# DISTRICT PLAN REVIEW

# Proposed Waimakariri District Plan - Submission

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991
Submitter details (Our preferred methods of corresponding with you are by email and phone).
Full name: Sa Gale
Email address: sgale@hotmail.co.nz
Please select one of the two options below:
✓ I <b>could not</b> gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (go to Submission details, you do not need to complete the rest of this section)
☐ I <b>could</b> gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (please complete the rest of this section before continuing to Submission details)
Please select one of the two options below:
✓ I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
A) Adversely affects the environment; and
B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition.
☐ I <b>am not</b> directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that:
A) Adversely affects the environment; and
B) Does not relate to trade competition or the effect of trade competition.



## **Submission details**

The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are as follows: (please give details)
As per attached sheet
My submission is that: (state in summary the Proposed Plan chapter subject and provision of your submission. Clearly indicate whether you support or oppose the specific provisions or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons) (please include additional pages as necessary)
As per attached sheet
I/we have included: additional pages
I/we seek the following decision from the Waimakariri District Council: (give precise details, use additional pages if required)
As per attached sheet

### Submission at the Hearing

✓	I/we	wish	to s	speak	in	support	of	my/our	submission
---	------	------	------	-------	----	---------	----	--------	------------

☐ I/we do not wish to speak in support of my/our submission

☑ If others make a similar further submission, I/we will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

### **Important Information**

- 1. The Council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submissions.
- 2. Please note that submissions are public. Your name and submission will be included in papers that are available to the media and public. Your submission will only be used for the purpose of the District Plan review process.
- 3. Only those submitters who indicate they wish to speak at the hearing will be emailed a copy of the planning officers report (please ensure you include an email address on this submission form).

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- · It is frivolous or vexatious
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case
- · It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further
- It contains offensive language
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a
  person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert
  advice on the matter.

**Send your submission to:** Proposed District Plan Submission

Waimakariri District Council Private Bag 1005, Rangiora 7440

**Email to:** developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz

Phone: 0800 965 468 (0800WMKGOV)

You can also deliver this submission form to one our service centres:

Rangiora Service Centre: 215 High Street, Rangiora

Kaiapoi Service Centre: Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre, 176 Williams Street, Kaiapoi

Oxford Service Centre: 34 Main Street, Oxford

Submissions close 5pm, Friday 26 November 2021

Please refer to the Council website waimakariri.govt.nz for further updates

Submission on the Proposed District Plan in relation to freshwater setbacks and esplanade provisions with particular interest in Northbrook Stream urban reaches

Proposed District Plan provisions	My Submission
District Planning Map Zoning: Medium Density Residential Zone (MRZ) for Rangiora town centre surrounds	Support: the medium density zoning surrounding the town centre of Rangiora
The decision I seek:	Retain the medium density residential zone around the town centre of Rangiora
Table SUB-1: Minimum allotment sizes and dimensions	Support: the medium density residential zone minimums and support no minimums for multi-unit residential development
The decision I seek:	Retain the medium density residential zone minimums and the multi-lot residential density
NATC-S1 Setback standards for the natural character of freshwater bodies	
Table NATC-1: Freshwater body setbacks Activities shall be outside of the setback distance specified in <a href="Table NATC-1">Table NATC-1</a> .  Unscheduled freshwater bodies, the setback requirement is 5m.	Object: the 5m setback is a reasonable and practical setback for a medium density residential zone such that the Northbrook Stream reaches affect – however when the stream is listed as an open public drain on the Councils Urban Drainage Maps, freshwater setback provisions should not be applied
NATCH-SCHED — Unscheduled tributaries: Any freshwater body not listed in SCHED1, SCHED2 or SCHED3	Object: boxed drains and similar modified freshwater bodies / urban drainage systems through urban areas should be clearly exempt from these provisions, eg: Northbrook Stream where it is a boxed drain and listed on the Councils Urban Drainage map as an open public drain
Decision I seek	Clearly exempt open public drains from the fresh water bodies provisions and setbacks
NATC-AN2 The rules do not apply to any artificial water courses, including but not limited to water races or drains, under the control of the District Council, Regional Council or the Crown, ponds and artificial lakes, or within any ephemeral flow path where there is no defined channel.	Support: Clarify that Northbrook Stream, where it is a boxed drain or similar modified urban system, and where it is listed as an open public drain on the Council urban drainage maps, is exempt from natural waterbody setback and requirements. There is no clarity,

Submission on the Proposed District Plan in relation to freshwater setbacks and esplanade provisions with particular interest in Northbrook Stream urban reaches

	especially as the urban reaches of Northbrook has esplanade requirements along with public drain classifications.
The decision I seek:	Clarify the status of urban drains/freshwater bodies so that northbrook Stream and other similar urban systems are clearly exempt.
SUB-S17 Esplanade reserves or strips An esplanade reserve or esplanade strip shall be created or set aside in the following circumstances:	•
a.except where provided by (c), an esplanade reserve or esplanade strip shall be created or set aside for any allotment which is created on subdivision regardless of the size of the allotment created where any part of the land to be subdivided:	
<ul> <li>i. adjoins or is crossed by a water body listed in Table SUB-2; or</li> <li>ii. adjoins the CMA boundary;</li> </ul>	
b. the minimum width of an esplanade reserve or esplanade strip required under (a)(i) and (a)(ii) above shall be 20m.  c. where any allotment of less than 4ha is created on subdivision an esplanade reserve or esplanade strip shall be created or set aside from that allotment along the bank of any other river or along the mark of MHWS of the sea; i.for the purpose of (c) above a river means a river whose bed has an average width of 3m or more where the river flows through or adjoins an allotment.	<b>Object:</b> 20m is a blanket provision that does not consider the residential medium density zone and constraints of urban development, or the conflict between freshwater bodies and urban drains. It is a broad brush approach that does not provide certainty for urban development and creates additional cost associated with growth when additional consent layers create costs and time constraints. The provisions are unrealistic and will make all urban subdivision with esplanade provision a non-complying activity due to the generic application of the rule.
Northbrook is listed in Table SUB-2	Object to Northbrook Stream being listed in Table SUB-2: Northbrook should not be listed as esplanade provision in this area given the medium density residential zoning, the developed nature of the area, the opinion of the Manger of Community and Recreation (email attached) and previous subdivisions along the

Submission on the Proposed District Plan in relation to freshwater setbacks and esplanade provisions with particular interest in Northbrook Stream urban reaches

AND ANY OTHER CONSEQUENTIAL AMENDMENTS NECESSARY TO GIVE EFFECT TO THE SUBMISSION	
Decision I seek:	Change Table TRAN-7 for 1-3 units by amending the legal width requirement to 4m, being 1m more than the formed width requirement.
Table TRAN-7: Design standards for new vehicle accessways 1-3 units minimum legal width 5.5m, minimum formed width 3m	<b>Oppose:</b> the legal width for 1-3 residential units only needs to be 1metre greater than the required formed width (being 3m), in order to contain services and drainage. This is consistent with 4-6 units being required to have a 5.5m legal width and a 4.5m formed width.
Decision I seek:	growth. There is no access or recreational value within the urban reaches of this waterway/drain.  Delete Northbrook Stream from the esplanade Table SUB-2 for the urban reaches  Or:  Undertake a fine grained analysis of where esplanade provisions can be effected to provide for the specific esplanade purpose, and list specific widths for urban stream reaches, preferably in line with setback provisions where public access is not sought, in order to provide certainty and constrain unnecessary cost to growth, but exempt urban drains from the provisions.
	stream/drain that have not had esplanade required. A fine grained assessment should be made to determine where esplanade will be able to be effected for a planned purpose rather than the broadbrushed approach that creates additional costs to development and