

Further Submission on Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

Under Clause 8 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waimakariri District Council
By email: developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz

Submitter: Ravenswood Developments Limited (**RDL**)
Postal address: c/- Anderson Lloyd, Level 3, 70 Gloucester Street
Christchurch 8141
Email: sarah.eveleigh@al.nz
sarah.schulte@al.nz

- 1 RDL is the developer of Ravenswood, a greenfield residential and commercial development located at North Woodend. RDL made a submission on Variation 2 to the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan (the **PWDP**).
- 2 This is a further submission on Variation 2.
- 3 RDL is a person with an interest greater than the interest in the PWDP than the general public has because the provisions of the PWDP will directly affect the development of RDL's land.
- 4 The further submissions, reasons for submissions, and decisions sought are specified in **Appendix 1**, attached.
- 5 RDL wishes to be heard in support of its further submission.



Ravenswood Developments Limited
Signed by its duly authorised agents
Anderson Lloyd
Per: **Sarah Eveleigh / Sarah Schulte**

Appendix 1

| This further submission is in relation to the original submission of: | The particular parts of the original submission I/we support/oppose are: | My/our position on the original submission is: | The reason for my/our support/opposition to the original submission are: | Allow or disallow the original submission (in full or in part) | Precise details of the submission to be allowed / disallowed – decision sought: |
|--|--|---|---|---|---|
| Kainga Ora 77.1 – 77.19 | The general intent of the submission, issues raised in respect of the notified provisions, and proposed amendments | Support | <p>Variation 2 is unclear and uncertain. It does not adequately and clearly specify the purposes for which financial contributions are required. The assessment methodology is unclear, inconsistent and inadequate, and does not allow potential developers to assess whether a financial contribution will be required and what the quantum of any contribution will be. The potential for overlap with development contributions is not sufficiently addressed.</p> <p>If Variation 2 is to be retained, RDL agrees that it is appropriate that an objection process be specified.</p> | Allow if Variation 2 is to be retained | If Variation 2 is to be retained, allow the specific amendments sought, together with any further amendments necessary to address the concerns raised in the submission and the original submission by RDL. |

| | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------------|---------|---|-------|--|
| Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited 76.1 | The submission in its entirety. | Support | RDL agrees with the reasons set out in the submission, noting that these are largely consistent with RDL's original submission. | Allow | Delete all provisions in Variation 2 in their entirety. Alternatively, if Variation 2 is to be retained, make all amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission and the original submission by RDL. |
|---|---------------------------------|---------|---|-------|--|