

**BEFORE INDEPENDENT HEARING COMMISSIONERS
AT RANGIORA / WAIMAKARIRI**

**I MUA NGĀ KAIKŌMIHANA WHAKAWĀ MOTUHAKE
RANGIORA / WAIMAKARIRI**

IN THE MATTER of the Resource Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER of the hearing of submissions and further
submissions on the **Proposed Waimakariri
District Plan**

HEARING TOPIC: **Stream 1**

**STATEMENT OF PRIMARY EVIDENCE OF CLARE DALE
ON BEHALF OF KĀINGA ORA – HOMES AND COMMUNITIES**

PLANNING

1 MAY 2023

Instructing solicitor:
C E Kirman
Special Counsel
Kāinga Ora - Homes and Communities
PO Box 14594
Central Auckland 1051
E: claire.kirman@kaingaora.govt.nz

Counsel instructed:
B J Matheson
Richmond Chambers
PO Box 1008
Shortland Street
Auckland 1140
E: matheson@richmondchambers.co.nz

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 My name is Clare Elizabeth Dale, and I am a Senior Planner at Novo Group Limited. I have been engaged by Kāinga Ora-Homes and Communities (**Kāinga Ora**) to provide evidence in support of its primary submission (submitter #325) and further submissions (further submitter #88) on both the Waimakariri District Council's (**WDC**) Proposed District Plan (**the PDP**) and Variation 1 (**V1**) to the Proposed District Plan (submitter #80).
- 1.2 Kāinga Ora made submissions and further submission points in relation to the definitions, introduction, strategic directions and urban form objectives and policies of the Waimakariri Proposed District Plan (**PDP**) and Variation 1 (**V1**). The Section 42A report only covers Kāinga Ora submission points on the PDP. In the Section 42A report the reporting officer Mr Buckley has recommended accepting some but not all the changes requested by Kāinga Ora. This statement of evidence focuses on the submission points that remain in contention.
- 1.3 In summary the key points of my evidence are as follows:
- (a) The language / wording of PDP provisions should be consistent with terminology used in the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (**NPS-UD**) and The Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (**the Housing Supply Act**). In particular requiring 'well-functioning urban environments' as defined in the NPS-UD should be embedded within the Strategic Directions.
 - (b) In relation to 'amenity values' the Urban Form and Development objectives and policies should refer to "*planned urban built form*" or "*anticipated / planned urban environment*". The NPS-UD focuses on the identification and promotion of the future character/amenity of urban environments, rather than protection and preservation of existing amenity (Objectives 1 and 4).

- (c) Objectives and policies relating to Urban Form are key to ensuring that the PDP adequately provides for long-term residential development capacity and well-functioning urban environments in accordance with the NPS-UD. They are also critical to enablement of a variety of housing typologies to provide greater housing choice within the district, particularly in or near centre zones and employment opportunities.
- (d) The PDP should enable a full variety of housing typologies to be delivered in appropriate locations, that contribute to the provision of quality, affordable housing choices that meet the diverse needs of the community. Of particular relevance to the Waimakariri District, the NPS-UD directs district plans to enable more people to live in areas of an urban environment near a centre zone or other areas with many employment opportunities (Objective 3).
- (e) Hazard and Reverse Sensitivity objectives and policies with 'avoid' directions need to allow for management or mitigation of effects and case by case assessment, as it could be possible to reduce risk /effects to a level where they are low or acceptable.

1.4 I consider that amendments are needed to Strategic Directions chapter to ensure that the PDP appropriately responds to the NPS-UD's requirements, provides for future urban growth, residential development capacity and ongoing housing affordability. I have recommended a number of further changes to the wording of the notified Strategic Directions and Urban Form provisions in order to better provide for residential development capacity, to give effect to the NPS-UD and the Housing Supply Act. I have attached, as **Appendix 2**, a marked up set of provisions showing the further amendments that I recommend.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 My full name is Clare Elizabeth Dale. I am a senior planner practising with Novo Group Limited in Christchurch. Novo Group is a resource

management planning and traffic engineering consulting company that provides resource management related advice to local authorities and private clients.

- 2.2 I hold the qualifications of a Bachelor of Resource Studies (Policy and Planning Stream) from Lincoln University, attained in 2002. I am associate member of the New Zealand Planning Institute.
- 2.3 I have 20 years of experience as a resource management planner, predominantly working at Christchurch City Council in a range of planning roles (consenting, policy and heritage), and as a consultant since 2021.
- 2.4 My time at Christchurch City Council included several years with a focus on the Central City rebuild and high and medium density residential development including in a decision making role. I have also prepared evidence for, and appeared in, resource management consent and plan hearings, Environment Court mediations, and Environment Court hearings.
- 2.5 I have been engaged by Kāinga Ora since July 2022 to provide planning expertise on the PDP process and V1 to the PDP. Novo Group had no involvement in preparing the Kāinga Ora primary submission on the PDP and became involved in this process at further submission stage. I have assisted with preparing the Kāinga Ora submission and further submissions on V1.
- 2.6 I am familiar with the Kāinga Ora corporate intent in respect of the provision of housing within the Waimakariri District. I am also familiar with the national, regional and district planning documents relevant to the PDP.
- 2.7 In preparing this evidence I have read the Section 32 and Section 42A reports together with the associated appendices prepared by Council staff and the evidence prepared by: (a) Mr Brendon Liggett - Corporate; and (b) Mr Phil Osborne - Urban Economist.

Code of Conduct

- 2.8 Although this is a Council hearing, I confirm that I have read the Expert Witness Code of Conduct set out in the Environment Court's Practice Note 2023. I have complied with the Code of Conduct in preparing this evidence and agree to comply with it while giving evidence.
- 2.9 Except where I state that I am relying on the evidence of another person, this written evidence is within my area of expertise. I have not omitted to consider material facts known to me that might alter or detract from the opinions expressed in this evidence.

Scope of Evidence

- 2.10 My evidence covers submissions and further submissions on the PDP in relation to, introduction, strategic directions and urban form and development objectives and policies.
- 2.11 My evidence will address the following matters:
- (a) **Strategic Directions/ Ruataki Ahunga:** Requested amendments to SD-O2 and SD-O6 (submission points PDP 325.1 – 325.3).
 - (b) **Urban Form and Development/ Āhukatanga Auaha ā Tāone Objectives and Policies:** Requested amendments to UFD-O1, UFD-O2, UFD-P1, UFD-P2, UFD-P4, UFD-P5, UFD-P6, UFD-P7, UFD-P8 and UFD-P10 (submission points PDP 325.7 – 325.17).
- 2.12 Where appropriate and relevant, my evidence will reference and rely on the evidence of, whose opinion I agree with. My evidence will reference the evidence of: (a) Mr Brendon Liggett - Corporate; and (b) Mr Phil Osborne - Urban Economist.
- 2.13 I note that the relevant statutory documents have been identified and outlined within the Section 42A report (Overarching and Part 1 matters) and I agree with the identification of those matters.

3. KĀINGA ORA SUBMISSIONS AND FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

3.1 The Kāinga Ora submission and further submission points allocated to the Stream 1 hearings are attached in **Appendix 1**.

3.2 As outlined in the corporate evidence of Mr Liggett, Kāinga Ora seeks to ensure that the PDP provisions align with national planning directions to provide for well-functioning environments that meet the needs of current and future generations. Kāinga Ora seeks amendments to the PDP to ensure that development opportunities are maximised in locations that are located close to public transport, employment opportunities and public amenities such as education facilities, retail, and community services. In this way, well-functioning environments are formed to provide for the whole communities social, economic, and cultural well-being.

4. RECOMMENDATIONS BY SECTION 42A REPORT AND RESPONSE

4.1 The evidence below is structured around the key headings in the Section 42A reports first noting the points of agreement.

Areas of Agreement with Section 42A Report

4.2 Having reviewed the respective Section 42A reports, I generally support the following recommendations by the reporting planner Mr Buckley on the matters covered within this evidence, and therefore I have not specifically addressed those matters in significant detail:

- (a) Deferring specific reverse sensitivity matters raised by infrastructure providers, including Christchurch International Airports (CIAL), to future hearings addressing other chapters¹. In my view it is clear that Strategic Directions are not intended to contain provisions or rules that deal with specific activities or the effects of those activities, or which single out individual operators.
- (b) Word changes to align Strategic Directions with NPS-UD terms and intent, particularly to reflect outcomes sought for well-

¹ Strategic Directions S42A paragraphs 128 and 131.

functioning urban environments and recognition that urban environments including amenity values change over time through planned urban growth and intensification².

Strategic Directions General Submissions (s325.1 and s325.3)

- 4.3 Kāinga Ora seek amendments to the introduction section of the PDP to clarify the relationship between the Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development chapter and other plan chapters (s325.1). My view is that the Strategic Directions Chapter should have primacy over the other chapter objectives and policies. I accept that there is no hierarchy between the specific strategic directions identified and that they should be read as a whole.
- 4.4 In the Section 42A report³ Mr Buckley has rejected this submission point, noting that in his view that Strategic Directions having a primacy or hierarchy over objectives and policies in other plan chapters would be inconsistent with: the National Planning Standards (**NPS**) Chapter 7; the intent of Strategic Directions; the approach taken by Central Government in National Policy Statements; and the approach taken by Environment Canterbury (**ECan**) in its Regional Plans.
- 4.5 I agree with Mr Buckley that Chapter 7 of the NPS contains no requirement or guidance that Strategic Directions should have primacy over other chapters. Equally, however I note that there is nothing in Chapter 7(1) that prevents the Council from determining how they want to interpret the Strategic Directions. There is also no statement in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (**CRPS**) introduction that suggests a hierarchy or other approach.
- 4.6 The NPS require that the Strategic Directions and objectives address *'key strategic or significant matters for the district and guide decision making at a strategic level'*⁴. Accordingly, I consider they are essential to the formulation and implementation of the PDP. Importantly in my view, they are critical to the preparing, changing, interpreting, and implementing the District Plan, and all other objectives and policies in

² Strategic Directions S42A paragraph 61.

³ Strategic Directions S42A paragraph 56.

⁴ National Planning Standard, section 7.0.

all other chapters of the District Plan are to be read and achieved in a manner consistent with the Strategic Directions. This approach ensures that the provisions in this chapter provide a 'touchstone' for the ongoing development and implementation of Plan provisions and implies a hierarchy even when this is not specifically stated where Strategic Directions are given primacy.

- 4.7 For example, the operative Christchurch District Plan contains a clear statement in its introduction section on Strategic Directions that “a. *This Chapter(ii) “Has primacy over the objectives and policies in the other chapters of the Plan, which must be consistent with the objectives in this Chapter”* ⁵. I note that decisions of the Environment Court⁶ have stated that the wording of Strategic Directions in the Christchurch District Plan are very general, their discrete application on a case-by-case basis was not intended, and they are given effect to by the balance of the Plan and are to be interpreted and applied accordingly.
- 4.8 If Strategic Directions do not take primacy, then Plan interpretation inconsistencies could arise. Where there is conflict between chapters or provisions, the Strategic Directions should be looked to for resolution. If equal weighting is applied to all chapters, you could have a complex consent application involving consideration of multiple chapters that was contrary to a strategic direction (and one plan chapter) but on the whole considered consistent with a majority of the other provisions approved. That would not be appropriate as Strategic Directions set out the most important matters for the District.
- 4.9 The relief sought by Kāinga Ora to give Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development primacy is set out in **Appendix 2**.
- 4.10 With regard to SD-02(10)⁷ Mr Buckley has rejected the submission point, noting that deleting this provision would be inconsistent with section 6(e) of the RMA and Objectives 5 and 9 of the NPS-UD. Mr Buckley may have misinterpreted the submission point, as Kāinga Ora is not seeking deletion of this provision entirely. They acknowledge that

⁵ Christchurch District Plan, Chapter 3 Strategic Directions, 3.1(a)(ii)

⁶ *Rogers v Christchurch City Council* [2019] NZ EnvC 119; *Pickering v Christchurch City Council* [2016] NZEnvC 237, *Fright v Christchurch City Council* [2018] NZEnvC165.

⁷ Strategic Directions S42A paragraph 61.

it is important and gives effect to section 6(e), but question whether this provision would be better located/incorporated into SD-05. In my view SD-05 is where point 10 of SD-02 is best located with all other relevant Ngāi Tahu mana whenua/Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga matters. If this is not the case, then there are other Strategic Directions that would also benefit from the wording in SD-O2(10) adding to them for example SD-03 and SD-04. I also note that there is no hierarchy amongst the strategic direction provisions and that they are to be read as a whole, in which case there would seem to be no difficulty in this relocation occurring in the manner I have recommended.

Infrastructure Submissions (s325.4)

- 4.11 Kāinga Ora supports retaining SD-03 as notified and as noted above I agree with Mr Buckley's assessment in Section 3.8 of the Section S42A report. In my view Strategic Directions are not intended to contain provisions or rules that deal with specific activities or the effects of those activities. There is no need at Strategic Direction level to individually identify each infrastructure provider and their specific concerns about reverse sensitivity effects. These activities are clearly covered by relevant infrastructure definitions referred to in SD-O3 and the details are best covered in other plan chapters, for example in the energy and infrastructure chapter and in the noise chapter.
- 4.12 Given that detailed discussion or consideration of these submissions in the section 42A reports relating to Hearing Stream 1 has not occurred, Kāinga Ora will provide further evidence on this matter at relevant hearings to follow.

Natural Hazard Submissions (s325.6)

- 4.13 The Kāinga Ora submission (s325.6) sought amendments to SD-06 to add the word "minimising" in relation to unacceptable risk as follows:

SD-06 Natural Hazards and Resilience: The District responds to natural hazard risk, including increased risk as a result of climate change, through:

- 1. avoiding **or minimising** subdivision, use and development where the risk is unacceptable; and*
- 2. mitigating other natural hazard risks.*

- 4.14 This relief has been rejected by Mr Buckley as it is not consistent with section 6(h) of the RMA which states; “*the management of significant risks from natural hazards*” or CRPS policy 6.2.1(8) that “*protects people from unacceptable risk from natural hazards and the effects of sea-level rise*” and Objective 11.2 and policies 11.3.1 and 11.3.5 of the CRPS which have an ‘avoid’ directive for ‘inappropriate development’⁸. (Refer to **Appendix 3** for a full copy the relevant provisions mentioned above.) In my opinion, those provisions seek to ‘avoid’ development that increases risk associated with natural hazards in the first instance and they acknowledge that, where avoidance is not possible, the risk is otherwise mitigated. I concur with Mr Buckley and cannot support wording of the Kāinga Ora submission as currently drafted.
- 4.15 However, as I understand it, the intention of the submission was not suggesting that people and assets should be exposed to unacceptable risk, but rather to acknowledge that even in identified high hazard/hazard environments, risks that could initially be viewed / identified as unacceptable or high can be mitigated, managed or minimised to a point where they are not being increased or are acceptable or low.
- 4.16 In my view the Strategic Directive as drafted does not prevent or avoid all development within hazard areas, only those with ‘unacceptable risk’ and acknowledges that effects of other natural hazards can be mitigated. A merit-based case by case expert assessment could determine that following mitigation the residual risk is acceptable. I concur with Mr Buckley that the RPS in policy 11.3.5 defines ‘unacceptable risk’ and sets out a framework for assessing this. Revised wording is recommended in **Appendix 2** to clarify that the direction only covers avoiding scenarios when ‘unacceptable risk’ would eventuate.

Housing Demand Capacity (UFD-01 and UDF-02) Submissions (s325. 7 and s325.8)

- 4.17 Mr Buckley has recommended amending UDF-O1 and UDF-O2 to better reflect requirements of the NPS-UD⁹, to provide “*at all times at*

⁸ Strategic Directions S42A paragraph 140.

⁹ Urban Form and Development S42A paragraph 77.

least sufficient development capacity” by adding the words “at least” to the start of the provision as proposed. However, he has not included the change requested by Kāinga Ora to include reference “at all times” or to the short, medium and long term which also forms part of NPS-UD Policy 2. The reporting officer likely considers that these additional words are unnecessary as these aspects are inherently included in the wording.

- 4.18 I do not contest Mr Buckley’s rejection of the Kāinga Ora request to include the words ‘*over the short term, medium term and long term*’ as regardless of this wording being included in Policy 2 of the NPS-UD, I accept this is inherent in ‘*at all times*’. However, I consider it necessary to include ‘*at all times at least*’ in order to give effect to, and to achieve consistency with, Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. This position is also supported by Mr Osborne in his evidence.
- 4.19 The words ‘*at all times, provide at least sufficient development capacity*’ were introduced to in Policy 2 of the NPS-UD in 2020 when it replaced the earlier National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 (**NPS-UDC**). By contrast the equivalent policy, PA1, in the NPS-UDC had the following wording: (a) “*Local authorities shall ensure that at any one time there is sufficient housing and business land development capacity..*”.
- 4.20 The change from ‘*at any one time*’, to ‘*at all times, provide at least*’ signals that sufficient development capacity must be provided for as a minimum rather than an ultimate target. Policy 2 of the NPS-UD now very clearly anticipates local authorities seeking to achieve a higher standard than simply “sufficient”. The NPS-UD further requires that if a local authority determines that there is insufficient development capacity over the short, medium or long term then it must take immediate steps to increase capacity¹⁰.
- 4.21 I therefore propose amendments to the s42A version of UFD-O1 and UDF-O2 so “*There is at all times at least sufficient feasible development capacity*”..... to ensure consistency with the NPS-UD. The recommended changes are in **Appendix 2**.

¹⁰ NPS-UD section 3.7 When there is insufficient development capacity.

- 4.22 While strategic objective UFD-P1 as recommended in the S42A officer report requires that there is sufficient feasible development capacity to meet anticipated demands for housing this does not mean that only sufficient development capacity should be provided and no more. The numbers in UFD-O1 are a bottom line (a minimum) and should not be treated as a cap or target. Mr Osborne concludes that there are economic benefits from 'full enablement' of residential capacity and the consolidation of land use activities within a compact urban form, focussed within and around centres and transport routes.
- 4.23 As noted in Mr Liggett's evidence, much of the recent development in Waimakariri, points to a risk that past land use development patterns will continue to promote a tendency towards urban sprawl and a preference for greenfield development. However, the overall direction of the NPS-UD, includes the consolidation of land use activities within a compact urban form, focussed within and around centres (and, ideally, also along key transport routes).
- 4.24 In my opinion, it is therefore appropriate that regulatory incentivisation in the form of enabling planning provisions for substantive infill and multi-unit development (brown field re-development), are therefore critical in achieving compact urban form outcomes that capitalise on the favourable location that existing urban areas have to established or planned public transport, service amenities, employment and education opportunities. Offering greater housing choice including high and medium density in proximity to centres, not only creates more affordable options but also contributes to a balanced and sustainable community.
- 4.25 The full enablement of residential, commercial and industrial capacity is a theme that be recurring throughout Kāinga Ora evidence on the PDP and V1.
- 4.26 **Uncontrolled Development (UFD-P1, UFD-P2 and UFD-P3) Submissions (s325.9)**
- 4.27 The section 42A report has accepted some of the changes to UDF-P1 requested by Kāinga Ora in s325.9. In particular UDF-P1(3)(a) which

now includes the request to refer to 'planned' commercial / mixed use zones and public transport¹¹. In the Section 42A report UDF-P1(3)(a) now reads to locate Medium Density Zones so that they “*supports, and have ready access, existing or planned Commercial and Mixed-Use Zones, education facilities, existing or planned public transport and open space;*”. I support the changes noted above as this now provides clarity as to the location of medium density zones. I also support the wording change from 'schools' to 'education facilities' as this would also cover pre-schools and tertiary providers.

- 4.28 Mr Buckley has rejected the relief requested in relation to UDF-P1 (2) (c) and (d), only providing reasons for point (d)¹².
- 4.29 UDF-P1(2)(c) as currently drafted states “*avoids or mitigates natural hazard risk in any high hazard area within existing urban areas*”. Kāinga Ora sought deletion of the word ‘*existing*’ in its submission (325.9). This is because medium density zones could also go into new Residential Development Areas in Kaiapoi subject to natural hazards.
- 4.30 Mr Buckley considers the Kāinga Ora requested amendments to UDF-P1(2)(d) are inconsistent¹³ with UDF-P10 and could result in reverse sensitivity where there is inadequate separation between Residential and Heavy Industrial Zones. He recommends that UDFP-1(2)(d) is retained as notified. In my view the current wording “*located away from*” is unclear and could be interpreted differently by different people. It is not apparent how far away from a Heavy Industrial Zone a Medium Density Residential Zone would need to locate. The Kāinga Ora submission sought to amend the wording to “*does not immediately adjoin any Heavy Industrial Zone*” to provide more certainty. However, I tend to agree with Mr Buckley that this wording could lead to reverse sensitivity effects on Heavy Industrial Zones as just because something is not immediately adjoining does not mean it is not close and does not have effects. Ultimately, it depends on what types of activities are occurring in the Heavy Industrial Zones, what the nature of the

¹¹ Urban Form and Development S42A paragraph 91.

¹² Urban Form and Development S42A paragraph 91.

¹³ Urban Form and Development S42A paragraph 91.

separation is, what form the nearby development might take, and what the potential effects are arising from that combination of factors.

- 4.31 In my opinion, the provision needs re-drafting to address reverse sensitivity effects on Heavy Industrial Zones rather than focusing on a distance, a specified separation or words such as 'adjacent' and 'adjoining'. This redrafting would enable an evidence-based case by case assessment. I recommend that UDFP1(2)(d) is redrafted as follows: "*manages reverse sensitivity effects on Heavy Industrial Zones.*" The relief is set out in **Appendix 2**.
- 4.32 Kāinga Ora submission point 325.10 sought changes to UDF-P2 that have not been addressed within the S42A report. Appendix B Table B 5 '*Recommended responses to submissions and further submissions Urban Form and Development Policy UDF-P2*' attached to the Section 42A report, however records the relief as being rejected, with the reasons being provided in report section 3.6 [sic].
- 4.33 Kāinga Ora generally supports policy UDF-P2 but considers that an amendment is required to clause 2(a) which requires that new residential development areas are 'attached' to existing urban environments. In my view the reference to being physically "attached" is unnecessary, as SD-02 refers to urban development being "*consolidated and integrated*" with urban environments and does not require "attachment". In my view the appropriate replacement word is '*integrates*'.
- 4.34 The CRPS provides support for the above re-drafting in Objective 6.2.2. This objective seeks to provide for "*the development of greenfield priority areas on the periphery of Christchurch's urban area, and surrounding towns at a rate and in locations that meet anticipated demand and enables the efficient provision and use of network infrastructure*". Use of the phrase "*on the periphery*" achieves a similar outcome as sought by Kāinga Ora in this submission, in that it ensures growth around existing development but is not so restrictive as to require it to be immediately adjacent or attached.

- 4.35 Efficient development that supports infrastructure and services, public transport use and consolidation does not necessarily require 'attachment' to existing towns. Provided the land is located within walking distance to centres, employment opportunities, education facilities and coordinated with staged infrastructure delivery, a well-functioning urban environment can still be achieved.
- 4.36 Further requiring 'attachment' to existing urban environments may unnecessarily preclude or limit responsive planning and conflict with objectives in the NPS-UD that potentially enable growth in other locations. I consider that the term "*attached*" should be replaced with "*integrated*" and this is recommended in the relief south in **Appendix 2**.
- 4.37 Submission point 325.10 also sought changes to UFD-P2(e) to specifically acknowledge, that as the character of planned urban areas evolves to deliver a compact urban form, amenity values will change rather than be 'maintained' that are also not addressed in the Section 42A report. In relation to 'amenity values' I consider that the Urban Form and Development objectives and policies should refer to "*planned urban built form*" or "*anticipated / planned urban environment*". The NPS-UD focuses on the identification and promotion of the future character/amenity of urban environments, rather than protection and preservation of existing amenity (Objectives 1 and 4).
- 4.38 Kāinga Ora seek the following changes to the wording of UDF-P2(e):
- "take into account the need to provide for intensification of residential development while maintaining managing the effect on appropriate levels of amenity values in accordance with the planned urban form ~~on surrounding sites and streetscapes~~ that will change and develop overtime in response to providing increased and varied housing densities and types."
- 4.39 I consider the changes sought are consistent with Objectives 1 and 4 and Policy 6 of the NPS-UD particularly to reflect outcomes sought for well-functioning urban environments, recognise that urban environments (including amenity values) change over time through

planned urban growth and intensification, enable a range and mix of housing typologies.

Reverse Sensitivity Effects – Submissions (s325.17)

- 4.40 The Kāinga Ora submission on UDF–P10 ‘Managing reverse sensitivity effects from new development sought that the word ‘avoid’ be replaced with ‘minimise’ with respect to the location of new residential activities and reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure. Mr Buckley has rejected this relief as he considers that it is inconsistent with policy 6.3.5(4) of the CRPS¹⁴, a copy of which is contained in **Appendix 3** and below.
- 4.41 I concur with Mr Buckley to the extent that the word ‘minimise’ is not used in the CRPS in relation to reverse sensitivity and could be considered inconsistent with the CRPS. However, I note that the word ‘manage’ is used along with the word ‘avoid’ in Policy 6.3.5 ‘Integration of land use and infrastructure’. Parts 4 and 5 of the policy are relevant:
- “4. Only providing for new development that does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading and safety of existing strategic infrastructure, including by avoiding noise sensitive activities within the 50dBA Ldn airport noise contour for Christchurch International Airport, unless the activity is within an existing residentially zoned urban area, residential greenfield area identified for Kaiapoi, or residential greenfield priority area identified in Map A (page 6-28) and enabling commercial film or video production activities within the noise contours as a compatible use of this land; and*
- 5. Managing the effects of land use activities on infrastructure, including avoiding activities that have the potential to limit the efficient and effective, provision, operation, maintenance or upgrade of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs.”*
- 4.42 Policy 6.3.5 provides for new development that does not affect the efficient use, development and appropriate upgrading of strategic infrastructure, implying that some new development near infrastructure will not affect its efficient operation and allowing for a case by case analysis of reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure. The policy also distinguishes its approach to ‘infrastructure’ and ‘strategic infrastructure’. With regard to infrastructure only the word manage is used, whereas for strategic infrastructure the word avoid is used.

¹⁴ Urban Form and Development S42A paragraph 128.

Specific provision for existing and priority greenfield areas of Kaiapoi are also made so that residential activities in these areas do not need to 'avoid' reverse sensitivity on CIAL.

- 4.43 Avoid provisions imply absolutes and can set an unrealistically high, unachievable or unnecessarily inflexible 'bar' for applications. Absolutes should be used with caution in objectives and policies generally and especially in strategically focused provisions that drive the Plan's development and subsequent implementation.
- 4.44 Re-drafted text is recommended in **Appendix 2** attached, that better aligns UDF-P10 with the wording in CPRS policy 6.3.5. The proposed wording leaves some limited scope for case-by-case assessment of whether new residential activities and development impact on the efficient operation of infrastructure and critical or strategic infrastructure.
- 4.45 The CIAL submission (s254.24) on UDF-P10 considers that within existing residentially zoned areas in Kaiapoi, further intensification should be avoided, beyond that which is already permitted in the Operative District Plan. They seek that the residential density in the area within the 50 dB Ldn Air Noise Contour is not increased and is retained at 600m² per residential unit. I agree with Mr Buckley¹⁵ that this level of detail essentially tries to insert a rule into a Strategic Direction, and this is not appropriate. This detail is best left to noise and infrastructure chapters of the PDP.
- 4.46 In addition to CIAL I note that a number of other infrastructure providers have sought changes to objectives in the Strategic Directions chapter to specifically provide for their particular type of infrastructure and in several cases requiring adverse effects from 'incompatible development and activities' be avoided, including reverse sensitivity effects. I cannot support the recognition of individual infrastructure providers being included in the strategic objectives. Nor can I support the level of detail some submitters have sought to be included. In my opinion such detail is better included in the Energy and Infrastructure and Noise chapters. In my opinion the objectives achieve an

¹⁵ Urban Form and Development S42A paragraph 123.

appropriate balance of enabling and protecting infrastructure, while not explicitly precluding other development.

UDF – P4, P5, P6 P7 and P8 Providing for New Development/ Growth

- 4.47 The Section 42A report does not address the Kāinga Ora submission points 325.11 – 325.15 within its text in relation to UDF-P4 to UDF- P8. These are however covered in ‘*Appendix B Recommended Responses to Submissions’ Tables B7 - B11*’ with the relief sought being rejected. The tables set out that the reason for rejecting the requested changes is that the Council does not have a ‘growth strategy’ but does have ‘town centre plans’ and ‘strategies’. Further the use of the word ‘mechanism’ in the title is appropriate as it implies a process. I concur with Mr. Buckley on this second point. I also agree with Mr Buckley that it is appropriate to deal with the details of any ‘certification process’ in other later chapters of the District Plan as this level of detail is not necessary within Strategic Directions.
- 4.48 However, Kāinga Ora seeks changes to these provisions to remove the name of particular or existing ‘growth strategy(ies)’ as the names of documents change over time. I support this amendment as best practice is not to cross reference other specific non-statutory plans or plans under the LGA as these change over time and require updates to the District Plan. Wording is suggested below to refer to the Council’s Future Development Plan as required by Policy 6 of the NPS-UD or more generically to other ‘Council adopted growth strategy’. I have recommended removing the reference to Town Centre Plans as these plans should sit below/ implement the districts growth strategy and contain a level of detail and methods beyond that appropriate for a Strategic Direction.
- 4.49 Submission points 325.14 on UDF-P7 and 325.15 on UDF-P8 also sought further changes to these provisions that are not addressed in the Section 42A report but are included in the relief sought tables as being rejected. Kāinga Ora sought to include the following into both policies: “does not reduce housing development capacity sought under SD-02 and UFD-01; and”. I agree with Mr Buckley that this relief is not

required as it is already covered by SD-02 and UDF-01 and does not need to be repeated, given that Strategic Directions are to be read as a whole and no hierarchy exists between these provisions.

5. SUMMARY OF PROPOSED WORDING CHANGES SOUGHT

5.1 The proposed additional changes sought by Kāinga Ora are included in **Appendix 2** of my evidence. In summary these seek:

- a) That Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development Objectives and Policies have primacy.
- b) That the PDP Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development Objectives and Policies reflect the NPS-UD requirements in relation to capacity, well-functioning urban environments and changing amenity values.
- c) That the PDP provides 'as least sufficient development capacity at all times'.
- d) That reverse sensitivity effects and natural hazard risks be managed/ mitigated and avoided where unacceptable effects or risk would eventuate.


5.2 I can confirm that the version of relief in my evidence represents the full "updated" set of relief requested by Kāinga Ora in relation to this hearing topic. Other than the specific additional changes sought by Kāinga Ora and set out in this evidence and **Appendix 2**, I support the wording as recommended by the reporting officer in the Section 42A report.

6. CONCLUSION

6.1 I consider that the amendments sought by Kāinga Ora, as outlined in this evidence and summarised in **Appendix 2**, will be efficient and effective in achieving the purpose of the RMA, the relevant objectives of the PDP and other relevant statutory documents including the CRPS, National Planning Standards and the NPS-UD. In my opinion, the underlying principles that have informed the proposed changes set out

in the Kāinga Ora submissions and evidence will better align the PDP with the NPS-UD and the purpose, principles and provisions of the RMA as amended by the Amendment Act.

- 6.2 The national direction contained within the NPS-UD requires the Council to provide for well-functioning urban environments which are capable of absorbing change over time. The NPS-UD specifically acknowledges that urban environment should provide for at least sufficient opportunities for housing and business land to meet demand and that a range of dwelling types within different locations are provided to meet the needs to people and communities for current and future generations.
- 6.3 Furthermore, the amendments sought by Kāinga Ora, which I have assessed throughout my evidence will strike an appropriate balance between managing adverse effects of development and enabling opportunities and change to provide for well-functioning urban environments.



Clare Dale
1 May 2023

Appendix 1: Kāinga Ora Submission and Further Submission Points for Stream 1 Hearing

Proposed District Plan Submissions

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
1. Part 2: District Wide Matters			
2. Part 2: Strategic Directions			
3. Part 2: Strategic Directions – Introduction			
<i>Interpretation and application of this chapter</i>	Oppose in part	<p>The interpretative notes for this chapter state that (<u>our emphasis</u>): <i>For the purpose of District Plan implementation, including the determination of resource consent applications:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>the SD <u>may</u> provide guidance for related objectives and policies in other chapters; and</i> 2. <i>the relevant objectives and policies of the DP, including SD in this chapter, are to be considered together <u>and no hierarchy exists</u> between them.</i> <p>Kāinga Ora seeks changes to clarify the relationship between the SD Chapter and other chapters in the proposed Plan. In Kāinga Ora’s view the Strategic Directions Chapter should have primacy over the other objectives and policies in other chapters of the Plan.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>For the purpose of District Plan development, including plan changes, the strategic objectives in this chapter provide direction for the more detailed provisions contained in the District Plan. For the purpose of District Plan implementation, including the determination of resource consent applications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. the SD may <u>provides</u> guidance for related objectives and policies in other chapters; and 5. the relevant objectives and policies of the DP, including SD in this chapter, are to be considered together, <u>with the SD having primacy over other objectives and policies of the District Plan.</u> and no hierarchy exists between them.

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
6. Part 2: Strategic Directions – Objectives			
SD-01 <i>Natural Environment</i>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain objective as notified.
SD-02 <i>Urban Development</i>	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports this objective, but considers that changes are required to better reflect the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD). In particular, Kāinga Ora consider that amendments are required to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. clause 1 to reflect the outcomes sought for well-functioning urban environments; 2. clause 2 to recognise that urban environments (including amenity values) change over time through planned urban growth and intensification; 3. clause 3 to enable a range and mix of housing typologies; and 4. recognises policy 2 of the NPSUD which requires that there shall be at all times, at least, sufficient 	<p>Amend, as follows:</p> <p>Urban development and infrastructure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. is consolidated and integrated with the well- <u>functioning</u> urban environments; 2. that recognises existing character, <u>planned urban form and</u> amenity values, and is attractive and functional to residents, businesses and visitors; 3. utilises the District Council’s reticulated wastewater system, and potable water supply and stormwater infrastructure where available; 4. provides a range <u>and mix</u> of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to achieve <u>at all times at least</u> the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1; 5. supports a hierarchy of urban centres, with the District’s main centres in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford and Woodend being:

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
		<p>development capacity to meet expected demand for housing.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora also questions whether clause 10, which deals with sites of significance to Ngāi Tūāhuriri, should be deleted as it appears to duplicate SD-05. If Council wishes to retain clause 10 in its current form, it should be subsumed into SD-05. Kāinga Ora notes for completeness that an equivalent of clause 10 does not appear in SD-04; reinforcing the view that clause 10 is best located in SD-05</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. the primary centres for community facilities; b. the primary focus for retail, office and other commercial activity; and c. the focus around which residential development and intensification can occur. <p>6. provides opportunities for business activities to establish and prosper within a network of business and industrial areas zoned appropriate to their type and scale of activity and which support district self-sufficiency;</p> <p>7. provides people with access to a network of spaces within urban environments for open space and recreation;</p> <p>8. supports the transition of the Special Purpose Zone (Kāinga Nohoanga) to a unique mixture of urban and rural activities reflecting the aspirations of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga;</p> <p>9. provides limited opportunities for Large Lot Residential development in identified areas, subject to adequate infrastructure; and</p> <p>10. recognise and support Ngāi Tūāhuriri cultural values through the protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori identified in SASM-SCHED1.—</p>

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
<i>SD-03 Energy and Infrastructure</i>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain objective as notified.
<i>SD-05 Ngāi Tahu mana whenua/Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga</i>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this objective.	Retain objective as notified.
<i>SD-06 Natural hazards and resilience</i>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this objective with amendments. In certain circumstances, where you cannot avoid you should consider to minimise subdivision, use and development where the risk is unacceptable.	Amend , as follows: The District responds to natural hazard risk, including increased risk as a result of climate change, through: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. avoiding <u>or minimising</u> subdivision, use and development where the risk is unacceptable; and 2. mitigating other natural hazard risks.

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
7. Part 2: District Wide Matters			
8. Part 2: Strategic Directions			
9. Part 2: Urban Form and Development – Objectives			
<i>UFD-01 Feasible development capacity for residential activities</i>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this objective, but considers that changes are required to reflect the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPSUD). In particular, Kāinga Ora notes that policy 2 of the NPSUD specifically requires that there shall be at all times, at least, sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing. The current wording of the objective does not align with policy 2 of the NPSUD.	Amend , as follows: <u>There is, at all times, at least Ssufficient</u> feasible development capacity for residential activity to meet specified housing bottom lines and a changing demographic profile of the District as follows ...
<i>UFD-02 Feasible development capacity for commercial activities and industrial activities</i>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this objective, but considers that changes are required to reflect the requirements of the NPSUD. In particular, Kāinga Ora notes that policy 2 of the NPSUD specifically requires that there shall be at all times, at least, sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for business land. Moreover, the policy requires provision of such capacity over the short, medium and long term. The current wording of the objective does not align	Amend , as follows: <u>There is, at all times, at least S-sufficient</u> feasible development capacity to meet commercial and industrial development demand <u>over the short term, medium term and the long term</u> .

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
		<p>with policy 2 of the NPSUD.</p> <p>Kāinga Ora notes for completeness that the title for UFD-02 refers to “commercial” and “business” activities, rather than the term “business land”, as used in the NPSUD. The objective itself then refers to “commercial and industrial development demand”. “Business land” is defined in the UFD-02 and refers to a range of zones in urban environments. Kāinga Ora accept that the manner in which “commercial” and “business” activities are defined in the proposed District Plan, cover the range of business activities anticipated under policy 2 of the NPSUD.</p>	
10. Part 2: Urban Form and Development – Policies			
<i>UFD-P1 Density of Residential Development</i>	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy in part with amendments sought. Amendments help to provide clarity to the application of the medium density residential zoning in Waimakariri and ensure UFD-P1 and UFD-P2 are aligned in application.</p>	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Density of residential development In relation to the density of residential development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provide for intensification in urban environments through provision for minor residential units, retirement villages, papakāinga or suitable up-zoning of Residential Zones where it is consistent with the anticipated built form and purpose of the zone; 2. locate any Medium Density Residential Zone so it: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. supports, and has ready access to, existing <u>or</u>

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
			<p><u>planned</u> Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, schools, <u>existing or planned</u> public transport and open space;</p> <p>b. supports well connected walkable communities;</p> <p>c. avoids or mitigates natural hazard risk in any high hazard area within existing urban areas; and</p> <p>d. located away from <u>does not immediately adjoin</u> any Heavy Industrial Zone.</p>
<i>UFD-P2 Identification/ location of new Residential Development Areas</i>	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy, but considers that a minor amendment is required to clause 2.a which requires that new residential development areas are attached to existing urban environments. Kāinga Ora consider that the reference to being “attached” is unnecessary, as SD-02 refers to urban development being “consolidated and integrated” with urban environments. SD-02 does not require “attachment”. Within this context Kāinga Ora consider that the term “attached” should be replaced with “integrated”.</p> <p>Further amendments are also sought to align to Policy 6 of the NPSUD and recognising that amenity values will change and develop overtime in response to providing for increased and</p>	<p>Amend, as follows:</p> <p>Identification/location of new Residential Development Areas</p> <p>In relation to the identification/location of residential development areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. residential development in the new Residential Development Areas at Kaiapoi, North East Rangiora, South East Rangiora and West Rangiora is located to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy; 2. for new Residential Development Areas, other than those identified by (1) above, avoid residential development unless located so that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. occur in a form that concentrates, or are <u>integrated with attached to</u>, an existing urban environment and promotes a coordinated pattern of development; b. occur in a manner that makes use of existing and planned transport and three waters infrastructure, or where

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
		varied housing densities and types that is different to what is there now across Waimakariri.	<p>such infrastructure is not available, upgrades, funds and builds infrastructure as required;</p> <p>c. have good accessibility for all people between to housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport;</p> <p>d. concentrate higher <u>and medium</u> density residential housing in locations focusing on activity nodes such as key <u>commercial centres and mixed use</u> activity centres, schools, public transport routes and open space;</p> <p>e. take into account the need to provide for intensification of residential development while maintaining <u>managing appropriate levels of</u> amenity values on surrounding sites and streetscapes <u>that will change and develop overtime in response to providing increased and varied housing densities and types</u>;</p> <p>f. are informed through the development of an ODP;</p> <p>...</p>
<i>UFD-P4 Identification/location and extension of Town Centre Zones</i>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora supports this policy in part with amendments sought. Names of growth strategies and plans constantly change. It is also unclear to what town centre plans might be developed and the	<p>Amend, as follows:</p> <p>Provide for the extension of existing Town Centres and locate and develop new commercial activities to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development</p>

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
		detail content of those plans are unknown – therefore it is best to delete any reference to implement and give effect to any Town Centre Plans unless these can be explicitly referenced and outlined in the PDP. Consequential amendments will be required throughout the document with proposed change.	Strategy <u>or Council's growth strategy</u> , WDDS or Town Centre Plans .
<i>UFD-P5 Identification/location and extension of Industrial Zones</i>	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora supports this policy in part with amendments sought. Names of growth strategies and plans constantly change; Kāinga Ora seeks deletion to any specific document names such as the WDDS. It is also unclear to what town centre plans are, which ones might be developed and the content of these plans are unknown – therefore it is best to delete any reference to implement and give effect to any Town Centre Plans unless these can be explicitly referenced and outlined in the PDP.</p> <p>Consequential amendments will be required to delete any reference to WDDS and Town Centre Plans throughout the PDP.</p>	<p>Amend, as follows:</p> <p>Provide for the extension of existing Town Centres and locate and develop new commercial activities to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy <u>or Council's growth strategy</u>, WDDS or Town Centre Plans.</p>

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
<i>UFD-P6 Mechanism to release Residential Development Areas</i>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this policy in part with amendments. It is unclear what the certification process may entail. Any release of new urban land should align with the Future Development Strategy or Council's growth strategy; especially the release of land per the timeframes set out in the growth strategy.	Amend , as follows: The release of land within the identified new development areas of Kaiapoi, North East Rangiora and South East Rangiora occurs in an efficient and timely manner <u>generally aligned to the Future Development Strategy or Council's growth strategy</u> via a certification process to enable residential activity to meet short to medium-term feasible development capacity and achievement of housing bottom lines.
<i>UFD-P7 Mechanism to provide additional Commercial and Mixed Use zones</i>	Support in part	Kāinga Ora generally supports this objective, but considers that: 1. the use of the term "mechanism" in the title is incorrect. The policy does not describe a mechanism or process; rather, it prescribes criteria for the consideration of plan change proposals; 2. for certainty, the criteria should ensure that any such rezoning proposal does not detract from the housing development capacity required under SD-O2 and UFD-01; and 3. minor editing changes to align the policy wording with other policies in the Urban form and development section.	Amend , as follows: <u>Mechanism to provide additional Commercial and Mixed Use Zones</u> If proposed, ensure any plan change to create new, or expanded existing Commercial and Mixed Use Zones: 1. improve commercial self-sufficiency within the town and the Waimakariri District; 2. are commensurate to align with the population growth forecast for the <u>District town</u> subject to the plan change; 3. consider and address any adverse effects that might undermine affect other town centres and local centres <u>form, function and role</u> in the District; and 4. address any development capacity shortfall as identified in the Future Development Strategy or WDDS ; 5. <u>does not reduce housing development capacity sought under SD-02 and UFD-01</u> ; and 6. is informed through the development of an ODP.

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
UFD-P8 <i>Mechanism to provide additional Industrial Zones</i>	Support in part	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports this objective, but considers that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the use of the term “mechanism” in the title is incorrect. The policy does not describe a mechanism or process; rather, it prescribes criteria for the consideration of plan change proposals; 2. for certainty, the criteria should ensure that any such rezoning proposal does not detract from the housing development capacity required under SD-O2 and UFD-01; and 3. minor editing changes. 	<p>Amend, as follows:</p> <p><u>Mechanism to provide additional Industrial Zones</u> If proposed, ensure any plan change to create new, or expanded existing Industrial Zones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. manages adverse effects at the interface between Industrial Zones and arterial roads, Rural Zones, Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones, through methods such as building setbacks and landscaping; 2. provides for development of greenfield areas in a manner aligned with the delivery of infrastructure, including upgrades to infrastructure, to avoid adverse effects on the capacity and efficiency of infrastructure serving these areas; and 3. locates new Industrial Zones in locations adjacent to existing urban environments where it can be efficiently serviced by infrastructure; 4. <u>does not reduce housing development capacity sought under SD-02 and UFD-01; and</u> 5. is informed through the development of an ODP.

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
<i>UFD-P9 Unique purpose and character of the Special Purpose Zone (Kāinga Nohoanga)</i>	Support	Kāinga Ora supports this policy as notified.	Retain as notified.
<i>UFD-P10 Managing reverse sensitivity effects from new development</i>	Oppose	Kāinga Ora opposes the policy as proposed and seeks an amendment to UFD-P10(1). The use of “avoid” will mean no new residential activity could be located or enabled close to any infrastructure. The policy should direct a ‘minimise’ policy with regards to the location of new residential activity rather than avoid, as the ODP process and UFD policies above should have identified the location and application of new residential areas that does not restrict or inhibit the operation and upgrade of any critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure. A minimise policy will also provide the opportunity for any application to be considered on its merits to see if it can enable some level of residential activity to occur without compromising the relevant infrastructure/s.	Amend , as follows: Within Residential Zones and new development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. avoid <u>minimise the location of new</u> residential activity that has the potential to limit <u>or compromise</u> the efficient and effective operation and upgrade of critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure, and regionally significant infrastructure, including avoiding noise sensitive activities within the Christchurch Airport Noise Contour, unless within an existing Residential Zone; 2. minimise reverse sensitivity effects on primary production from activities within new development areas through setbacks and screening, without compromising the efficient delivery of new development areas.

Section/Sub-section/Provision	Support/Support in Part/Oppose	Reason(s) for submission	Relief sought / decision requested Changes sought by Kāinga Ora is shown in red as strikethrough for deletion and <u>underline</u> for addition. Consequential amendments may be required to give effect to the relief sought.
		Kāinga Ora also opposes all provisions related to the Airport Noise Contour in the PDP and seeks all relevant airport noise contour provisions in the PDP including objectives, policies, rules and standards (with any associated tables, figures and overlays) are amended in the PDP.	

Proposed District Plan Further Submissions

Submitter Name and Submission Point Number	Chapter Topic/ Provision	Submission Position / Summary of Decision Sought	Kāinga Ora response/ reasons
MainPower NZ #249.245	UFD - Ahuatanga auaha a taone - Urban form and development - UFD-P10	Amend: Support UFD-P10 but seek amendments to provide further clarity. Amend UFD-P10(1): (shown in bold) "... 1. avoid residential activity and development that has the potential to limit the efficient and effective operation, maintenance, repair, development and upgrade of critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure, and regionally significant infrastructure, important infrastructure including avoiding noise sensitive	Kāinga Ora oppose the proposed amendments.

Submitter Name and Submission Point Number	Chapter Topic/ Provision	Submission Position / Summary of Decision Sought	Kāinga Ora response/ reasons
		<p>activities within the Christchurch Airport Noise Contour, unless within an existing Residential Zone;</p>	
<p>Christchurch International Airport Limited</p> <p># 254.2, 254.18, 254.19, 254.21, 254.22, 254.23 and 254.24</p>	<p>Strategic Directions and Urban Form and Development</p>	<p>Amend:</p> <p>To better recognise and enable important infrastructure and to explicitly require avoidance of adverse effects on important infrastructure, particularly Christchurch International Airport.</p> <p>Residential growth must avoid reverse sensitivity effects on critical infrastructure, regionally significant infrastructure, and strategic infrastructure.</p> <p>Safe and efficient operations should be recognised and provided for, and not constrained by urban growth and intensification. Activities can affect airport operations such as location of noise sensitive activities in noise contours and risk from bird strike, and should be addressed appropriately.</p> <p>CIAL considers that the District Plan should direct urban growth and intensification away from the 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on Airport operations, as provided for in the CRPS.</p>	<p>Consistent with its submission on the PDP Kāinga Ora opposes the airport noise contour. Kāinga Ora seeks the deletion of the Aircraft/ Airport noise provisions in full including any mapped noise overlays, contour maps.</p>

Submitter Name and Submission Point Number	Chapter Topic/ Provision	Submission Position / Summary of Decision Sought	Kāinga Ora response/ reasons
		Place objectives and policies providing for Airport operations and protecting from reverse sensitivity in appropriate plan sections to guide rules. Locate rules restricting land use and addressing reverse sensitivity issues for noise sensitive activities in the 50 dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour, and rules for bird strike risk, in appropriate plan chapters for easy identification.	
Canterbury Regional Council/ Environment Canterbury #316.8	UFD - Ahuatanga auaha a taone - Urban form and development UFD-P2	Amend: UFD-P2 is not consistent with Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). Clause 1 should refer to Map A in the CRPS rather than the Future Development Strategy (FDS) to give effect to the CRPS and have regard to the FDS. Concerned that clause 2 appears to provide for new Residential Development Areas within Greater Christchurch that are outside of the future development areas identified in Map A of the CRPS. This would not give effect to the objective and policy framework in Chapter 6 of the CRPS, which provides clear and strong direction as to where new urban activities should be located, based on strategic growth planning undertaken by the Greater Christchurch Partnership. To give effect to Policy 5.3.12 of the CRPS, the need to protect highly productive soils should also be considered when assessing any new development areas.	Oppose. CRPS needs to respond to NPS-UD. NPS-UD provision for out a sequence development.

Submitter Name and Submission Point Number	Chapter Topic/ Provision	Submission Position / Summary of Decision Sought	Kāinga Ora response/ reasons
Christchurch City Council #360.3	SD - Rautaki ahunga - Strategic Directions SD-O2	Supports wording of SD-O2(2) as it recognises changes likely to occur to existing character with intensification, and reflects direction provided by Policy 6 of National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD). Notes development covenants can limit intensification in some areas, and are contrary to wider intensification outcomes sought by NPS-UD. Covenants also limit the development of community (social) housing and affordable housing types. The Greater Christchurch Partnership's Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan (which implements 'Our Space 2018-2048' actions) will address deficits in social housing and Council should consider this.	Oppose. Kāinga Ora generally supports this objective but considers that changes are required to better reflect the requirements of the NPS-UD. In particular, Kāinga Ora consider that amendments are required to: 1. clause 1 to reflect the outcomes sought for well-functioning urban environments; 2. clause 2 to recognise that urban environments (including amenity values) change over time through planned urban growth and intensification; 3. clause 3 to enable a range and mix of housing typologies; and 4. recognises policy 2 of the NPSUD which requires that there shall be at all times, at least, sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing.
Kiwi Rail Holdings Limited #373.14	UFD - Ahuatanga auaha a taone - Urban form and development UFD-P10	Support strategic direction to protect the function and operation of regionally strategic infrastructure from incompatible activities, including residential and noise sensitive activities.	Oppose. Kāinga Ora opposes the policy as proposed and seeks an amendment to UFD-P10(1). The use of "avoid" will mean no new residential activity could be located or enabled close to any infrastructure. The policy should direct a 'minimise' policy with regards to the location of new residential activity rather than avoid.

Appendix 2: Kāinga Ora Updated Relief Sought following S42A

In the table below black text is as notified, “blue mark up” amendments from s42A Report, and “red mark” Kāinga Ora evidence relief sought.

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
Strategic Directions Introduction	<p>Interpretation and application of this chapter</p> <p>For the purpose of District Plan development, including plan changes, the strategic objectives in this chapter provide direction for the more detailed provisions contained in the District Plan. For the purpose of District Plan implementation, including the determination of resource consent applications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the strategic objectives may provide guidance for related objectives and policies in other chapters; and 2. the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan, including strategic objectives in this chapter, are to be considered together and no hierarchy exists between them. 	Retain as Notified	<p><u>Amend</u> as follows:</p> <p>For the purpose of District Plan development, including plan changes, the strategic objectives in this chapter provide direction for the more detailed provisions contained in the District Plan. For the purpose of District Plan implementation, including the determination of resource consent applications:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 11. the strategic objectives may provide guidance for related objectives and policies in other chapters; and 12. the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan, including Strategic Directions in this chapter, are to be considered together, <u>with the Strategic Directions having primacy over other objectives and policies of the District Plan, and no hierarchy exists between them.</u>
SD-02	As proposed:	<u>Amend</u> , as follows:	<u>Amend</u> , as follows:

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
Urban Development	<p>Urban development and <u>infrastructure</u> that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. is consolidated and integrated with the <u>urban environment</u>; 2. that recognises existing character, <u>amenity values</u>, and is attractive and functional to residents, businesses and visitors; 3. utilises the <u>District Council's</u> reticulated <u>wastewater system</u>, and potable <u>water supply</u> and <u>stormwater infrastructure</u> where available; 4. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new <u>residential activity</u> within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to achieve the housing bottom lines in <u>UFD-O1</u>; 5. supports a hierarchy of urban centres, with the <u>District's</u> main centres in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford and Woodend being: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the primary centres for <u>community facilities</u>; b. the primary focus for retail, <u>office</u> and other <u>commercial activity</u>; and 	<p>Urban development and infrastructure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. is consolidated and integrated with <u>the well-functioning urban environment centres</u>; 2. <u>that</u> recognises <u>existing character, planned urban form and</u> amenity values, and is attractive and functional to residents, businesses and visitors; 3. utilises the District Council's reticulated wastewater system, and potable water supply and stormwater infrastructure where available; 4. provides a range of housing opportunities, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to achieve the 	<p>Urban development and infrastructure that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. is consolidated and integrated with <u>the well-functioning urban environments</u>; 2. <u>that</u> recognises <u>existing character, planned urban form and</u> amenity values, and is attractive and functional to residents, businesses and visitors; 3. utilises the District Council's reticulated wastewater system, and potable water supply and stormwater infrastructure where available; 4. provides <u>for a diverse variety of range</u>-housing opportunities <u>and typologies</u>, focusing new residential activity within existing towns, and identified development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi, in order to achieve <u>at least</u> the housing bottom lines in UFD-O1 <u>at all times</u>;

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
	<p>c. the focus around which residential development and intensification can occur.</p> <p>6. provides opportunities for business activities to establish and prosper within a network of business and industrial areas zoned appropriate to their type and scale of activity and which support <u>district</u> self-sufficiency;</p> <p>7. provides people with access to a network of spaces within <u>urban environments</u> for open space and recreation;</p> <p>8. supports the transition of the Special Purpose Zone (<u>Kāinga Nohoanga</u>) to a unique mixture of urban and rural activities reflecting the aspirations of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga;</p> <p>9. provides limited opportunities for Large Lot Residential development in identified areas, subject to adequate <u>infrastructure</u>; and</p> <p>10. recognise and support Ngāi Tūāhuriri cultural values through the protection of <u>sites</u> and areas of significance to Māori identified in <u>SASM-SCHED1</u>.</p>	<p>housing bottom lines in UFD-O1;</p> <p>5. supports a hierarchy of urban centres, with the District's main centres in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford and Woodend being:</p> <p>(a) the primary centres for community facilities;</p> <p>(b) the primary focus for retail, office and other commercial activity; and</p> <p>(c) the focus around which residential development and intensification can occur.</p> <p>6. provides opportunities for business activities to establish and prosper within a network of business and industrial areas zoned appropriate to their type and scale of activity and</p>	<p>5. supports a hierarchy of urban centres, with the District's main centres in Rangiora, Kaiapoi, Oxford and Woodend being:</p> <p>a. the primary centres for community facilities;</p> <p>b. the primary focus for retail, office and other commercial activity; and</p> <p>c. the focus around which residential development and intensification can occur.</p> <p>6. provides opportunities for business activities to establish and prosper within a network of business and industrial areas zoned appropriate to their type and scale of activity and which support district self-sufficiency;</p> <p>7. provides people with access to a network of spaces within urban environments for open space and recreation;</p>

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
		<p>which support district self-sufficiency;</p> <p>7. provides people with access to a network of spaces within urban environments for open space and recreation;</p> <p>8. supports the transition of the Special Purpose Zone (Kāinga Nohoanga) to a unique mixture of urban and rural activities reflecting the aspirations of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga;</p> <p>9. provides limited opportunities for Large Lot Residential development in identified areas, subject to adequate infrastructure; and</p> <p>10. recognise and support Ngāi Tūāhuriri cultural values through the protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori identified in SASM-SCHED1.</p>	<p>8. supports the transition of the Special Purpose Zone (Kāinga Nohoanga) to a unique mixture of urban and rural activities reflecting the aspirations of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga;</p> <p>9. provides limited opportunities for Large Lot Residential development in identified areas, subject to adequate infrastructure; and</p> <p>10. recognise and support Ngāi Tūāhuriri cultural values through the protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori identified in SASM-SCHED1. <u>Relocated to SD-05 below.</u></p>

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
SD-05 Ngāi Tahu mana whenua/Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga	<p>Ngāi Tahu mana whenua/Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga</p> <p>Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga's role in the management of natural and physical resources is recognised, so that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ngāi Tūāhuriri's historic and contemporary connections, and cultural and spiritual values, associated with the land, water and other taonga are recognised and provided for; 2. the values of identified sites and areas of significance to Ngāi Tūāhuriri are protected; 3. Ngāi Tūāhuriri can retain, and enhance access to sites of cultural significance; 4. Māori land is able to be occupied and used by Ngāi Tūāhuriri for its intended purposes and to maintain their relationship with their ancestral land; 5. recognised customary rights are protected; 6. Ngāi Tūāhuriri are able to carry out customary activities in accordance with tikanga; and 7. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga are able to actively participate in decision-making and exercise kaitiakitanga. 	<p>Retain as Notified.</p>	<p>Ngāi Tahu mana whenua/Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga</p> <p>Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga's role in the management of natural and physical resources is recognised, so that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Ngāi Tūāhuriri's historic and contemporary connections, and cultural and spiritual values, associated with the land, water and other taonga are recognised and provided for; 2. recognise and support Ngāi Tūāhuriri cultural values through the protection of sites and areas of significance to Māori identified in SASM-SCHED1. 3. the values of identified sites and areas of significance to Ngāi Tūāhuriri are protected; 4. Ngāi Tūāhuriri can retain, and enhance access to sites of cultural significance; 5. Māori land is able to be occupied and used by Ngāi Tūāhuriri for its intended purposes and to maintain their relationship with their ancestral land; 6. recognised customary rights are protected;

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
			7. Ngāi Tūāhuriri are able to carry out customary activities in accordance with tikanga ; and 8. Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga are able to actively participate in decision-making and exercise kaitiakitanga .
SD-06 Natural Hazard Resilience	The District responds to natural hazard risk, including increased risk as a result of climate change, through: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. avoiding subdivision, use and development where the risk is unacceptable; and 2. mitigating other natural hazard risks. 	Retain as Notified.	The District responds to natural hazard risk, including increased risk as a result of climate change, through: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. avoiding subdivision, use and development where unacceptable risk would eventuate or occur; and 2. mitigating other natural hazard risks.
Urban Form and Development-Introduction	Interpretation and application of this chapter: For the purpose of District Plan development, including plan changes and resource consents, the objectives and policies in this chapter must be given effect to through more detailed provisions contained in the District Plan .	<u>Amend</u> , as follows: For the purpose of District Plan development, including plan changes and resource consents, the strategic direction UDF objectives and policies in this chapter must be given effect to through provide direction for the more detailed provisions contained in other Part 2 and Part 3 chapters of the District Plan . For the purpose of District Plan implementation, including the	<u>Amend</u> , as follows: For the purpose of District Plan development, including plan changes and resource consents, the objectives and policies in this chapter must be given effect to through more detailed provisions contained in the District Plan . <u>With the Strategic Directions Urban Form and Development having primacy over other objectives and policies of the District Plan.</u>

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
		<p><u>determination of resource consent applications:</u></p> <p>1. <u>the strategic UFD objectives and policies may provide guidance for related objectives and policies in other chapters; and</u></p> <p>2. <u>the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan, including strategic objectives in this chapter, are to be considered together and no hierarchy exists between them.</u></p>	
<p>UDF-01 Feasible Development Capacity for Residential Activities</p>	<p>As proposed:</p> <p>Sufficient feasible development capacity for <u>residential activity</u> to meet specified housing bottom lines and a changing demographic profile of the <u>District</u> as follows.....</p>	<p><u>Amend</u>, as follows:</p> <p><u>At least S</u>sufficient feasible development capacity for residential activity to meet specified housing bottom lines and a changing demographic profile of the district as follows...</p>	<p><u>Amend</u>, as follows:</p> <p><u>There is at all times at least S</u>sufficient feasible development capacity for residential activity to meet specified housing bottom lines and a changing demographic profile of the district as follows...</p>
<p>UDF-02 Feasible Development Capacity for Commercial</p>	<p>As Proposed:</p> <p>Sufficient feasible development capacity to meet commercial and industrial development demand.</p>	<p><u>Amend</u>, as follows:</p> <p><u>At least S</u>sufficient feasible development capacity to meet commercial and industrial development</p>	<p><u>Amend</u>, as follows:</p> <p><u>There is at all times at least S</u>sufficient feasible development capacity to meet commercial and industrial development demand.</p>

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
and Industrial Activities		demand.	
UDF-P1 Density of Residential Development	<p>As proposed:</p> <p>In relation to the density of residential development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provide for intensification in urban environments through provision for minor residential units, retirement villages, papakāinga or suitable up-zoning of Residential Zones where it is consistent with the anticipated built form and purpose of the zone; 2. locate any Medium Density Residential Zone so it: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. supports, and has ready access to, existing Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, schools, public transport and open space; b. supports well connected walkable communities; c. avoids or mitigates natural hazard risk in any high hazard area within existing urban areas; and d. located away from any Heavy Industrial Zone. 	<p>Amend, as follows:</p> <p>In relation to the density of residential development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provide for intensification in urban environments centres through provision for minor residential units, retirement villages, papakāinga or suitable up-zoning of Residential Zones where it is consistent with the anticipated built form and purpose of the zone; 2. locate any Medium Density Residential Zone so it: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) supports, and has ready access to, existing or planned Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, schools educational facilities, existing or planned public transport and open space; 	<p>Amend, as follows:</p> <p>In relation to the density of residential development:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. provide for intensification in urban environments through provision for minor residential units, retirement villages, papakāinga or suitable up-zoning of Residential Zones where it is consistent with the anticipated built form and purpose of the zone; 2. locate any Medium Density Residential Zone so it: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. supports, and has ready access to, existing or planned Commercial and Mixed Use Zones, schools education facilities, existing or planned public transport and open space; b. supports well connected walkable communities; c. avoids or mitigates natural

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
		<p>(b) supports well connected walkable communities;</p> <p>(c) avoids or mitigates natural hazard risk in any high hazard area within existing urban areas; and</p> <p>(d) located away from any Heavy Industrial Zone.</p>	<p>hazard risk in any high hazard area within existing urban areas; and</p> <p>d. located away from <u>manages reverse sensitivity effects on any</u> Heavy Industrial Zones.</p>
<p>UDF-P2 Identification/location of new Residential Development</p>	<p>As proposed:</p> <p>In relation to the identification/location of residential development areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. residential development in the new Residential Development Areas at Kaiapoi, North East Rangiora, South East Rangiora and West Rangiora is located to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy; 2. for new Residential Development Areas, other than those identified by (1) above, avoid residential development unless located so that they: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. occur in a form that concentrates, or are attached to, an 	<p>Amend. as follows:</p> <p>In relation to the identification/location of residential development areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. residential development in the new Residential Development Areas at Kaiapoi, North East Rangiora, South East Rangiora and West Rangiora is located to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy; 	<p>Amend. as follows:</p> <p>In relation to the identification/location of residential development areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. residential development in the new Residential Development Areas at Kaiapoi, North East Rangiora, South East Rangiora and West Rangiora is located to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy; 2. for new Residential Development Areas, other than those identified by (1) above, avoid residential development unless located so that they:

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
	<p>existing <u>urban environment</u> and promotes a coordinated pattern of development;</p> <p>b. occur in a manner that makes use of existing and planned transport and <u>three waters infrastructure</u>, or where such <u>infrastructure</u> is not available, upgrades, funds and builds <u>infrastructure</u> as required;</p> <p>c. have good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or <u>active transport</u>;</p> <p>d. concentrate higher density residential housing in locations focusing on activity nodes such as key activity centres, schools, public transport routes and open space;</p> <p>e. take into account the need to provide for intensification of residential development while maintaining appropriate levels of <u>amenity values</u> on surrounding <u>sites</u> and streetscapes;</p> <p>f. are informed through the development of an <u>ODP</u>;</p>	<p>2. for new Residential Development Areas, other than those identified by (1) above, avoid residential development unless located so that they:</p> <p>a) occur in a form that concentrates, or are attached to, an existing urban <u>environment centres</u> and promotes a coordinated pattern of development;</p> <p>b) occur in a manner that makes use of existing and planned transport and three waters infrastructure, or where such infrastructure is not available, upgrades, funds and builds infrastructure as required;</p> <p>c) have good accessibility for all</p>	<p>a. occur in a form that concentrates, or are <u>integrated with attached to</u>, an existing urban environment and promotes a coordinated pattern of development;</p> <p>b. occur in a manner that makes use of existing and planned transport and three waters infrastructure, or where such infrastructure is not available, upgrades, funds and builds infrastructure as required;</p> <p>c. have good accessibility for all people <u>between to</u> housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport;</p> <p>d. concentrate higher <u>and medium</u> density residential housing in locations focusing on activity nodes such as key <u>commercial centers and mixed use activity centres, schools</u></p>

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
	<p>g. supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and</p> <p>h. are resilient to natural hazards and the likely current and future effects of climate change as identified in SD-O6.</p>	<p>people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport;</p> <p>d) concentrate higher density residential housing in locations focusing on activity nodes such as key activity centres, schools, public transport routes and open space;</p> <p>e) take into account the need to provide for intensification of residential development while maintaining appropriate levels of amenity values on surrounding sites and streetscapes;</p> <p>f) are informed through the</p>	<p>education facilities, public transport routes and open space;</p> <p>e. take into account the need to provide for intensification of residential development while maintaining managing the effect on appropriate levels of amenity values in accordance with the planned urban form on surrounding sites and streetscapes that will change and develop overtime in response to providing increased and varied housing densities and types;</p> <p>f. are informed through the development of an ODP;</p> <p>g. supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and</p> <p>h. are resilient to natural hazards and the likely current and future effects of climate change as identified in SD-O6.</p>

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
		<p>development of an ODP;</p> <p>g) supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; and</p> <p>h) are resilient to natural hazards and the likely current and future effects of climate change as identified in SD-O6.</p>	
UFD-P4 Identification/ location and extension of Town Centre Zones	<p>As proposed:</p> <p>Provide for the extension of existing Town Centres and locate and develop new commercial activities to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy, WDDS or Town Centre Plans.</p>	Retain as Notified.	<p><u>Amend</u>, as follows:</p> <p>Provide for the extension of existing Town Centres and locate and develop new commercial activities to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy <u>or other Council adopted growth strategy, WDDS or Town Centre Plans.</u></p>
UFD-P5 Identification/ location and extension of Industrial Zones	<p>As proposed:</p> <p>Provide for the extension of existing Industrial Zones and locate and develop new industrial activities to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy or WDDS.</p>	Retain as Notified.	<p><u>Amend</u>, as follows:</p> <p>Provide for the extension of existing Industrial Zones and locate and develop new industrial activities to implement the urban form identified in the Future Development Strategy <u>or other Council adopted growth strategy, WDDS or Town Centre Plans.</u></p>

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
UFD-P6 Mechanism to release Residential Development Areas	As proposed: The release of land within the identified new development areas of Kaiapoi, North East Rangiora and South East Rangiora occurs in an efficient and timely manner via a certification process to enable residential activity to meet short to medium-term feasible development capacity and achievement of housing bottom lines.	<u>Amend.</u> as follows: The release of land within the identified new development areas of Kaiapoi, West Rangiora , North East Rangiora and South East Rangiora occurs in an efficient and timely manner via a certification process to enable residential activity to meet short to medium-term feasible development capacity and achievement of housing bottom lines.	<u>Amend.</u> as follows: The release of land within the identified new development areas of Kaiapoi, West Rangiora , North East Rangiora and South East Rangiora occurs in an efficient and timely manner aligned with the Future Development Strategy or other Council adopted growth strategy via a certification process to enable residential activity to meet short to medium-term feasible development capacity and achievement of housing bottom lines in UDF-01.
UFD-P7 Mechanism to provide additional Commercial and Mixed Use zones	As proposed: If proposed, ensure any plan change to create new, or expanded existing Commercial and Mixed Use Zones : 1. improve commercial self-sufficiency within the town and the Waimakariri District ; 2. are commensurate to the population growth forecast for the town subject to the plan change; 3. consider and address any adverse effects that might undermine other town centres and local centres in the District ; and	Retain as notified.	<u>Amend.</u> as follows: If proposed, ensure any plan change to create new, or expanded existing Commercial and Mixed Use Zones: 1. improve commercial self-sufficiency within the town and the Waimakariri District; 2. are commensurate to align with the population growth forecast for the District town subject to the plan change ; 3. consider and address any adverse effects that might undermine impact other town centres and local centers form, function and role in the District;

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. address any development capacity shortfall as identified in the Future Development Strategy or WDDS. 5. is informed through the development of an ODP. 		<p>and</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. address any development capacity shortfall as identified in the Future Development Strategy or WDDS or other Council adopted growth strategy; 5. is informed through the development of an ODP.
UFD-P8 Mechanism to provide additional Industrial Zones	<p>As proposed:</p> <p>If proposed, ensure any plan change to create new, or expanded existing Industrial Zones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. manages adverse effects at the interface between Industrial Zones and arterial roads, Rural Zones, Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones, through methods such as building setbacks and landscaping; 2. provides for development of greenfield areas in a manner aligned with the delivery of infrastructure, including upgrades to infrastructure, to avoid adverse effects on the capacity and efficiency of infrastructure serving these areas; and 3. locates new Industrial Zones in locations adjacent to existing urban 	Retain as notified.	<p><u>Amend</u>, as follows:</p> <p>If proposed, ensure any plan change to create new, or expanded existing Industrial Zones:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. manages adverse effects at the interface between Industrial Zones and arterial roads, Rural Zones, Residential Zones and Open Space and Recreation Zones, through methods such as building setbacks and landscaping; 2. provides for development of greenfield areas in a manner aligned with the delivery of infrastructure, including upgrades to infrastructure, to avoid adverse effects on the capacity and efficiency of infrastructure serving these areas; and 3. locates new Industrial Zones in locations adjacent to existing

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
	<p>environments where it can be efficiently serviced by infrastructure.</p> <p>4. is informed through the development of an ODP.</p>		<p>urban environments where it can be efficiently serviced by infrastructure.</p> <p>4. is informed through the development of an ODP.</p>
UFD-P10 Managing reverse sensitivity effects from new development	<p>As proposed:</p> <p>Within Residential Zones and new development areas in Rangiora and Kaiapoi:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. avoid residential activity that has the potential to limit the efficient and effective operation and upgrade of critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure, and regionally significant infrastructure, including avoiding noise sensitive activities within the Christchurch Airport Noise Contour, unless within an existing Residential Zone; 2. minimise reverse sensitivity effects on primary production from activities within new development areas through setbacks and screening, without compromising the efficient delivery of new development areas. 	<p>Amend, as follows:</p> <p>Within Residential Zones and new development areas in Rangiora, and Kaiapoi, Woodend, Ravenswood and Pegasus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid residential activity and development that has the potential to be impacted by or limit the efficient, and effective and safe operation, maintenance, repair, development and upgrade of critical infrastructure, strategic infrastructure, and regionally significant infrastructure, including avoiding noise sensitive activities within the Christchurch Airport Noise Contour, unless within an existing Residential Zone; 	<p>Amend, as follows:</p> <p>Within Residential Zones and new development areas in Rangiora, and Kaiapoi, Woodend, Ravenswood and Pegasus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Manage the effects of new residential activities and development on infrastructure, including avoiding activities that would limit the safe and efficient provision, operation and maintenance of existing critical and strategic infrastructure. 2. Only provide for new development that does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading and safety of existing strategic infrastructure, including by avoiding noise sensitive activities within the 50dBA Ldn airport noise contour for Christchurch International Airport.

Provision Number	As notified	Council S42A Drafting	Kāinga Ora Relief Sought
		<p>2. Minimise reverse sensitivity effects on <u>industrial and</u> primary production from activities within new development areas through setbacks and screening, <u>or other methods</u>, without compromising the efficient delivery of new development areas.</p>	<p><u>unless the activity is within an existing residentially zoned urban area, residential greenfield area identified for Kaiapoi, or residential greenfield priority area identified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement Chapter 6, Map A.</u></p> <p>3. <u>manage</u> Minimise reverse sensitivity effects on <u>industrial and</u> primary production from activities within new development areas through setbacks and screening, <u>or other methods</u> without compromising the efficient delivery of new development areas.</p>

Appendix 3: Canterbury Regional Policy Statement Provisions – Hazards and Reverse Sensitivity

Regional Policy Statement / Chapter 6 - Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch

Objective 6.2.1 Recovery framework

Recovery, rebuilding and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that:

1. identifies priority areas for urban development within Greater Christchurch;
2. identifies Key Activity Centres which provide a focus for high quality, and, where appropriate, mixed-use development that incorporates the principles of good urban design;
3. avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas for development, unless expressly provided for in the CRPS;
4. protects outstanding natural features and landscapes including those within the Port Hills from inappropriate subdivision, use and development
5. protects and enhances indigenous biodiversity and public space;
6. maintains or improves the quantity and quality of water in groundwater aquifers and surface waterbodies, and quality of ambient air;
7. maintains the character and amenity of rural areas and settlements;
8. protects people from unacceptable risk from natural hazards and the effects of sea-level rise;
9. integrates strategic and other infrastructure and services with land use development;
10. achieves development that does not adversely affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrade, and future planning of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs;
11. optimises use of existing infrastructure; and
12. provides for development opportunities on Māori Reserves in Greater Christchurch.

Policy 6.3.5 Integration of land use and infrastructure

Recovery of Greater Christchurch is to be assisted by the integration of land use development with infrastructure by:

1. Identifying priority areas for development and Future Development Areas to enable reliable forward planning for infrastructure development and delivery;
2. Ensuring that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development are co-ordinated with the development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure in order to:
 - a. optimise the efficient and affordable provision of both the development and the infrastructure;
 - b. maintain or enhance the operational effectiveness, viability and safety of existing and planned infrastructure;

- c. protect investment in existing and planned infrastructure;
 - d. ensure that new commercial film or video production facilities are connected to reticulated water and wastewater systems; and
 - e. ensure new development does not occur until provision for appropriate infrastructure is in place;
3. Providing that the efficient and effective functioning of infrastructure, including transport corridors, is maintained, and the ability to maintain and upgrade that infrastructure is retained;
 4. Only providing for new development that does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading and safety of existing strategic infrastructure, including by avoiding noise sensitive activities within the 50dBA Ldn airport noise contour for Christchurch International Airport, unless the activity is within an existing residentially zoned urban area, residential greenfield area identified for Kaiapoi, or residential greenfield priority area identified in Map A (page 6-28) and enabling commercial film or video production activities within the noise contours as a compatible use of this land; and
 5. Managing the effects of land use activities on infrastructure, including avoiding activities that have the potential to limit the efficient and effective, provision, operation, maintenance or upgrade of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs.

Regional Policy Statement / Chapter 11- Natural Hazards

Objective 11.2.1 Avoid new subdivision, use and development of land that increases risks associated with natural hazards

New subdivision, use and development of land which increases the risk of natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure is avoided or, where avoidance is not possible, mitigation measures minimise such risks.

11.3.1 Avoidance of inappropriate development in high hazard areas

To avoid new subdivision, use and development (except as provided for in Policy 11.3.4) of land in high hazard areas, unless the subdivision, use or development:

1. is not likely to result in loss of life or serious injuries in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and
2. is not likely to suffer significant damage or loss in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and
3. is not likely to require new or upgraded hazard mitigation works to mitigate or avoid the natural hazard; and
4. is not likely to exacerbate the effects of the natural hazard; or
5. Outside of greater Christchurch, is proposed to be located in an area zoned or identified in a district plan for urban residential, industrial or commercial use, at the date of notification of the CRPS, in which case the effects of the natural hazard must be mitigated; or
6. Within greater Christchurch, is proposed to be located in an area zoned in a district plan for urban residential, industrial or commercial use, or identified as a "Greenfield Priority Area" on Map A of Chapter 6, both at the date the Land Use Recovery Plan was notified in the Gazette, in which the effect of the natural hazard must be avoided or appropriately mitigated; or
7. Within greater Christchurch, relates to the maintenance and/or upgrading of existing critical or significance infrastructure.

11.3.5 General risk management approach

For natural hazards and/or areas not addressed by policies 11.3.1, 11.3.2, and 11.3.3, subdivision, use or development of land shall be avoided if the risk from natural hazards is unacceptable. When determining whether risk is unacceptable, the following matters will be considered:

1. the likelihood of the natural hazard event; and
2. the potential consequence of the natural hazard event for: people and communities, property and infrastructure and the environment, and the emergency response organisations.

Where there is uncertainty in the likelihood or consequences of a natural hazard event, the local authority shall adopt a precautionary approach.

Formal risk management techniques should be used, such as the Risk Management Standard (AS/NZS ISO 31000:2009) or the Structural Design Action Standard (AS/NZS 1170.0:2002).