

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
32.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	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.
32.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	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.
32.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
33.1	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Notable	Rachel Louise Malloch		<p>Requests amendment to Variation 1 that reflects the protection of trees, birds, and insects. Notes how higher buildings have caused travelling bird populations to change their flight paths, and increased traffic from intensification reduced natural nesting. Values, and has been enhancing, natural habitat for owl, herons, and lizards. Notes Te Kohanga infers a nursery of life and the submitter has witnessed the creation of many chicks, new born lizards, rabbits and fish. Supports development potential provided by Variation 1 for property at Te Kohanga Drive, Pegasus however seeks clarity on development requirements and restrictions given context of this property. The submitter underestimated the size of buildings on Te Kohanga Drive and their effect on the neighbourhood rate increases and sale prices.</p> <p>Concerned that 12m buildings would create road corridors that do not provide for natural light, bird migration, and natural habitat. Such matters need to be considered within Variation 1 given the impacts of climate change. Requests the use of trees to mitigate global warming be included in the legislation to allow all citizens, including animal and plant life, protection and cultural heritage recognition.</p> <p>Supports Variation 1 given the benefits of the development potential however requests adequate amendments that consider character and cultural environmental values to increase the strength of Variation 1.</p>	Not specified.
33.2	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	General	Rachel Louise Malloch		<p>Requests amendment to Variation 1 that reflects the protection of trees, birds, and insects. Notes how higher buildings have caused travelling bird populations to change their flight paths, and increased traffic from intensification reduced natural nesting. Values, and has been enhancing, natural habitat for owl, herons, and lizards. Notes Te Kohanga infers a nursery of life and the submitter has witnessed the creation of many chicks, new born lizards, rabbits and fish. Supports development potential provided by Variation 1 for property at Te Kohanga Drive, Pegasus however seeks clarity on development requirements and restrictions given context of this property. The submitter underestimated the size of buildings on Te Kohanga Drive and their effect on the neighbourhood rate increases and sale prices.</p> <p>Concerned that 12m buildings would create road corridors that do not provide for natural light, bird migration, and natural habitat. Such matters need to be considered within Variation 1 given the impacts of climate change. Requests the use of trees to mitigate global warming be included in the legislation to allow all citizens, including animal and plant life, protection and cultural heritage recognition.</p> <p>Supports Variation 1 given the benefits of the development potential however requests adequate amendments that consider character and cultural environmental values to increase the strength of Variation 1.</p>	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
34.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Janette Avery	Oppose	<p>Opposes blanket approach of Medium Density Residential Standards applying to a range of areas. Considers Variation 1 is not in accordance with the ideals of planning as it seeks to apply provisions appropriate for a large city, to rural towns. Every area has its unique context which should be the basis of any planning in that area.</p> <p>Opposes rezoning of General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone as this is inappropriate.</p> <p>Notes the region is subject to earthquakes, and flood hazard (which has been exacerbated by climate change). Stormwater infrastructure would not function effectively if additional housing is added and permeable surfaces reduced. Services can be easily disrupted by earthquakes, and an increased population would only increase difficulties with life preservation and sanitation.</p> <p>Notes recent subdivisions have provided for greater housing density with the option of smaller sections and areas for two-to-three-storey apartments appropriately located near public amenity areas.</p> <p>Concerned that multiple 11m high units within an existing subdivision would affect sunlight levels (for providing heat and light) and outlook for neighbouring houses, which could affect the desirability and value of these properties and the neighbourhood. Infill housing could destroy Rangiora's attractive developments that make it a good place to live. Rangiora needs to maintain its rural town character; it is not a city.</p>	Reject Variation 1.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
34.2	General	General	General	Janette Avery	Oppose	<p>Opposes blanket approach of Medium Density Residential Standards applying to a range of areas. Considers Variation 1 is not in accordance with the ideals of planning as it seeks to apply provisions appropriate for a large city, to rural towns. Every area has its unique context which should be the basis of any planning in that area.</p> <p>Opposes rezoning of General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone as this is inappropriate.</p> <p>Notes the region is subject to earthquakes, and flood hazard (which has been exacerbated by climate change). Stormwater infrastructure would not function effectively if additional housing is added and permeable surfaces reduced. Services can be easily disrupted by earthquakes, and an increased population would only increase difficulties with life preservation and sanitation.</p> <p>Notes recent subdivisions have provided for greater housing density with the option of smaller sections and areas for two-to-three-storey apartments appropriately located near public amenity areas.</p> <p>Concerned that multiple 11m high units within an existing subdivision would affect sunlight levels (for providing heat and light) and outlook for neighbouring houses, which could affect the desirability and value of these properties and the neighbourhood. Infill housing could destroy Rangiora's attractive developments that make it a good place to live. Rangiora needs to maintain its rural town character; it is not a city.</p>	Reject Variation 1.
34.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	Janette Avery	Oppose	<p>Concerned that multiple 11m high units within an existing subdivision would affect sunlight levels (for providing heat and light) and outlook for neighbouring houses, which could affect the desirability and value of these properties and the neighbourhood. Infill housing could destroy Rangiora's attractive developments that make it a good place to live. Rangiora needs to maintain its rural town character; it is not a city.</p> <p>Opposes blanket approach of Medium Density Residential Standards applying to a range of areas. Considers Variation 1 is not in accordance with the ideals of planning as it seeks to apply provisions appropriate for a large city, to rural towns. Every area has its unique context which should be the basis of any planning in that area.</p>	Reject Variation 1.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
34.4	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	Janette Avery	Oppose	<p>Opposes blanket approach of Medium Density Residential Standards applying to a range of areas. Considers Variation 1 is not in accordance with the ideals of planning as it seeks to apply provisions appropriate for a large city, to rural towns. Every area has its unique context which should be the basis of any planning in that area.</p> <p>Opposes rezoning of General Residential Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone as this is inappropriate.</p> <p>Notes the region is subject to earthquakes, and flood hazard (which has been exacerbated by climate change). Stormwater infrastructure would not function effectively if additional housing is added and permeable surfaces reduced. Services can be easily disrupted by earthquakes, and an increased population would only increase difficulties with life preservation and sanitation.</p> <p>Notes recent subdivisions have provided for greater housing density with the option of smaller sections and areas for two-to-three-storey apartments appropriately located near public amenity areas.</p> <p>Concerned that multiple 11m high units within an existing subdivision would affect sunlight levels (for providing heat and light) and outlook for neighbouring houses, which could affect the desirability and value of these properties and the neighbourhood. Infill housing could destroy Rangiora’s attractive developments that make it a good place to live. Rangiora needs to maintain its rural town character; it is not a city.</p>	Reject Variation 1.
35.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Elisabeth and Alphons Sanders		Opposes high density housing on the outskirts of towns; suggests Council direct housing intensification closer to town centres and the amenities there.	Reject Variation 1.
35.2	General	General	General	Elisabeth and Alphons Sanders		Opposes high density housing on the outskirts of towns; suggests Council direct housing intensification closer to town centres and the amenities there.	Reject Variation 1.
36.1	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	Greg and Diane Lowe		Concerned about the potential for a three-storey building to be built on the north side of an existing house without approval from the residents/owners of the existing house. Three-storey houses should not be permitted on the north side of an existing residence, or only be allowed on the north side of an east/west street. Considers developers should pay compensation to the neighbouring owner(s) for the consequential reduction in property values, established by an independent property valuer.	Amend Variation 1 to reflect submitter’s submission.
36.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	Greg and Diane Lowe		Concerned about the potential for a three-storey building to be built on the north side of an existing house without approval from the residents/owners of the existing house. Three-storey houses should not be permitted on the north side of an existing residence, or only be allowed on the north side of an east/west street. Considers developers should pay compensation to the neighbouring owner(s) for the consequential reduction in property values, established by an independent property valuer.	Amend Variation 1 to reflect submitter’s submission.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
37.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Nick and Cilla Taylor		<p>Supports the need to facilitate housing intensification to improve the sustainable use of resources and provide a range of housing types.</p> <p>Opposes Variation 1's blanket approach for housing intensification rezoning all General Residential Zone areas in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, and Pegasus to Medium Density Residential Zone as this leaves housing intensification decisions with the market in a piecemeal manner and removes the ability of Council to direct the location.</p> <p>Notes that abundant analysis and experience in Aotearoa New Zealand show that housing intensification is best located considering the provision of supporting infrastructure such as public transport, roading, parking, three waters, commercial centres, recreation facilities, and greenspace.</p> <p>Considers Council needs to decide on housing intensification strategically, as provided for in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Suggests use of a nuanced approach to intensification over time directed by District Plans, including assessment of proposals with public input.</p>	Decline Variation 1 and amend the provisions for intensification to have a more specific strategic direction.
37.2	General	General	General	Nick and Cilla Taylor		<p>Supports the need to facilitate housing intensification to improve the sustainable use of resources and provide a range of housing types.</p> <p>Opposes Variation 1's blanket approach for housing intensification rezoning all General Residential Zone areas in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Woodend, and Pegasus to Medium Density Residential Zone as this leaves housing intensification decisions with the market in a piecemeal manner and removes the ability of Council to direct the location.</p> <p>Notes that abundant analysis and experience in Aotearoa New Zealand show that housing intensification is best located considering the provision of supporting infrastructure such as public transport, roading, parking, three waters, commercial centres, recreation facilities, and greenspace.</p> <p>Considers Council needs to decide on housing intensification strategically, as provided for in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Suggests use of a nuanced approach to intensification over time directed by District Plans, including assessment of proposals with public input.</p>	Decline Variation 1 and amend the provisions for intensification to have a more specific strategic direction.
38.1	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	General	General	Gavin Court		Queried the effect of Variation 1 on subdivision requirements at community consultation session and was told by Council staff that subdivision consents would require the erection of dwellings before approval could be given. Seeks clarification on this as it does not appear to be a reasonable interpretation, or intention, of Variation 1.	Seeks assurance from Council that the opinion given by the Council staff member detailed above was incorrect or misunderstood and that subdivisions can be undertaken without the erection of dwellings. It is reasonable to accept that any subdivision consent application should include an at least indicative illustration that the proposed lots can accommodate the dwelling design and location standards included in Schedule 3A of the Resource Management Act 1991.
38.2	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	General	Gavin Court		Notes there is currently a continuous reserve or pathway around Lake Pegasus, except for the section north of the 'Good Home' restaurant and up to the main bridge. Seeks that a reserve area is protected to cover this gap, such as via a designation, or by excluding the area from the zone, or by covenant on the title (with owners' approval). Suggest consultation with the owners. Offers to supply sketches or photos if considered helpful.	Secure reserve status of identified land [area of Lake Pegasus lake front reserve north of the 'Good Home' restaurant and up to the main bridge].

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
39.1	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	MRZ-BF55	Anderson Lloyd - Alex Booker - on behalf of Foodstuffs South Island Ltd and Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Ltd		<p>Generally supports the housing intensification provisions, and recognises the need for housing intensification to be located around commercial centres. Particularly interested in how Variation 1 affects New World Kaiapoi, New World Rangiora and Pak'n'Save. Rangiora properties as these properties partly adjoin Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). Seeks appropriate recognition for commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and associated effects through the objectives and policies framework to ensure future compatibility between activities; particularly in terms of any effects on residential amenity for new MDRZ developments locating near commercial centres and existing commercial operations to avoid reverse sensitivity issues.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification's increase in density, reduced setbacks, and removal of viewshaft minimums will increase surrounding resident's exposure to the effects of the commercial environment thus making existing, acceptable effects such as noise, light and traffic felt more significantly by newly exposed residents. Concerned that these changes were not anticipated when these areas were zoned for commercial activities and/or where commercial activities were established in commercial areas and existing lawfully established activities may find themselves in situations where breaches occur.</p> <p>Supports the management of zone interfaces and considers this should be managed from both directions to ensure that activities within differing zones are appropriate. Considers appropriate recognition for existing commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and their interaction with the MDRZ has not been properly evaluated in the Variation 1 Section 32 Report, or appropriately provided for in MDRZ provisions to ensure future compatibility. Considers MRZ-P1(4) does not reflect the location of medium-density living close to commercial centres and adjacent to supermarkets and other commercial activities.</p> <p>Supports the objectives and policies of Large Format Retail Zone, particularly</p>	<p>Amend to include provisions which explicitly recognise the existing amenity effects of adjacent commercial activities to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); and any other amendments which ensure operational and functional needs of existing lawfully established activities are not hindered or constrained in future by new residential development in the MDRZ.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to reflect the matters raised in submission.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
						<p>LFRZ-O1(3) and LFRZ-P1, as they appropriately reflect the intensity and character of the retail development on the surrounding environment. Considers the MDRZ objectives and policies are not similarly responsive to the effects of medium-density housing on the adjacent zones. Supermarkets have specific operational and functional requirements which include delivery vehicles movements and associated noise (including during night-time hours); large store sizes; generators and other specialised equipment; car park, signs and lighting to ensure the safety and security. Such operations were established in accordance with zone provisions and/or resource consent decisions, and in response to the receiving environment at the time. Providing for future compatibility of the residential zone - commercial zone interface now will manage expectations and reduce future monitoring and compliance costs.</p> <p>Notes that the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) seeks well-functioning urban environments which includes the need to have or enable a variety of sites suitable for different business sectors. Policy 2 of the NPS-UD requires local authorities to provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet the expected demand for business land over the short, medium and long term that meets the demands of a variety of business sectors. Concerned that Variation 1 could have the unintended consequence of constraining the efficient use of business land.</p> <p>Considers there should be express recognition of the effects of residential intensification near existing commercial activities, and cannot be restricted and Opposed in future by new neighbouring MDRZ residents expecting an unrealistic amenity, e.g. "Where new residential activity in the MDRZ locates in close proximity to commercial centres and lawfully established commercial activities it is recognised that this may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people (due to hours of operation, noise, lighting, traffic from commercial activities) but this is not to be considered an adverse effect."</p>	

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
39.2	General	General	MRZ-BF55	Anderson Lloyd - Alex Booker - on behalf of Foodstuffs South Island Ltd and Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Ltd		<p>Generally supports the housing intensification provisions, and recognises the need for housing intensification to be located around commercial centres. Particularly interested in how Variation 1 affects New World Kaiapoi, New World Rangiora and Pak'n'Save. Rangiora properties as these properties partly adjoin Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). Seeks appropriate recognition for commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and associated effects through the objectives and policies framework to ensure future compatibility between activities; particularly in terms of any effects on residential amenity for new MDRZ developments locating near commercial centres and existing commercial operations to avoid reverse sensitivity issues.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification's increase in density, reduced setbacks, and removal of viewshaft minimums will increase surrounding resident's exposure to the effects of the commercial environment thus making existing, acceptable effects such as noise, light and traffic felt more significantly by newly exposed residents. Concerned that these changes were not anticipated when these areas were zoned for commercial activities and/or where commercial activities were established in commercial areas and existing lawfully established activities may find themselves in situations where breaches occur.</p> <p>Supports the management of zone interfaces and considers this should be managed from both directions to ensure that activities within differing zones are appropriate. Considers appropriate recognition for existing commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and their interaction with the MDRZ has not been properly evaluated in the Variation 1 Section 32 Report, or appropriately provided for in MDRZ provisions to ensure future compatibility. Considers MRZ-P1(4) does not reflect the location of medium-density living close to commercial centres and adjacent to supermarkets and other commercial activities.</p> <p>Supports the objectives and policies of Large Format Retail Zone, particularly</p>	<p>Amend to include provisions which explicitly recognise the existing amenity effects of adjacent commercial activities to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); and any other amendments which ensure operational and functional needs of existing lawfully established activities are not hindered or constrained in future by new residential development in the MDRZ.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to reflect the matters raised in submission.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
39.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Policies	MRZ-BF55	Anderson Lloyd - Alex Booker - on behalf of Foodstuffs South Island Ltd and Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Ltd		<p>Considers MRZ-P1(4) does not reflect the location of medium-density living close to commercial centres and adjacent to supermarkets and other commercial activities. Supports the management of zone interfaces and considers this should be managed from both directions to ensure that activities within differing zones are appropriate. Considers appropriate recognition for existing commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and their interaction with the MDRZ has not been properly evaluated in the Variation 1 Section 32 Report, or appropriately provided for in MDRZ provisions to ensure future compatibility.</p> <p>Supports the objectives and policies of Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ-O1(3) and LFRZ-P1, as they appropriately reflect the intensity and character of the retail development on the surrounding environment. Considers the MDRZ objectives and policies are not similarly responsive to the effects of medium-density housing on the adjacent zones. Supermarkets have specific operational and functional requirements which include delivery vehicles movements and associated noise (including during night-time hours); large store sizes; generators and other specialised equipment; car park, signs and lighting to ensure the safety and security. Such operations were established in accordance with zone provisions and/or resource consent decisions, and in response to the receiving environment at the time. Providing for future compatibility of the residential zone - commercial zone interface now will manage expectations and reduce future monitoring and compliance costs.</p> <p>Generally supports the housing intensification provisions, and recognises the</p>	<p>Amend to include provisions which explicitly recognise the existing amenity effects of adjacent commercial activities to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); and any other amendments which ensure operational and functional needs of existing lawfully established activities are not hindered or constrained in future by new residential development in the MDRZ.</p> <p>Amend Variation 1 to reflect the matters raised in submission.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
						<p>need for housing intensification to be located around commercial centres. Particularly interested in how Variation 1 affects New World Kaiapoi, New World Rangiora and Pak'n'Save. Rangiora properties as these properties partly adjoin Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). Seeks appropriate recognition for commercial activities, such as supermarkets, and associated effects through the objectives and policies framework to ensure future compatibility between activities; particularly in terms of any effects on residential amenity for new MDRZ developments locating near commercial centres and existing commercial operations to avoid reverse sensitivity issues.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification's increase in density, reduced setbacks, and removal of viewshaft minimums will increase surrounding resident's exposure to the effects of the commercial environment thus making existing, acceptable effects such as noise, light and traffic felt more significantly by newly exposed residents. Concerned that these changes were not anticipated when these areas were zoned for commercial activities and/or where commercial activities were established in commercial areas and existing lawfully established activities may find themselves in situations where breaches occur.</p> <p>Notes that the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) seeks well-functioning urban environments which includes the need to have or enable a variety of sites suitable for different business sectors. Policy 2 of the NPS-UD requires local authorities to provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet the expected demand for business land over the short, medium and long term that meets the demands of a variety of business sectors. Concerned that Variation 1 could have the unintended consequence of constraining the efficient use of business land.</p> <p>Considers there should be express recognition of the effects of residential intensification near existing commercial activities, and cannot be restricted and Opposed in future by new neighbouring MDRZ residents expecting an unrealistic amenity, e.g. "Where new residential activity in the MDRZ locates in close proximity to commercial centres and lawfully established commercial activities it is recognised that this may detract from amenity values appreciated by some people (due to hours of operation, noise, lighting, traffic from commercial activities) but this is not to be considered an adverse effect."</p>	

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
40.1	Planning Maps	General	MRZ-BF55	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Ben Dormer	Amend	<p>Rezone 70 Oxford Road, Rangiora (0.81ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) to yield 15 residential lots which would contribute towards meeting Rangiora's housing needs. It will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes and will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment. Adverse effects will be minimal and mitigatable.</p> <p>The site is a logical and preferred location for Rangiora's urban growth as it adjoins existing urban development to the north and east and is located within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area (FDA). The FDAs for Rangiora need to be rezoned now give effect to the NPS-UD and address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land. The NPS-UD requires provision of at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected housing demand in the medium term and this must be zoned and infrastructure ready; thus Council must rezone the site to MDRZ.</p> <p>Notes that Variation 1 only proposes to rezone 86ha of FDA land at south-west Rangiora and north-east Rangiora in the ownership of just two developers, with a yield of approximately 1000 households, which favours these developers and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD's direction to promote a competitive land market. It is also inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in both the short and medium term, given there are an estimated 13,500 additional dwellings required for the period up to 2051.</p> <p>Rezoning the site is appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth of Rangiora and to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD), will give effect to Policy 12 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), will be consistent with the objectives and policies of Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development Chapters of the Proposed District Plan, and consistent with, and the most appropriate, efficient, and effective means of achieving the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991. The alternatives of retaining General Rural or Large Lot Residential zones across the site are not an efficient use of land and do not give effect to Change 1 of CRPS, or the NPS-UD.</p>	Rezone 70 Oxford Road, Rangiora (0.81ha) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
40.2	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-023	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Ben Dormer	Amend	Amend SD-03 in order to help to enable the submitter's request to rezone 70 Oxford Road, Rangiora (0.81ha) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone, and amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to identify all residential areas as Medium Residential Density and consequential amendments to the ODP narrative and other related provisions.	Amend SD-03: "Urban development and infrastructure that:... 4. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to <u>as a minimum</u> achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1."

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
40.3	WR - West Rangiora	General	MRZ-BF55	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Ben Dormer	Amend	<p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan to identify all residential areas as Medium Residential Density and consequential changes to the ODP narrative and other related provisions.</p> <p>Rezone 70 Oxford Road, Rangiora (0.81ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) to yield 15 residential lots which would contribute towards meeting Rangiora's housing needs. It will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes and will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment. Adverse effects will be minimal and mitigatable.</p> <p>The site is a logical and preferred location for Rangiora's urban growth as it adjoins existing urban development to the north and east and is located within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area (FDA). The FDAs for Rangiora need to be rezoned now give effect to the NPS-UD and address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land. The NPS-UD requires provision of at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected housing demand in the medium term and this must be zoned and infrastructure ready; thus Council must rezone the site to MDRZ.</p> <p>Notes that Variation 1 only proposes to rezone 86ha of FDA land at south-west Rangiora and north-east Rangiora in the ownership of just two developers, with a yield of approximately 1000 households, which favours these developers and is inconsistent with the NPS-UD's direction to promote a competitive land market. It is also inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in both the short and medium term, given there are an estimated 13,500 additional dwellings required for the period up to 2051.</p> <p>Rezoning the site is appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth of Rangiora and to meet the requirements of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD), will give effect to Policy 12 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), will be consistent with the objectives and policies of Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development Chapters of the Proposed District Plan, and consistent with, and the most appropriate, efficient, and effective means of achieving the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991. The alternatives of retaining General Rural or Large Lot Residential zones across the site are not an efficient use of land and do not give effect to Change 1 of CRPS, or the NPS-UD.</p>	Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to identify all residential areas as Medium Residential Density and consequential changes to the ODP narrative and other related provisions.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
41.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Julie Power	Oppose	This new proposal conflicts with Pegasus Town Covenants which are supposed to protect Pegasus residents from this very thing. Submitter built in Pegasus with confidence that they would be protected by the covenants. If the developers do not enforce them it falls to the private individual to do so which is expensive, time consuming and stressful. New developers and existing landowners could end up in legal battles, and going to arbitration can be a very lengthy and costly process. Covenants are legally binding and Courts in NZ have an obligation to enforce if bought before them. All could be avoided if the Council objects to the governments ruling on these grounds. Statistics NZ describe Pegasus as a small urban area. The population at the 2018 census was 2,637. This new proposal was intended for areas of over 5000 or more as at 2018 census. Questions why Pegasus was included together with Ravenswood and Woodend and thinks Pegasus should be excluded. The medium density residential standards will enable up to three houses up to 3 storeys high, per site for a potential of 12 plus people and cars. Questions where they will park in the narrow streets of Pegasus. There is an abundance of land in the South Island which could be designed for this proposal.	1. Reject the governments Housing Intensification MDRS rules. 2. Eliminate Pegasus from this Variation 1:Housing Intensification.
41.2	General	General	General	Julie Power	Oppose	This new proposal conflicts with Pegasus Town Covenants which are supposed to protect Pegasus residents from this very thing. Submitter built in Pegasus with confidence that they would be protected by the covenants. If the developers do not enforce them it falls to the private individual to do so which is expensive, time consuming and stressful. New developers and existing landowners could end up in legal battles, and going to arbitration can be a very lengthy and costly process. Covenants are legally binding and Courts in NZ have an obligation to enforce if bought before them. All could be avoided if the Council objects to the governments ruling on these grounds. Statistics NZ describe Pegasus as a small urban area. The population at the 2018 census was 2,637. This new proposal was intended for areas of over 5000 or more as at 2018 census. Questions why Pegasus was included together with Ravenswood and Woodend and thinks Pegasus should be excluded. The medium density residential standards will enable up to three houses up to 3 storeys high, per site for a potential of 12 plus people and cars. Questions where they will park in the narrow streets of Pegasus. There is an abundance of land in the South Island which could be designed for this proposal.	1. Reject the governments Housing Intensification MDRS rules. 2. Eliminate Pegasus from this Variation 1: Housing Intensification.
41.3	TRAN - Ranga waka - Transport	General	General	Julie Power	Oppose	The medium density residential standards will enable up to three houses up to 3 storeys high, per site for a potential of 12 plus people and cars. Questions where they will park in the narrow streets of Pegasus.	1. Reject the governments Housing Intensification MDRS rules. 2. Eliminate Pegasus from this Variation 1:Housing Intensification.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
42.1	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Qualifying	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Amend	<p>Generally supports introductory text that sets out qualifying matters.</p> <p>Considers the reasoning in Table RSL-1 does not make it clear how reducing minimum lot sizes will protect the National Grid.</p> <p>Considers it is unclear why National Grid subdivision corridor is a qualifying matter, and the National Grid Yard is not. The Medium Density Residential Standards allows intensification that may not require subdivision. The National Grid Yard must be included to manage land use in order to apply the National Grid as a qualifying matter and give effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission (NPSET).</p> <p>Seeks amendments to Table RSL-1 to better reflect the rule and policy framework direction, including the NPSET and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Notes intensification within the National Grid's vicinity could significantly affect Transpower's ability to operate, maintain, upgrade, and develop the National Grid.</p> <p>Notes significance of NPSET in ensuring recognition of the benefits of electricity transmission, while both managing effects both on, and from, the National Grid.</p> <p>Notes the only area where National Grid assets traverse an intensification area is in north-west Rangiora.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to ensure that the nationally consistent rule framework for land use activities addressed within the National Grid Yard provisions are explicitly set out as part of the National Grid qualifying matter to give effect to higher order policy and establish a clear and appropriate expectation of future land use in the vicinity of the National Grid.</p>	<p>Amend Table RSL-1 as follows:</p> <p>Qualifying matter and area - Electricity</p> <p>- National grid transmission lines National Grid transmission lines within Medium Density Residential Zone in north-west Rangiora}. As mapped in qualifying matter, <u>National Grid Subdivision Corridor and National Grid Yard</u></p> <p>Reasoning</p> <p>Identifies the location of <u>nationally significant Electricity Distribution transmission Lines within the Medium Density Residential Zones, and avoids potential effects of subdivision and development on the ability to safely and efficiently operate, maintain, develop and upgrade the National Grid. by imposing minimum setbacks and reducing minimum allotment size ensures the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.</u></p>
42.2	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Table	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Oppose	<p>Opposes lack of restrictions relating to structures and activities in the National Grid Yard. Seeks addition of definition of 'National Grid Yard' to improve clarity regarding this qualifying matter.</p>	<p>Insert a definition of "NATIONAL GRID YARD":</p> <p><u>"means:</u></p> <p><u>a. the area located 12m in any direction from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid support structure;</u></p> <p><u>b. the area located 10m either side of the centreline of an overhead 66kV National Grid transmission line;</u></p> <p><u>c. the area located 12m either side of the centreline of any overhead 220kV or 350kV National Grid transmission line."</u></p>
42.3	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Qualifying	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Amend	<p>Supports the inclusion of 'National Grid subdivision corridor' definition as it provides for the National Grid as a qualifying matter, however seeks minor amendments to improve clarity.</p>	<p>Amend 'National Grid subdivision corridor' definition:</p> <p>"a. the area 32m either side of the centreline of an above ground 66kV transmission lines on towers (including tubular steel towers <u>poles</u> where these replace steel lattice towers);</p> <p>b. the area 37m either side of the centreline of an above ground 220kV transmissions line;</p> <p>c. the area 39m either side of the centreline of an above ground 350kV transmission line."</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
42.4	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Qualifying	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Amend	Supports the inclusion of the 'Qualifying Matters' definition, however seeks additional clarity through a cross reference and hyperlink to Table RSL-1.	Amend the 'Qualifying Matters' definition: "QUALIFYING MATTERS' means a matter referred to in section 771 or 770 of the <u>RMA44A</u> and includes the matters set out in Table RSL-1."
42.5	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic	Objectives	SD-O2	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Transpower New	Support	Supports SD-O2, particularly its recognition of wellbeing and health and safety. Notes SD-O2 is required by Section 3A.	Retain SD-O2 as notified.
42.6	EI - Pungao me te hanganga hapori - Energy and infrastructure	General	General	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Oppose	Opposes lack of inclusion of restrictions that relate to structures and activities in the National Grid Yard. Seeks inclusion of new provisions to provide clarity that land use is also managed as a qualifying matter in the National Grid Yard.	Amend the 'Activity Rules - Managing effects of activities and development on the National Grid': EI-R51 Activities and development (other than earthworks) within a National Grid Yard <u>Qualifying matter – National Grid Yard</u> <u>status: PER</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>1. the activity is not a sensitive activity;</u> <u>2. buildings or structures comply with NZECP34: 2001 and are:</u> <u>a. for a network utility; or</u> <u>b. a fence not exceeding 2.5m in height above ground level; or</u> <u>c. building alterations or additions to an existing building or structure that do not increase the height above ground level or footprint of the building or structure;</u> <u>3. A building or structure provided for by (2)(a) to (c) must:</u> <u>a. not be used for the handling or storage of hazardous substances with explosive or flammable intrinsic properties in greater than domestic scale quantities;</u> <u>b. not permanently obstruct existing vehicle access to a National Grid support structure;</u> <u>c. be located at least 12m from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid support structure, except where it is a fence not exceeding 2.5m height above ground level that is located at least 6 metres from the outer visible edge of a foundation of a National Grid support structure</u> <u>Activity status when compliance not achieved: NC</u> <u>Notification</u> <u>An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified only to Transpower NZ Ltd where the consent authority considers this is required, absent its written approval.</u>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
42.7	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Activity Rules	SUB-R6	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Amend	Generally supports SUB-R6. Seeks amendment to align Proposed District Plan provisions in respect of notification (notes Clause 5 (Part 1) of Schedule 3A does not apply).	Amend SUB-R6: Qualifying matter - National Grid subdivision corridor Notification An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly and limited notified <u>but may be limited notified only to Transpower New Zealand Limited, where the consent authority considers this is required, absent its written approval.</u>
42.8	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Zone	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Oppose	Opposes the 200m ² minimum allotment size for the National Grid Subdivision Corridor qualifying matter as there is no rationale for how this gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, or for how it provides a matter of national significance and ensures the safe or efficient operation of nationally significant infrastructure.	Amend minimum allotment size that applies to the National Grid Subdivision Corridor qualifying matter to reflect the minimum area in the Proposed District Plan.
42.9	RESZ - Matters of Discretion for all Residential Zones	General	General	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney		Supports RESZ-P15 as it recognises qualifying matters. Notes it reflects that required under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Retain RESZ-P15 as notified.
42.10	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Objectives	MRZ–O1	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-O1 noting it reflects that required under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Retain MRZ-O1 as notified.
42.11	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Policies	MRZ-P1	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Amend	Notes that within the Medium Density Residential Activity Area, qualifying matter areas may limit the amount of permitted medium density development possible. Supports MRZ-P1's direction, and notes it reflects Schedule 3A, Part 1, Clause (6)(2)(a) of the Resource Management Act 1991, however requests reference to qualifying matter areas as they directly influence capacity for intensification.	Amend MRZ-P1: MRZ-P1 Housing types Enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities within the zone, including 3-storey attached and detached dwellings, and low-rise apartments, <u>while avoiding inappropriate locations, heights and densities of buildings and development within qualifying matter areas as directed by the relevant qualifying matter area provisions.</u>
42.12	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Policies	MRZ-P2	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-P2, noting it meets requirements under Schedule 3A Part 1(6)(2) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Retain MRZ-P2 as notified.
42.13	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R1	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-R1 to the extent that the immediate legal effect is not limited to situations where qualifying matters do not apply. This may result in situations where the alteration of a residential building breaches rules relating to the National Grid Yard.	Amend MRZ-R1: "This rule shall have immediate legal effect in relation to residential activities if <u>no qualifying matter applies.</u> "
42.14	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports clear direction in MRZ-R2 that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain MRZ-R2 as notified.
42.15	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS1 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS1 as notified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
42.16	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS2	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS2 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS2 as notified.
42.17	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS4 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS4 as notified.
42.18	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS4 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS4 as notified.
42.19	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS7 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS7 as notified.
42.20	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS9	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS9 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS9 as notified.
42.21	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS10	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS10 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS10 as notified.
42.22	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS-11	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS11 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS11 as notified.
42.23	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS12	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS11 as it provides clear direction that it does not have immediate legal effect where qualifying matters apply.	Retain the direction regarding legal effect in MRZ-BFS11 as notified.
42.24	General	General	General	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Amend	Supports the Variation 1 Section 32 report's precautionary approach of including the 39m setback. Generally supports the Section 32 report's analysis of the National Grid as a qualifying matter.	Not specified.
42.25	Planning Maps	General	General	Transpower New Zealand Ltd - Pauline Whitney	Support	Neutral on extent of the zones and development areas as notified. Suggests that if the extent of the areas be amended within the vicinity of the National Grid, the provisions that manage effects on the National Grid, subject to amendments sought by submitter, are similarly extended to new zones or development areas.	Not specified.
43.1	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	General	Resource Management Group - Teresa Walton - on behalf of Momentum Land Ltd	Amend	Oppose the Rural Lifestyle zoning of Lot 2 DP 83191, Lot 2 DP 4532, Lot 1 DP 5010 and Lot 5 DP 313322.	Rezone Lot 2 DP 83191, Lot 2 DP 4532, Lot 1 DP 5010 and Lot 5 DP 313322 to Medium Density Residential.
43.2	Planning Maps	General	General	Resource Management	Amend	Oppose the Rural Lifestyle zoning of Lot 2 DP 83191, Lot 2 DP 4532, Lot 1 DP 5010 and Lot 5 DP 313322.	Rezone Lot 2 DP 83191, Lot 2 DP 4532, Lot 1 DP 5010 and Lot 5 DP 313322 to Medium Density Residential.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
43.3	K - Kaiapoi	General	General	Resource Management Group - Teresa Walton - on behalf of Momentum Land Ltd	Amend	Oppose the notified Kaiapoi ODP DEV-K-APP1, as it does not reflect submitter's development intentions for development of the site.	Amend the notified Kaiapoi Outline Development Plan (ODP) to reflect the ODP prepared by submitter and contained in Appendix 3 (see full submission).
43.4	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Airport	Resource Management Group - Teresa Walton - on behalf of Momentum Land Ltd	Amend	Oppose use of the Operative Airport Noise Contour to define the spatial extent of the airport noise qualifying matter.	Amend the spatial extent of the airport noise qualifying matter to apply to the Annual Average Outer Control Boundary.
43.5	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Natural	Resource Management Group - Teresa Walton - on behalf of Momentum Land Ltd	Amend	Seek that the natural hazards qualifying matter does not apply to any land parcels subject to this submission on the basis that ground levels will be raised to mitigate flood risk.	Amend the natural hazards qualifying matter so that upon rezoning the land parcels to Medium Density Residential, the natural hazards qualifying matter does not apply to the parcels.
43.6	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	General	Resource Management Group - Teresa Walton - on behalf of Momentum Land Ltd	Support	Support in part the minimum allotment area of 200m ² in the Medium Density Residential Zone where the airport noise qualifying matter applies. This is on the proviso that the submitters relief is accepted with regard to use of the Annual Average Outer Control Boundary (AAOCB) as defining the spatial extent of the qualifying matter. As a result, the 200m ² minimum lot area would only apply to Lot 2 DP83191, being the South Block (retirement village).	Retain SUB-S1 as notified, insofar as it relates to minimum allotment area in the area covered by airport noise qualifying matter. This relief is sought on the basis that the qualifying matter will only apply to the South Block (retirement village site).

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

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
46.1	General	General	Airport	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Support	<p>Waka Kotahi is generally supportive of the proposed changes and provisions put forward by the Council. While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone. Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, as Opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone. Waka Kotahi seeks further evidence on why a 6m setback for new buildings on sites bordering a strategic or arterial road (state highways) is considered a qualifying matter and why this setback is more appropriate than the required 1.5m standard. Waka Kotahi does not have an accepted setback, rather, requires any sensitive activity located within 100m of the state highway to be designed and constructed to achieve adequate noise standards. In NOISE-R16, increase the area in which sensitive activities are required to be adequately designed and constructed to the relevant noise standards to address reverse sensitivity, from 80m to 100m. Waka Kotahi consider that if the noise standards requested through the Proposed District Plan submission are accepted then there will be appropriate standards in place to manage the potential health effects on any residents in proximity of the state highway and located within a residential area proposed to be up zoned. Through the Proposed District Plan submission period, Waka Kotahi requested that further consideration be given to increasing the area zoned Medium Density Residential. Variation 1 has provided for this density such that Waka Kotahi consider that their request through the Proposed</p>	<p>Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town centre. Retain the proposed objectives and policies. Provide further evidence on why a 6m setback for new buildings on sites bordering a strategic or arterial road (state highways) is considered a qualifying matter and why this setback is more appropriate than the required 1.5m standard. Increase the area in which sensitive activities adjacent to strategic and arterial roads are required to be adequately designed and constructed to the relevant noise standards to address reverse sensitivity, from 80m to 100m. Retain the increase in the area zoned Medium Density Residential in the North-East Development Area and South-West Development Area of Rangiora as provided for through Variation 1. Use financial contributions to contribute towards public realm improvement projects, and initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports transport mode shift.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
						District Plan submission process has been met. There are adequate ODPS in place such that transportation requirements including cycle/shared path connections are appropriately provided for. Waka Kotahi supports the use of financial contributions as a financial tool to contribute towards public realm improvement projects, and seeks that consideration be given to initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports mode shift.	

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
46.2	TCZ - Town Centre Zone	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Amend	While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town centre.
46.3	LCZ - Local Centre Zone	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Amend	While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town centre.
46.4	NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Amend	While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town centre.
46.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Amend	While the Council has raised the height standards with the centre zones so that they are commensurate with the 11m height limit in the MDRS, the Council has also stated that they consider a walkable catchment to be those areas within 800m of a centre zone. However, there is no intermediate height allowance or change in zoning proposed, surrounding those town, local or neighbourhood centre zones. In Waimakariri, the Proposed District Plan should enable a greater intensity of development within walking distance of a town centre in particular, as currently it is proposed to drop from a 6-storey limit (if mixed use development is proposed), to a 3-storey limit within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Consider an increased height limit to be included immediately surrounding a town centre zone, to better provide for denser residential development within a walkable catchment, for example, at least 4 storeys. This could be stepped down as the walking catchment extends further out from the town centre.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
46.6	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Support	Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, as opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone.	Retain the proposed objectives and policies.
46.7	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Support	Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, as opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone.	Retain the proposed objectives and policies.
46.8	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Support	Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, as opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone.	Retain the proposed objectives and policies.
46.9	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	Policies	RESZ-P15	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Support	Waka Kotahi have reviewed the relevant proposed objectives and policies and consider that they appropriately provide for the character of the development anticipated in the zone, in particular proposed RESZ-P15, as opposed to retaining the existing character of a residential zone.	Retain the proposed objectives and policies, in particular proposed RESZ-P15.
46.10	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Transport	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Amend	Waka Kotahi seeks further evidence on why a 6m setback for new buildings on sites bordering a strategic or arterial road (state highways) is considered a qualifying matter and why this setback is more appropriate than the required 1.5m standard. Waka Kotahi does not have an accepted setback, rather, requires any sensitive activity located within 100m of the state highway to be designed and constructed to achieve adequate noise standards.	Provide further evidence on why a 6m setback for new buildings on sites bordering a strategic or arterial road (state highways) is considered a qualifying matter and why this setback is more appropriate than the required 1.5m standard.
46.11	General	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Amend	In NOISE-R16, increase the area in which sensitive activities are required to be adequately designed and constructed to the relevant noise standards to address reverse sensitivity, from 80m to 100m. Waka Kotahi consider that if the noise standards requested through the Proposed District Plan submission are accepted then there will be appropriate standards in place to manage the potential health effects on any residents in proximity of the state highway and located within a residential area proposed to be up zoned.	In NOISE-R16, increase the area in which sensitive activities adjacent to strategic and arterial roads are required to be adequately designed and constructed to the relevant noise standards to address reverse sensitivity, from 80m to 100m.
46.12	NER - North East Rangiora	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Support	Through the Proposed District Plan submission period, Waka Kotahi requested that further consideration be given to increasing the area zoned Medium Density Residential in North-East Development Area (Rangiora). Variation 1 has provided for this density such that Waka Kotahi consider that their request through the Proposed District Plan submission process has been met. There are adequate ODPs in place such that transportation requirements including cycle/shared path connections are appropriately provided for.	Retain the increase in the area zoned Medium Density Residential in the North-East Development Area of Rangiora as provided for through Variation 1.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
46.13	SWR - Southwest Rangiora	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Support	Through the Proposed District Plan submission period, Waka Kotahi requested that further consideration be given to increasing the area zoned Medium Density Residential in South-West Development Area (Rangiora). Variation 1 has provided for this density such that Waka Kotahi consider that their request through the Proposed District Plan submission process has been met. There are adequate ODPs in place such that transportation requirements including cycle/shared path connections are appropriately provided for.	Retain the increase in the area zoned Medium Density Residential in the South-West Development Area of Rangiora as provided for through Variation 1.
46.14	General	General	General	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency - Gemma Kean	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the use of financial contributions as a financial tool to contribute towards public realm improvement projects, and seeks that consideration be given to initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports mode shift.	Use financial contributions to contribute towards public realm improvement projects, and initiatives and/or infrastructure that supports transport mode shift.
47.1	General	General	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	<p>Variation 1 was a mandatory direction from Central Government to incorporate the required medium density residential standards from the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act. Council records that it is currently underway with a proposed district plan that it considers responded to the housing capacity challenges that the Act sought to address.</p> <p>Because of the complexities of incorporating the Act and medium density residential standards into the notified Proposed District Plan, the Council proposes to submit on Variation 1, in order to signal and obtain scope for changes that might be needed to provisions.</p> <p>Council seeks to provide submissions on suggested pathways and issues involved with integrating this plan variation into the proposed district plan as required by law.</p> <p>The points of this submission can be broadly themed into the following categories:</p> <p>a. Drafting and linking matters – where drafting can be amended to improve the consistency and linkages and usability without changing the intent of anything that already has immediate legal effect.</p> <p>b. Consequential amendments – where minor changes to the content of the variation which are outside the scope of the RMA's Clause 16 minor amendments and s80H 'identifying mark-up'.</p> <p>c. Other amendments - where planning concepts and issues of implementation have emerged following notification and which may require changes.</p>	The Council seeks that Variation 1 be amended as set out in Table 1 of the submission.
47.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R1	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	MRZ-R1, and MRZ-R2 are the main rules that operationalise the medium density residential standards (MDRS) within Variation 1. They are unclear in their scope – as MRZ-R1 applies district wide standards, and MRZ-R2 applies the residential standards (as amended by the MDRS). The activity status on MRZ-R1 requires amendment to ensure that the relevant district wide rule and activity status from elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan is invoked, rather than the rules in the MRZ section.	<p>Amend MRZ-R1 as follows:</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>1. the activity complies with all <u>applicable medium density residential and district-wide</u> built form standards.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</p> <p><u>for medium density residential provisions, as set out in the relevant built form standard;</u></p> <p><u>for district-wide provisions, as set out in the relevant district-wide rule and/or standard;</u></p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
47.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	<p>MRZ-R1, and MRZ-R2 are the main rules that operationalise the medium density residential standards (MDRS) within Variation 1. They are unclear in their scope – as MRZ-R1 applies district wide standards, and MRZ-R2 applies the residential standards (as amended by the MDRS).</p> <p>The activity status on MRZ-R1 requires amendment to ensure that the relevant district wide rule and activity status from elsewhere in the Proposed District Plan is invoked, rather than the rules in the MRZ section.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-R1 as follows:</p> <p>Where:1. the activity complies with all <u>applicable medium density residential and district-wide</u> built form standards.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: <u>for medium density residential provisions, as set out in the relevant built form standard;</u> <u>for district-wide provisions, as set out in the relevant district-wide rule and/or standard;</u></p>
47.4	EI - Pungao me te hanganga hapori - Energy and infrastructure	General	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective. Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p>	<p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display).</p> <p>Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>
47.5	TRAN - Ranga waka - Transport	General	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p>	<p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display). Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>
47.6	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p>	<p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display).</p> <p>Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>
47.7	HH - Taonga o onamata - Historic heritage	General	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	<p>The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective.</p> <p>Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made.</p> <p>Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.</p>	<p>Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display).</p> <p>Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
47.8	TREE - Rakau hirahira - Notable trees	General	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective. Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made. Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.	Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display). Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.
47.9	NATC - Ahuatanga o te awa - Natural character of freshwater bodies	General	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective. Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made. Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.	Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display). Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.
47.10	OSZ - Open Space Zone	General	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	The linkage between qualifying matters and the rules that make them operational need to be improved to ensure they are fully effective. Some existing or new qualifying matters may need to be linked to rules and standards as decisions are made. Qualifying matters may require both subdivision and land-use rules to make them operational, and not all qualifying matters have linkages or references to both types of rule.	Link qualifying matters where listed directly to maps (noting that existing qualifying area maps may need changes in how they display). Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.
47.11	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Table	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	Table RSL-1 lists the currently proposed qualifying matters – places and areas where the MDRS may not apply or be restricted in its application - that apply across the District. However it could be improved by outlining the exact nature of the qualifying matter in spatial extent and reasoning.	Amend Table RSL-1 to directly explain the area, nature and extent of qualifying matters. Link Table RSL-1 to the relevant qualifying layers on map, noting that this may require improvements to the map display (but not content). Consequential linkages or amendments required to give effect to relief sought.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
47.12	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	It is not clear how to treat garages and other non- <i>living accommodation</i> parts of a building under the MDRS. The Proposed District Plan definitions for ‘residential activity’ are clearly linked to the living accommodation only, which can be interpreted to exempt a garage from consideration under the MDRS, but this may need to be clarified.	Clarify that the non-living parts of a building are not part of assessment under the relevant MDRS built form standards. This includes attached garages, roof cavity/facade, and foundations.
47.13	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	The notified version of the Proposed District Plan set a discretionary status for activities that do not conform to the built form standards or rules. However, the Enabling Housing provisions require a restricted discretionary status for non-compliance. This was changed by Variation 1 in all relevant activity standards except for MRZ-R18 and MRZBFS4. Note: the restricted discretionary status is in force by way of s77M regardless.	Amend activity status for non-compliance to restricted discretionary “RDIS” for MRZ-BFS4.
47.14	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R187	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	The notified version of the Proposed District Plan set a discretionary status for activities that do not conform to the built form standards or rules. However, the Enabling Housing provisions require a restricted discretionary status for non-compliance. This was changed by Variation 1 in all relevant activity standards except for MRZ-R18 and MRZBFS4. Note: the restricted discretionary status is in force by way of s77M regardless.	Amend activity status for non-compliance to restricted discretionary “RDIS” for MRZ-R18.
47.15	RESZ - Matters of Discretion for all Residential Zones	Matters of Discretion for all Residential Zones	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	The language and wording in the matters of discretion could be refined to make the wording of concepts more objective and rational where subjective terminology is used.	Amend to make the wording of concepts to be more objective and rational where subjective terminology is used, for example, where the phrase “visual perception of cramped living conditions” is used in RES-MD12.
47.16	General	General	General	Waimakariri District Council - Tracy Tierney	Amend	The proposed plan introduced a medium density residential zone in the centre of Rangiora which was (arguably) more permissive of development than the MDRS and which provided substantial additional development capacity consistent with national directives.	Any changes required in the event where the panel determines that variation 1 is not the most effective way of achieving the purpose of the Enabling Housing Amendment Act and MDRS.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
48.1	Planning Maps	General	Airport	Anthony Harper Lawyers - Gerard Cleary - on behalf of Woodwater Ltd	Amend	<p>This submission relates to the following land:</p> <p>21 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 2567 and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>320 Woodend Beach Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 75359)</p> <p>1 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 2567)</p> <p>328 Woodend Beach Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 2567)</p> <p>36 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Land 689 and Part Rural Land 689)</p> <p>40 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>46 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>50 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>52 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689, Part Rural Section 689, Part Rural Section 367A and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>60 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Parcel ID: 3401266)</p> <p>62 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>Copper Beech Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 1, 101 Deposited Plan 503969)</p> <p>43 Petries Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 367A and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>In the Proposed Plan the above land is zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ). The surrounding zoning includes General Residential to the north, and Special Purpose Kainga Nohoanga Zone (SPZ-KN) to the west. To the east and south, land has been rezoned as either Open Space Zone (OSZ) or Large Lot Residential Zoning (LLRZ). The net outcome is that the above land will essentially be an island of rural land surrounded by urban land which is undesirable as it is likely to result in significant constraints on any rural activities that can be undertaken and may render it incapable of reasonable use.</p>	Seeks that the subject land be rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
48.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	Airport	Anthony Harper Lawyers - Gerard Cleary - on behalf of Woodwater Ltd	Amend	<p>This submission relates to the following land:</p> <p>21 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 2567 and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>320 Woodend Beach Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 2 Deposited Plan 75359)</p> <p>1 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 2567)</p> <p>328 Woodend Beach Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Lot 1 Deposited Plan 2567)</p> <p>36 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Land 689 and Part Rural Land 689)</p> <p>40 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>46 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>50 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>52 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689, Part Rural Section 689, Part Rural Section 367A and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>60 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (ParcelID: 3401266)</p> <p>62 Judsons Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>Copper Beech Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Lot 1, 101 Deposited Plan 503969)</p> <p>43 Petries Road, Woodend, Waimakariri District (Part Rural Section 367A and Part Rural Section 689)</p> <p>In the Proposed Plan the above land is zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ). The surrounding zoning includes General Residential to the north, and Special Purpose Kainga Nohoanga Zone (SPZ-KN) to the west. To the east and south, land has been rezoned as either Open Space Zone (OSZ) or Large Lot Residential Zoning (LLRZ). The net outcome is that this land will essentially be an island of rural land surrounded by urban land which is undesirable as it is likely to result in significant constraints on any rural activities that can be undertaken and may render it incapable of reasonable use.</p>	Seeks that the subject land be rezoned Medium Density Residential Zone.

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

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
50.1	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Airport	Beverley Waters	Oppose	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) applying to a portion of lots within Stage 7 of Silverstream East as addressed in resource consents RC215144 and RC215145, which was granted consent on 9 December 2021 subject to conditions. Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 (refer to full submission for plan showing location of these lots) be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. These conditions were added to the development's resource consent decision by the Commissioner to address issues relating to the departure from the Outline Development Plan, interface and integration issues between the existing Kaiapoi residential area and the new development - primarily in relation to raising ground levels above that of adjoining residential properties, the form of fencing on Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135, building setbacks, building height, and access arrangements. Considers the effect of this additional qualifying matter will be minor to the implementation of the MDRS given it only relates to 15 lots.</p>	<p>Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. Some of the main conditions are:</p> <p>Subdivision resource consent RC215144</p> <p>Condition 14.15 - Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have no vehicle access to Road 8. Condition 14.16 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 14.15 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 128 to 130 and 134 and 135. Condition 28.1 and 28.2 - Any buildings to be single storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m and windows facing existing properties not to be above 3m in height. Condition 28.3 - Pursuant to section 221 of the resource management act 1991, Conditions 28.1 and 28.2 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the record of the title for lots 107 — 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135. Condition 29.4 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A1 as shown on approved plan, stamped RC 215144 and RC 215145. Condition 29.5 - Pursuant to section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 29.4 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lot 128. Condition 30.3 - Area B Allotments — Dwellings erected on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall have conditions as set out in the Commissioners Report. Condition 30.4 - Pursuant to Section 221 of the Resource Management Act 1991, Condition 30.3 shall be subject to a consent notice which shall be registered on the Records of Title for Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135.</p> <p>Land use resource consent RC215145</p> <p>Condition 9.1 - Any buildings to be constructed at any time on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130 and 134 and 135, shall be single storey only with a height no greater than 6.5m measured from finished ground level. Condition 9.2 - Any dwellinghouse constructed on Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, 134 and 135 shall not have any windows above 3m height, facing towards Kynnersley Street, 8, 10, 11 and 12 Murray Place and 31 and 35 Adderley Terrace. Condition 10.1 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within the 10m of the Eastern Boundary. Condition 10.2 - No structure or dwellinghouse on Lot 128 shall be constructed within easement A1 as shown on approved plan stamped RC215144/RC215145. Condition 10.3 - No dwellinghouse on Lots 107 to 116 shall be constructed within 11.5m of the eastern boundary.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
51.1	General	General	General	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock		<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFSS. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFSS.</p> <p>The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line (MNL) passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>The proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFSS do not include consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. A matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure.</p>	<p>Retain the rail corridor as a qualifying matter.</p> <p>Retain TRAN-R21 and TRAN-APP7 as notified.</p> <p>Retain MRZ-BFSS.</p> <p>Include a new matter of discretion in MRZ-BFSS.</p>
51.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFSS	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	Amend	<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFSS. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFSS. The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>Considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks from the rail corridor in MRZ-BFSS. However, the proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFSS do not require consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. Considers a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure.</p>	<p>Retain MRZ-BFSS and include a new matter of discretion in MRZ-BFSS.</p> <p>"MRZ-BFSS Building and structure setbacks ... Matters of discretion are restricted to: RES-MD2 - Residential design principles RES-MD5 - Impact on neighbouring property <u>RES-MDX - The location and design of the building as it relates to the ability to safely use, access and maintain buildings without requiring access on, above or over the rail corridor.</u> ..."</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
51.3	TRAN - Ranga waka - Transport	General	General	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	Support	<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFSS. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFSS. The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>Considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks from the rail corridor in MRZ-BFSS. However, the proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFSS do not require consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. Considers a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure.</p>	Retain identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter.
51.4	TRAN - Ranga waka - Transport	General	General	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	Support	<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFSS. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFSS. The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>Considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks from the rail corridor in MRZ-BFSS. However, the proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFSS do not require consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. Considers a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure.</p>	Retain TRAN-R21 as notified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
51.5	TRAN - Ranga waka - Transport	General	General	Kiwirail Holdings Ltd - Michelle Grinlinton-Hancock	Support	<p>Supports the identification of the rail corridor as a qualifying matter and its application to protect sight triangles and setbacks. Supports the retention of TRAN-R21, TRAN-APP7 and MRZ-BFSS. Seeks an amendment to MRZ-BFSS. The national railway network is a nationally and regionally significant infrastructure asset. The designated corridor of the Main North Line passes through the Waimakariri District and the ability to operate, maintain, and upgrade this line into the future should be protected. Railway operations cannot fully internalise all their effects within the railway corridor boundaries. Increasing development around railway corridors increases reverse sensitivity effects constraining existing and lawful railway activities. Noise and vibration controls and boundary setbacks are planning tools to manage this interface with urban development.</p> <p>Considers 5m is an appropriate distance for setbacks from the rail corridor in MRZ-BFSS. However, the proposed matters of discretion in MRZ-BFSS do not require consideration of the effects where the setback from the rail corridor is infringed. Considers a matter of discretion directing consideration of impacts on the safety and efficiency of the rail corridor is appropriate in situations where the 5m setback standard is not complied with. The relief sought by this submission will meet the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991 and provide health, safety and amenity outcomes and preserve operational and developmental capacity and efficiency for nationally significant infrastructure.</p>	Retain TRAN-APP7 as notified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
52.1	General	General	Airport	Helen Mary Sparrow		<p>Acknowledges Council's obligation to adopt Variation 1, however considers mitigation of associated adverse effects on existing built environments of Kaiapoi and Rangiora important. Concerned about s771(j) of Resource Management Act which relates to other matters that make intensification inappropriate. Considers it inappropriate for Woodend (including Ravenswood) and Pegasus to be considered a single residential area and therefore meet the population threshold of 5000 for Variation 1 to apply. Woodend and Pegasus are clearly separate areas when viewed on a map, with the proposed Woodend Bypass, parks, reserves and rural holdings in between them. Woodend and Pegasus had populations of 2784 and 2637 respectively in the 2018 Census, and there is no provision for an increase of Pegasus' urban area. Pegasus was developed along 'new urbanist' principles with more intensive development than the Residential 2 zoning of Kaiapoi and Rangiora. The Pegasus Area Unit bounds the Woodend Area Unit because it includes the large lot area of Mapleham, which is excluded from consideration. Ravenswood already has many smaller lots, which have urban design controls to maintain amenity.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification will result in the removal of mature trees from Kaiapoi and Rangiora that currently would mitigate effects of urban environments heating due to climate change. Protection should not be limited to notable trees listed in the District Plan only.</p> <p>Concerned that the intensification's increase in site coverage will cause issues for the existing stormwater management systems, especially within low-lying areas of Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Notes that Proposed District Plan's requirement for 30% permeability highlights the importance of the ground disposal of stormwater within urban environments. Notes that while newer developments, particularly of Rangiora, have substantial stormwater retention areas which can delay the transfer of stormwater from older areas during heavy rain, it may become difficult to manage stormwater across the town as a whole with increasingly intensive rainfall episodes projected as the climate changes. This must be taken into account when considering the areas to which Variation 1 will apply.</p>	Not specified.
52.3	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Airport	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that the 50 dBA Ldn Christchurch International Airport Ltd noise contour over Kaiapoi will constrain a comprehensive redevelopment of Kainga Ora properties in North Kaiapoi.	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
52.4	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Notable	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that the intensification will result in the removal of mature trees from Kaiapoi and Rangiora, which help to mitigate effects of urban environments heating due to climate change. Protection should not be limited to notable trees listed in the District Plan only.	Not specified.
52.5	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R2	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments.	Not specified.
52.6	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments.	Not specified.
52.7	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments.	Not specified.
52.8	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments.	Not specified.
52.9	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that infill development will unreasonably impact adjoining landowner's enjoyment of their property, particularly in terms of privacy and sunlight; this must be mitigated, potentially via performance standards. Variation 1 removes the long-standing assumption that buyers can have reasonable confidence about potential adjoining developments.	Not specified.
52.10	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS2	Helen Mary Sparrow		Concerned that the intensification's increase in site coverage will cause issues for the existing stormwater management systems, especially within low-lying areas of Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Notes that Proposed District Plan's requirement for 30% permeability highlights the importance of the ground disposal of stormwater within urban environments. Notes that while newer developments, particularly of Rangiora, have substantial stormwater retention areas which can delay the transfer of stormwater from older areas during heavy rain, it may become difficult to manage stormwater across the town as a whole with increasingly intensive rainfall episodes projected as the climate changes. This must be taken into account when considering the areas to which Variation 1 will apply.	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
53.1	General	General	General	Resource Management Group - Resource Management Group - Melanie Foote - on behalf of MainPower New Zealand Ltd - on behalf of MainPower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	Seeks to maintain, build, operate, and upgrade the critical network infrastructure in a safe, efficient and effective manner. The electricity distribution network in North Canterbury and Kaikoura regions covers Waimakariri, Hurunui and Kaikoura districts. The electricity distribution network is identified as critical infrastructure, regionally significant infrastructure, is an essential lifeline service and is recognised in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (2013). Seeks the Council insert corridor protection rules into the Medium Density Residential zone, or as alternate relief to be clearly cross referenced by rule requirements within the relevant zone chapters. This submission should be read alongside the original submission on the Proposed District Plan.	Grant the relief as set out in Appendix One; and or grant any other consequential or similar relief that is necessary to deal with the concerns and issues raised in this submission.
53.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	General	Resource Management Group - Melanie Foote - on behalf of MainPower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	Seeks to insert a new objective and policy to support the introduction of new corridor protection rules for electricity distribution lines within the Medium Density Residential Zone.	<p>Insert the following new objective and policy:</p> <p><u>Objective:</u> <u>The operation and security of critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure is not compromised by other activities.</u></p> <p><u>Policy - Separation of incompatible activities</u> <u>Protect critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure by avoiding adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, from incompatible activities by avoiding buildings, structures and any sensitive activities that may compromise the operation of Electricity Distribution Lines within an identified buffer corridor.</u></p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
53.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	General	Resource Management Group - Melanie Foote - on behalf of MainPower New Zealand Ltd	Amend	<p>Seeks to insert corridor protection rules relating to Electricity Distribution Lines into the Medium Residential Zone Chapter rules as lines are located within or immediately adjacent to that zone.</p> <p>Provisions relating to corridor protection for Electricity Distribution Lines do not fall easily into the National Planning Standards framework because they restrict land use activities and subdivision, and apply to specific zones.</p> <p>Corridor protection rules should be located appropriately within the relevant zone chapters. From a usability perspective, it is most logical to include land use constraints associated with Electricity Distribution Lines in the applicable zone chapters where they are clearly visible to landowners who may check the plan to determine rules affecting their property.</p>	<p>Insert the following new rule:</p> <p><u>Earthworks adjacent to a major electricity distribution line</u> <u>Activity Status: PER</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. Earthworks shall be setback at least 6m from the centreline of the Major Electricity Distribution Line as shown on the planning maps or;</u></p> <p><u>2. Meet the following requirements:</u></p> <p><u>a. be no deeper than 300mm within 2.2m of the foundation of the major electricity distribution line support structure; and</u></p> <p><u>b. be no deeper than 0.75m between 2.2m and 6m from the foundation of the major electricity distribution line support structure; and</u></p> <p><u>c. earthworks shall not destabilise a major 66kV or 33kV electricity distribution line pole or tower; and</u></p> <p><u>d. earthworks shall not result in a reduction in the ground to conductor clearance distances below what is required by Table 4 in NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances, unless the requirements of Clause 2.2.3 of NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances are met.</u></p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
							<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: NC</p> <p>Notification <u>An application for a noncomplying activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified only to the relevant electricity distribution line operator where the consent authority considers this is required, absent its written approval.</u></p> <p>Exemptions This rule does not apply to: - earthworks undertaken as part of agricultural or domestic cultivation; or repair, sealing or resealing of a road, footpath, driveway or vehicle access track; - earthworks that are undertaken by a network utility operator or their approved contractor on behalf of the network utility operator (other than for the reticulation and storage of water in canals, dams or reservoirs including for irrigation purposes); - earthworks for which prior written consent has been granted by the relevant electricity distribution line operator under the NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances;</p> <p>Advisory Notes - Major electricity distribution lines are shown on the planning maps. - Vegetation to be planted around electricity distribution lines should be selected and managed to ensure that it will not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. - The NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances contains restrictions on the location of activities and development in relation to electricity distribution lines. Activities and development in the vicinity of these lines must comply with NZECP 34:2001</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
							<p><u>New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances.</u></p> <p>Insert the following new rule:</p> <p><u>Network utilities within 6 of the centre line of a major electricity distribution line</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: PER</u></p> <p>-</p> <p><u>Where:</u></p> <p><u>1. the network utility complies with the NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances.</u></p> <p><u>Activity status when compliance not achieved: NC</u></p> <p><u>Advisory Note</u></p> <p><u>- Major electricity distribution lines are shown on the planning map</u></p> <p>Insert the following new rule:</p> <p><u>Activities and development (other than earthworks or network utilities) adjacent to a major electricity distribution line</u></p> <p><u>Activity status: NC</u></p> <p><u>Where:</u></p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
							<p>1. activities and development adjacent to a major electricity distribution line involve the following:</p> <p>a. new sensitive activity and new buildings within 6m of the centreline of a major electricity distribution line or within 6m of the foundation of a support structure; or</p> <p>b. complies with the requirements of NZECP34:2001.</p> <p><u>Notification</u> An application under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified, but may be limited notified only to the relevant electricity distribution line operator where the consent authority considers this is required, absent its written approval.</p> <p><u>Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A</u></p> <p><u>Advisory Notes</u> - Major electricity distribution lines are shown on the planning map. - Vegetation to be planted around electricity distribution lines should be selected and managed to ensure that it will not breach the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003. - The NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances contains restrictions on the location of activities and development in relation to electricity distribution lines. Activities and development in the vicinity of these lines must comply with NZECP 34:2001 New Zealand Electricity Code of Practice for Electricity Safe Distances.</p> <p>Insert the following new rule:</p> <p><u>Structures near a major electricity distribution line</u> <u>Activity status: NC</u> 1. The establishment of a new, or expansion of an existing structure: <u>Where:</u> 2. The structure is within 6m of the centreline of a major electricity distribution line as shown on the planning maps; or 3. The structure is within 6m of the foundation of a support structure of a</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
54.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of John and Coral Broughton	Amend	<p>Rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora (8.5ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is adjacent to existing residential development, within the West Rangiora Development Area and Future Development Area (FDA), and will accommodate approximately 127 lots. Considers the rezoning will help achieve a compact and efficient urban form, contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, and help address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land.</p> <p>Notes that Variation 1 rezones 86ha of FDA land, with an anticipated yield of approximately 1000 households, and in the ownership of just two major local developers. Concerned that this favours these existing developers and is inconsistent with the direction of the National Policy Statement in Urban Development's (NPS-UD) promotion of a competitive land market, and also that the anticipated yield is inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in the short and medium term.</p> <p>Opposes certification process as it is an uncertain and unproven mechanism for delivering housing; rezoning is quicker and more certain process for addressing acute housing demand and escalating prices due to a supply shortage. Rezoning is also required to meet Council's requirements of the NPS-UD of providing zoned and infrastructure ready development capacity to meet demand, and give effect to Policy 12 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). Notes this submission is supported by a submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora (8.5ha) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
54.2	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-023	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of John and Coral Broughton	Amend	Amend SD-03 to require provision of housing to as a minimum achieve housing bottom lines, in order to enable the submitter's request to rezone 113 and 117 Townsend Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	<p>Amend SD-03:</p> <p>"Urban development and infrastructure that:...</p> <p>1. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to <u>as a minimum</u> achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-01."</p>

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

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

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
55.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Miranda Hales	Amend	<p>Rezone 125 Lehman's Road, Rangiora (5.57ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area thus is recognised for future urban growth and would create at least 84 lots. It will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes, a well-functioning urban environment, and supports the growth direction for Rangiora set down in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan. The rezoning proposed in Variation 1 is insufficient to meet the anticipated demand for housing thus additional land needs to be rezoned urgently.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process given its uncertainty, highly discretionary nature, lack of applicant objection or appeal rights, and potential lack of transparent documentation of its decision-making process. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty. Council needs to meet its requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) of providing sufficient development capacity that is zoned and infrastructure ready to meet expected housing demand for the medium term; certification will not achieve this. Concerned that certification lapses if a Section 224(c) (Resource Management Act 1991) subdivision completion certification is not granted within three years of certification. Rezoning would only occur when the entire development area is rezoned, which may not be within the life of the Proposed District Plan. Concerned that the ability to meet the subdivision 'completion' requirement by completing a smaller subdivision is not suitable as the subdivision would be hardly underway, yet services would be allocated to potentially a significant area indefinitely, which may prejudice other subdividers if there are servicing capacity constraints. Considers there is a lack of clarity about how services will be allocated between different certification applicants (i.e. first come, first served, or priority for favoured areas). Considers Variation 1's s32AA assessment is inadequate for the above reasons.</p> <p>Notes that except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought, this submission should be read alongside and subject to the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Rezone 126 Lehman's Rd, Rangiora (Pt RS 48562) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
55.2	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-O23	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Miranda Hales	Amend	Amend SD-O3 to require provision of housing to as a minimum achieve housing bottom lines, in order to enable the submitter's request to rezone 125 Lehman's Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	<p>Amend SD-O3:</p> <p>"Urban development and infrastructure that:</p> <p>...</p> <p>4. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to <u>as a minimum</u> achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1</p> <p>..."</p>