. 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. Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.
14.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	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.	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. 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. Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.
14.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	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.	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. 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. Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
14.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	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.	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. 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. Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.
14.6	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	Cory and Philippa Jarman	Oppose	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.	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. 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. Council maintain the aesthetics and small-town character of Kaiapoi by not permitted multi-storey developments.
15.1	HH - Taonga o onamata - Historic heritage	General	General	Kaiapoi District Historical Society (KDHS) - Jean Turvey		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.
15.2	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Qualifying	Kaiapoi District Historical Society (KDHS) - Jean Turvey		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.
16.1	General	General	General	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
16.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.
16.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.
16.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	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.
16.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	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.
17.1	General	General	General	Helen Pickles - on behalf of Domett Properties Ltd	Support	Supports Variation 1 in its entirety.	Retain Variation 1 provisions as notified.
18.1	General	General	General	Helen Pickles - on behalf of Clampett Investments Ltd	Support	Supports Variation 1 in its entirety.	Retain Variation 1 provisions as notified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
19.1	Planning Maps	General	General	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.
19.2	General	General	General	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.
19.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.
19.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
19.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	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.
20.1	Planning Maps	General	General	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.
20.2	General	General	General	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.
21.1	General	General	General	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.
21.2	Planning Maps	General	General	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.
21.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.
21.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
22.1	General	General	General	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.</p>	Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.
22.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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>	Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
22.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	Mark Day	Oppose	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.	Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.
22.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	Mark Day	Oppose	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.	Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
22.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	Mark Day	Oppose	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.	Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.
22.6	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	Mark Day	Oppose	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.	Council does not agree with the proposed intensification remit from Central Government.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
23.1	General	General	General	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.
23.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
23.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	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.
23.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	General	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
23.5	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Activity Rules	SUB-R2	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.
23.6	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Zone	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
23.7	TRAN - Ranga waka - Transport	General	General	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.
24.1	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.
24.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	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.
24.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	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.
24.4	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Table	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.
25.1	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.
25.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
26.1	Planning Maps	General	SD-O2	Kim McCracken - on behalf of 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 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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
26.2	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	SD-O2	Kim McCracken - on behalf of 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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
26.3	General	General	SD-O2	Kim McCracken - on behalf of 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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
27.1	General	General	General	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.</p>	Reject Medium Density Residential Standards in total, especially within Pegasus.
27.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	General	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.</p>	Reject Medium Density Residential Standards in total, especially within Pegasus.
27.3	TRAN - Ranga waka - Transport	General	General	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.</p>	Reject Medium Density Residential Standards in total, especially within Pegasus.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
28.1	Planning Maps	General	General	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.</p> <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>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.</p> <p>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>	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
28.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	General	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.</p> <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>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.</p> <p>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>	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
28.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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.</p> <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>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.</p> <p>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>	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
28.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.</p> <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>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.</p> <p>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>	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
28.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BF55	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.</p> <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>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.</p> <p>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>	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
28.6	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BF55	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.</p> <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>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.</p> <p>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>	Not specified.
28.7	TRAN - Ranga waka - Transport	General	General	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>	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
29.1	Planning Maps	General	MRZ-BF55	Kim McCracken - on behalf of 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.</p>	<p>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 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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
29.2	General	General	MRZ-BF55	Kim McCracken - on behalf of 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.</p>	<p>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 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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
29.3	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	MRZ-BF55	Kim McCracken - on behalf of 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 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>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.</p>	<p>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 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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
30.1	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	MRZ-BF55	Forme Planning Ltd - Kay Panther Knight - on behalf of 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. 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).</p> <p>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 enable, growth.</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>Seeks clarification and necessary amendments to Variation 1 to address the matters outlined in this submission.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
30.2	NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BF55	Forme Planning Ltd - Kay Panther Knight - on behalf of 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).</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. 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).</p> <p>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 enable, growth.</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>Seeks clarification and necessary amendments to Variation 1 to address the matters outlined in this submission.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
30.3	NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BF55	Forme Planning Ltd - Kay Panther Knight - on behalf of 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).</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. 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).</p> <p>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 enable, growth.</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>Seeks clarification and necessary amendments to Variation 1 to address the matters outlined in this submission.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
30.4	General	General	MRZ-BF55	Forme Planning Ltd - Kay Panther Knight - on behalf of 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. 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).</p> <p>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 enable, growth.</p>	<p>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).</p> <p>Seeks clarification and necessary amendments to Variation 1 to address the matters outlined in this submission.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
31.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated - Roger Rule	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.</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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
31.2	General	General	General	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated - Roger Rule	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.</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>
31.3	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Historic	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated - Roger Rule	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.</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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
31.4	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Natural	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated - Roger Rule	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>
31.5	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	General	Pegasus Residents Group Incorporated - Roger Rule	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.</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>
32.1	Planning Maps	General	General	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>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
32.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	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>	Amend Variation 1 to restrict Medium Density Residential Zone to specific areas, and surrounded by green space.