

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
55.3	WR - West Rangiora	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>	<p>Delete, or alternatively amend, the certification provisions to ensure it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and address any future certification concerns.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Development Area provisions to delete all references to the certification process, and instead rezone 126 Lehman's Road, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan by identifying all residential areas as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
55.4	General	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Miranda Hales	Amend	<p>Rezone 125 Lehmans Road, Rangiora (5.57ha) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area thus is recognised for future urban growth and would create at least 84 lots. It will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes, a well-functioning urban environment, and supports the growth direction for Rangiora set down in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan. The rezoning proposed in Variation 1 is insufficient to meet the anticipated demand for housing thus additional land needs to be rezoned urgently.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process given its uncertainty, highly discretionary nature, lack of applicant objection or appeal rights, and potential lack of transparent documentation of its decision-making process. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty. Council needs to meet its requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) of providing sufficient development capacity that is zoned and infrastructure ready to meet expected housing demand for the medium term; certification will not achieve this. Concerned that certification lapses if a Section 224(c) (Resource Management Act 1991) subdivision completion certification is not granted within three years of certification. Rezoning would only occur when the entire development area is rezoned, which may not be within the life of the Proposed District Plan. Concerned that the ability to meet the subdivision 'completion' requirement by completing a smaller subdivision is not suitable as the subdivision would be hardly underway, yet services would be allocated to potentially a significant area indefinitely, which may prejudice other subdividers if there are servicing capacity constraints. Considers there is a lack of clarity about how services will be allocated between different certification applicants (i.e. first come, first served, or priority for favoured areas). Considers Variation 1's s32AA assessment is inadequate for the above reasons.</p>	<p>Delete, or alternatively amend the certification provisions to ensure it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and to address any other concerns with certification which arise on further investigation.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Development Area provisions to remove all references to the certification process, and instead rezone 126 Lehmans Road, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan by identifying all residential areas as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>

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

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

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

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
57.2	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-O23	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	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 [212 Johns Rd and 63 Oxford Rd, Rangiora] from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Amend SD-O3: "Urban development and infrastructure that: ... 6. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to <u>as a minimum</u> achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1. "
57.3	WR - West Rangiora	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Amend	<p>Rezone [212 Johns Rd and 63 Oxford Rd, Rangiora] ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone. The site is within the West Rangiora Development Area and a Future Development Area so is recognised to provide for urban growth and would create at least 297 lots. More land needs to be rezoned to help address an anticipated shortfall in residential zoned land, and give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) requirement of providing zoned and infrastructure ready development capacity to meet expected demand in the short and medium term. The rezoning will help achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with connectivity with multiple transport modes and will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, and supports the growth direction for Rangiora set down in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan. Notes that Variation 1 rezones 86ha of FDA land, with an anticipated yield of approximately 1000 households, and in the ownership of just two major local developers. Concerned that this favours these existing developers and is inconsistent with the direction of the National Policy Statement in Urban Development's (NPS-UD) promotion of a competitive land market, and also that the anticipated yield is inadequate to meet Rangiora's housing needs in the short and medium term. Considers any adverse effects arising from the proposed rezoning will be minimal, if any, and mitigatable.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process as it is an uncertain and unproven method for delivering land for housing when there is an urgent need to address the supply shortfall. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty.</p> <p>Notes this submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update of the relief sought.</p>	<p>Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to identify all residential areas as Medium Density Residential; and consequential amendments to the West Rangiora ODP narrative and other provisions.</p> <p>Delete, or alternatively amend, the certification provisions so that it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and addresses any other future concerns with certification.</p> <p>Amend the West Rangiora Development Area provisions to delete all references to the certification process, and instead rezone 212 Johns Rd and 63 Oxford Rd, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone.</p>
57.4	General	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Amend	<p>Opposes the certification process as it is an uncertain and unproven method for delivering land for housing when there is an urgent need to address the supply shortfall. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty.</p> <p>Notes this submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update of the relief sought.</p>	<p>Delete, or alternatively amend, the certification provisions so that it is a fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters that can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and addresses any other future concerns with certification.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
58.1	General	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd		<p>Originally submitted on the Proposed District Plan (#266) seeking to rezone the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora from proposed Rural Lifestyle Zone (RLZ) to proposed General Residential Zone (GRZ) and Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ). The previous submission is still relevant in conjunction with this submission in so far as it demonstrates the site is suitable for residential re-zoning. It is considered that Council accepts this position and now proposed re-zoning for the site as Medium Density Residential Zone.</p> <p>Support the re-zoning of the site in Variation 1: Housing Intensification through the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process and notes the rezoning of the site has “legal effect”.</p> <p>Generally support Variation 1 to the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan, the technical reports prepared which contribute to the overall findings outlined in Section 32 Report, and the overall summary which concludes “<i>there is no impediment to rezoning North East and South West Rangiora</i>” as Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) to enable the Medium Density Residential Standards. Request small amendments to proposed rules as outlined in this submission.</p>	<p>Supports to the Council proposal to now re-zone the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora from General Residential Zone (GRZ) and Medium Residential Density Zone (MRZ) to Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ –Variation 1) as part of the Intensification Streamlined Planning Process (ISPP).</p> <p>Where the Submitters are neutral or oppose specific provisions, these are provided.</p> <p>Specific details and reference to provisions within the Proposed District Plan Variation 1 are provided.</p>
58.2	SWR - Southwest Rangiora	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Supports the re-zoning of the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora as Medium Density Residential Zone to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards. Specifically, supports the change from ‘South West Rangiora Development Area’ to Medium Density Residential Zone.	Supports rezoning from ‘South West Rangiora Development Area’ to Medium Density Residential Zone.
58.3	General	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Support	<p>Agrees that the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora should not be subject to any qualifying matters, specifically, those specified in the Amendment Act and those justified via assessment in the Amendment Act (s77G to s77R).</p> <p>Agrees with the assessment of District-Wide Matters as listed on Page 25 of the Variation 1 Section 32 Report and supports the inclusion of District-Wide Matters within the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan.</p>	Not specified
58.4	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Activity Rules	SUB-R2	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Supports amending SUB-R2 to have immediate legal effect if there is no qualifying matter.	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
58.5	SWR - Southwest Ranglora	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Support the inclusion of South West Ranglora and the Outline Development Plan as an Area Specific Matter in Part 3 as an Existing Development Area.	Not specified.
58.6	General	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd		Neutral on the removal of objectives, policies, standards, and rules to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Not specified.
58.7	General	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd		Neutral on the addition of objectives, policies, standards, and rules to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
58.8	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Activity Rules	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Oppose	<p>Opposes emphasised wording for subdivision within the Medium Density Zone (MRZ) under Rule SUB-R2:</p> <p>"... (3)(b)(i) the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site, and that no vacant sites will be created; or ... (ii) (3). no vacant allotments are created."</p> <p>This effectively requires all subdivisions in the zone to be undertaken on a "building commitment" basis and would treat a subdivision seeking vacant allotments in the MRZ as a Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>The submitter intends to provide sections only; not the final housing product that allow the community to invest in housing of their own choice and differentiates their product from other subdivision developments in Rangiora.</p> <p>It is considered unreasonable for the MRZ to only allow controlled subdivision activities where they are in conjunction with residential buildings, particularly given the legislation enables 'up to three houses' on a site which also reasonably includes the provision of one (or two) houses on a vacant site. The creation of a vacant section does not warrant a Discretionary Activity status and should be considered on a Controlled Activity status basis.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-R2:</p> <p>"Medium Density Residential Zone</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>2. SUB-S1 to SUB18 are met, except where:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3(b)(i). the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that shall demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site and that no vacant sites will be created; or</p> <p>...</p> <p>3(b)(ii)(3). no vacant allotments are created;</p> <p>..."</p> <p>Requests that a minimum allotment size be required for any new allotment created by subdivision within the Medium Density Residential Zone. This minimum allotment size should be consistent with that included in the Proposed District Plan in Table SUB-1 – Minimum Allotment Sizes and Dimensions.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
						<p>Opposes emphasised wording for subdivision within the MRZ under Rule SUB-R2: "...</p> <p>3(b) For every site without an existing residential unit, either;</p> <p>i. the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site, and that no vacant sites will be created; or</p> <p>..."</p> <p>This specifically requires a land use consent to be applied for and concurrently assessed with a controlled subdivision application in the zone on the basis that land use consents cannot be issued under the RMA for Permitted Activities. This is not an efficient and effective (including cost to the community) consent process, which is meant to be streamlined, more permissive and enabling.</p>	
58.9	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Oppose	<p>Opposes the removal of minimum allotment sizes under Rule SUB-S1 and table SUB-1 for the "Medium Density Residential Zone (without qualifying matters)". In the case where a residential unit does not exist on the site, subdivision in the Medium Density Residential Zone to create a vacant allotment will still require a minimum site size to be specified in order to continue to achieve current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement requirements of at least 10 houses per hectare (as a minimum).</p> <p>The proposed minimum of 200m² for the zone has been removed and no minimum site size for the construction of residential units is proposed. This is appropriate with the building commitment model, but is less so when providing some guidance on the minimum size site a house can reasonably be constructed on.</p> <p>Inclusion of minimum site size for vacant site subdivision would maintain existing and future amenity. This would ensure that inappropriate and unanticipated density is avoided and intended amenity outcomes are preserved, especially as the density standards do not provide for urban design discretion to maintain onsite urban amenity.</p>	Not specified.
58.10	SWR - Southwest Rangiora	Activity Rules	DEV-SWR-R1	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Oppose	<p>Oppose the activity status of Rule DEV-SWR-R1 as a Permitted Activity. Oppose this activity classification on the basis that development is in accordance with an outline development plan and it is typically undertaken at the time of subdivision with road and reserve vesting, and site layout design guided by the outline development plan as a Controlled Activity.</p> <p>A change from Permitted Activity to Controlled Activity status would better align the subdivision amendments requested.</p>	<p>Amend DEV-SWR-R1:</p> <p>Activity status: PER <u>CON</u></p> <p>Where:1. development shall be in accordance with DEV-SWR-APP1.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: DIS</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
58.11	WR - West Rangiora	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Oppose	<p>- Oppose the inclusion of Fixed outline development plan features that specifically relate to the wider West Rangiora development area which is not being specified as an Existing Development Area.</p> <p>Oppose this on the basis that the location of medium density over the whole site and specific locations for some required features (E.g Oxford Road, Lehmans Road, stormwater corridor to the east, etc) are outside of the outline development plan area and are not relevant to the subject site.</p> <p>- Oppose the inclusion of the Outline Development Plan for West Rangiora in its current form as it creates an inconsistency with the current South West Rangiora Outline Development Plan.</p>	Not specified.
58.12	SWR - Southwest Rangiora	Appendix	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond - on behalf of 199 Johns Road Ltd, Carolina Homes Ltd, Carolina Rental Homes Ltd, Allan Downs Ltd	Amend	Amend DEV-SWR-APP1 Southwest Rangiora ODP.	<p>Amend DEV-SWR-APP1:</p> <p>"Land Use Plan The Outline Development Plan for the South West Rangiora located within Fixed Outline Development Plan Features for the <u>South</u> West Rangiora Development Area: Location of a concentration of medium density residential activity (meaning a minimum ratio of 70% medium density residential zone density and a maximum 30% general residential zone density) immediately adjoining the new north/south road. Location of the local/neighbourhood centre at the juncture of Oxford Road and the north/south road Green link with cycleway adjoining the north/south road Location of stormwater corridor at eastern edge of the West Rangiora Development Area Separated shared pedestrian/cycleway at Johns Road and southern part of new north/south road - Cycleways at Oxford Road, the new north/south road, Johns Road, Lehmans Road and southern flow path - Integrated road connections with 77A Acacia Avenue, Beech Drive, Walnut Way and Sequoia Way. - Flow paths and adjoining green links and cycleways, including any required water body setbacks." <p>The Submitter's seek to have the South West Rangiora Outline Development Area included as proposed in Appendix 1 of DEV-SWR-APP1 South West Rangiora Outline Development Plan. The Submitter's request that the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan in DEV-WR-APP1 be updated accordingly to be consistent with DEV-SWR-APP1.</p> </p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
							APPL.
59.1	General	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond		General support Variation 1: Housing intensification on the basis that small amendments to better implement the District Plan should be made. Specific details and reference to provisions within Variation 1 are provided and where neutral or opposed to specific provisions, these are also provided.	General support. Where the submitter is neutral or oppose specific provisions, this is provided. Specific details and reference to provisions within the Proposed District Plan Variation 1 are provided (see full submission).
59.2	SWR - Southwest Rangiora	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond	Support	Supports the inclusion of the South West Rangiora site being re-zoned as Medium Density Residential Zone to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards. Specifically, supports the change from 'South West Rangiora Development Area' to Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ).	Not specified.
59.3	General	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond	Support	Agrees that the site at 163, 191, 199, & 203 Johns Road, Rangiora should not be subject to any qualifying matters, specifically, those specified in the Amendment Act and those justified via assessment in the Amendment Act (s77G to s77R). Agrees with the assessment of District-Wide Matters as listed on Page 25 of the Variation 1 Section 32 Report and supports the inclusion of District-Wide Matters within the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan.	Not specified
59.4	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Activity Rules	SUB-R2	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond	Support	Supports amending SUB-R2 to have immediate legal effect if there is no qualifying matter.	Not specified
59.5	SWR - Southwest Rangiora	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond	Support	Support the inclusion of South West Rangiora and the Outline Development Plan as an Area Specific Matter in Part 3 as an Existing Development Area.	Not specified
59.6	General	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond		Neutral on the removal of objectives, policies, standards, and rules to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Not specified.
59.7	General	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond		Neutral on the addition of objectives, policies, standards, and rules to implement the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Not specified.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
59.8	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Activity Rules	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond	Amend	<p>Opposes emphasised wording for subdivision within the Medium Density Zone under Rule SUB-R2:</p> <p>"...</p> <p>(3)(b)(i). the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site, and that no vacant sites will be created; or</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. no vacant allotments are created."</p> <p>This effectively requires all subdivisions in the zone to be undertaken on a "building commitment" basis and would treat a subdivision seeking vacant allotments in the MRZ as a Discretionary Activity.</p> <p>There is significant investment in providing reserves, civil, and roading infrastructure in the construction of a greenfield subdivision. For this reason, not all developers construct housing within their development on finished sections, but instead provide vacant sections to the property market that allow the community to invest in housing of their own choice.</p> <p>There also needs to be an opportunity for a developer to create large 'superlot' sections suitable for comprehensive development. The various types of subdivision development, whether superlot, vacant section or house and land package needs to be able to be catered for within the Proposed District Plan rules.</p> <p>It is considered unreasonable for the MRZ to only allow controlled subdivision activities where they are in conjunction with residential buildings, particularly given the legislation enables 'up to three houses' on a site which also reasonably includes the provision of one (or two) houses on a vacant site. The creation of a vacant section does not warrant a Discretionary Activity status and should be considered on a Controlled Activity status basis.</p> <p>Opposes emphasised wording for subdivision within the MRZ under Rule SUB-R2:</p> <p>"...</p> <p>3(b) For every site without an existing residential unit, either;</p> <p>i. the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site, and that no vacant sites will be created; or</p> <p>..."</p> <p>This specifically requires a land use consent to be applied for and concurrently assessed with a controlled subdivision application in the zone on the basis that land use consents cannot be issued under the RMA for Permitted Activities. This is not an efficient and effective (including cost to the community) consent process, which is meant to be streamlined, more permissive and enabling.</p>	<p>Amend SUB-R2:</p> <p>"Medium Density Residential Zone</p> <p>Where:</p> <p>2. SUB-S1 to SUB18 are met, except where:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3(b)(i). the subdivision application is accompanied by a land use application that will be determined concurrently with the subdivision application that shall demonstrates that it is practicable to construct, as a permitted activity, a residential unit on every site and that no vacant sites will be created; or</p> <p>...</p> <p>3(b)(ii)(3). no vacant allotments are created;</p> <p>..."</p> <p>Requests that a minimum allotment size be required for any new allotment created by subdivision within the Medium Density Residential Zone. This minimum allotment size should be consistent with that included in the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan in Table SUB-1 – Minimum Allotment Sizes and Dimensions.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
59.9	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Zone	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond	Oppose	<p>Opposes the removal of minimum allotment sizes under Rule SUB-S1 and table SUB-1 for the "Medium Density Residential Zone (without qualifying matters)". In the case where a residential unit does not exist on the site, subdivision in the Medium Density Residential Zone to create a vacant allotment will still require a minimum site size to be specified in order to continue to achieve current Canterbury Regional Policy Statement requirements of at least 10 houses per hectare (as a minimum).</p> <p>The proposed minimum of 200m² for the zone has been removed and no minimum site size for the construction of residential units is proposed. This is appropriate with the building commitment model, but is less so when providing some guidance on the minimum size site a house can reasonably be constructed on.</p> <p>Inclusion of minimum site size for vacant site subdivision would maintain existing and future amenity. This would ensure that inappropriate and unanticipated density is avoided and intended amenity outcomes are preserved, especially as the density standards do not provide for urban design discretion to maintain onsite urban amenity. Therefore. the minimum allotment size is important to support best practice.</p>	Not specified
59.10	SWR - Southwest Rangiora	Activity Rules	DEV-SWR-R1	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond	Oppose	<p>Oppose the activity status of Rule DEV-SWR-R1 as a Permitted Activity. Oppose this activity classification on the basis that development is in accordance with an outline development plan and it is typically undertaken at the time of subdivision with road and reserve vesting, and site layout design guided by the outline development plan as a Controlled Activity.</p> <p>A change from Permitted Activity to Controlled Activity status would better align the subdivision amendments requested.</p>	<p>Amend DEV-SWR-R1:</p> <p>Activity status:-PER CON</p> <p>Where:1. development shall be in accordance with DEV-SWR-APP1.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: DIS</p>
59.11	WR - West Rangiora	General	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond	Oppose	<p>- Oppose the inclusion of Fixed outline development plan features that specifically relate to the wider West Rangiora development area which is not being specified as an Existing Development Area.</p> <p>Oppose this on the basis that the location of medium density over the whole site and specific locations for some required features (E.g Oxford Road, Lehman's Road, stormwater corridor to the east, etc) are outside of the outline development plan area and are not relevant to the subject site.</p> <p>- Oppose the inclusion of the Outline Development Plan for West Rangiora in its current form as it creates an inconsistency with the current South West Rangiora Outline Development Plan.</p>	Not specified

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
59.12	SWR - Southwest Rangiora	Appendix	General	Eliot Sinclair - Samuel Hammond	Oppose	Amend DEV-SWR-APP1 Southwest Rangiora ODP.	<p>Amend DEV-SWR-APP1:</p> <p>"Land Use Plan The Outline Development Plan for the South West Rangiora located within Fixed Outline Development Plan Features for the <u>South</u> West Rangiora Development Area: Location of a concentration of medium density residential activity (meaning a minimum ratio of 70% medium density residential zone density and a maximum 30% general residential zone density) immediately adjoining the new north/south road. Location of the local/neighbourhood centre at the juncture of Oxford Road and the north/south road Green link with cycleway adjoining the north/south road Location of stormwater corridor at eastern edge of the West Rangiora Development Area Separated shared pedestrian/cycleway at Johns Road and southern part of new north/south road - Cycleways at Oxford Road, the new north/south road, Johns Road, Lehmans Road and southern flow path - Integrated road connections with 77A Acacia Avenue, Beech Drive, Walnut Way and Sequoia Way. - Flow paths and adjoining green links and cycleways, including any required water body setbacks."</p> <p>The Submitter seek to have the South West Rangiora Outline Development Area included as proposed in Appendix 1 of DEV-SWR-APP1 South West Rangiora Outline Development Plan.</p> <p>The Submitter request that the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan in DEV-WR-APP1 be updated accordingly to be consistent with DEV-SWR-APP1.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
60.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Jo Appleyard - on behalf of Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd	Oppose	<p>Opposes the Rural Lifestyle zoning (RLZ) proposed for several Ohoka properties legally described as Lot 2 & 3 DP 318615, Lot 2 & Part Lot 1 DP 8301, Lot 2 DP 61732, Lot 1 DP 55849, Lot 2 DP55404, Part RS 2220, Lot 1 DP 318615 and Part Lot 1 DP 2267 as indicated in the relevant planning map below (see full submission for map).</p> <p>This land is subject to private plan change 31 (PC31) to the Operative District Plan that proposes an extension of the existing Ohoka settlement. PC31 seeks to rezone the land from Rural to a combination of Residential 3 Zone, Residential 4A Zone, Business 4 Zone and a new Residential 8 Zone, enabling up to 850 households, local services, and either a school or retirement village on the subject land.</p> <p>Also submitted on the Proposed District Plan (PDP) seeking equivalent zones as sought in PC31 of General Residential Zone (GRZ), Large Lot Residential Zone (LLRZ), Local Centre Zone (LCZ), and Open Space Zone (OSZ). The GRZ sought in that submission is a relevant residential zone under the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>Accounting for this, Rural Lifestyle zoning is not appropriate, and the land should be re-zoned according to PC31, including some Medium Density Residential Zoning (MRZ) under Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers the appropriate location for the MRZ sought within the PC31 site are those areas proposed to be rezoned Residential 3 and Residential 8 in PC31 (sought GRZ zoning under its submission on the PDP).</p> <p>Notes the site is not subject to any Qualifying Matters in the proposed Variation.</p>	<p>Amend the planning maps so as to zone the subject land a combination of MDRZ, LLRZ, LCZ, and OSZ as indicated in Appendix 2 (see full submission for map).</p> <p>The nature of this submission is such that relief is sought to enable the equivalent outcomes as sought in the PC31 request, and accordingly, consequential changes may be required to other provisions in the Proposed Variation in order to provide the requested relief.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
61.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Richard and Geoff Spark	Amend	<p>Rezone an area of land (approximately 56ha) located north and south of Boys Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to provide approximately 836 lots. This would be a sustainable and efficient use of resources that better provides for Rangiora's social, economic, environmental well-being than continuation of its increasingly problematic use as a dairy farm. Rezoning will help achieve a compact and efficient urban form. The site is within a preferred business growth direction in the District Development Strategy, however residential growth, or both, is more appropriate. The certification process for providing development capacity is uncertain and slower than rezoning. Variation 1 does not rezone a sufficient area of land for residential to meet predicted demand; thus additional land is needed to avoid impacts on housing affordability. Rezoning the site will add further developers to promote a competitive land market, as required by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD).</p> <p>The part of the site north of Boys Road is within the South East Rangiora Development Area and is a Future Development Area, thus needs to be rezoned urgently to give effect to Policy 12 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).</p> <p>The part of the site south of Boys Road, to the west of the Eastern Bypass between Boys and Marsh Roads will become isolated and thus difficult to farm so should be rezoned for residential, or BIZ, or large format/mixed use (or a mix). Rezoning this area is provided for in the NPS-UD as it provides significant development capacity, ensures there is 'at least' sufficient capacity to meet housing needs, and contributes to a well-functioning urban environment.</p> <p>This submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought.</p>	Rezone all land north and south of Boys Road outlined in red on Figure 1 below (refer to full submission for Figure 1) ('the site') the Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ). With respect to the land south of Boys Road and west of the eastern bypass, in the alternative, rezone to MDRZ, BIZ, Format Retail/Mixed Use, or a mix. The site is part of the Spark dairy farm, located at 197 Boys Rd, Rangiora. The land north of Boys Road is contained in four titles (19 Spark Lane - Lot 2 DP 418207, Lot 3 DP 418207, Part Rural Section 1436, and 234 Boys Rd - Lot 1 DP 22100). It includes the Rossburn Events Centre and Northbrook Museum at 17 Spark Lane (Lot 1 DP 418207). Land south of Boys Road (approximately 30 ha) is part of the larger Sparks farm title (Lots 1, 3 DP 418207 Lot 1 DP 80780 Lot 1 DP 80781 RURAL SECS 1883 1884 2452 2512 PT RURAL SECS 316 358A 387 1436 1438 BLK VII XI RANGIORA SD 1) (refer to figure 2 of the full submission for map of Spark farm).

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
61.2	SER - South East Rangiora	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Richard and Geoff Spark	Amend	<p>Supports South East Rangiora Development Area (DEV-SER) in principle, however considers references to the feasibility of development within the DEV-SER narrative are inappropriate and should be removed as nearby developments have been successful with similar ground conditions, and market prices also affect feasibility.</p> <p>Opposes the certification process given its uncertainty, highly discretionary nature, lack of applicant objection or appeal rights, and potential lack of transparent documentation of its decision-making process. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty. Council needs to meet its requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) of providing sufficient development capacity that is zoned and infrastructure ready to meet housing demand for the medium term; certification will not achieve this. Concerned that certification lapses if a Section 224(c) (Resource Management Act 1991) subdivision completion certification is not granted within three years of certification. Rezoning would only occur when the entire development area is rezoned, which may not be within the life of the Proposed District Plan. Concerned that the ability to meet the subdivision 'completion' requirement by completing a smaller subdivision is not suitable as the subdivision would be hardly underway, yet services would be allocated to potentially a significant area indefinitely, which may prejudice other subdividers if there are capacity constraints. Considers there is a lack of clarity about how services will be allocated between different certification applicants.</p> <p>This aligns with the submitter's request to rezone an area of land (approximately 56ha) located north and south of Boys Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to provide approximately 836 lots, which is needed to help provide sufficient development capacity for residential development to meet anticipated demand, and therefore help meet the requirements of the CRPS and NPS-UD.</p> <p>Notes this submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought.</p>	<p>Amend the South East Rangiora Outline Development Plan and associated narrative to identify all residential areas as Medium Density Residential; and give effect to the other amendments to the South East Rangiora Outline Development Plan sought in the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan shown in Figure 3 (refer to full submission for Figure 3).</p> <p>Delete the certification process, or in the less preferred alternative amend to ensure that it is a lawful, fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters than can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and addresses any other future concerns.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
61.3	General	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Richard and Geoff Spark		<p>Opposes the certification process given its uncertainty, highly discretionary nature, lack of applicant objection or appeal rights, and potential lack of transparent documentation of its decision-making process. Considers Council must instead rezone land to address the shortfall in housing supply quickly and with certainty. Council needs to meet its requirements under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) of providing sufficient development capacity that is zoned and infrastructure ready to meet housing demand for the medium term; certification will not achieve this. Concerned that certification lapses if a Section 224(c) (Resource Management Act 1991) subdivision completion certification is not granted within three years of certification. Rezoning would only occur when the entire development area is rezoned, which may not be within the life of the Proposed District Plan. Concerned that the ability to meet the subdivision 'completion' requirement by completing a smaller subdivision is not suitable as the subdivision would be hardly underway, yet services would be allocated to potentially a significant area indefinitely, which may prejudice other subdividers if there are capacity constraints. Considers there is a lack of clarity about how services will be allocated between different certification applicants.</p> <p>This aligns with the submitters request to rezone an area of land (approximately 56ha) located north and south of Boys Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone to provide approximately 836 lots, which is needed to help provide sufficient development capacity for residential development to meet anticipated demand, and therefore help meet the requirements of the CRPS and NPS-UD.</p> <p>Notes this submission should be read alongside the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan, except where this submission provides an update to the relief sought.</p>	Delete the certification process, or as a less preferred alternative amend the certification process to ensure that is a lawful, fair, equitable, transparent, appealable, efficient and fast process for delivering land for housing and does not duplicate matters than can be dealt with at subdivision stage; and addresses any other future concerns.
61.4	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-023	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Richard and Geoff Spark	Amend	Amend SD-03 to enable the submitter's request to rezone for residential development an area of land located north and south of Boys Road, Rangiora that adjoins a Future Development Area as this is consistent with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development's requirement of ensuring there is 'at least' sufficient capacity to meet housing needs.	<p>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-01 ..."</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
62.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Rick Allaway and Lionel Larsen	Amend	<p>Rezone 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora (Lot 2 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 328154, Lot 2 DP 328154, Lot 3 DP 328154, Lot 4 DP 328154, Lot 5 DP 328154, Lot 6 DP 328154, Lot 7 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 83612, Lot 7 DP 83612, Lot 6 DP 83612, and Lot 5 DP 83612 respectively) ('the site') from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential – Specific Control Area Density 2, with a minimum net site area 1000m² and minimum average net site area 1500m² (or similar); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential (LLR); or a mixed density residential zone which enables a wide range of residential lot sizes from MDRZ to LLRZ sizes.</p> <p>The site adjoins an urban area and its development will help achieve a compact, efficient, and connective urban form. This mix of densities will provide for varying needs, and is therefore consistent with the requirement of National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) to enable housing variety. The rezoning is consistent with the NPS-UD provision for plan changes that add significant additional development capacity and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment. The total area of land rezoned by Variation 1 is inconsistent with NPS-UD requirements - as the yield is insufficient to meet Rangiora's housing needs in both the short and medium term; and it favours just two developers thus would not promote a competitive market.</p> <p>Notes that except where this submission provides an update the relief sought, this submission should be read subject to the submitter's submission on the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Rezone 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora (Lot 2 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 328154, Lot 2 DP 328154, Lot 3 DP 328154, Lot 4 DP 328154, Lot 5 DP 328154, Lot 6 DP 328154, Lot 7 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 83612, Lot 7 DP 83612, Lot 6 DP 83612, and Lot 5 DP 83612 respectively) from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential – Specific Control Area Density 2, with a minimum net site area 1000m ² and minimum average net site area 1500m ² (or similar); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential (LLR); or a mixed density residential zone which enables a wide range of residential lot sizes from MDRZ to LLRZ sizes.
62.2	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-O23	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Rick Allaway and Lionel Larsen		Amend SD-O3 to help enable the submitter's request to rezone 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora to Medium Density Residential Zone, or a mix of residential density zones.	Amend SD-O3: "Urban development and infrastructure that: ... 6. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to <u>as a minimum</u> achieve the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1 "
62.3	WR - West Rangiora	General	General	Aston Consultants Ltd - Fiona Aston - on behalf of Rick Allaway and Lionel Larsen	Amend	Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan to include 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora as Medium Density Residential or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential – Specific Control Area Density 2, with a minimum net site area 1000m ² and minimum average net site area 1500m ² (or similar); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential (LLR); or a mixed density residential zone which enables a wide range of residential lot sizes from MDRZ to LLRZ sizes.	Amend the West Rangiora Outline Development Plan (ODP) to include 181, 201, 255, 257, 259, 261, 263, 265, 267, 271, 285, 305, 311, and 315 Lehmans Rd, Rangiora (Lot 2 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 83770, Lot 1 DP 328154, Lot 2 DP 328154, Lot 3 DP 328154, Lot 4 DP 328154, Lot 5 DP 328154, Lot 6 DP 328154, Lot 7 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 328154, Lot 8 DP 83612, Lot 7 DP 83612, Lot 6 DP 83612, and Lot 5 DP 83612 respectively) as Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential – Specific Control Area Density 2, with a minimum net site area 1000m ² and minimum average net site area 1500m ² (or similar); or a mix of MDRZ and Large Lot Residential (LLR); or a mixed density residential zone which enables a wide range of residential lot sizes from MDRZ to LLRZ sizes.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
63.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Stuart Allan	Amend	Concerned that 249 Coldstream Road, Rangiora would not adjoin any Rural Lifestyle Zone land, and any adjoining medium density residential developments could affect the site's rural lifestyle activities.	Rezone 249 Coldstream Road, Rangiora from Rural Lifestyle Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone.
64.1	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	General	Environment Canterbury Regional Council - Jeff Smith	Amend	<p>Support the inclusion of natural hazards as a qualifying matter under Variation 1 to the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan. However, concerned regarding the density of development provided for within the areas subject to high hazard risk within Kaiapoi. Note that the qualifying matter for Kaiapoi Area A provides for a minimum allotment area of 200m². While Policy 11.3.1 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) provides for development within existing residential areas that may be subject to high hazard risk (provided that the risk is appropriately mitigated), it is considered it would be more appropriate to avoid further intensification in these areas that are subject to high hazard risk (ie. within the High Hazard Flooding Overlay).</p> <p>Appropriately mitigating high hazard risk in these areas will be a difficult process to undertake and assess through the district plan. It could lead to unforeseen consequences on the surrounding areas due to the nature of mitigation that would likely be required. This could be on amenity effects (raised floor levels) and offsite flood displacement.</p> <p>Support inclusion of the operative airport noise contour (specifically 50 dBA) as a qualifying matter in the proposed Waimakariri District Plan as part of Variation 1 and consider this gives effect to Policy 6.3.5 of the CRPS.</p>	<p>Request that the Council quantifies the potential number of new dwellings that could be located in high hazard areas and considers the effects that this will have on increasing the risk from a high hazard flood event. Retain the minimum allotment size for sites within Kaiapoi Area A (and in any other areas) that are affected by the High Hazard Flood Overlay, as was notified in the Proposed District Plan. Further assess these provisions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness, to determine whether what is proposed is the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives under section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>Retain the operative airport noise contour (specifically 50 dBA) as a qualifying matter.</p>
64.2	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Natural	Environment Canterbury Regional Council - Jeff Smith	Amend	<p>Support the inclusion of natural hazards as a qualifying matter under Variation 1 to the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan. However, concerned regarding the density of development provided for within the areas subject to high hazard risk within Kaiapoi. Note that the qualifying matter for Kaiapoi Area A provides for a minimum allotment area of 200m². While Policy 11.3.1 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) provides for development within existing residential areas that may be subject to high hazard risk (provided that the risk is appropriately mitigated), it is considered it would be more appropriate to avoid further intensification in these areas that are subject to high hazard risk (i.e. within the High Hazard Flooding Overlay). Appropriately mitigating high hazard risk in these areas will be a difficult process to undertake and assess through the district plan. It could lead to unforeseen consequences on the surrounding areas due to the nature of mitigation that would likely be required. This could be on amenity effects (raised floor levels) and offsite flood displacement.</p>	<p>Request that Council quantifies the potential number of new dwellings that could be located in high hazard areas and considers the effects that this will have on increasing the risk from a high hazard flood event. Retain the minimum allotment size for sites within Kaiapoi Area A (and in any other areas) that are affected by the High Hazard Flood Overlay, as was notified in the Proposed District Plan. Further assess these provisions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness, to determine whether what is proposed is the most appropriate way of achieving the objectives under section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
64.3	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Airport	Environment Canterbury Regional Council - Jeff Smith	Support	Support inclusion of the operative airport noise contour (specifically 50 dBA) as a qualifying matter in the Proposed District Plan as part of Variation 1 and consider this gives effect to Policy 6.3.5 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.	Retain the operative airport noise contour (specifically 50 dBA) as a qualifying matter.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
65.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Inovo Projects Ltd - Max Stevenson - on behalf of Williams Waimak Ltd	Amend	Rezoned the northern portion of 12 Williams St, Kaiapoi from General Industrial Zone (GIZ) to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) so the entire site is MDRZ. This is a more cohesive and efficient use of this largely vacant land adjoining a residential environment, rather than retrospective infill development. This rezoning would benefit residents of the MDRZ properties adjoining the west of the site as they would no longer be adjacent to industrial activities thus reducing the potential for reverse sensitivity. Courtenay Drive and Stone Street will provide a buffer between the MDRZ and adjoining GIZ. The rezoning would allow for additional housing to help alleviate the housing crisis. The current GIZ boundary line goes through existing buildings which could create boundary issues. In terms of Section 32 considerations, the rezoning would be a more efficient and effective method of providing for medium density housing, rather than a non-complying resource consent process.	Rezoned the northern portion of 12 Williams St, Kaiapoi from General Industrial Zone to Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) so the entire site is MDRZ.
66.1	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Airport	Emma Davey	Amend	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.	Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. Some of the main conditions are: Subdivision resource consent RC215144 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 AI 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.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
							Land use resource consent RC215145 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.
67.1	General	General	Airport	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	<p>Variation 1 needs to adequately address the critical need for retirement accommodation and aged care in the District. New Zealand, including Waimakariri District, has a rapidly increasing ageing population and longer life expectancy and there is a growing trend of people wishing to live in retirement villages. The ageing population is recognised in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) as one of the key housing and urban development challenges facing New Zealand.</p> <p>The retirement village industry provides appropriate accommodation to address the specific needs of the older population, including a range of large and smaller scaled retirement villages and aged care homes with differing services, amenities and care. This variety enables differing price points and options, which are vital to enabling choices for the growing ageing population. Retirement villages also combat isolation and loneliness felt by many older people. Appropriately planning for the ageing population will impact on the mental and physical health and wellbeing of some of society's most vulnerable members.</p> <p>What Variation 1 must deliver for retirement villages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better enable housing and care for the ageing population to promote the wellbeing of older persons within our communities. This requires district plans to better enable the construction of new retirement villages instead of cumbersome and uncertain resource management processes. - Recognise that retirement villages are a residential activity as they provide permanent homes for the residents that live there. In line with the Enabling Housing Act, the construction of retirement villages (being four or more residential units on a site) can be regulated as a restricted discretionary activity. - Provide for retirement villages in the Medium Density Residential Zone to enable older people to stay within the communities in which they currently live. - Provide for change to the character and amenity of existing urban environments to enable retirement villages, in accordance with the NPS-UD. 	<p>Seeks that Variation 1 is amended to provide a retirement-village specific framework as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The MDRS must be accurately translated into the Proposed Plan. Seek some amendments to the MDRS to ensure they are workable for retirement villages. Seek amendments to other provisions to ensure there is no conflict, overlap or inconsistency with the MDRS. - The objectives and policies of the Plan must enable appropriate accommodation and care for the aging population. - Rules to enable retirement villages in the Medium Density Residential Zone. - Tailored matters of discretion for retirement villages. - Proportionate notification. - Clear, targeted and appropriate development standards. - Providing for retirement villages in commercial, mixed use and other zones. <p>Any alternative or consequential relief to address the matters addressed in this submission.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
						<p>- recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites. Given large sites in urban areas are a rare resource, it is important they are developed efficiently to maximise the benefits from their development.</p> <p>- Recognise the unique internal amenity needs of retirement villages compared to typical residential housing.</p> <p>- Provide clear and focused matters of discretion to avoid significant cost and time delays in consenting retirement villages in residential zones.</p> <p>- Provide appropriately focused notification rules. Given the significant costs associated with notification, it should only be required where it will benefit the decision-making process.</p> <p>- Use the MDRS as a guideline. The retirement village-specific framework sought in this submission takes a similar approach to the Enabling Housing Act (given that retirement villages are a form of development with four or more residential units) with the standards informing matters of discretion and limited notification presumptions. With some amendments to reflect the specific nature of retirement villages, the submitter considers the MDRS set a relevant baseline for identifying standards relevant for the construction of retirement villages.</p> <p>- Provide for retirement villages in commercial and mixed use zones. Due to the lack of suitable sites in existing residential areas and the need to respond to the retirement living and care crisis, retirement villages also operate in some commercial and mixed use zones where there is good access to services and amenities.</p> <p>Seeks amendments to Variation 1 to provide a retirement-village specific framework to address the above issues.</p>	

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.2	General	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Considers that a 'retirement unit' definition is required to acknowledge the differences from typical residential activities in terms of layout and amenity needs.	Add a new definition for 'retirement unit' : <u>"Retirement Unit means any unit within a retirement village that is used or designed to be used for a residential activity (whether or not it includes cooking, bathing, and toilet facilities). A retirement unit is not a residential unit."</u>
67.3	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-O2	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports SD-O2 as it aligns with Objective 1 of the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Retain SD-O2 as notified.
67.4	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-O23	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Considers that SD-O3 should recognise and enable the housing and care needs of an ageing population and the specific housing typologies catering to older persons results in.	Amend SD-O3.2 to recognise that existing character and amenity values are anticipated to change. Retain SD-O3.4 but amend to specifically recognise the importance of retirement villages. Amend SD-O3.5 to recognise that retirement villages need to be located in all residential zones, not just in the vicinity of centres.
67.5	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Paragraph 3 of the introduction states that <i>'the key difference between the General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone is housing density, with the latter located within walkable distance to town centres, schools, open space and transport routes'</i> . Noting that the General Residential Zone applies to Oxford only (in accordance with clause (b)(ii) of the 'relevant residential zone' definition of the Act), this explanation does not align with the proposed variations to the General Residential Zone and Medium Density Residential Zone.	Seeks that paragraph 3 of the General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones Chapter be updated to explain the key difference between the General Residential Zone and the Medium Density Residential Zone.
67.6	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Considers that RESZ-O3 conflicts with the Medium Density Residential Standards, in that it seeks to manage the form, scale and design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Seeks that RESZ-O3 not apply to the Medium Density Residential Zone.
67.7	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	Policies	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	In addition to the current general objectives for all residential zones, an ageing population specific objective must be integrated that recognises and enables the housing and care needs of the ageing population.	Add a new objective in the General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones Chapter that provides for the housing and care needs of the ageing population. <u>RESZ-OX Ageing population</u> <u>Recognise and enable the housing and care needs of the ageing population.</u>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.8	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	Policies	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Considers that RESZ-P1 conflicts with the Medium Density Residential Standards, in that it seeks to manage the design of development in a manner that is inconsistent with the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act.	Seeks that RESZ-P1 not apply to the Medium Density Residential Zone.
67.9	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	Policies	RESZ-P3	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Acknowledges that RESZ-P3 has been amended to address Policy 3 of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). However, the language from Policy 3 of the MDRS has been added to Policy RESZ-P3 without amendments to the language to reflect the direction provided in the Enabling Housing Act. This creates overlap and inconsistency between the existing language in (1) and (2) and the new language in (3).	Delete or amend RESZ-P3 to ensure there is no overlap or inconsistency with Policy 3 of the MDRS.
67.10	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	Policies	RESZ-P8	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of	Oppose	Acknowledges that RESZ-P8 has been amended to address Policy 4 of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). However, the existing language within Policy RESZ-P8 is inconsistent with Policy 1 of the MDRS. Further, Policy 4 of the MDRS is not a qualification on the direction to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.	Delete or amend RESZ-P8 to ensure there is no overlap or inconsistency with Policy 1 of the MDRS and ensure Policy 4 is not a qualification.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.11	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	Policies	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	The retention of RESZ-P10 and its continued application to retirement villages within the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) creates a conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and the relief sought in relation to MRZ-R18. It is therefore not fit for purpose as a general policy and should be deleted or moved to the General Residential Zone policies. Additional policies are needed to provide policy support for MRZ-R18 and the retirement village-specific matters of discretion sought in this submission.	<p>Delete RESZ-P10 or relocate to the General Residential Zone, and new policies for the Medium Density Residential Zone:</p> <p>Provision of housing for an ageing population</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Provide for a diverse range of housing and care options that are suitable for the particular needs and characteristics of older persons in [add] zone, such as retirement villages. 2. Recognise the functional and operational needs of retirement villages, including that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. May require greater density than the planned urban built character to enable efficient provision of services. b. Have unique layout and internal amenity needs to cater for the requirements of residents as they age. <p>Changing communities</p> <p>To provide for the diverse and changing residential needs of communities, recognise that the existing character and amenity of the [add] zone will change over time to enable a variety of housing types with a mix of densities.</p> <p>Larger sites</p> <p>Recognise the intensification opportunities provided by larger sites within the [add] zone by providing for more efficient use of those sites.</p>
67.12	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	Policies	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports RESZ-P15 as it aligns with Policy 2 of the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Retain RESZ-P15 as notified.
67.13	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Introduction	The	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Paragraph 1 of the introduction refers to the zone comprising of "residential areas predominantly used for residential activity with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings...". The reference to residential activity having a moderate concentration and bulk of buildings does not reflect the expectations for the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) as set out in the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). The introductory text should acknowledge that the amenity and character of the MRZ will substantially change as a result of the MDRS. It should also acknowledge the broad scope of the MRZ.	<p>Amend paragraph 1 of the Medium Density Residential Zone Chapter to provide clarity around the level of residential activity anticipated in the zone:</p> <p>"Introduction</p> <p>The purpose of the Medium Density Residential Zone is to provide for residential areas predominantly used for residential activity <u>and enables medium density development, including with moderate concentration and bulk of buildings, such as</u> detached, semidetached and terrace housing, low rise apartments and other compatible activities. Such areas are identified close to town and neighbourhood centres, along public transport corridors, or close to public transports.</p> <p>..."</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.14	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Objectives	MRZ–01	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-01 as it aligns with Objective 2 of the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Retain MRZ-01 as notified.
67.15	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Policies	MRZ-P1	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-P1 as it aligns with Policy 1 of the Medium Density residential Standards.	Retain MRZ-P1 as notified.
67.16	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Policies	MRZ-P2	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-P2 as it aligns with Policy 5 of the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Retain MRZ-P2 as notified.
67.17	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Policies	MRZ-P13	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Opposes MRZ-P3 as it has not been amended to align with the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS). The use of the word “maintain” does not acknowledge the change that is anticipated in the Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) in line with the MDRS, and there should not be an expectation to maintain character in the MRZ.</p> <p>MRZ-P3(1) – (8) also introduce requirements that overlap and conflict with MRZ-P1 and P2. For example, (3) requires activities to “provide for” high quality building and landscape design, which overlaps and conflicts with the reference to “encouraging” high-quality developments in MRZ-P2.</p>	Delete or amend MRZ-P3 to ensure there is no overlap or inconsistency with Policy 3 of the Medium Density Residential Standards.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.18	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Policies	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of	Support	Considers that it is appropriate for the Medium Density Residential Standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments.	Insert new policy in the Medium Density Residential Zone Chapter. "MRZ-PX Role of density standards Enable the density standards to be utilised as a baseline for the assessment of the effects of developments."
67.19	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Supports MRZ-R1. However, the construction of retirement villages will likely be a restricted discretionary activity under this rule. Retirement villages should be a permitted activity, and that it should only be the construction of a retirement village that is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity. The matters of discretion should provide for the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities, including providing for the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village. Internal amenity standards applicable to retirement villages should be limited to those controls/standards necessary or appropriate for retirement villages.	Amend MRZ-R1 to exclude retirement villages and include a bespoke rule for the construction of retirement villages with a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities: <u>"MRZ-R1A Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure for a retirement village</u> <u>Activity status: PER</u> <u>Where:</u> <u>1. the activity complies with MRZ-BFS1-12 (as applicable).</u> <u>Legal Effect</u> <u>This rule will have immediate legal effect.</u> <u>Activity status when compliance is not achieved: RDIS</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>RES-MDX – Construction of buildings for a retirement village</u> <u>Notification</u> <u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly notified.</u> <u>An application for resource consent for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule that complies with MRZ-BFS2, MRZ-BFS4, MRZ-BFS5, and MRZ-BFS7 is precluded from being limited notified."</u>
67.20	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Activity Rules	MRZ-R198	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Amend	Supports the inclusion of a specific rule for the establishment of retirement villages, and that resource consent applications are precluded from being publicly notified. However, retirement villages as a land use activity should be classified as a permitted activity - with the construction/establishment of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity. In this regard, the residential use component of a retirement village should be permitted. Consider that the requirement for a design statement and the retention of matters of discretion regarding residential design principles to be inappropriate as those provisions are designed for standard residential development, not retirement villages. The residential design principles also do not align with the expectations for the Medium Density Residential Zone. Retirement villages should be assessed against bespoke matters of discretion.	Seeks to amend the activity status of retirement villages as an activity to be provided for as a permitted activity, with the construction of retirement villages provided for as a restricted discretionary activity (retirement village specific matters of discretion) as set out in relation to MRZ-R1. Delete the requirement for a design statement to be provided with the application. Amend MRZ-R18 to provide for retirement villages as an activity to be permitted.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.21	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS1	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Supports in part MRZ-BFS1 and the number of residential units per site provisions which reflect the number of residential units per site standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS), with some additions/alternatives relating to qualifying matters. However, amend to refer to “retirement units” with the addition of the definition proposed.</p> <p>In relation to the notification clauses of MRZ-BFS1 which relate to compliance with MRZ-BFS2 to MRZBFS12, considers that the inclusion of additional standards within the notification clause to those provided by the Resource Management Act 1991 (relating to landscaped permeable surface, street interface, and fencing) create a conflict with the MDRS and should be deleted.</p>	<p>Amend MRZ-BFS1 to refer to retirement units.</p> <p>Delete those standards that have been included in the notification clauses that conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards:</p> <p>"MRZ-BFS1 Number of residential units per site</p> <p>...</p> <p>Notification</p> <p>An application for the construction and use of 1, 2 or 3 residential units that does not comply with 1 or more of MRZ-BFS2, <u>3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12</u>MRZ-BFS4, MRZBFS5, MRZ-BFS7, MRZ-BFS9, MRZ-BFS10, MRZ-BFS11 or MRZ-BFS12 is precluded from being publicly notified.</p> <p>Legal Effect</p> <p>This standard has immediate legal effect.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS</p> <p>...</p> <p>Notification</p> <p>An application for the construction and use of 4 or more residential units that does comply with the MRZBFS2, <u>3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12</u> MRZ-BFS4, MRZ-BFS5, MRZ-BFS7, MRZ-BFS9, MRZ-BFS10, MRZ-BFS11 or MRZ-BFS12 is precluded from being publicly or limited notified."</p>
67.22	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS2	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS2 and the building coverage provisions which reflects the Medium Density Residential Standards.	Retain MRZ-BFS2 as notified.
67.23	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Opposes MRZ-BFS3 as the Medium Density Residential Standards do not include this standard.</p> <p>In particular, considers that that the discretionary status for non-compliance with this standard is inconsistent with the other built form standard provisions of the Medium Density Residential Zone and goes against the Resource Management Act's purpose to enable increased intensification. For example, if a residential development were to comply with all built form standards except MRZ-BFS3 (landscape permeable surface), the activity status would be discretionary.</p>	Delete MRZ-BFS3.
67.24	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-BFS4 in part as it is considered that the discretionary activity status for any exceedance is contrary to Schedule 3A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	<p>Amend the activity status for noncompliance with MRZ-BFS4 to be restricted, in accordance with the requirements of Schedule 3A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991:</p> <p>"MRZ-BFS4 Height</p> <p>...</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</p> <p>RDIS</p> <p><u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u></p> <p><u>The effects of the breach of the height standard"</u></p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.25	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Oppose MRZ-BFS5 as it seeks to restrict the provision of residential buildings adjacent to strategic or arterial roads by applying a 6m setback in excess of the Medium Density Residential Standards, when all such roads are not considered to be qualifying matters in accordance with section 771 of the Enabling Housing Act. Opposes the application of residential design principles as a matter of discretion.	Amend MRZS-BFS5 so that it only applies to nationally significant infrastructure, and the matters of discretion only relate to the effects of the breach of the standard: "Matters of discretion are restricted to: RES-MD2 – Residential design principles RES-MD5 - Impact on neighbouring property"
67.26	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS6	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-BFS6 as the Medium Density Residential Standards does not include this standard.	Delete MRZ-BFS6.
67.27	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS7	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS7 in principle as it reflects the Medium Density Residential Standards. However, it is considered that additional exclusions should be integrated with the standard to reflect that some developments may occur adjacent to less sensitive zones. Opposes the application of residential design principles as a matter of discretion.	Amend MRZ-BFS7 to include additional exclusions from the standard: "MRZ-BFS7 Height in relation to boundary ... This standard does not apply to a. a boundary with a road b. existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site c. site boundaries where there is an existing common wall between 2 buildings on adjacent sties or where a common wall is proposed <u>d. boundaries adjoining open space and recreation zones, commercial and mixed use zones, and special purpose zones.</u> Matters of discretion are restricted to: RES-MD2 – Residential design principles RES-MD5 - Impact on neighbouring property"
67.28	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS8	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes MRZ-BFS8 as the Medium Density Residential Standards do not include this standard.	Delete MRZ-BFS8.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.29	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS9	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Acknowledges that MRZ-BFS9 and the outdoor living space provisions reflect the outdoor living space standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards. However, it is considered that as a result of retirement villages providing a range of private and communal outdoor areas, amendments should be made to MRZ-BFS9 that enable the communal areas to count towards the amenity standard.	Amend MRZ-BFS9 to enable the communal outdoor living spaces of retirement villages to count towards the amenity standard: "MRZ-BFS9 Outdoor living space (per unit) ... 3. For retirement units, clause 1 and 2 apply with the following modifications: a. the outdoor living space may be in whole or in part grouped cumulatively in 1 or more communally accessible location(s) and/or located directly adjacent to each retirement unit; and b. a retirement village may provide indoor living spaces in one or more communally accessible locations in lieu of up to 50% of the required outdoor living space."
67.30	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS10	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS10 and the outlook space provisions in principle which reflect the outlook space standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards, however consider that in a retirement village environment (that has multiple communal spaces available for residents), the standard is not directly relevant. Amendments should be made to MRZ-BFS10 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages.	Amend MRZ-BFS10 to provide for outlook space requirements that are appropriate for retirement villages: "MRZ-BFS10 Outlook space (per unit) ... 7. For retirement units, clauses 1 – 9 apply with the following modification: The minimum dimensions for a required outlook space are 1 metre in depth and 1 metre in width for a principal living room and all other habitable rooms."
67.31	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS-11	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS11 and the windows to street provisions in principle which reflect the windows to street standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards, however consider that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units.	Amend MRZ-BFS11 to provide for retirement units: "MRZ-BFS11 Windows to street 1. Any residential unit or retirement unit facing the a public street must have a minimum of 20% of the street-facing façade in glazing. This can be in the form of windows or doors. ..."
67.32	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS12	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	Supports MRZ-BFS12 and the landscaped area provisions in principle which reflect the landscaped area standard of the Medium Density Residential Standards. However, it is considered that the standard should be amended to provide for retirement units also.	Amend MRZ-BFS12 to provide for retirement units: "MRZ-BFS12 Landscaped area 1. A residential unit or retirement unit at ground floor level must have a landscaped area of a minimum of 20% of a developed site with grass or plants, and can include the canopy of trees regardless of the ground treatment below them. 2. The landscaped area may be located on any part of the development site, and does not need to be associated with each residential unit or retirement unit."

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.33	RESZ - Matters of Discretion for all Residential Zones	Matters of Discretion for all Residential Zones	RES-MD2	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of	Oppose	Opposes the residential design principles of RES-MD2 – as they seek design outcomes which are inconsistent with the expectations for development in the Medium Density Residential Zone. Further, the residential design principles reflect matters relevant to standard residential development but are not fit-for-purpose for retirement villages.	Delete RES-MD2.
67.34	RESZ - Matters of Discretion for all Residential Zones	Matters of Discretion for all Residential Zones	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Opposes RES-MD5 relating to potential impacts on neighbouring properties as it seeks outcomes which are inconsistent with the expectations for development in the Medium Density Residential Zone. For example, the requirement to consider the “extent to which ... buildings ... do not compromise the amenity values of adjacent properties” is inconsistent with the change anticipated in the Medium Density Residential Zone.	Delete RES-MD5.
67.35	RESZ - Matters of Discretion for all Residential Zones	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	In accordance with the response to MRZ-R1 and MRZ-R18, a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion should apply to the construction of retirement villages.	<p>In accordance with the relief sought for MRZ-R1 and MRZ-R18, seeks for the following matter of discretion to be integrated into the matters of discretion for all Residential Zones under the District Plan:</p> <p><u>"RES-MDX Construction of buildings for a retirement village</u> <u>1. The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards;</u> <u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> <u>5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider:</u> <u>a. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> <u>b. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>6. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village save as specified."</u></p>
67.36	NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	<p>Considers NCZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>The activity of a retirement village should be a permitted activity and the construction of a retirement village should be a restricted discretionary activity, and the construction of retirement villages should have a focused matters of discretion (so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities).</p> <p>The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to appropriately provide for / support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>	Seeks that the Neighbourhood Centre Zone is amended to provide a permitted activity for retirement villages and a restricted discretionary activity for the construction or alternation of retirement village buildings, as per the submissions on the Medium Density Residential Zone.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.37	NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone	Built Form Standards	NCZ-BFS1	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand	Oppose	A number of the standards in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are inconsistent with the Medium Density Resident Standards (MDRS). Although the Resource Management Act 1991 only requires the MDRS to be applied in relevant residential zones, considers that, to give effect to Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, standards applying in centres zones should not be more restrictive.	Amend the Neighbourhood Centre Zone standards as they apply to residential activities (including retirement villages) to achieve consistency with the Medium Density Residential Standards.
67.38	NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone	Built Form Standards	NCZ-BFS2 Height	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	A number of the standards in the Neighbourhood Centre Zone are inconsistent with the Medium Density Resident Standards (MDRS). Although the Resource Management Act 1991 only requires the MDRS to be applied in relevant residential zones, considers that, to give effect to Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, standards applying in centres zones should not be more restrictive.	Amend the Neighbourhood Centre Zone standards as they apply to residential activities (including retirement villages) to achieve consistency with the Medium Density Residential Standards.
67.39	NCZ - Neighbourhood Centre Zone	Built Form Standards	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Oppose	Neighbourhood Centre Zone BFS3 – BFS11 are inconsistent with the Medium Density Resident Standards (MDRS). Although the Resource Management Act 1991 only requires the MDRS to be applied in relevant residential zones, considers that, to give effect to Policy 3 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development, standards applying in centres zones should not be more restrictive.	Amend the Neighbourhood Centre Zone standards as they apply to residential activities (including retirement villages) to achieve consistency with the Medium Density Residential Standards.
67.40	LCZ - Local Centre Zone	General	RES-MD2	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers LCZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Supports LCZ-R1 and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant built form standards and gross floor area standard; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant standards.</p> <p>The construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>	<p>Amend LCZ-R1 to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</p> <p>"LCZ-R1 Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure Activity status: PER Where: 1. the activity complies with: a. all built form standards (as applicable); and b. the building or addition is less than 450m² GFA. 2. the activity is not a retirement village.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved with LCZ-R1(1)(a): as set out in the relevant built form standards Activity status when compliance not achieved with LCZ-R1(1)(b): RDIS</p> <p>Matters of discretion are restricted to: CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design</p> <p><u>Activity status when compliance not achieved with LCZ-R1(2): RDIS</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards (as applicable)</u> <u>CMUZ-MDX – Construction of buildings for a retirement village</u> <u>CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design</u> <u>CMUZ-MD11 – Residential development"</u></p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.41	LCZ - Local Centre Zone	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers LCZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers that the Local Centre Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), as the Enabling Housing Act provides for intensification in non-residential zones. This will recognise that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>	<p>Insert new rule in the Local Centre Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities.</p> <p><u>"LCZ-RX Retirement village</u> <u>Activity status: PER</u> <u>Activity status when compliance not achieved:</u> <u>N/A"</u></p>
67.42	MUZ - Mixed Use Zone	General	RES-MD2	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers MUZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Supports MUZ-R1 and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant built form standards and gross floor area standard; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant standards.</p> <p>The construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>	<p>Amend MUZ-R1 to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</p> <p>"MUZ-R1 Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure Activity status: PERWhere: 1. the activity complies with: a. all built form standards (as applicable); and b. the building or addition is less than 450m² GFA. <u>2. the activity is not a retirement village.</u></p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved with MUZ-R1(1)(a): as set out in the relevant built form standards Activity status when compliance not achieved with MUZ-R1(1)(b): RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design</p> <p><u>Activity status when compliance not achieved with MUZ-R1(2): RDIS</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards (as applicable)</u> <u>CMUZ-MDX – Construction of buildings for a retirement village</u> <u>CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design</u> <u>CMUZ-MD11 – Residential development"</u></p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.43	MUZ - Mixed Use Zone	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers the Mixed Use Zone is in conflict with the Medium Density residential Standards and needs to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers that the Mixed Use Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), as the Enabling Housing Act provides for intensification in non-residential zones. This will recognise that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>	<p>Insert new rule in the Mixed Use Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities.</p> <p><u>"MUZ-RX Retirement village</u> <u>Activity status: PER</u> <u>Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A"</u></p>
67.44	TCZ - Town Centre Zone	General	RES-MD2	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers TCZ-R1 and the related built form standards are in conflict with the Medium Density residential Standards and need to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Supports TCZ-R1 and the permitting of the construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure when complying with the relevant built form standards and gross floor area standard; and the triggering of more restrictive activity statuses based on non-compliance with relevant standards.</p> <p>The construction of retirement villages should have their own set of focused matters of discretion to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities.</p> <p>The matters of discretion applicable to retirement villages need to support the efficient use of larger sites for retirement villages, and the functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</p>	<p>Amend TCZ-R1 to include a set of focused matters of discretion that are applicable to retirement villages, so to provide for and acknowledge the differences that retirement villages have from other residential activities:</p> <p>"TCZ-R1 Construction or alteration of or addition to any building or other structure Activity status: PER Where: 1. the activity complies with: a. all built form standards (as applicable); b. the building or addition is less than 450m² GFA; and c. any new building or addition does not have frontage to a Principal Shopping Street. 2. the activity is not a retirement village.</p> <p>Activity status when compliance not achieved with TCZ-R1(1)(a): as set out in the relevant built form standards Activity status when compliance not achieved with TCZ-R1(1)(b) and TCZ-R1(1)(c): RDIS Matters of discretion are restricted to: CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design</p> <p><u>Activity status when compliance not achieved with TCZ-R1(2): RDIS</u> <u>Matters of discretion are restricted to:</u> <u>The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards (as applicable)</u> <u>CMUZ-MDX – Construction of buildings for a retirement village</u> <u>CMUZ-MD3 – Urban design</u> <u>CMUZ-MD11 – Residential development"</u></p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
67.45	TCZ - Town Centre Zone	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>Considers the Town Centre Zone is in conflict with the Medium Density Residential Zone and needs to be amended as part of Variation 1.</p> <p>Considers that the Town Centre Zone should provide for retirement village activities as a permitted activity (with the construction of the retirement village being a restricted discretionary activity), as the Enabling Housing Act provides for intensification in non-residential zones. This will recognise that retirement villages provide substantial benefit in residential zones including enabling older people to remain in familiar community environments for longer (close to family and support networks), whilst also freeing up a number of dwellings located in surrounding suburbs.</p>	<p>Insert new rule in the Town Centre Zone that provides for retirement villages as permitted activities.</p> <p><u>"TCZ-RX Retirement village</u> <u>Activity status: PER</u> <u>Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A"</u></p>
67.46	General	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated	Support	<p>In accordance with the response to NCZ-R1, LCZ-R1, MUZ-R1 and TCZ-R1, considers that a retirement village specific set of matters of discretion should apply to the construction of retirement villages in the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones.</p>	<p>In accordance with the relief sought for NCZ-R1 LCZ-R1, MUZ-R1 and TCZ-R1, seeks that the following matter of discretion be integrated into the Matters of Discretion for the Commercial and Mixed Use Zones of the District Plan:</p> <p><u>"CMUZ-MDX Construction of buildings for a retirement village</u> <u>1. The matters of discretion of any infringed built form standards;</u> <u>2. The effects of the retirement village on the safety of adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>3. The effects arising from the quality of the interface between the retirement village and adjacent streets or public open spaces;</u> <u>4. The extent to which articulation, modulation and materiality addresses adverse visual dominance effects associated with building length;</u> <u>5. When assessing the matters in 1 – 4, consider:</u> <u>6. The need to provide for efficient use of larger sites; and</u> <u>7. The functional and operational needs of the retirement village.</u> <u>8. The positive effects of the construction, development and use of the retirement village.</u></p> <p><u>For clarity, no other rules or matters of discretion relating to the effects of density apply to buildings for a retirement village."</u></p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
68.1	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	RES-MD2	Anthony John Page and Carole-Anne Louise Morgan	Amend	Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) applying to a portion of lots within Stage 7 of Silverstream East as addressed in resource consents RC215144 and RC215145, which was granted consent on 9 December 2021 subject to conditions. Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place (refer to full submission for plan showing location of these lots). These conditions were added to the development's resource consent decision by the Commissioner to address issues relating to the departure from the Outline Development Plan, interface and integration issues between the existing Kaiapoi residential area and the new development - primarily in relation to raising ground levels above that of adjoining residential properties, the form of fencing on Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135, building setbacks, building height, and access arrangements. Considers the effect of this additional qualifying matter will be minor to the implementation of the MDRS given it only relates to 15 lots.	Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. Some of the main conditions are: Subdivision resource consent RC215144 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. Land use resource consent RC215145 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.
68.2	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Table	Anthony John Page and Carole-Anne Louise Morgan	Amend	Opposes application of Medium Density Residential Standards to Area B on Figure 2 (refer to full submission), within the West Kaiapoi area (Silverstream), including 35 Adderley Terrace, Kaiapoi. The most significant natural hazards affecting urban areas is flooding, sea water inundations, and earthquakes including liquefaction. Increased density in areas subject to significant natural hazards increases risks to people and property. Increased site coverage also increases stormwater runoff and floodwater displacement, which can overwhelm the design capacity of stormwater infrastructure and exacerbate flood risk. Seeks an additional qualifying matter for where the Outline Development Plan is applied to Area B on Figure 2 (refer to full submission) to mitigate any high hazard flooding and its associated impact on property owners.	Seeks an additional qualifying matter for where the Outline Development Plan is applied to Area B on Figure 2 (refer to full submission) within the West Kaiapoi area (Silverstream), including 35 Adderley Terrace, Kaiapoi.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
69.1	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	RES-MD2	Carolyn and Peter Wright	Amend	<p>Opposes Medium Density Residential Standards (MDRS) applying to a portion of lots within Stage 7 of Silverstream East as addressed in resource consents RC215144 and RC215145, which was granted consent on 9 December 2021 subject to conditions. Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 (refer to full submission for plan showing location of these lots) be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. These conditions were added to the development's resource consent decision by the Commissioner to address issues relating to the departure from the Outline Development Plan, interface and integration issues between the existing Kaiapoi residential area and the new development - primarily in relation to raising ground levels above that of adjoining residential properties, the form of fencing on Lots 128 to 130, 134 and 135, building setbacks, building height, and access arrangements. Considers the effect of this additional qualifying matter will be minor to the implementation of the MDRS given it only relates to 15 lots.</p>	<p>Seeks the conditions relating to Lots 107 to 116, 128 to 130, and 134 and 135 of Stage 7 of RC215144 and RC215145 be added as a new qualifying matter so that applicable restrictions and consent notices remain in place. Some of the main conditions are: Subdivision resource consent RC215144 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
70.1	General	General	General	Chapman Tripp - Luke Hinchey - on behalf of Ryman Healthcare Ltd	Amend	Supports in full the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated (RVA) submission on Variation 1. Submitter believes that a quality site, living environment, amenities and the best care maximises the quality of life for retirement village residents. Waimakariri's growing ageing population and the increasing demand for retirement villages is addressed in the RVA's submission and that is adopted by submitter. There is a shortage in appropriate accommodation and care options, which allow older people to "age in place" because appropriate sites in good locations are scarce. The comprehensive care nature of the villages means all of the communal amenities and care rooms need to be located in the Village Centre to allow for safe and convenient access between these areas, resulting in a layout that differs from a typical residential development.	Seeks the relief sought by the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand Incorporated in its submission on Variation 1 is adopted.
71.1	General	General	General	Martin Hugh and Robyn Jennifer Pyke	Oppose	The Medium Density Residential Standards are a significant and undemocratic change to planning processes and property rights potentially impacting the traditional New Zealand lifestyle for the majority of the population. Significant potential effect on the character of our towns and cities over time. Giving developers freedom to build up to three storeys a metre from anyone's boundary without recourse is a momentous change. Acknowledge there are climate change aspects to the rules, but do not believe they justify wholesale imposition across entire townships like Rangiora and Kaiapoi. Changes should be limited to city centres and transport hub environs to contain intensification.	Requests Council rejects the Medium Density Residential Standards to show that centralised edicts are not appropriate.
71.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	Martin Hugh and Robyn Jennifer Pyke	Oppose	To give developers freedom to build up to three storeys a metre from anyone's boundary in most sizeable settlements in New Zealand, with zero recourse, is a momentous change and warrants a national referendum.	Requests Council rejects the Medium Density Residential Standards to show that centralised edicts are not appropriate.
71.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	Martin Hugh and Robyn Jennifer Pyke	Oppose	To give developers freedom to build up to three storeys a metre from anyone's boundary in most sizeable settlements in New Zealand, with zero recourse, is a momentous change and warrants a national referendum.	Requests Council rejects the Medium Density Residential Standards to show that centralised edicts are not appropriate.
72.1	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	General	Dominic Robert Hassan	Amend	Concerned that previously the visual impact of building bulk was mitigated by reduced permitted height and scale, and vegetation could typically be established by affected neighbours to provide privacy; however the intensification enabled by the Medium Density Residential Standards could create new adverse visual effects from neighbouring structures and there is no controls to mitigate this.	Amend to include appearance controls in the Medium Density Residential Standards provisions.
72.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS5	Dominic Robert Hassan	Amend	Notes that Clause 4 of MRZ-BFS5, which related to habitable room windows avoiding direct views into adjacent residential units, has been deleted yet the need for such privacy increases with increased density. Requests this matter is reconsidered and the deleted clause 4 is possibly included, as this makes basic urban design sense.	Amend MRZ-BFS5 to include privacy between residential unit provisions.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
72.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS-11	Dominic Robert Hassan	Amend	Questions the benefit of MRZ-BFS-11 requirement to glaze 20% of street facade and notes it will create heat loss to homes where these facades face south, and privacy should be considered.	Amend to allow reduced glazed areas for south facing street facades.
73.1	General	General	General	Summerset Group Holdings Limited - Stephanie Muller		Supports the submission of the Retirement Villages Association of New Zealand in its entirety. Submitter is a leading retirement village operator, offering a range of independent living options and care, and employing over 1,800 staff members across various sites. Requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Variation 1: Housing Intensification.	Requests the Council engages constructively with the Retirement Villages Association in relation to Variation 1.
74.1	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	General	General	Ken Fletcher	Amend	No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m ² in the operative plan and 500m ² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m ² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m ² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m ² range or between 2500-4000m ² .	Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m ² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m ² (or 2000m ²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m ² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m ² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.
74.2	GRZ – General Residential Zone	General	General	Ken Fletcher	Amend	No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m ² in the operative plan and 500m ² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m ² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m ² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m ² range or between 2500-4000m ² .	Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m ² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m ² (or 2000m ²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m ² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m ² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
74.3	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	General	General	Ken Fletcher	Amend	No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m ² in the operative plan and 500m ² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m ² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m ² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m ² range or between 2500-4000m ² .	Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m ² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m ² (or 2000m ²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m ² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m ² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.
74.4	RESZ - General Objectives and Policies for all Residential Zones	Policies	RESZ-P8	Ken Fletcher	Amend	No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m ² in the operative plan and 500m ² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m ² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m ² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m ² range or between 2500-4000m ² .	Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m ² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m ² (or 2000m ²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m ² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m ² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.
74.5	GRZ – General Residential Zone	Introduction	General	Ken Fletcher	Amend	No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m ² in the operative plan and 500m ² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m ² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m ² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m ² range or between 2500-4000m ² .	Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m ² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res4a or 4b in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m ² (or 2000m ²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m ² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m ² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
74.6	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-O2	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone.</p> <p>There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p>	<p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res4a or 4b in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>
74.7	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Subdivision Standards	Zone	Ken Fletcher	Amend	<p>No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m² in the operative plan and 500m² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m² average in the Large Lot Residential zone.</p> <p>There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m² range or between 2500-4000m².</p>	<p>Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m² (or 2000m²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.</p>

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
74.8	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	General	General	Ken Fletcher	Amend	No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m ² in the operative plan and 500m ² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m ² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m ² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m ² range or between 2500-4000m ² .	Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m ² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m ² (or 2000m ²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m ² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m ² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.
74.9	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-O23	Ken Fletcher	Amend	No issue with the provision of medium density housing per se, but it has the effect of limiting even more the range of lot sizes being made available, and thereby greatly limiting the range and variety of residential types sizes and densities, contrary to the strategic directions, objectives and policies. The current and proposed rules interact with economics to drive the range of residential lot sizes brought to the market towards two points: the minimum size enabled in the General Residential and Medium Density Residential zones, and the required average lot size in the Large Lot Residential zone. Thus residential lot sizes in the Medium Density Residential and General Residential zones are just above the minimum lot size (600m ² in the operative plan and 500m ² in the proposed plan) - typically 600-700m ² depending on size of lot being subdivided, and around the required 5000m ² average in the Large Lot Residential zone. There is almost nothing subdivided to produce lots in the 800-2500m ² range or between 2500-4000m ² .	Introduce provisions that will produce a range of lot sizes, such as by: redefining the Large Lot Residential Zone to be anything greater than 1000m ² as a restricted discretionary or discretionary activity applied to all land zoned Res 4A or 4B in the current plan; creating a new zone (Large Lot Residential Zone 1) that allows subdivision down to 1000m ² (or 2000m ²) as a controlled or restricted discretionary activity applied to land currently zoned Res 4A or 4B; renaming the proposed Large Lot Residential Zone to be Large Lot Residential Zone 2 applied to land rezoned from rural, with subdivision down to 2500m ² as a discretionary activity; and enabling subdivision of Large Lot Residential Zone land to (say) 2500m ² as a restricted discretionary activity, and below that discretionary.
75.10	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	General	M Magendans	Oppose	Oppose enabling new residential buildings to be built up to 3 storeys high (11 metres plus roof). For many existing properties this could adversely affect sunlight, resulting in unhealthy homes and possible financial burden for additional heating, may look unattractive and may adversely affect privacy and property values.	New residential buildings in existing areas should be single storey only and the sunlight and outlook for existing properties should be protected.
75.2	MRZ – Medium Density Residential Zone	Built Form Standards	MRZ-BFS4	M Magendans	Oppose	Oppose enabling new residential buildings to be built up to 3 storeys high (11 metres plus roof). For many existing properties this could adversely affect sunlight, resulting in unhealthy homes and possible financial burden for additional heating, may look unattractive and may adversely affect privacy and property values.	New residential buildings in existing areas should be single storey only and the sunlight and outlook for existing properties should be protected.

Sub No.	Section	Sub-Section	Provision	Submitter Name	Sentiment	Submission Point Summary	Relief Sought Summary
76.1	Planning Maps	General	General	Anderson Lloyd - Sarah Eveleigh - on behalf of M and J Schluter	Amend	Land located 237 Johns Road, Rangiora legally described as Lot 3 DP 341829 and part of the West Rangiora Development Area is proposed to be zoned Rural Lifestyle Zone in the proposed Plan. Amendments are sought separately to the provisions of the West Rangiora Development Area. As an alternative, it is sought that this land be rezoned to Medium Density Residential Zone. Rezoning supports the need for significant additional housing capacity including in West Rangiora which has been identified as an appropriate location for urban growth and there are no impediments to the development of this land including any infrastructure capacity reasons.	Land located 237 Johns Road, Rangiora legally described as Lot 3 DP 341829 be rezoned from Rural Lifestyle Zone in the proposed Plan to Medium Density Residential Zone.
76.2	WR - West Rangiora	Activity Rules - if certification has been approved	DEV-WR-R1	Anderson Lloyd - Sarah Eveleigh - on behalf of M and J Schluter	Support	In the proposed 'Activity Rules - if certification has been approved', support the proposed amendments to rule 'DEV-WR-R1 Activities provided for in General Residential Zone'.	Retain the proposed amendments to rule 'DEV-WR-R1 Activities provided for in General Residential Zone'.
76.3	WR - West Rangiora	Activity Rules - if certification has been approved	DEV-WR-R21	Anderson Lloyd - Sarah Eveleigh - on behalf of M and J Schluter	Support	Support rule 'DEV-WR-R2 Activities provided for in Medium Density Residential Zone' (renumbered as a consequence of proposed amendments to rule 'DEV-WR-R1 Activities provided for in General Residential Zone').	Retain rule 'DEV-WR-R2 Activities provided for in Medium Density Residential Zone'.
76.4	WR - West Rangiora	General	General	Anderson Lloyd - Sarah Eveleigh - on behalf of M and J Schluter	Amend	In the Outline Development Plan for West Rangiora in DEV-WR-APP1, the majority of the land located at 237 Johns Road, Rangiora legally described as Lot 3 DP 341829 is identified as "General Residential Density", with only a small area to the north identified as "Medium Residential Density". Seek that the Outline Development Plan be amended to identify that Medium Residential Density will be enabled on all residential areas of the Outline Development Plan.	Amend the Outline Development Plan for West Rangiora in DEV-WR-APP1 to enable Medium Residential Density on all residential areas of the Outline Development Plan.
77.1	Relationships between spatial layers	Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act	Natural	Beca - Nola Smart - on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Under Fire and Emergency's secondary function responding to medical events, rescues and public assists, support the inclusion of a qualifying matter relating to high hazard flooding areas. Avoiding higher density development in these areas reduces risk to property and life.	Retain as notified
77.2	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions	Objectives	SD-O2	Beca - Nola Smart - on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Support the inclusion of the health and safety of people and communities in the explanation of well-functioning urban environments. This includes the provision of adequate emergency access and sufficient firefighting water supply and pressure.	Retain as notified
77.3	SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision	Activity Rules	SUB-R2	Beca - Nola Smart - on behalf of Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Support provision for subdivision as a controlled activity provided that the subdivision is able to comply with the relevant standards, which includes water supply for firefighting (SUB-S11).	Retain as notified