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Disclaimer

Waimakariri District Council does not accept any responsibility should its future growth and development planning and management approaches differ from those outlined in this document following decisions made under the Resource Management Act 1991. Similarly, the Council holds no responsibility for the particular outcomes of any course of action taken by any person in regard to the Development Plan, including property investment decisions.
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Executive Summary

Rural residential development is the subdivision and use of land to cater for the needs of those wishing to live within a rural or semi rural setting. Lots are smaller than required for traditional farming and horticultural purposes and are commonly 2500m$^2$ to 2ha in area.

As with other forms of development, it is necessary for the Waimakariri District Council to consider and plan for rural residential development within the district. It is also necessary for the Council to take into account regional planning initiatives, such as the Urban Development Strategy and Proposed Change No. 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.

Identification of development locations addresses a range of issues and constraints at a high level. The Rural Residential Development Plan identifies these issues, to the extent possible without development specific investigations, as they apply to various land areas within the eastern part of the Waimakariri District. The eastern part of the district accords with the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy area.

The Development Plan identifies locations where the Council considers growth should occur, acknowledging its key roles as the planning authority and service/infrastructure provider for the district. Eight locations were identified. Seven were confirmed and one added based on high level background assessments and community engagement.

These locations are Mandeville, Ohoka, Waikuku, Fernside, southeast Rangiora, southeast Woodend, north Kaiapoi and Kaiapoi Waterways (located to the immediate south east of Kaiapoi). These eastern district locations, in the opinion of the Council, offer the best opportunity for efficiencies and outcomes for rural residential development within the short to medium term. In total, these locations provide for 1045 households.

Tuahiwi was initially considered as a potential growth location. However following consultation, it has become apparent that a comprehensive investigation of growth and development is required before rural residential housing is confirmed as an option for Tuahiwi and Maori Reserve 873. This review is scheduled for the 2010/2011 financial year. The review will consider development options in consultation with land owners, the Tuahiwi community and Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga.

It is important to note that the Development Plan does not rezone land. The Development Plan broadly identifies locations that are considered suitable for rezoning, taking into account high level initial planning and servicing considerations. It is envisaged that more detailed planning and servicing considerations will be undertaken on a site specific basis to support any plan change request to rezone the land. It is only at this time that the suitability or otherwise of a particular site can be determined.
1 Introduction

1.1 Context

The Waimakariri District Council (the ‘Council’) is a partner in the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS). This document sets out a sub-regional settlement pattern for growth and development. The UDS specifically provides for rural residential opportunities as part of providing for a range of living environments. The area covered by this Development Plan corresponds to the area of the UDS that extends into Waimakariri District.

The UDS is in part implemented by Proposed Change No. 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, bringing it into statutory consideration when planning for growth. Like the UDS, Proposed Change No. 1 provides for 1510 additional rural residential households in the eastern part of the Waimakariri District out to 2041.

In response to the Council’s statutory obligations in relation to Proposed Change No.1, a Rural Residential Development Plan has been prepared that identifies several growth locations for potential rural residential development. The Development Plan also responds to the limited availability of lots within existing rural residential zones.

The identification of these locations takes into account current Waimakariri District Plan provisions for rural residential development (defined as Residential 4A or 4B Zones), key planning issues, clear hazard constraints, high level infrastructure requirements and community viewpoints.

The Development Plan is intended to provide a level of certainty to landowners, developers, the Council, and the Waimakariri community. It does this by indicting growth locations and the general spatial and household extent of any future rural residential development.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of the Development Plan is to identify growth locations for rural residential development within the eastern district. It takes a pragmatic approach to the Council’s role in managing development based on the following principles:

1. The Council is a key partner in the land development process;
2. Rural residential living opportunities are sought after within the district; and
3. The Council will take a proactive approach to managing growth.

The Development Plan signals an approach where the Council provides greater leadership, guidance and partnership roles in managing growth, particularly where community assets are involved e.g. water and wastewater reticulations.

1.3 Primary Objectives

The objectives of the Development Plan are as follows:

1. To develop sustainable, long term servicing/infrastructure solutions and planning outcomes for existing and future rural residential development;
2. To identify rural residential household growth locations and distribution; and

3. To identify appropriate methods to assist in the implementation of the identified growth locations.

The Development Plan identifies locations for rural residential development from the perspective of the Council as the planning authority and service/infrastructure provider. The aim is to assist the Council in its role as a regulator and facilitator of development by informing decision making under the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) and the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA).

The Development Plan does not rezone land or provide detailed plans for rural residential development. Instead, it illustrates broad locations that could be suitable for such development. Detailed infrastructure and planning investigations will need to be undertaken to confirm or otherwise the suitability of any specific site as part of any District Plan change for rezoning and/or resource consents.

1.4 Development Issues

Development and land use issues that give rise to the primary objectives include:

1. Rural 4 ha subdivision as an alternative to rural residential living and its impact on rural Waimakariri, in terms of the resulting character and amenity;

2. Differing community and policy opinions on the role, form and extent of rural residential development;

3. Privately initiated rural residential plan change requests and associated impacts on rural Waimakariri, existing rural residential zones, settlements and towns;

4. The total number of new rural residential households that are appropriate for the eastern part (UDS area) of the district;

5. The amenity, character, size, community facilities and features of rural residential developments; and

6. Provision and funding of infrastructure associated with growth and development.

1.5 Anticipated Outcomes

By identifying growth locations, the Development Plan signals the degree of change that can be expected. However, it does not prescribe that change must occur. Instead it indicates how the Council and the community would prefer to see land developed, should change occur.

The Development Plan provides a level of certainty to the Council, landowners, developers, and property investors regarding the location and infrastructure requirements for growth and development. It also provides some certainty as to the general spatial extent of development and an understanding of what the surrounding area may look like in the future.

The Development Plan cannot preclude requests to rezone land for rural residential purposes in non-growth areas. However, it indicates where development requests are most likely to be supported by the Council.
1.6 Consultation

A Draft Rural Residential Development Plan document was prepared for public consultation to enable input by public submission. The submission period closed at the end of November 2009. A number of public information evenings were held during this period to enable Council staff to explain the Development Plan further, respond to any questions, and hear the public desires and concerns.

A total of 109 submissions were received. This included 11 specifically relating to Fernside, 5 for Kaiapoi, 34 for Mandeville, 14 for Ohoka, 1 for Rangiora, 6 for Tuahiwi, 5 for Waikuku and 10 for Woodend. The remainder of the submissions were issue based with no particular reference to a locality. Many submissions set out greater than one submission point. Table 1 sets out the consultation process followed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: The Development Plan Preparation Process</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Draft Rural Residential Development Plan prepared and released for submissions (October 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Information evenings convened and submissions received (October 17 - November 27 2009).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Submissions considered and heard by Hearings Panel (March 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Decisions on submissions made by Hearings Panel (May 2010).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Growth locations confirmed and Rural Residential Development Plan adopted (July 2010).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The decisions on the submissions upheld seven of the locations identified and added one new location, subject to the following:

- Further investigation and consultation of growth at Mandeville;
- Support for the Maori Reserve 873 review, which will include Tuahiwi;
- Centralisation of development at Ohoka without a preferred direction;
- Enlarging the preferred area at Fernside towards Lilly Road;
- Enlarging the preferred area at Woodend to provide for some development within this area rather than the whole area; and
- Inclusion of Kaiapoi Waterways as a potential growth location subject to planning, hazard and infrastructure issues being adequately addressed and overcome.

Other recommended actions are:

- Review of District Plan Residential 4A and 4B Zone characteristics and development controls; and
- Further investigation of development sequencing.

The Rural Residential Development Plan Supporting Documents sets out the relevant background documents and decisions on submissions.
2 Background

2.1 Rural Residential Development

Rural residential development provides low density living within a rural setting. The Waimakariri District Plan, prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991, refers to rural residential development as Residential 4A or 4B Zones. These zones exhibit the following characteristics:

- predominant activity is living;
- detached dwellings and associated buildings;
- some limited farming and horticulture;
- dwelling density is lowest for Residential Zones;
- dwellings in generous settings;
- average lot size of 0.25-1.0 hectare;
- limited number of lots located in a rural environment;
- rural style roads or access ways;
- opportunity for a rural outlook from within the zone;
- few vehicle movements within the zone;
- access to zones not from arterial roads;
- community water and/or sewerage schemes; and
- kerb, channelling and street lighting.

The District Plan also requires each rural residential zone to adhere to an average lot size to allow for a mix of sizes in the interests of maintaining rural character. The average is 5000m² for Residential 4A zones and 1 ha for Residential 4B zones.

---

2.2 Existing Rural Residential Zones and Locations

Some of the district’s older Residential 4A and 4B Zones were created from the former ‘rural residential’ zones, developed under previous legislation. These zones generally allowed for small scale farming and living within the rural area.

During the late 1970s and the 1980s development within these zones was generally slow to moderate. Zones within the eastern district have tended to develop at a greater pace than those in the west, reflecting their proximity to employment hubs and the amenities of the district’s main towns. Most of the zones established in the recent past, by way of private plan changes, have developed relatively quickly. Truro Close at Mandeville is such an example.

Some of the district’s Residential 4A and 4B Zones have been extended since being established as rural residential zones under previous County/District Schemes. These include Fernside, Waikuku Village, and Mandeville. The area initially zoned at Mandeville in the 1980s accommodated only 39 lots. As the result of two further plan changes, the area now has 122 lots extending across approximately 130 hectares of land area bounded by Tram Road, McHugh’s Road, and No.10 Road. Figure 1 shows the existing Residential 4A and 4B zones within the eastern part of the district.

---

1 Waimakariri District Plan Policies 17.1.1.1 and 17.1.1.2.
Figure 1: Existing Residential 4A and 4B Zones within the Eastern District
The existing rural residential zones have a mix of infrastructure including Council maintained and operated wastewater and water reticulations, private water supplies or wells, and collectively run private wastewater schemes. Some households at Mandeville and Fernside have individual on-site septic tanks and disposal fields.

In 2006, the Council conducted a survey of households in the district’s Residential 4A and 4B Zones. The purpose of the survey was to ascertain the views of residents on a range of issues, including satisfaction with wastewater disposal schemes and domestic water supplies. Appendix 1 includes a copy of the executive summary from the 2006 Residential 4 (Rural Residential) Zone Household Survey.

2.3 Existing Supply

Over the past 10 years, new house building within the Residential 4A and 4B Zones across the district has averaged 18 per year. New builds peaked in 2003/4 coinciding with strong economic conditions and uptake of the last available lots within some of the more recent rural residential subdivisions.

Residential 4A and 4B Zone new builds have declined in the last 3 years, with 2008 recording the lowest number since 1995. In part this could be attributed to the availability of vacant lots, noting that the current stock of approximately 500 lots is largely exhausted, particularly in the eastern part of the district. Waikuku is an exception where some Residential 4B Zone development potential remains.

This decline could also be attributed to the popularity and relative abundance of 4 hectare ‘lifestyle’ blocks as an alternative to smaller Residential 4A and 4B Zone properties. Approximately 1800 building consents for new houses have been issued for the Rural Zone of Waimakariri District since 2001.

![Graph showing new houses within Residential 4A and 4B Zones](image)

**Figure 2: New Houses within Residential 4A and 4B Zones**

2.4 Private Rural Residential Plan Changes

The Resource Management Act 1991 allows for privately initiated District Plan changes to rezone land. Such requests generally seek to rezone land from rural to residential, such as Residential 4A or 4B.

At the time of writing, the Council had received several requests to rezone land for rural residential purposes. These requests collectively signal market demand for rural residential living opportunities. The Development Plan does not specifically assess the merits of these plan changes.
3 Policy Overview

3.1 Waimakariri District Plan

The Waimakariri District Plan includes policies specifically related to the Residential 4A and 4B Zones. These policies must be considered by decision makers at the time a plan change request to rezone land to Residential 4A or 4B is considered.

Policy 13.1.1.2 seeks to manage the effects of rural residential development. It states:

“Avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of the development of Residential 4A and 4B Zones by limiting the establishment of new zones to locations where the subdivision and development will not:

a. adversely affect significant natural and physical resources;
b. exacerbate damage from natural hazards (including flood damage); and
c. create conflict with neighbouring land uses.”

The explanation to Policy 13.1.1.2 identifies that Residential 4A and 4B Zones by their low density, and often isolated nature, have the potential to adversely affect the natural and physical resources of the district.

Policy 14.1.1.4 states:

“Maintain rural character as the setting for Residential 4A and 4B Zones.”

Policy 14.1.1.4 recognises that people living in Residential 4A and 4B Zones value an outlook which is dominated by paddocks, trees, natural features, and agricultural, pastoral or horticultural activities. Some long established Residential 4A and 4B Zones are on the edges of the main towns and part of their setting is urban in nature.

Policies 17.1.1.1 and 17.1.1.2 outline the characteristics of the various residential zones, including the Residential 4A and 4B Zones. These matters are listed above. Zone management should ensure the retention of these characteristics in order to meet Policies 17.1.1.1 and 17.1.1.2.

Policy 17.1.1.1 states:

“Maintain and enhance the characteristics of Residential Zones that give them their particular character and quality of environment.”

Policy 17.1.1.2 states:

“Recognise and provide for differences between Residential Zones reflecting the community’s expectations that a range of living environments will be maintained and enhanced.”

3.2 Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

The UDS sets out a sub-regional settlement pattern for growth and development. It applies to the part of the Waimakariri District east of Two Chain Road and south of the Ashley River.

One of the key outcomes of the UDS is to maintain the contrast between the towns of the district and the surrounding rural land. However, it advocates limited rural residential provision to provide living choice and to help offset rural 4 ha ‘lifestyle block’ development.
In doing so, caution is exercised noting that such growth and development can lead to increased traffic movements, a dispersed settlement pattern, and a potential change in rural character. For Waimakariri District, the UDS acknowledges the limited supply of vacant rural residential lots.

### 3.3 Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

Proposed Change No. 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement was publicly notified by Environment Canterbury (ECan) in July 2007. It introduces a new chapter to the Regional Policy Statement taking into account the strategic direction set by the UDS. It states:

“Chapter 12A provides the sub-regional policy framework under the Resource Management Act 1991 to implement the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy. This strategy is adopted policy by the Canterbury Regional Council and the territorial authorities of Christchurch City, Selwyn, and Waimakariri District Councils. The purpose of Chapter 12A is to provide for development in a way which achieves quality outcomes and takes a sustainable development approach to managing growth.”

Policy 14 of Proposed Change No. 1 sets out the criteria for the location of new rural residential development within the UDS area of the district (see Appendix 2). Notable criteria include a requirement to locate development so that it can be serviced with reticulated water and wastewater and ensure that development supports existing or upgraded community infrastructure.

Hearings of submissions on Proposed Change No. 1 concluded in August 2009 and decisions were issued in December 2009. The decisions made various amendments to Proposed Change No. 1.

The Commissioners’ generally endorsed the approach of Proposed Change No. 1 to manage the relationship of infrastructure provision and future households, including rural residential provision. However, the decisions outline some inadequacies in regard to the rural residential provision, particularly in regard to the background analysis. The Commissioners were of the opinion that the rationale for restricting rural residential growth to no more than 5% of total households was imperfect and that the figures included in Proposed Change No. 1 did not correspond.

The Commissioners confirmed that rural residential provision and the extent of any such provision is a regional matter and should be included within Proposed Change No. 1. However, the decision requires that a review of the rural residential provisions is carried out in 2010. This Development Plan forms Waimakariri District’s review of rural residential growth.

The Council is required to ‘give effect’ to Proposed Change No. 1 once it becomes operative and have regard to it in the meantime. At the time of publication, Proposed Change No. 1 is not ‘operative’ and the outcomes of the Development Plan process may need to be reviewed following the resolution of any appeals.

---

2 Pages 114 and 115, Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy, 2007
3 As amended by Commissioners’ decisions on submissions, December 2009.
3.4 Provision of Households and Infrastructure

Proposed Change No. 1 provides for 1510 new rural residential households over the period to 2041 within the eastern district as set out in Table 2 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2: Regional Policy Statement Household Provision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2007-2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UDS area (east of Two Chain Road and south of the Ashley River)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A primary objective of Proposed Change No. 1 is the integration of infrastructure with development to manage growth and its consequences. To assist with this objective, Proposed Change No. 1 provides for the sequencing of development and households over three time periods, including rural residential households.

The main objectives of the sequencing policy are to:

- Provide sufficient land for the population and economic growth of Greater Christchurch;
- Ensure timely, efficient and integrated provision of infrastructure to support growth;
- Allow for consolidation and infill of existing urban lands;
- Encourage urban development to occur within areas that already have or can easily be provided with essential infrastructure, and
- Minimise 'out of sequence' development.

Should rural residential development be realised in more than one location within a similar time period, the Council may need to consider controls on development to ensure that the provision of infrastructure is achievable and affordable and that household numbers are not exceeded.

---

4 Proposed Change No. 1 Officers Report, May 2008
4 Growth Considerations

The identification of rural residential growth locations reflects the roles of the Council as the service/infrastructure provider and planning authority for the district. This allows locations for development and infrastructure to be identified which in turn could enable existing properties, with current servicing deficiencies, access to new or upgraded services.

This approach also allows for the identification of any physical constraints or character considerations that might make rural residential development suitable or unsuitable at any particular location. These matters are summarised as follows:

1. Location Considerations
   - Rural character and amenity: Characteristics that define the rural area and are valued by both the wider community and those people living in the area.
   - Rural residential character and amenity: Characteristics, features, and qualities people attribute to where they live.
   - Settlement and community: Sustainable settlement size and facilities. Location, type, and scale of facilities including public open space, shops and other businesses or services.
   - Environmental: Physical constraints and the effects of development (positive and negative) on the environment.

2. Service/infrastructure Considerations
   - Water and wastewater provision: Infrastructure and reticulated systems for water supply and wastewater.
   - Transport network: Roads, footpaths, public transport, equestrian, pedestrian, and cycling links.

The Development Plan is not intended to produce detailed planning and infrastructure outcomes. Its focus is on broad growth locations for rural residential development. Detailed assessments will need to form part of any plan change requests (developer/landowner or Council initiated) to rezone land within the growth locations.

4.1 Servicing/Infrastructure

The Council is responsible for the provision and maintenance of infrastructure relating to roads, water, wastewater, and drainage in Waimakariri District. The Council provides and maintains approximately 1400 km of roads, 17 water supply schemes, and 7 wastewater schemes within the district.

Where there are currently identified deficiencies in existing water supplies or wastewater schemes, new development provides an opportunity for existing households to benefit from new reticulations or upgrades.

A key issue is the identification of practical, achievable and cost effective solutions, particularly with respect to wastewater. Preliminary investigations show that connection to the Eastern District Sewerage
The Eastern District Sewerage Scheme (EDSS) is possible for all growth locations given that a minimum number of new households are achieved to provide economies of scale.

The EDSS manages wastewater treatment and disposal for the population of the eastern district. There are significant benefits by connecting to the EDSS in terms of long term maintenance, operation consenting, environmental outcomes and long term sustainability when compared to individual or localised wastewater package treatment plants.

It should be noted that the Council, through its 10 year plan, is required to undertake forward planning of infrastructure requirements. This includes setting out its anticipated share of any development costs where that development may have benefits to existing or future communities.

The projected household total for the eastern district, including rural residential development, is 22,550 by 2041. This is a medium to high projection with most of the urban growth anticipated to occur within the next 10 to 20 years. This is within the design capacity of the EDSS without significant upgrades.

The EDSS has adequate capacity for locations within its service area including potential rural residential development within the eastern district, with appropriate upgrades. However, it is acknowledged that further work is required to demonstrate that this capacity is available and to assess the detailed costs of any required upgrades or improvements.

4.2 Planning

In addition to infrastructure considerations, managing the number and location of future rural residential households is important to ensure that the characteristics of a particular location, settlement, or town are maintained. Alternatively, if change is significant, it is important that the extent and nature of the change is understood and addressed appropriately.

If a significant portion of the households allocated by Proposed Change No. 1 were developed in any one community, it could have a negative impact on the characteristics and amenity values that are valued by that community. Alternatively, additional households may have a beneficial impact on a community through improved or better utilised facilities or new or upgraded reticulated infrastructure. For larger communities, such as Mandeville, additional households may enhance self sufficiency and long term sustainability through the provision of an integrated wastewater scheme and other community facilities.
The shortage of vacant rural residential lots available for building and the projected demand for rural residential living requires growth locations to be well placed to mitigate any adverse impacts. Choice of locations could be left solely to private plan change requests. This approach involves considerable uncertainty for both the Council and community and provides few assurances that growth would be managed by being planned for and development would maintain the qualities characteristics of the locality. It also provides few assurances that efficient and effective reticulated infrastructure would be provided.

The 1510 households provided by Proposed Change No. 1 is significantly greater that the recent historical rate of rural residential growth within Waimakariri District. The rate of growth over the past 10 years within the eastern part of Waimakariri District has averaged approximately 20 households per year (see Figure 2). The UDS and Proposed Change No. 1 provide for 43 per year.

The Development Plan helps to determine whether 1510 households may, or may not be, appropriate for the eastern part of the district and assists with determining the key issues associated with rural residential development. It does this by allocating the households provided by Proposed Change No. 1 through the identification of potential growth locations and approximate household yields.

This approach lies outside of the statutory Resource Management Act 1991 private plan change request process, but will inform recommendations and decisions on requests to rezone land.
5 Growth Locations

5.1 Specific Constraints

Rural residential growth and development within the eastern part of the district is constrained or influenced by a number of factors. These are matters which ideally should be avoided in identification of locations so that are free of such constraints or issues. Key constraints include:

- Ashley and Waimakariri River flood risk and implications for people, property and infrastructure;
- Ground water resurgence, particularly in the Mandeville area and the suitability of land within this area for housing and infrastructure;
- Localised ponding or poor drainage, particularly with respect to Ohoka and east Rangiora (poor drainage) and adjacent to the beach communities of Kairaki, Pines, Woodend and Waikuku, including land to the east of Kaiapoi (localised ponding);
- Community expectations, signalled in the District Plan, that development will not occur to the south of Kaiapoi in order to maintain a rural outlook and to avoid continuous urban development towards Christchurch;
- Community expectations, signalled in the District Plan, that the beach settlements will retain their existing character through limitations on adjacent subdivision and development; and
- Christchurch International Airport aircraft noise contour that includes parts of Kaiapoi and the majority of land to the south of Kaiapoi and associated policies to limit housing development to no greater than one household per 4 ha.

Figure 3 illustrates the constraints imposed by the Christchurch International Airport noise contour, Ashley River flood breakout and groundwater resurgence. Figure 3 also illustrates the policy requirements of the District Plan in respect to localised flooding and the development constraints for the beach settlements.

5.2 Household Numbers Methodology

The Development Plan calculates the total households for each identified growth location based on an average lot size of 5000m$^2$. This lot size is the mid point between the existing Residential 4A and 4B Zone lot sizes included in the District Plan and is also consistent with the definition of rural residential activities$^5$ included in Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy statement, which states:

“Residential units outside the Urban Limits at an average density of no less than one per hectare”

To assess affordability associated with providing water and wastewater for the growth locations, a maximum development contribution of $15,000 for each service was assumed. This applies to those locations other than those identified at the ‘urban edge’ (see 5.4 below). It was also assumed that ‘urban edge’ locations could connect to the existing reticulated town schemes.

---

$^5$ As amended by decisions on submissions, December 2009.
The total cost for each service per location was divided by $15,000 to give a conservative minimum number of households required to viably provide a reticulated service or an upgraded service. Appendix 3 provides a summary of the calculations.
5.3 Community Engagement Outcomes

The Development Plan Supporting Documents provide the background and outcomes of the community engagement process. This includes the summary of submissions, submission maps and the decisions issued by the Hearings Panel. It also includes a copy of the engineering assessments for water and wastewater.

5.4 Growth Locations

Eight growth locations are identified based on initial infrastructure and planning assessments. These locations are Mandeville, Ohoka, Waikuku, Fernside, south east Rangiora, south east Woodend, north Kaiapoi and Kaiapoi Waterways. Each location reflects one of two location types:

1. Addition to existing ‘stand alone’ Residential 4A or 4B Zones i.e. Mandeville, Ohoka, Waikuku and Fernside; and

2. Addition to ‘urban edge’ locations i.e. south east Rangiora, south east Woodend, north Kaiapoi and Kaiapoi Waterways.

Central to the identification of growth locations is a position to avoid establishment of new ‘stand alone’ rural residential developments. These are locations that are physically separated by distance from existing Residential 4A and 4B Zones or from an existing settlement or an identified urban growth area i.e. the urban limits identified in Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.

The Council prefers to support community resources and infrastructure established in existing settlements or centres. New rural residential developments have the potential to result in increased traffic movements and could impact on established farming operations. Inappropriate development could also alter the existing rural landscape and generate demand for reticulated infrastructure at the expense of existing settlements.

Sheet 01 illustrates the identified rural residential growth locations.
5.5 ‘Stand Alone’ Locations

‘Stand alone’ locations are based on existing rural residential zones situated within the rural area and are physically separated from a major town, village or settlement.

The key driver for the identification of the ‘stand alone’ locations, from the Council’s perspective, is that additional households will help to address servicing deficiencies within existing communities. These locations should also be free from significant environmental constraints. ‘Stand alone’ locations exhibit the general ‘Pros’ and ‘Cons’ set out in Table 3 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: Rural Setting Adjacent to Existing Residential 4 Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential infrastructure benefits for existing properties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduces perception/reality of ‘town creep or urban sprawl’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports existing community facilities e.g. community halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports existing community facilities e.g. community halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports existing community facilities e.g. community halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports existing community facilities e.g. community halls</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5.6 Tuahiwi

Tuahiwi was identified in the Draft Rural Residential Development Plan discussion document has a potential stand alone location, although it is zoned Residential 3 (small settlement) rather than rural residential (Residential 4A or 4B). At that time, Tuahiwi was signalled though the Proposed Change No. 1 process as potentially suitable for rural residential development. In addition, Tuahiwi was also considered as a possible location due to it current reticulated infrastructure deficiencies, in particular the absence of a reticulated water supply.

A clear message taken from the Development Plan information evening held at the Tuahiwi Marae was the need to look at the development and growth options for Maori Reserve 873 as a whole prior to consideration of particular forms of development, such as rural residential. A development project for Maori Reserve 873 is due to start in the 2010/2011 financial year. This project will assess development options in consultation with the Tuahiwi community and with regard to Proposed Change No. 1.

As a consequence, Tuahiwi at this time is no longer included in the Development Plan as an identified growth location. However, provision of future rural residential households on a nominal basis to this area has been reserved to ensure some allocation is available if required once development and growth options have been investigated.
**Fernside**

**Location**

Located between Oxford Road and Johns Road, approximately 5km west of Rangiora.

**Growth and Development**

Developed in the 1970s and 1980s through a Council initiated change to the District Scheme. Subdivision and house building within the zone has occurred throughout this time, with the last significant subdivision occurring in 2007.

**Development Plan Growth Location**

Development in the area between Lily Road, Swannanoa Road, Oxford Road and the Cust Main Drain as shown on Map Sheet 02.

The reasons for this are:

- The area has good connectivity to adjoining roads and Rangiora;
- The area is located in close proximity to community facilities, including the Fernside School and hall;
- The area is located near to existing reticulated infrastructure; and
- The area is contiguous with the existing Residential 4B Zone and has the ability to integrate with existing development.

**Households**

**Existing**

Approximately 80 households. The majority of lots are in the 1 hectare range.

**Potential**

Greater than 100 households based on a reticulated wastewater connection to the EDSS via Rangiora. Lots in the vicinity of 5000m$^2$ average size.

**Community and Community Facilities**

**Existing**

Approximately 200 people based on 2.5 persons per household. Fernside has a community hall, primary school, and preschool.

**Potential**

An additional 250 people (based on 100 additional households) in the period to 2041.

**Settlement**

**Existing**

Approximately 90 ha zoned Residential 4B.

**Potential**

An additional 80 ha approximately (gross).
**Reticulated Services**

**Existing**
There is currently a small wastewater scheme serving 21 households on the western side of Fernside. There is no spare capacity. All other households have on site septic tanks with individual disposal fields.

Domestic water is sourced from a well located on Swannanoa Road. It has adequate capacity but is non-secure and requires chlorination treatment.

**Potential**
Reticulated wastewater connection to the EDSS at Rangiora via on site septic tanks. Water supply options include an upgrade to the existing supply or connection to either the Mandeville or Rangiora supplies.

**Comments**

Fernside presents an option to combine wastewater disposal from any new development with the existing Fernside scheme. This would involve pumping wastewater from Fernside to Rangiora. Water improvement options include treatment of the existing water source, a new well or connecting to the Mandeville or Rangiora supplies. These reticulations could also benefit existing households at Fernside.

Development to the south of Johns Road is not preferred as the area is susceptible to localised flooding from Dockey Creek and cannot achieve the same level of integration as land to the west of Swannanoa Road.

The Development Plan provides for greater than 100 households with the identified growth location. The quantum and location of households is to be determined as part of any development proposal.

**Other Matters**

**Flood Risk**
Recent flood modelling undertaken by ECan has identified a potential flood risk from the Ashley River originating north west of Fernside. The growth location has avoided the modelled flood path where possible, noting that mitigation options are available for development, particularly in low hazard areas.

Land adjacent to Dockey Creek is affected by localised flooding from Dockey Creek during high rainfall events. This does not necessarily preclude development, but will need to be the subject of more detailed investigation as part of any rezoning proposal.

**Connectivity**
The growth area between Lily Road, Swannanoa Road, Oxford Road, and the Cust Main Drain is located close to the Fernside Hall and School, and avoids development on both sides of Oxford Road. As the growth location is located near existing infrastructure, household development will be contiguous and will avoid creating a new 'stand alone' location.
Waikuku

Location
Main North Road (State Highway 1), approximately 3 km from Waikuku Beach and 3 km from Woodend.

Past Growth and Development
Developed in the 1880s as part of local farming and milling activities. The existing rural residential zone is largely undeveloped. Some subdivision within the zone has occurred recently.

Development Plan Growth Location
To the south of Gressons Road as shown on Map Sheet 06.

The reasons for this are:
- The area is free of Ashley River breakout flood risk;
- The area avoids potential community severance associated with State Highway 1; and
- The area is achieves a greater level of integration with the existing Residential 4B Zone when considered against other locations to the north and east.

Households

Existing
Approximately 30 households. Lots range in size from several hectares through to 1000m$^2$ reflecting development patterns in existence prior to Residential 4B zoning.

Potential
Approximately 80 households based on a reticulated wastewater connection to the EDSS Woodend treatment ponds. Lots in the vicinity of 5000m$^2$ average size.

Community and Community Facilities

Existing
Approximately 75 people, based on 2.5 persons per household. Waikuku includes a primary school, a service station, café, and other specialty shops located at the old Mill site.

Potential
An additional 200 people in the period to 2041.

Settlement

Existing
Approximately 50 ha zoned Residential 4B.

Potential
An additional 40 ha approximately (gross).

Reticulated Services

Existing
Waikuku has neither a reticulated wastewater scheme nor a public water supply. Existing households are served by on site septic tanks or in one case a small private community scheme serving five lots. Domestic water is sourced from private wells.
Potential
Reticulated wastewater connection to the EDSS at Waikuku Beach or Woodend. Water connection to the Woodend supply or Pegasus supply (capacity unknown at this time).

Comments
The Development Plan presents an opportunity to establish a reticulated wastewater system that could be extended to cover the existing Residential 4B Zone. There is also an opportunity to install a reticulated water supply via a connection to Woodend for the benefit of the existing community.

Other Matters
Flood Risk
Recent flood modelling undertaken by ECan has identified a potential flood risk from the Ashley River originating in the area to the north west of Waikuku. Depending on the level of risk, parts of the land surrounding the Waikuku Residential 4B Zone could be affected by flood waters during a break out event, particularly to the north. The identified growth location avoids this area of risk.

Main North Road
State Highway 1 is a limited access road, controlled by the New Zealand Transport Agency. Limited access roads are established in the interests of road user safety, particularly in areas where development may create additional access requirements. New vehicle crossings are strictly controlled by the Transport Agency.

Development at Waikuku may not be able to use State Highway 1 for individual vehicle crossings to new households. The growth location recognises this potential constraint. Land to the east is not preferred to avoid Waikuku developing on two sides of the State Highway and creating a split community.
**Mandeville**

**Location**

Generally situated at the junction of Tram Road, McHughs Road, Mandeville Road, and Bradley’s Road, approximately 15 km from Rangiora and Kaiapoi.

**Past Growth and Development**

Initial rural residential development occurred in the 1980s followed by an extension in the 1990s to include the majority of land bounded by Tram Road, No. 10 Road, and McHughs Road. Development of Ohoka Meadows and Truro Place occurred in the 1990s.

The San Dona subdivision was established in the 1990s comprising small Rural Zone lots for Olive production. This development, located to the north of Tram Road, was approved under the previous District Plan where an independent farm unit test applied.

**Development Plan Growth Location**

Map Sheet 05 identifies a growth location to the south of Tram Road.

The reasons for this are:

- The area to the south of Tram Road consolidates and supports the Residential 4A and 4B Zones and San Dona;
- The land to the south of Tram Road avoids community severance associated with households developing on either side of a significant road;
- The area to the south of Tram Road provides a logical development boundary in the form of North Eyre Road. The area to the north of Tram Road does not have such a boundary;
- The area to the south is located in close proximity to the focal point of Mandeville, being the community facilities of the Mandeville domain and sports ground, and will not result in new development needing to cross Tram Road to access these facilities; and
- Development to the south of Tram Road will protect the rural outlook provided by the area of rural land to the north.

Private plan change requests (including in respect of the area to the north of Tram Road and the San Dona Olive Grove) will be received and considered in accordance with the Resource Management Act process. This allows for public participation, so a clear view on the appropriate location and extent of growth in Mandeville can be obtained from the Mandeville community and considered as part of that process.

The small Rural zoned area of land located at the junction of Tram Road and Mandeville Road is also identified as a growth location. This area constitutes a logical extension to the Mandeville form given its central position within the wider Mandeville area.

**Households**

**Existing**

The existing Residential 4B Zones include approximately 170 households, the majority of which are situated on properties of around 1 ha in size. San Dona comprises approximately 120 additional households.
Potential
An additional 200 households based on reticulated wastewater connection to the EDSS at Kaiapoi. Lots in the region of 5000m² average size.

Community and Community Facilities

Existing
Approximately 720 people, based on 2.5 persons per household. Mandeville Sports Centre and reserve is located on Mandeville Road. Swannanoa Primary School and pre-school is approximately 3km to the west along Tram Road.

Potential
An additional 500 people within the period to 2041.

Settlement

Existing
Approximately 175 ha zoned Residential 4B; San Dona 200 ha.

Potential
Approximately 100 ha gross as indicated by Map Sheet 05. The Mandeville rural residential area would cover in excess of 475 ha, including San Dona.

Reticulated Services

Existing
Seven wastewater package treatment plants, three operated and maintained by Waimakariri District Council. Four are privately operated. The existing Mandeville water supply well has limited capacity.

Potential
Reticulated wastewater connection to the EDSS, probably to Rangiora, and eventual decommissioning of the package treatment plants. A new water supply well is proposed for the 2012/13 financial year.

Comments

Servicing
The Development Plan presents an opportunity to implement an overall wastewater solution for the Mandeville area. This has the potential to include some of the privately operated schemes and would involve a common pipeline designed in conjunction with development at Ohoka. This will reduce the number of individual wastewater schemes, which are generally expensive to operate and have a relatively short life span due to consent and land/plant requirements. A new well is programmed for installation to serve the domestic water requirements of the Mandeville community.

Settlement size
Specific controls are considered necessary to manage the spatial extent and layout of future development. The Development Plan requires further consultation with the Mandeville community to ascertain boundary limits for rural residential development in the Mandeville area. Ideally this consultation will occur before any further development is undertaken at Mandeville.
Other Matters

Groundwater Resource
Mandeville is located within a groundwater allocation zone under ECAn policy. This means that water taken from the underlying aquifer is monitored and controlled. This is a potential constraint on any future development as consent from ECAn for additional water abstraction could be difficult to obtain, depending on the amount of groundwater allocated within the allocation limit.

A survey was undertaken in 2006 of the Mandeville area. A copy of the executive summary is attached as Appendix 4. Of note, the survey found that environment and lifestyle were the features most liked by respondents living at Mandeville. Of the respondents households 55.2% bought their properties as bare land and 44.8% bought their properties with a house.

The survey found that there was limited support for the re-subdivision of existing lots with 20.9% of respondents indicating that they supported this option, while 75.5% indicated that they opposed it. Full residential development gained even less support with 6.3% of respondents indicating that they supported this option, while 92.8% indicated that they opposed it.

Respondents were also asked to indicate their level of support for the development of a village centre at Mandeville. Approximately 60% supported such a centre at Mandeville. A dairy or grocery/convenience store was the favoured type of shop or service.

Commercial Centre and Self sufficiency
The Development Plan does not establish a position on the appropriateness of a commercial centre at Mandeville. This is a matter to be addressed at the time of specific rezoning proposal, where any such proposal can be assessed on their specific impacts. It is also a matter that could be addressed further as part of future consultation with the Mandeville community regarding growth locations.
**Ohoka**

**Location**

Generally situated at the junction of Mill Road and Whites Road, approximately 4 km from Mandeville and 8 km from Kaiapoi.

**Past Growth and Development**

Ohoka was founded in the late 1800s as a mill town and as a centre to support farming. The last significant developments were the 1990s Keetly Place and Wilson Drive subdivisions. Ohoka retains its semi-rural feel characterised by country roads, surrounding farmland and established trees.

**Development Plan Growth Location**

Development centred on the existing village of Ohoka, without an identified growth location, as shown on Map Sheet 04.

The reasons for this are:

- Additional households assist with the provision of reticulated infrastructure; and
- Additional households support and enhance the community facilities and the character of Ohoka.

**Issues and Constraints**

The following matters must be considered as part of any development proposal:

- Potential impact on the character and amenity values of the Ohoka village, depending on the growth direction;
- The total households do not exceed 150;
- A high level of development integration; and
- Consideration of the current District Plan growth limitation policy.

**Households**

**Existing**

Approximately 80 households. Properties range in size from approximately 1000m$^2$ (in the Residential 3 Zone along Mill Road) through to 2 ha (Residential 4B Zones).

**Potential**

No more than 150 households based on a reticulated wastewater connection to the EDSS via Kaiapoi or Rangiora. Lots in the vicinity of 5000m$^2$ average size.

**Community and Community Facilities**

**Existing**

Approximately 200 people, based on 2.5 persons per household. Ohoka has a service station, church, community hall, primary school, and a domain.

**Potential**

An additional 375 in the period to 2041.
Settlement Size

Existing
Approximately 14 ha zoned Residential 3; 50 ha Residential 4B.

Potential
Development generally within the area shown on Sheet Map 04. No preferred direction for growth; this is most appropriately considered as part of any comprehensive development proposal to rezone land.

Reticulated Services

Existing
There is no public reticulated wastewater scheme in Ohoka. Existing households are served by on site septic tanks and individual disposal fields. The existing community well has inadequate capacity to cater for additional development.

Potential
Reticulated wastewater connection to the EDSS to Rangiora via on site septic tanks. Water supply options include a significant upgrade of the existing supply or an extension of the Kaiapoi supply.

Comments

The Development Plan presents an opportunity to provide reticulated water and wastewater schemes for Ohoka, including existing households. Wastewater would be managed by a common pipeline that also serves Mandeville connecting to the existing EDSS infrastructure at either Kaiapoi or Rangiora.

Other Matters

Character and Settlement Size
The Waimakariri District Plan includes the following policy to manage development at Ohoka:

Policy 18.1.1.9
Limit the Ohoka settlement to within its Residential 3 and 4B boundaries existing at 20 June 1998.

Explanation
The Council considers the expansion of the Ohoka settlement is undesirable because of the low-lying nature of the area and the difficulty of providing satisfactory drainage and effluent disposal services. The Ohoka settlement has already experienced considerable growth over recent years with the rural-residential development at Keetly Place and Wilson Drive. The Council supports the argument, however, that further development has the potential for adverse effects that will overwhelm the character, and form and function of the Ohoka settlement (Armstrong vs Waimakariri District Council 1994).

This policy will need to be amended or replaced to ensure that the location, direction and extent, design or number of households associated with any growth and development is sympathetic to the character and values of the existing settlement.

Groundwater Resource
Ohoka is located within a groundwater allocation zone under Environment Canterbury policy. This means that water taken from the underlying aquifer is monitored and controlled. This is a potential constraint on an upgrade of the existing water supply as any
groundwater take is linked to the minimum flows of the Ohoka Stream. This combined with previous water quality issues means it may be better to connect to the Kaiapoi supply, which has ample consented water.

**Ground Soakage**

Septic tank disposal field performance within the Ohoka area is affected by poor drainage and a high water table. This is known to affect the longevity of disposal fields. A reticulated wastewater system for new and existing households would assist in alleviating this problem.
5.7 Addition to or Extension of ‘Urban Edge’ Locations

‘Urban Edge’ locations are those areas located adjacent to existing towns on the basis that they support existing infrastructure and community facilities and are free of significant environmental constraints. A key issue for the urban edge is to avoid locations that may constrain future urban growth in the medium to long term. Inappropriate locations could constrain future urban growth or impose significant costs on future Councils’ and the community when trying to retrofit urban development within existing rural residential areas.

Advantages and Disadvantages

This approach exhibits the general ‘Pros’ and ‘Cons’ set out in Table 4 below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Urban Edge Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pros</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defines an urban/rural edge and provides a town buffer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports existing businesses and community facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports existing or upgraded reticulated services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessens impact on rural character and reduces rural fragmentation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Urban Edge’ Locations

Four locations have been identified. These are south east Rangiora, north Kaiapoi, south east Woodend and Kaiapoi Waterways.
South East Rangiora

Location
North side of Boys Road, south of the Northbrook Stream. Adjacent to the Northbrook Waters development.

Past Growth and Development
Used for farming purposes. Currently subject to a private District Plan request to rezone land from Rural to Residential 2.

Development Plan Growth Location
To the north of Boys Road, south of the Northbrook Stream and immediately adjacent to the Northbrook Waters subdivision and lake as shown on Map Sheet 03.

The reasons for this are:

- The area is not appropriate for residential density household development and will not constraint future urban growth;
- The area does not preclude a future north/south road linkage along the Sparks Lane paper road alignment; and
- The Sparks Lane paper road alignment provides a development boundary to the east.

Households

Existing:
The site is currently used for farming purposes.

Potential
Approximately 25 households based on an average lot size of not less than 2500m² (source: private plan change request)

Community and Community Facilities

Existing
The Northbrook Wetlands passive recreation area is located to the immediate north. Rangiora town centre and Southbrook are located to the north west and west respectively.

Potential
Approximately 60 people, based on 2.5 persons per household.

Settlement

Existing
The population of Rangiora is approximately 13,000 people.

Potential
Map Sheet 03 identifies an area of approximately 7.6 ha.

Reticulated Services

Existing
Wastewater and water connections available from the Rangiora public schemes.

Potential
Reticulated wastewater connection to the Rangiora scheme and EDSS via treatment ponds at Southbrook. The Rangiora water supply is available to the site.
Comments

Private Plan Change

The site is currently subject to a private plan change request to rezone the land from Rural to Residential 2. This plan change is now seeking a Residential 4C Zone comprising 25 lots in the range of 2000m² to 2500m².

The request has been publicly notified and is to be followed by hearing of submissions in due course. The site is located within the urban limits set by Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.

Other Matters

Road Network

Spark Lane, a paper road, has been identified as a possible north/south link in the future and should be protected by future rezoning plan changes. Boys Road is also considered as a link road from Woodend to Southbrook and any development in this locality will need to address traffic circulation.
**North Kaiapoi**

**Location**
North of Lees Road and the urban limits identified in Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement. Generally south to south east of existing quarrying activities.

**Past Growth and Development**
Used for farming purposes, including some intensive horticulture.

**Development Plan Growth Location**
To the north of Lees Road and the urban limit proposed by Proposed Change No. 1 as shown on Map Sheet 08.

The reasons for this are:
- The area is free of significant District Plan policy such as the growth and development limitation policy that applies to south Kaiapoi; and
- The area is best and most easily developable piece of land available in Kaiapoi outside of the urban limits.

**Households**

*Existing*
Some households associated with rural land use.

*Potential*
Approximately 40 households based on lots in the vicinity of 5000m² average size.

**Community and Community Facilities**

*Existing*
Undeveloped for residential use. Kaiapoi town centre is approximately 4km to the south.

*Potential*
Approximately 100 people, based on 2.5 persons per household.

**Settlement**

*Existing*
The population of Kaiapoi is approximately 10,000 people.

*Potential*
An additional 20 ha approximately (gross).

**Reticulated Services**

*Existing*
Wastewater and water connections available from the Kaiapoi public schemes.

*Potential*
Wastewater connection to the EDSS via treatment ponds at Ferry Road. Water generally available from the Kaiapoi supply.
Other Matters

Proximity to Future Urban Limit
The land to the south of Lees Road (within the urban limit) has recently been rezoned Residential 2 and is currently under staged development. Development within this area will assist with the provision of infrastructure within the north Kaiapoi area.

Flood Risk
Recent flood modelling undertaken by ECan has identified a potential flood risk from the Ashley River originating in the area to the north of Kaiapoi. The identified growth location is potentially affected by low hazard level flooding. Mitigation options would need to be investigated further prior to any new development.
**South East Woodend**

**Location**

Generally north of Woodend Beach Road and to the east of Judsons Road and the urban limits identified in Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.

**Past Growth and Development**

Used for farming purposes.

**Development Plan Growth Location**

To the south and east of Woodend, and generally to the north of Woodend Beach Road and immediately adjacent to the proposed urban limit for Woodend (as shown on Map Sheet 07).

The reasons for this are:

- The Waimakariri District Council’s preferred alignment for a Woodend State Highway One by-pass provides a development boundary to the east;
- Development within part of the identified growth location provides a transition between Woodend and the by-pass; and
- The area is free of any identified hazard constraints.

**Households**

- **Existing**
  Some households associated with rural land use.

- **Potential**
  Not more than 200 households based on an average size of 5000m². It is not anticipated that the entire area identified will be used for rural residential purposes.

**Community and Community Facilities**

- **Existing**
  Undeveloped for residential use. The Woodend town centre is located nearby.

- **Potential**
  Approximately 500 people, based on 2.5 persons per household.

**Settlement**

- **Existing**
  The population of Woodend is approximately 2,500 people.

- **Potential**
  Approximately 100 ha in area, located on the periphery of the existing town boundary and to the immediate east of the urban limits identified in Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.

**Reticulated Services**

- **Existing**
  Wastewater and water connections available from the Woodend public schemes.
Potential
Reticulated wastewater connection to the EDSS via treatment ponds at Gladstone Road. Water generally available from the Woodend supply.

Comments
The Development Plan provides for not more than 200 households with the identified growth location. The quantum and location of households is to be determined as part of any development proposal to rezone land.

Other Matters

Proximity to Future Urban Limit
A feature of this location, which differs from the other ‘urban edge’ locations, is that it is generally located adjacent to undeveloped land within the proposed urban limit for Woodend. In this regard, is the location is physically separated from the existing Woodend urban area but adjacent to a future growth area that is anticipated to develop over the next 35 years.

Woodend By-Pass
The growth location identified on Map Sheet 07 is generally located within and on the town side of the bypass currently being considered by the New Zealand Transport Agency. This helps to avoid poor connectivity and linkages with Woodend should development occur to the east of the by-pass.
Kaiapoi Waterways

Location and Development Proposal

Kaiapoi Waterways is a development proposal situated on rural land located to the immediate southeast of Kaiapoi. The land area is generally located between the Kaiapoi River to the north, Kaiapoi and the Courtenay Stream to the west, the Waimakariri River to the east and the Woodford Glen speedway to the south.

Key features of the proposal are:

- A network of canals and waterways surrounding the houses and open living spaces;
- A lock through the stopbank to allow boat access to the Kaiapoi River;
- Berths for boats adjacent to most households;
- An inland marina and public slipway;
- Potential for restaurants and bars within the central area;
- Commercial activities associated with boating and water sports;
- Style consistent with the historic river town context of Kaiapoi;
- An industrial area of approximately 25 hectares relating to the marine industry.

Through submission on the Draft Development Plan, Kaiapoi Waterways Developments Ltd outlined a number of benefits that the development could bring to wider Kaiapoi community. These benefits focus on innovative features, in particular the landmark qualities of the proposal and its uniqueness to the South Island.

Issues and Constraints

Connectivity
The development is physically separated from the existing urban area of Kaiapoi by the Courtenay Stream and larger residential sections located to the west of the stream. Road access is currently from Doubledays Road. An additional road connection to Raven Quay may be possible to help achieve a greater level of connectivity with Kaiapoi. This would only be feasible subject to land ownership and legislative requirements being appropriately addressed.

Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement
Kaiapoi Waterways has appealed Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement to allow the proposal to be included within the urban limits. If the area is included within the urban limits, it will no longer be suitable for rural residential development. However, Kaiapoi Waterways has indicated that the development could be developed in a rural residential style, at a lesser density, and as an alternative to development within the urban limits. Any rural residential development would need to be aligned with the requirements set out in Proposed Change No.1.

Flood Risk
The Kaiapoi Waterways area is affected by flooding from both the Waimakariri and Ashley Rivers during breakout flood events. The area is also identified as a localised flooding area in the District Plan. Kaiapoi Waterways proposes to utilise minimum floor levels and a canal system to attenuate floodwater flows. These mitigation measures will need to be demonstrated in detail as part of any request
to rezone the land. This work would need to show that both the proposed development is adequately protected from floodwater and also that floodwaters are not dissipated causing an adverse effect on nearby properties.

Reverse Sensitivity
The Woodford Glen speedway is located adjacent to the southern boundary of the proposed development. The speedway is used for motor sports events which can generate significant noise, affecting surrounding properties. Rural residential development with the Kaiapoi Waterways site may be affected by noise from the speedway. As an existing activity it will need to be shown that any development in this area will not adversely impact on the current, or consented, usage of the speedway.

Infrastructure
The development proposes water, stormwater, and drainage infrastructure to be at an urban standard. This is a constraint to most rural residential locations within the district that have restricted water supplies with on site storage, where available, and wastewater systems utilising on site primary treatment where no reticulated scheme exists. This development does not offer any advantages to existing households with deficiencies that would be upgraded via this development and therefore offer few advantages in this respect as a growth location.

District Plan Development Constraint
The Waimakariri District Plan includes the following policy to manage peripheral urban development at Kaiapoi (explanation abbreviated):

Policy 18.1.1.4 states:

"Limit Kaiapoi urban area to within its southern and south western boundaries existing at 20 June 1998.

Explanation
A consistent message that has emerged from community consultation is the desire to keep urban areas separate from one another by a rural environment.

Of most concern was the potential for Kaiapoi to expand south and Christchurch City to expand north to create a continuous urban environment. (See explanation to Policy 15.1.1.1 for an explanation of "urban environments"). If this was to happen there was concern that Kaiapoi would lose its distinctive character and become a suburb of Christchurch. A second concern was the adverse effects arising if the Kaiapoi urban area was to expand south west of the Motorway. The community sees the motorway as a logical barrier to further growth. As the major road in the area it was appropriate that the rural setting of Kaiapoi be enhanced by retaining a rural outlook from the motorway where it was not already compromised. A sustainable future for Kaiapoi lies in its rural setting, and in avoiding future adverse effects from future urban development straddling the motorway. Provision has been made, subject to strict requirements as to flooding, traffic, foundations and exclusion of residential uses within the 50 dBA Ldn aircraft noise contour, by way of a Deferred Residential 2 zone for a limited residential subdivision of land in the Island Road area. This would involve a future change to establish a satisfactory Outline Development Plan.

The area bounded by the existing town, the Kaiapoi River, the Waimakariri River, and a line to the west based on Island Road up to
Ohoka Road should be free of urban development. This area would create an area of rural segregation, and promote growth of the town in a more sustainable direction.

The Council supports the community view. In particular, the community has identified the maintenance and enhancement of the form and function of Kaiapoi, and the maintenance and enhancement of open space values of the river and its margins. Further, consideration is also needed of the ability of any urban subdivision and development to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse effects of natural hazards on the future uses of this land”.

This development and subdivision constraint policy would need to be altered to allow the Kaiapoi Waterways proposal to occur. In order for this to be successful through a subsequent District Plan change, it would need to be shown that this development could meet the concerns of the policy and would not undermine the policy in general.

**Development Plan Growth Location**

Should the Kaiapoi Waterways proposal address the matters outlined above satisfactorily, the location could be considered as an identified rural residential growth location.

**Households**

**Existing**
No households existing.

**Potential**
Kaiapoi Waterways could provide for 250 rural residential households. Lot sizes would probably need to vary depending on the alignment and design of the canal system but could generally average 2500m² in area.

**Community and Community Facilities**

**Existing**
None existing. Kaiapoi has a full range of urban services.

**Potential**
Could possibly be in the order of 625 people, based on 2.5 persons per household over the period to 2041. A small central ‘leisure’ area is proposed. Limited light industrial activities are proposed in the southern end of the development.

**Settlement Size**

**Existing**
N/A

**Potential**
Approximately 85 ha (gross) generally within the area shown on Map Sheet 09.

**Reticulated Services**

**Existing**
Full urban water and wastewater services are provided in Kaiapoi. The nearest possible connection points are located to the west across the Courtney Stream.

**Potential**
Reticulated water and wastewater connections are likely to be possible to the Kaiapoi schemes.
Legend

- Preferred Development Location
- Household Yield: 250
- Existing Residential Zoning (Residential 1)
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- Ashley River 500 Year Flood Breakout (0.2% AEP)
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General Note:
Ashley River 500 Year Flood Area Obscures District Plan Zones On This Plan
Other Areas Considered

West of District
The Development Plan does not apply to the district outside of the Urban Development Strategy area i.e. west of Two Chain and Lily Roads and north of the Ashley River. It is anticipated that District Plan rezoning requests and development proposals within the west of district are likely to be limited, however it is recognised that a request for rezoning can be made any time. The District Plan, as it has done so for the past few years, has an existing policy framework in place to manage new rural residential development proposals.

West of Lehmans Road
This area does not have any identified constraints that would preclude the area being developed in the long term. However, in the short term development within this area is likely to compromise any further long term growth for Rangiora to the west.

Waikuku Beach
The District Plan manages development at the beach settlements through its policies limiting additional growth and development. These policies recognise the unique characteristics of the beach settlements. Much of the land around the beach settlements is also subject to localised flooding policy. Unlike Waikuku, Waikuku Beach has reticulated water and wastewater systems.

San Dona
The San Dona subdivision is not an identified growth area as the development is currently rural residential in nature and, as such, development would be more akin to intensification. This would result in a significant change in established character.

Swannanoa
Swannanoa is a small Residential 4B Zone with existing reticulated services. It has its own character associated with a compact form and the Swannanoa School. It is located in close proximity to Mandeville; however it is separated by rural land that contributes to its setting. Swannanoa is not a growth location as any additional development may impinge on these characteristics.

Waiora Lane
Waiora Lane has not been included as growth location. It is a small well established zone developed under the former Town and Country planning acts. Although additional development may assist with the proposition of reticulated infrastructure, the ‘hamlet’ values associated with a small number of houses clustered adjacent to the Taranaki Stream would be compromised.

North East Rangiora
North east Rangiora has not been identified as a growth location as infrastructure would need to occur after reticulated services have moved through the greenfields area at east Rangiora. For this reason, north east Rangiora is best considered as a long term growth area. The area is also subject to Ashley River flooding in a breakout event.

Land between Woodend and Kaiapoi
This is a large land area. If all of this area was identified as a growth location it would change the landscape and would effectively join Woodend with Kaiapoi. This is potentially inconsistent with existing District Plan policy.
6 Implications of Growth Locations

6.1 Infrastructure Funding

A set of cost estimates for each identified location has been prepared as outlined in Appendix 3. These are indicative and provide a rough order cost only. Further investigation and detailed design is required before the estimates can be confirmed. However, for the purposes of the Development Plan they provide an indication that new or upgraded water and wastewater reticulations are feasible given a minimum number of new households to share the cost of development.

For new growth and development, the bulk of the costs will lie with the developer. The Council may pay a portion of the development cost where it seeks extra capacity within any given system in order to serve existing households or to provide for any additional future households. In this case, the capital outlay of the Council would generally be recovered from the future beneficiaries or from developers through its Development Contributions policy.

6.2 Existing Rural Residential (Residential 4A and 4B Zone) Households

A benefit of utilising the EDSS for any new development is that capacity can be made available for existing properties. It provides an opportunity for existing households to take advantage of any new reticulations, should existing services become uneconomic to maintain or regulatory conditions change.

At this time, the Development Plan does not anticipate any direct implications or costs to existing households located near or within a growth development location. However, it is anticipated that connection to any new reticulation would require, at least in some instances, the installation of new or upgraded internal reticulations within existing developed areas. This may incur a cost to each property but potentially at a lesser rate than an upgrade or replacement of an existing scheme.

6.3 Sequencing

If sequencing of future rural residential development were to occur (see 3.4), this should be based on prioritising areas of greatest benefit to existing communities. Engineering issues associated with the sequencing of rural residential development include:

- Understanding and investigations into existing deficiencies;
- Designing and providing infrastructure where there are currently none;
- Overall affordability and impact on rates;
- Implications for and capacity of downstream infrastructure, particularly in respect to the EDSS.

Sequencing is particularly pertinent to the ‘stand alone’ locations where there are existing infrastructure deficiencies. The following is based on prioritising areas where greatest benefit to existing communities would be achieved:

1. Mandeville and Ohoka
2. Fernside
3. Waikuku
6.4 Total Households

The following is a summary of the total households, in the opinion of the Council, that are achievable in broad terms at each of the identified growth locations. The Development Plan indicates that a total allocation in the order of 1045 households is appropriate for the eastern part of the Waimakariri District\(^6\) as follows:

**Urban edge** preferences: 515 households. This total is based on development locations that support the adjacent facilities and infrastructure of the adjacent town and do not constrain future urban growth options.

- North Kaiapoi: 40
- South East Woodend: Less than 200.
- South East Rangiora: 25
- Kaiapoi Waterways: Potentially 250\(^*\)

*Subject to identified issues being adequately addressed.

**Stand alone** preferences: 530 households. This total is based on a minimum number of households per identified location based on a maximum development contribution of $15,000 per new lot for each service.

- Mandeville: 200\(^*\)
- Ohoka: Less than 150
- Fernside: Greater than 100

Waikuku: 80

**Any further household allocation is subject to a comprehensive review of growth and development options.**

Total households: 1045.

**Balance of households:**

Options available for the remainder of the households allocated by Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement include:

- An ECan initiated variation or change to Proposed Change No. 1 to review and alter the rural residential households as they apply to Waimakariri District;
- ‘Hold in reserve’ until the first scheduled review of Proposed Change No. 1 and the Maori Reserve 873 development and growth option review have been completed.

It is also anticipated that the Development Plan will assist the ECan led review of the rural residential provisions included in Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement, as required by Policy 14.

---

\(^6\) Based on a gross density of 5000m\(^2\) per lot.
6.5 Document Relationships

This document has relevance to the following:

- Promoting the sustainable management of natural and physical resources under the Resource Management Act 1991, with particular application to resource consent and District Plan change proposals;
- Giving effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, including Proposed Change No. 1;
- Providing a basis to engage with landowners and developers as a means to convey Council and community preferences for growth;
- Allowing for the costs of development to be appreciated and factored into the Council’s 10 year plan prepared under the Local Government Act 2002, including development contributions;
- Contributing to the achievement of desired community outcomes (10 year plan); and
- Helping to achieve the Council’s obligations under the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy.

6.6 Implementation

In addition to the identified growth locations, the Development Plan identifies a number of actions. These are:

- A review of the Residential 4A and 4B characteristics and development controls within the District Plan; and
- Further investigation into development sequencing.

Appendices

- Appendix 3: Summary of Costs and Minimum Households.
Appendix 1: 2006 Residential 4 (Rural Residential) Zone Household Survey Executive Summary

• Introduction

The 2006 Waimakariri Residential 4 (rural residential) Zone Survey was conducted in August/September 2006. The purpose of the survey was to find out what is prompting people to choose to live in one of the District’s Residential 4 Zones. These Zones, which were previously identified as “Rural Residential Zones”, were also surveyed by the Waimakariri District Council in 1991 and 1996.

Lots in the San Dona Olive Grove subdivisions were also included in the 2006 survey because, although zoned Rural in the Waimakariri District Plan, the majority of these lots are in the same size range of less than 2.0 ha as lots in the District’s Residential 4 Zones.

In 2006 the Waimakariri District Council also conducted a survey of a sample of Small Holding (2.0 ha to 7.9 ha) Owners, using a similar questionnaire. Where appropriate, comparisons between the findings of the two surveys are included in this report.

A total of 779 questionnaires were posted to all households in the District’s Residential 4 Zones, and the San Dona Olive Grove development accompanied by a reply paid return envelope. Of these questionnaires 350 were returned, giving a response rate of 44.8 percent.

The household is the “unit of analysis”.

As there was no sampling involved, it is inappropriate to calculate a sampling error for this survey. The relatively low response rate may, however, mean that there is a significant non-response error in the findings reported.

Many of the results of this survey for households in the Mandeville area were also reported in the Council’s Mandeville Area Community Report released in March 2007.

• The respondent households and their properties

The age distribution for members of respondent household differs significantly from that for the District’s usually resident population in 2006. When compared with the results of the 2006 Census for the District the respondent household had:

A lower percentage of children 0 – 9 years (12.9% compared with 14.4%);
The same percentage of young people 10 – 19 years (14.8%);
Lower percentages people:
20 – 29 years (4.0% compared with 7.1%); and
30 – 39 years (10.6% compared with 14.2%);
Higher percentages people:
40 – 49 years (19.8% compared with 16.4%);
50 – 59 years (19.1% compared with 13.7%); and
60 – 69 years (13.5% compared with 10.2%).

The distribution for the time respondents had been living at their Residential 4 Zone property was:
45.1% less than 5 years
26.3% 5 – 9 years
27.4% more than 10 years.

Respondent households were asked where they had lived prior to moving onto their Residential 4 Zone property:

- 34.4% had moved from Christchurch City
- 31.5% had moved from within the District
- 8.8% had moved from elsewhere in the South Island
- 7.9% had moved from the North Island
- 6.3% had moved from overseas

People who had lived in the District prior to moving to their Residential 4 Zone property comprised the highest percentages of households that had been in residence for 0 – 4 years (33.8%), and 10 – 19 years (45.9%). People who had moved from Christchurch on to their Residential 4 Zone property comprised the highest percentage of households that had been in residence for 5 – 9 years (45.6%).

- **Property characteristics and satisfaction**

The distribution for size of property was:

- 11.4% less than 0.50 ha
- 25.4% 0.50 – 0.99 ha
- 30.0% 1.00 – 1.49 ha
- 14.3% 1.50 – 1.99 ha
- 14.6% 2.00 ha or more

Levels of respondents’ satisfaction with the size of their property were:

- 59.4% very satisfied
- 30.8% quite satisfied
- 5.8% not very satisfied
- 2.0% not at all satisfied

When asked about the amount of land that they would prefer, 73.5 percent of respondents did not answer or indicated that they considered a question was “not applicable”.

Of those who answered this question:

- 30 favoured an area of less than 1.00 ha
- 17 favoured an area of between 1.00 ha and 2.50 ha
- 31 favoured an area of between 4.00 ha and 5.00 ha
- 6 favoured an area greater than 5.00 ha

- **Reasons for choosing to live in a Residential 4 Zone, and features “liked”**

The main reasons given by respondents for choosing to live in a Residential 4 Zone were:

- 86.3% Characteristics of the property, including as an investment
- 84.9% Environmental reasons, including space, clean air and views
- 53.4% Lifestyle, including having animals, a garden and a place for children to do things

The environment (94.5%) and lifestyle (90.3%) were the main features “liked” by respondents now that they were living at their property in a Residential 4 Zone. Others liked the community life (15.6%) and not having neighbours too close (14.5%).
• **Satisfaction with services**

Respondents’ levels of *satisfaction with their water supplies* were:

- 70.8% very satisfied or quite satisfied
- 26.9% not very satisfied or not at all satisfied

The main concerns were with high levels of chlorination, insufficient water for gardens, and low water pressure particularly during summer.

Respondents’ levels of *satisfaction with their sewage disposal systems* were:

- 76.2% very satisfied or quite satisfied
- 21.8% not very satisfied or not at all satisfied

The reasons for dissatisfaction varied and were influenced by the differences in the circumstances with respect to sewage disposal systems in the various zones. The age of septic tanks was a concern for River Road (Rangiora) residents, while the cost of installing the Swannanoa Fields system was mentioned frequently by respondents from this zone.

Respondents’ levels of *satisfaction with roadways* in their zones were:

- 70.3% very satisfied or quite satisfied
- 27.4% not very satisfied or not at all satisfied

Concerns about the roadways in zones were clearly related to the circumstances in the various zones, and in some instances the comments were about the increasing levels of traffic on roads bordering zones such as River Road (Rangiora), or in the vicinity of zones such as the Tram Road for zones in the Mandeville area.

Respondents’ levels of *satisfaction with drainage* in their zones were:

- 76.3% very satisfied or quite satisfied
- 18.9% not very satisfied or not at all satisfied

The highest levels of dissatisfaction with drainage came from zones on relatively heavy land, including those at Oxford, Kaiapoi North and Ohoka.

Respondents’ levels of *satisfaction with reserves* in their locality were:

- 66.0% very satisfied or quite satisfied
- 15.7% not very satisfied or not at all satisfied

A relatively high percentage of respondents (18.3%) did not have an opinion about reserves, which may be attributable to the fact that some zones do not have a reserve. Others commented on reserves or sports fields in their area, such as the Swannanoa Reserve which was described as “derelict” by one respondent and the Mandeville Sports Ground which was described by another as a “jewel to be treasured”.
**Servicing Residential 4 Zones**

Respondents were asked how important they considered the provision of a range of services were for a Residential 4 Zone:

- 90.3% considered **sealed roadways** were very important or quite important
- 85.3% considered a **reticulated water supply** was very important or quite important
- 64.6% considered **neighbourhood reserves** were very important or quite important
- 61.3% considered a **reticulated sewerage system** was very important or quite important
- 56.3% considered **street lighting** was very important or quite important
- 53.2% considered a **separate irrigation water supply** was very important or quite important
- 37.8% considered **sealed footpaths** were very important or quite important
- 37.7% considered **kerb and channel** was very important or quite important

Overall higher percentages respondents from zones adjoining urban areas and those developed more recently tended to favour features such as kerb and channel, sealed footpaths, and street lighting than respondents from older zones and ones located away from a Residential 2 Zone.

The type of land on which a zone is located also appeared to influence respondent’s views. Higher percentages of those from zones on heavier land also tended to favour sealed footpaths, while higher percentages those on lighter more free draining land favoured having a separate irrigation water supply.

Having **refuse collection services** was seen as very important or quite important by 73.2 percent of respondents.

There was some concern that features such as sealed footpaths and streetlights tended to promote city values, and were not conducive to the maintenance of rural character.

**Home based enterprises and farming on small-holdings**

Respondents were asked whether they were involved with home based business enterprises.

In response to a question about involvement with home based business enterprises:

- 32.6% San Dona indicated that they were growing olives
- 24.8% Residential 4 Zone respondents indicated that they were involved with a wide range of business activities based at home

Office based enterprises including consultancies, administration services including accountancy, importing and sales were prominent among the businesses listed.

**Members of the paid workforce**

286 (81.7%) households provided information about workforce participation for 494 household members
Of the people in the paid workforce, 69.4% were working full-time and 29.9% were working part-time, with no information about time worked provided about the remaining 2 people.

In terms of place of work:

56.8% worked in Christchurch
28.3% worked in the Wairarapa District (including working at home)
9.1% were “mobile workers”, or worked elsewhere
5.8% provided no information about place of work

At household level:

68.6% households with at least one person working in Christchurch
35.7% households with at least one person working in the Waimakariri District

The level of household participation in the Christchurch workforce was higher than for the 2006 Small Holding Owners Survey, which had 61.4 percent of households with at least one person working in Christchurch, and 47.2 percent with at least one person working in the District.

Of the households with people working in Christchurch, 69.0 percent indicated that they were travelling up to 35 km one way to reach their workplace. Respondents were asked to indicate that the difference in travelling time for this journey at “peak-time” and at “off-peak”, and 67.2 percent reported an increase of less than 15 minutes travelling time at “peak-time”.

• **Issues associated with the rising cost of motor fuel**

Respondents were asked to indicate whether they had taken, or were likely to take, a number of possible actions in response to the increasing cost of motor fuel. At the time of the survey the cost of 91 octane petrol was in the vicinity of $1.70.

53.2% indicated that they were already making fewer trips
24.0% indicated that they had already change to a more fuel efficient vehicle

In response to questions about whether households were likely to move closer to their place of work, or members find jobs closer to where they lived because of the cost of fuel for motor vehicles, 23.8 percent of the 238 respondent households with people working away from home indicated that these were possibilities.

A number of options for reducing the cost of travel to work were offered to respondents, including working more frequently from home, car-pooling and park-and-ride using public transport for part of the trip. Of the households with people working away from home, 104 (42%) indicated that members were already working from home and/or car-pooling, and others indicated that they were very likely or quite likely to do this. A few indicated an interest in “park and ride”, using public transport for part of their trip to work.

• **Local service centre and shopping patterns**

The majority of respondent households nominated one or more of the District’s main centres as their “local service centre”, the highest percentages were:
75.8% Rangiora only or in combination with another centre(s) including Christchurch
24.9% Kaiapoi only or in combination with another centre(s) including Christchurch

Christchurch alone was only nominated as their local service centre by 3.1 percent and in combination with another centre(s) by 10.3 percent of respondent households.

Rangiora was the centre most regularly visited by respondents to buy a range of convenience goods and for key services. Kaiapoi was visited by a fewer respondents for most of the goods and services listed.

Christchurch was visited for some or all of their banking services by 42.6 percent of respondents, while 48.5 percent accessed some or all of their banking services in Rangiora. In addition, 34.6 percent of respondents purchased some or all of their fuel for motor vehicles in Christchurch.

The level of satisfaction with the standard of shopping and services available in the Waimakariri District as a whole was high with:

- 26.0% very satisfied
- 65.0% quite satisfied
- 7.5% not very satisfied
- 0.9% not at all satisfied

- Leisure activities and involvement with organisations

Members of respondent households were involved with a relatively wide range of leisure activities, many of which were sporting activities and/or involved the outdoors. There were 69.4 percent of respondent households with at least one member involved with one community organization or group. Sports clubs dominated the list of clubs with which household members were involved. Teenagers and children were almost exclusively involved with sports clubs.

A significant proportion of the clubs with which household members were involved were Christchurch based, but relatively few households (8.2%) of the households with involvement in clubs and organizations were only involved with these outside of the District.

- “Dislikes”, changes “wanted” and “not wanted”

Problems associated with traffic, such as the volume of heavy traffic on the District’s roads, the speed of traffic on rural roads, and noise from motor/trail bikes were respondents’ main “dislike”, followed by difficulties with neighbours and the time spent traveling.

83.0 percent of respondent households were connected to the internet, and 58.1 percent of these households had a dial-up service. There was considerable dissatisfaction with the speed of dial-up and broadband services.

When asked about the changes that respondents did not want to see occur in their locality, most focused on issues associated with subdivision and development. The greatest concerns were:
When asked about the **changes that respondents wanted to see** in their locality, roading and related issues attracted most attention. These included the provision of facilities for walking, cycling and horse riding off road, and improvements to the District’s bridges including the Cones Road Bridge over the Ashley River/Rakahuri. Respondents from the Mandeville and Fernside areas wanted another bridge across the Waimakariri River.

- **Likelihood of moving away within 5 years**

Relatively few respondent households indicated that they were likely to move within the next 5 years, with 9.7 percent “very likely” and 15.7 percent indicating that they were “quite likely” to move. Households with all adults 60 years and over had the highest level of uncertainty about whether they would move away from their small-holding in the next 5 years.

In response to a question concerning where respondents were likely to move to, when they moved away from their Residential 4 Zone property, irrespective of when this was:

- 23.7% thought they were likely to go to one of the District's main towns
- 17.2% thought that they would move to a larger property
- 16.3% thought that they would go to Christchurch City
- 12.9% thought that they would go to a smaller property
- Others indicated that they would go to one of the District’s small settlements, possibly a beach settlement, and a few indicated that they would be likely to leave the District, but not move to Christchurch.
Appendix 2: Proposed Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement: Policy 14

Policy 14: Rural Residential Development

Rural Residential development further to areas already zoned in district plans as at 28 July 2007 may be provided for by territorial authorities, if it does not exceed the maximum quantities for the periods set out in Table 1, Policy 6, and if it accords with the methods under this policy.

Methods

14.1 Areas within which Rural Residential development may occur shall be defined by changes to the district plan by the territorial authorities subject to the following:

(i) The location must be outside the Urban Limits
(ii) All subdivision and development must be located so as to be able to be economically provided with a reticulated sewer and water supply integrated with a publicly owned system, and appropriate stormwater treatment and disposal
(iii) Legal and physical access is provided to a sealed road, but not directly to a road defined in the relevant district plan as a Strategic or Arterial Road, or as a State highways under the Transit New Zealand Act 1989;
(iv) The location of any proposed Rural Residential development shall:
   • limit noise sensitive activities occurring within the 50 dBA Ldn air noise contour surrounding Christchurch International Airport so as not to compromise the future efficient operation of Christchurch International Airport or the health, well-being and amenity of people;
   • avoid adversely affecting the groundwater recharge zone for Christchurch City’s drinking water;
   • avoid land between the primary and secondary stop banks south of the Waimakariri River;
   • avoid land required to protect the landscape character of the Port Hills;
   • not compromise the operational capacity of the Burnham Military Camp, West Melton Military Training Area or Rangiora Airfield;
   • support existing or upgraded community infrastructure and provide for good access to emergency services;
   • not give rise to significant reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent rural activities, including quarrying and agricultural research farms, or strategic infrastructure;
   • avoid significant natural hazard areas including steep or unstable land;
   • avoid significant adverse ecological effects;
   • not adversely affect ancestral land, water sites, wahi tapu and wahi taonga of Ngai Tahu;
   • where adjacent to or in close proximity to an existing urban or rural residential area, be able to be integrated into or consolidated with the existing settlement;
   • avoid adverse effects on existing surface water quality.
(v) An Outline Development Plan is prepared which sets out an integrated design for subdivision and land use, and provides for the long-term maintenance of rural residential character.
(vi) A Rural Residential development area shall not be regarded as in transition to full urban development.

14.2 The Canterbury Regional Council together with the three territorial local authorities within Greater Christchurch shall undertake monitoring of Rural Residential development in
accordance with Policy 16, and shall undertake a review of the provisions in 2010.

Explanation

Provision for rural residential development enables a choice of living environments and provides a rural living environment which is more space conserving than the four hectare minima of most rural zones within Greater Christchurch. Rural residential development can have significant effects disproportionate to the numbers of households living within this form of development, and more than limited provision would undermine Objective 1 and Policies 1 and 2.
Appendix 3: Summary of Engineering Costs and Minimum Households as determined by those costs

The minimum number of households required at an assumed maximum development contribution of $15,000 per new lot for each location is outlined below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum number of households (h/h) at a maximum development contribution of $15,000 per lot</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Water (h/hs/total cost)</th>
<th>Sewer (h/hs/total cost)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fernside</td>
<td>5/$45,000 1</td>
<td>55/$803,000 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mandeville</td>
<td>N/A 2</td>
<td>250/$3,710,000 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>55/$838,000 3</td>
<td>170/$2,538,000 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohoka</td>
<td>25/$342,000 4</td>
<td>5/$36,000 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuahiwi</td>
<td>25/$327,000 4</td>
<td>65/$922,000 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waikuku</td>
<td>25/$327,000 4</td>
<td>65/$922,000 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Fernside water supply.
2. Mandeville water supply.
3. Kaiapoi water supply.
4. Woodend water supply.
5. Eastern Districts Sewage Scheme at Rangiora.
6. Eastern Districts Sewage Scheme at Kaiapoi.
7. Tuahiwi Sewer Scheme; this upgrade could support 45 new households. Ninety-five households could be serviced at a cost of $1,425,000 by connection to the EDSS at Woodend.
8. Eastern Districts Sewage Scheme at Waikuku Beach

Notes:

1. To assess affordability associated with providing water and wastewater services to the preferred rural residential locations, the maximum development contribution has been set at $15,000 for each service.
2. The estimated total costs were divided by the maximum $15,000 development contribution to obtain a minimum number of households required in a location to make that service affordable.
3. This method results in a conservative minimum number of properties being allocated to each of the proposed locations. However, it provides an order of magnitude figure and not a specific number of lots. Numbers have been rounded to the nearest five presented.
4. Alteration to the number of properties assessed in the cost estimates may change the design criteria, which could change pipe and pump sizes, and the cost estimates themselves. This would have a corresponding change to the minimum number of households.
5. In all locations it is likely that some upgrades will be required to existing roads. It is difficult to determine the cost of such upgrades before the location and extent of development is determined. This has not been specifically assessed at this time.
6. Funding issues associated with cost sharing between the developer, development contributions and Council will need to be reassessed as and when development occurs or when preferred locations are confirmed.
7. The servicing assessment has not included a full analysis of all options for water or sewer service for the locations. Other options may be available.
8. A full copy of the servicing assessment is available from the Council on request.
Appendix 4: 2006 Mandeville Area Community Report Executive Summary

- The report

The report sets out the results of the Waimakariri District’s Residential 4 (rural residential) Zone Survey for respondents from the Mandeville area, and a separate Mandeville Area Community Survey conducted at the same time concerning future development at Mandeville.

Questionnaires were posted to all households in the Residential 4 Zones in the Mandeville area, and the San Dona Olive Grove subdivisions in August/September 2006. Of the 300 questionnaires distributed 154 (51.4 percent) were returned.

As questionnaires were distributed to all households, it is not appropriate to calculate a sampling error. The results of the survey can, however, be seen as a good indication of the overall range and balance of formed views towards present living and future development at Mandeville without focusing on any specific proposed or potential changes.

The Residential 4 Zone questionnaires were returned from the following (with the number returned from each in parentheses):

- Swannanoa Fields (22)
- Mandeville (66)
- Ohoka Meadows (17)
- Truro Close (7)
- San Dona (44)

The Mandeville Area Community Survey questionnaires were returned from the following (with the number returned from each in parentheses):

- Swannanoa Fields (5)
- Mandeville (38)
- Ohoka Meadows (17)
- Truro Close (7)
- San Dona (41)

Where appropriate comparisons are drawn between the findings of the Residential 4 Zone Survey for Mandeville area respondents and the Council’s other recent surveys, particularly the 2006 Small-Holding Owners Survey, and the results for the District of the 2006 Census.

- Members of respondent households

There were 422 people living in the 154 Mandeville area respondent households, which gave an average number of people per household of 2.76. This is slightly higher than the average number of people per household of 2.69 for the District's usually resident population calculated on the basis of occupied dwellings at the 2006 Census, but lower than the 3.05 people per household recorded in the Council's 2006 Small-Holding Owners Survey.

Compared with the District as a whole at the 2006 Census, the members of Mandeville area respondent households had higher percentages of adults in the 40 – 49 and 60 – 69 years age groups. At the same time, these households had lower percentages of adults in the 20 – 29 years, 30 – 39 years, and 70 years and over age groups than the District as a whole in 2006.
The Mandeville area households had 30.9 percent of household members 19 years and under, which was slightly lower than the 31.3 percent recorded in the Small-Holding Owners Survey but higher than the 29.2 percent recorded for the District as a whole in 2006.

The distribution for time spent at present address for Mandeville area households reflected the extent of recent development in the Residential 4 Zones and the San Dona subdivisions:

- 14.9 percent had lived in the area for less than 2 years
- 31.9 percent had lived in the area for 2 – 4 years
- 42.2 percent had lived in the area for 5 – 9 years

Of the respondent households, 22.1 had moved to the Mandeville area from within the Waimakariri District, 42.9 had moved from Christchurch, and 22.0 had moved from elsewhere including from overseas, while 13.0 percent provided no information about previous place of residence.

### Reasons for choosing to live in the Mandeville area

In response to an open or unprompted question, the main reasons for choosing to live at Mandeville were:

- **88.5%** Property – including the ability to build a house of choice
- **82.0%** Environment – including space, clean air, rural character and quiet
- **61.7%** Lifestyle – including develop a garden, and a place for children to do things
- **9.7%** Proximity to Christchurch
- **9.7%** Community – including a good place to bring up children

### Features liked most

In response to an open or unprompted question, the main features liked by respondents “now that they were living at Mandeville” were:

- **95.2%** Environment
- **92.6%** Lifestyle
- **17.5%** Community
- **6.5%** Proximity to Christchurch
- **6.5%** Services available in the area

### “Dislikes”, changes “wanted” and not “wanted”

In response to an open or unprompted question, the main dislikes about living in the Mandeville area identified by respondents were:

- **20.8%** Roading including the conditions on the Tram Road
- **15.0%** Neighbourhood issues including noise and the burning of rubbish
- **14.3%** Travelling
- **8.4%** Lack of services in the area including café/wine bar

The main changes sought by respondents were:

- **26.0%** Roading improvements
- **16.9%** Services and shops located closer to Mandeville
- **15.6%** Recycling and refuse collection services

The main change not wanted was subdivision. This issue was raised by 58.5 percent of respondents who did not want:

- Lots of houses everywhere
Subdivision of less than 5000m$^2$
More subdivision including strip development
Residential subdivision

- **Respondents’ properties**

Of the respondent households:

- 55.2% bought their properties as bare land
- 44.8% bought their properties with a dwelling

The sizes of respondents’ properties ranged from under 5000m$^2$ to 4.00ha, with 64 percent having properties of 1.00ha or less and 23.5 percent having properties of between 1.00ha and 1.50ha.

Most respondents were satisfied with the size of their property, with 61.0 percent very satisfied and 30.5 percent quite satisfied with the area of land that they had.

- **Workplace participation**

In total, 130 (84.4 percent) respondent households provided information about 227 members who were in the paid workforce. Of these people 71.9 percent were working full-time and 27.8 percent were working part-time. No information was provided about one person.

Of those in the paid workforce:

- 33.5% were in professional or managerial occupations
- 25.2% were in clerical, sales and service occupations
- 15.5% were trades people, drivers and machine operators.

Among the members of the paid workforce from respondent households 63.7 percent worked in Christchurch, 28.7 percent worked either at home or elsewhere in the Waimakariri District, the remainder were either classified as mobile workers, were working elsewhere or provided no information about place of work.

Respondents had relatively high household incomes compared with the District as a whole at the 2001 Census, with:

- 27.3% having household incomes of less than $70,000
- 27.9% having household incomes of $70,001 - $100,000
- 24.7% having household incomes of $100,001 or more

A further 20.1 percent of respondents indicated that they preferred not to answer this question.

- **Education**

Information about educational participation was provided by 35.7 percent (55) of Mandeville areas respondents.

- 16 had children involved with early childhood education, including daycare
- 58 had children at primary or intermediate school
- 35 had teenagers at secondary school
- 4 had household members involved with tertiary education

- **Leisure activities**

The highest percentages for leisure activities for adult members of respondent households were recorded for gardening, walking,
cycling and golf. The main feature of the leisure activities listed for adults members of respondent households was diversity.

The main leisure activities listed for teenagers (13 – 17 years) were netball and rugby, followed by equestrian, skiing, cycling and tennis.

The main leisure activities listed for children 12 years and under were swimming and cycling, followed by rugby, soccer, and basketball.

- **Involvement with organisations and groups**

  Of the respondent household 60.2 percent indicated that a member(s) were involved with one or more community organisation or group. Membership of sports clubs was high for adults as well as teenagers (13 – 17 years) and children. Involvement with organisations or clubs based in Christchurch was high, followed by involvement with organisations or clubs based in Kaiapoi and at Mandeville.

- **Local service centre identified**

  Many respondents gave multiple answers to the question about the place that they identified as their main service centre.

  83.8% identified Rangiora alone or in combination with one or more other centres in the District and/or Christchurch
  36.3% identified Kaiapoi alone or in combination with one or more other centres in the District and/or Christchurch
  24.0% identified Christchurch alone or in combination with one or more centres in the District

  Rangiora was the centre most regularly visited by respondents to buy a range of convenience goods and for key services, such as groceries, books magazines and stationery, chemist supplies, garden and farm supplies.

  Christchurch was visited for some or all of their medical services by 66.2 percent of households, and for some or all of their banking services by 55.9 percent of households.

  Christchurch was the centre typically visited by:

  56.5 percent of households to go to a restaurant
  55.3 percent of households for fuels motor vehicles
  52.6 percent of households for motor vehicle servicing.

  Overall there was a high level of satisfaction with the shopping and services available in the Waimakariri District, with 24.7 percent very satisfied and 65.0 percent quite satisfied.

- **Preferences for the future development in the Mandeville area**

  The Mandeville Area Community Survey was completed by the members of 110 respondent households.

  There was limited support for the re-subdivision of existing lots with 20.9 percent of respondents indicating that they strongly supported or supported this option, while 75.5 percent indicated that they opposed or strongly opposed it.

  Full residential development gained even less support with 6.3 percent of respondents indicating that they strongly supported or supported this option, while 92.8 percent indicated that they opposed or strongly opposed it.
Respondents were also asked to indicate their level of support for the development of a village centre at Mandeville, and their responses were:

- 27.3% strongly supported
- 33.7% supported
- 11.8% opposed
- 21.8% strongly opposed
- 5.4% had no opinion

Responses to a series of questions about the importance of having various shops and/or services available at a village centre are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of shop/service</th>
<th>Very important or quite important</th>
<th>Not very important or not at all important</th>
<th>No opinion/no response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairy/grocery/convenience store</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Café</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Station</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical centre</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>51.0%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine bar</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Takeaways</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retirement village</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>64.5%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden centre</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
<td>70.0%</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports goods shop</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Mandeville sports ground**

Respondents offered a range of suggestions for additional facilities at the Mandeville sports ground. These included a covered and heated swimming pool, a gymnasium, and a golf course. Also, a significant number of respondents (18) called for the general upgrading of facilities at this sport ground.