

Form 6

Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency further submission on notified proposal for the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan under Clause 8 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

21st November 2022

Development Planning Unit
Waimakariri District Council
Private Bag 1005
Rangiora 7440

Via email: developmentplanning@wmk.govt.nz

This is a further submission on a change proposed to the following plan:

Proposed Waimakariri District Plan including Variation 1: Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021.

The Waka Kotahi further submission is:

1. Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency (Waka Kotahi) is a Crown entity that takes an integrated approach to transport planning, investment and delivery. The statutory objectives of Waka Kotahi are to undertake its functions in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient and safe land transport system in the public interest. Our vision is for a sustainable, multi-modal land transport system where public transport, active or shared modes are the first choice for most daily transport needs.
2. Waka Kotahi has a mandate under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA), the Government Rounding Powers Act 1989 (GRPA), and the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport 2021/22-2030/31 (GPS) to carry out its functions in a way that delivers on the transport outcomes set by the government.
3. In the 2021-2024 National Land Transport Programme, Waka Kotahi has allocated significant investment in the Canterbury Region (including Waimakariri District) to the improvement, operation and maintenance of the state highway network, including public transport investment, walking and cycling and transport planning. In addition, Waka Kotahi is a co-funder of the local roading network. Waka Kotahi is therefore a significant investor in the infrastructure required to achieve the land use change and growth anticipated in the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan and through Variation 1: Housing Intensification.

4. Overall, Waka Kotahi has an interest in the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan and Variation 1: Housing Intensification as a result of its role as a:
 - Transport investor – to maximise effective, efficient and strategic returns for New Zealand;
 - Planner of land transport networks – to ensure the integration of infrastructure and land use so as to support liveable communities and the development of an effective and resilient land transport network for customers;
 - Provide for access to and the use of the land transport system – to shape smart, efficient, safe and responsible transport choices; and
 - Manager of the state highway network – to deliver efficient, safe and responsible highway solutions for customers.
5. For these reasons it is considered that Waka Kotahi has an interest which is greater than the general public.
6. Further points are summarised in Tables 1 and 2, which form the bulk of our submission.
7. Waka Kotahi could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

We seek the following decision from the local authority:

Amend the provisions of the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan as detailed in Tables 1 and 2 (attached) including such further, alternative or consequential relief as may be necessary to fully achieve the relief sought in this further submission.

Waka Kotahi would like to be heard in support of its submission. If others make a similar submission, Waka Kotahi will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.

Signature of person authorised to sign on behalf of Submitter:



Richard Shaw

Team Leader South – Environmental Planning

Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency

richard.shaw@nzta.govt.nz

Table 1: Decisions Sought on the Proposed Waimakariri District Plan

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Part 1 – Introduction and general provisions						
Definitions						
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	192.2	Definitions	Support	The relief sought to include a definition of 'biodiversity compensation'	Waka Kotahi supports the inclusion of a definition that defines biodiversity/indigenous vegetation compensation, as this would assist with the interpretation and implementation of ECO-MD1(4). Waka Kotahi has an interest in any new policy direction, that sets out best practice and limits for 'biodiversity compensation', as suggested by the submitter.	Accept part of submission seeking inclusion of definition for biodiversity compensation
Waimakariri District Council	367.32	Definitions	Support	The relief sought to widen the definition of 'active transport' to include low-powered e-bikes and e-scooters	Waka Kotahi supports the widening of the definition of 'active transport' to include low-powered e-bikes and e-scooters, as these may be used in a manner that primarily relies on human power and therefore align with the intent of the notified definition.	Accept the submission
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	192.19	Definitions	Oppose	The relief sought to amend the definition of 'infrastructure' to exclude, or more clearly define the types of infrastructure provided for or excluded from sensitive environments	Waka Kotahi considers that the notified definition of 'infrastructure, which has the same meaning as Section 2 of the RMA, is appropriate. Moreover, should changes to the definition be considered, Waka Kotahi would want to ensure that any change to the notified definition to identify, or exclude, types of infrastructure from sensitive environments, takes into consideration that sometimes infrastructure has an operational need or functional need to be located in a sensitive environment.	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	192.23	Definitions	Oppose	The relief sought to delete the definition of 'no net loss'	Waka Kotahi considers it appropriate that the Plan contain a definition of 'no net loss' and notes that the use of this term in the NPS for Freshwater Management (NPS-FM) is particular to rivers and wetlands. The term in the Plan relates to indigenous biodiversity, and is not particular to rivers and wetlands, and as such, we consider it does not need to strictly align with the NPS-FM.	Reject the submission
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc.	192.25	Definitions	Oppose	The relief sought to delete cycleways and walkways from the definition of 'public amenities'	Waka Kotahi considers that cycleways and walkways would, depending on their formation, comply with the definition of a structure, and as such they may also provide amenity and assist the public, we consider they also comply with the notified definition of a 'public amenity'.	Accept the submission
Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc	414.21	Definitions	Oppose	The relief sought to delete the definition of 'upgrading'	Waka Kotahi considers it appropriate that the Plan contain a definition of 'upgrading', as it provides clarity to Plan users as to the nature and scale of natural hazard mitigation works that are considered to constitute 'upgrading'.	Reject the submission
Part 2 – District-wide matters						
Strategic directions						
SD – Rautaki ahunga - Strategic directions						
CA and GJ McKeever	111.3	SD-O2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The purpose of the strategic direction is to limit large lot residential development to specific locations within the district. The submitter seeks to provide for large lot development throughout the district provided there are not infrastructure constraints. Waka Kotahi does not support this	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					principle as this type of development does not reflect the good urban development form that is sought throughout the district and through the NPSUD and Variation 1: Housing Intensification, therefore, it is not considered to be appropriate.	
John Stevenson	162.2	SD-O2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The purpose of the strategic direction is to limit large lot residential development to specific locations within the district. The submitter seeks to provide for large lot development throughout the district provided there are not infrastructure constraints. Waka Kotahi does not support this principle as this type of development does not reflect the good urban development form that is sought throughout the district and through the NPSUD and Variation 1: Housing Intensification, therefore, it is not considered to be appropriate.	Reject the submission
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc. (Forest and Bird) - Nicky Snoyink	192.31	SD-O3	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supported SD-O3 as notified and seek that the effects of reverse sensitivity are recognised, whereas the submitter seeks to remove reference to reverse sensitivity.	Reject the submission
Resource Management Group Limited - Melanie Foote	249.202	SD-O6	Support	The general intent of the suggested wording is supported	Waka Kotahi generally support the intent of the wording proposed by the submitter, however, suggest that reference to the operational and functional needs of infrastructure could be included	Further consider the wording proposed

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					as opposed to "reasonable alternative" for consistency with the National Planning Standards.	
Christchurch International Airport – Amy Hill	254.18	SD-O2	Support	Waka Kotahi supports the intent of the wording proposed by the submitter which is similar to that proposed by Waka Kotahi in its original submission	Waka Kotahi generally support the additional wording proposed by the submitter which recognises the need to consider the operational needs of infrastructure when providing for urban development.	Accept the submission
Chloe Chai and Mark McKitterick	256.3	SD-O2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The purpose of the strategic direction is to limit large lot residential development to specific locations within the district. The submitter seeks to provide for large lot development throughout the district provided there are not infrastructure constraints. Waka Kotahi does not support this principle as this type of development does not reflect the good urban development form that is sought throughout the district and through the NPSUD and Variation 1: Housing Intensification, therefore, it is not considered to be appropriate.	Reject the submission
Ngai Tahu Property – Tanya Stevens	411.2	SD-O2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The submitter seeks to alter the objective such that the focus for urban development is not solely on existing centres. Waka Kotahi does not support the shift in emphasis as this is likely to result in development that is not well connected by public transport and active transport modes in other locations.	Reject the submission
Keith Goodwin	418.3	SD-O2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The purpose of the strategic direction is to limit large lot residential development to specific locations within the district. The submitter seeks to	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					provide for large lot development throughout the district provided there are not infrastructure constraints. Waka Kotahi does not support this principle as this type of development does not reflect the good urban development form that is sought throughout the district and through the NPSUD and Variation 1: Housing Intensification, therefore, it is not considered to be appropriate.	
Department of Conservation – Amy Young	419.32	SD-O3	Support	Support proposed clauses ii. and iii.	The submitter seeks to amend the objective to include reference to the benefits and functional needs of infrastructure and the need to manage reverse sensitivity effects on infrastructure. Waka Kotahi support reference to these two needs and suggest that reference to the functional and operational needs of infrastructure could be considered for consistency with the plan and National Planning Standards.	Accept proposed clauses ii. and iii.
UFD – Āhuatanga auaha ā tāone - Urban form and development						
Ara Poutama Aotearoa, the Department of Corrections - Andrea Millar	52.4	UFD-XX	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	While Waka Kotahi does not oppose the intent of the proposed policy, it is considered that this would be better incorporated into one of the existing policies, and reference to considerations for residential development should be included, for example reverse sensitivity.	Reject the submission
Chapman Tripp - Jo Appleyard / Lucy Forrester - on behalf of Rolleston	160.3	UFD-P3	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	As per its submission on Proposed Plan Change 31 Waka Kotahi does not support proposed rezoning at this location.	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Industrial Developments Limited						
Fiona Aston	223.4	UFD-P2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi does not support the proposed amendment to clause 2 which seeks to remove the 'avoid' clause, thus weakening the requirement for new residential development to occur in a manner that reflects good urban form and makes use of existing and planned transport networks. Waka Kotahi does not support the proposed amendments to clauses 2(c) and 2(g) which seek to provide for some new residential development which may not support a reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and private vehicle use.	Reject the submission
Concept Services – Jane West	230.2	UFD-P2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The intent of the policy is to avoid new residential development that does not meet the listed criteria. Waka Kotahi does not support replacing the word 'avoid' with manage as this opens the policy to further interpretation and room for new residential development that is not well connected to existing urban development or well serviced by public and active transport modes.	Reject the submission
Concept Services – Jane West	230.2	UFD-P10	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	As per above point.	Reject the submission
Fiona Aston	236.5	UFD-P2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The intent of the policy is to avoid new residential development that does not meet the listed criteria. Waka Kotahi does not support the amendments proposed by the submitter which would change the	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					wording so that new residential development generally has to meet the listed criteria. The original wording has a stronger requirement to meet the criteria listed, to ensure any new development is well connected and reflects good urban form.	
Resource Management Group Limited - Melanie Foote	249.237	UFD-P2	Support in part	Consider changes in light of the wording proposed by Waka Kotahi	Waka Kotahi generally supports the change proposed by the submitter which better requires infrastructure delivery to be aligned with development, however, as per the original submission made by Waka Kotahi the onus should be on the developer if there is insufficient existing or planned transport infrastructure to provide for new Residential Development Areas.	Consider the changes proposed by the submitter in conjunction with the changes proposed by Waka Kotahi in its original submission
Resource Management Group Limited - Melanie Foote	249.238	UFD-P3	Support in part	Generally support the submission	Waka Kotahi generally supports the change proposed by the submitter which better requires infrastructure delivery to be aligned with development, however, as per the submission point above the onus should be on the developer if there is insufficient existing or planned transport infrastructure to provide for additional development.	Consider the changes proposed by the submitter in conjunction with the changes proposed by Waka Kotahi in its original submission on UFD-P2
Resource Management Group Limited - Melanie Foote	249.239	UFD-P4	Support in part	Generally support the submission	Waka Kotahi generally supports the change proposed by the submitter which better requires infrastructure delivery to be aligned with development, however, as per the submission point above the onus should be on the developer if there is insufficient existing or planned transport	Consider the changes proposed by the submitter in conjunction with the changes proposed by Waka Kotahi in its original submission on UFD-P2

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					infrastructure to provide for additional development.	
Resource Management Group Limited - Melanie Foote	249.240	UFD-P5	Support in part	Generally support the submission	Waka Kotahi generally supports the change proposed by the submitter which better requires infrastructure delivery to be aligned with development, however, as per the submission point above the onus should be on the developer if there is insufficient existing or planned transport infrastructure to provide for additional development within an existing industrial zone.	Consider the changes proposed by the submitter in conjunction with the changes proposed by Waka Kotahi in its original submission on UFD-P2
Resource Management Group Limited - Melanie Foote	249.242	UFD-P7	Support in part	Generally support the submission	Waka Kotahi generally supports the change proposed by the submitter which better requires infrastructure delivery to be aligned with development, however, as per the submission point above the onus should be on the developer if there is insufficient existing or planned transport infrastructure to provide for additional development within a new commercial and mixed-use zone.	Consider the changes proposed by the submitter in conjunction with the changes proposed by Waka Kotahi in its original submission on UFD-P2.
Resource Management Group Limited - Melanie Foote	249.243	UFD-P8	Support in part	Generally support the submission	Waka Kotahi generally supports the change proposed by the submitter which better requires infrastructure delivery to be aligned with development, however, as per the submission point above the onus should be on the developer if there is insufficient existing or planned transport infrastructure to provide for additional development in a new industrial zone.	Consider the changes proposed by the submitter in conjunction with the changes proposed by Waka Kotahi in its original submission on UFD-P2
Beca - Adriene Grafia	278.11	UFD-XX	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	While Waka Kotahi does not oppose the intent of the proposed policy, it is considered that this would be better incorporated into one of the existing	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					policies, and reference to considerations for residential development should be included, for example reverse sensitivity.	
Canterbury Regional Council – Jo Mitten, Principal Planner	316.7	UFD-P1	Support	Support the submission in full	The submitter seeks to cross-reference the minimum net densities contained in the Subdivision Chapter. Waka Kotahi supports this for ease of use of the plan.	Accept the submission
Canterbury Regional Council – Jo Mitten, Principal Planner	316.9	UFD-P3	Support	Support the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supports this submission point which seeks to limit new Large Lot Residential Development to areas already identified for development. Large lot development does not support a consolidated urban form, reduction in private vehicle use and associated reduction in greenhouse gas emissions from the transport sector such that Waka Kotahi support limiting new Large Lot Residential development as per this submission point and do not support new large-lot residential development.	Accept the submission
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities - Brendon Liggett	325.9	UFD-P1	Support in part	Reference to planned public transport	The submitter seeks to include a reference to existing or planned public transport. While Waka Kotahi generally supports this point, it is unclear how close is in time a development and planned public transport provision need to be for this to be a relevant consideration in the assessment of a new residential development.	Consider whether a timeframe on planned public transport is required
Kainga Ora – Homes and	325.17	UFD-P10	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi seek to avoid reverse sensitivity effects from noise on new development and	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Communities - Brendon Liggett					consider that an avoid policy is most appropriate. The submitter seeks to minimise the location of new development that could adversely affect existing infrastructure. Waka Kotahi are of the opinion that the proposed wording should be retained.	
Christchurch City Council – Team Leader City Planning	360.9	UFD-P2	Support	Support the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supports this submission and agrees that further consideration should be given to the policy to ensure that new development outside of existing development areas is not provided for.	Consider the points raised in the submission in full
Ngai Tahu Property – Tanya Stevens	411.5	UFD-P2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi seeks that the change proposed by the submitter be rejected as new development should not be considered unless the criteria listed can be fulfilled.	Reject the submission
Ngai Tahu Property – Tanya Stevens	411.7	UFD-P8	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi consider that any new industrial development should be located adjacent to existing development as this is likely to be more accessible by public transport and multi-modal transport options.	Reject the submission
Energy, Infrastructure and Transport						
EI – Pūngao me te hanganga hāpori - Energy and infrastructure						
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities – Brendon Liggett	325.26	EI-P5	Oppose	Oppose in part	The submitter seeks to amend EI-P5 to remove the reference to more than minor upgrades. Waka Kotahi does not support the removal of this reference as this could have implications for minor upgrades outside of a designation.	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc. – Peter Wilson	414.71	EI-P6	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The submitter seeks to remove EI-P6: Effects of other activities and developments on energy and infrastructure. This policy recognises the potential for other activities to adversely affect the operation of established infrastructure activities. Waka Kotahi seek that this policy be retained.	Reject this submission and retain the provision as notified.
Resource Management Group – Melanie Foote	249.88	EI-R35	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The submitter seeks to remove a matter of discretion related to the extent of the effects and replace this with the operational constraints. Waka Kotahi do not consider this appropriate as the potential effects on other infrastructure including the state highway would have no avenue to be considered.	Reject the submission
Incite - Chris Horne - on behalf of Chorus New Zealand, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited	62.32	EI-R18	Support	Support the submission in full	Waka Kotahi support the removal of clauses a. and c., as infrastructure providers have different requirements for attaching infrastructure to their assets and is managed by the infrastructure provider through their own standards. Therefore, Waka Kotahi consider it appropriate for these two clauses to be deleted.	Accept the submission
Incite - Chris Horne - on behalf of Chorus New Zealand, Spark New Zealand Trading	62.62	EI-R2	Support	Support the submission in full	Waka Kotahi support the inclusion of MD3: Operational considerations in relation to EIR2 as often there are few options when locating vehicle access tracks.	Accept the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Limited, Vodafone New Zealand Limited						
Transpower New Zealand Limited - Ainsley McLeod	195.32	EI-R2	Support	Support the submission in full	The submitter proposes to remove the requirement to meet the applicable zone earthworks standard as earthworks are already required to meet specific standards set out in the Earthworks chapter. Waka Kotahi support this point.	Accept the submission
Resource Management Group – Melanie Foote	249.72	EI-R12	Oppose in part	Oppose the removal of MD14	The submitter seeks a range of amendments to this rule to provide for more flexibility when replacing a pole or tower and while Waka Kotahi does not have any comments on the proposed changes to the rule standards, the matter of discretion MD14: Extent of effects should be retained so that the potential effects of such a change to overhead infrastructure can be appropriately considered, including on the transport network.	Reject in part
Resource Management Group – Melanie Foote	249.74	EI-R13	Oppose in part	Oppose the removal of MD14	The submitter seeks a range of amendments to this rule to provide for more flexibility when adding equipment to a pole or tower and while Waka Kotahi does not have any comments on the proposed changes to the rule standards, the matter of discretion MD14: Extent of effects should be retained so that the potential effects of such a change to overhead infrastructure can be appropriately considered, including on the transport network.	Reject in part
Resource Management	249.75	EI-R15	Oppose in part	Oppose the removal of MD14	The submitter seeks a range of amendments to this rule to provide for more flexibility when replacing	Reject in part

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Group – Melanie Foote					an infrastructure cabinet or building and while Waka Kotahi does not have any comments on the proposed changes to the rule standards, the matter of discretion MD14: Extent of effects should be retained so that the potential effects of such a change can be appropriately considered, including on the transport network.	
Resource Management Group – Melanie Foote	249.76	EI-R16	Oppose in part	Oppose the removal of MD14	The submitter seeks a range of amendments to this rule to provide for more flexibility when upgrading above ground lines, ducts, cables and pipes and while Waka Kotahi does not have any comments on the proposed changes to the rule standards, the matter of discretion MD14: Extent of effects should be retained so that the potential effects of such a change can be appropriately considered, including on the transport network.	Reject in part
KiwiRail Holdings Limited – Sheena McGuire	373.26	EI-R6	Support	Support the submission in full	The submitter seeks to amend the advice note so that it better reflects the rule wording which states that the rule applies to tree trimming related to all infrastructure- not just overhead lines etc. Waka Kotahi support this amendment as it clarifies the scope for tree trimming required to maintain all infrastructure.	Accept the submission
Waimakariri District Council – Jim Harland	367.15	EI-RXX	Support in part	Support the insertion of a new rule subject to appropriate matters of discretion.	While Waka Kotahi does not oppose the addition of a new rule to specifically apply to large scale solar farms, an appropriate matter of discretion should be included to manage potential effects on the transport network – including safety (from glare) and construction effects. Either MD14 should apply	Accept the submission in part and include a relevant matter of discretion (likely MD14).

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					to this rule if accepted, or a new matter of discretion be included.	
Transpower New Zealand Limited – Ainsley McLeod	195.48	EI-MD4	Support	Accept the submission in full	Waka Kotahi agree that the matter of discretion should be expanded to cover impacts on safety as well as on human health as currently the provision only refers to human health.	Accept the submission
Transpower New Zealand Limited – Ainsley McLeod	195.50	EI-MD9	Support	Accept the submission in full	Waka Kotahi agrees with the submitter that reference to the relevant earthworks standards and mention of the benefits of infrastructure would assist in providing clarity to this matter.	Accept the submission
Transpower New Zealand Limited – Ainsley McLeod	195.51	EI-MD10	Support	Accept the submission in full	Waka Kotahi support the submitter in stating that the benefits of the infrastructure should be included as a matter of discretion in relation to the relocation of existing infrastructure.	Accept the submission
Resource Management Group – Melanie Foote	249.97	EI-MD2	Support	Accept the submission in full	Waka Kotahi support the recognition of the operational and functional needs of infrastructure to be located where they are as often there are few suitable alternatives. Recognition of this matter in this provision is suitable.	Accept the submission
Resource Management Group – Melanie Foote	249.104	EI-MD14	Oppose	Reject the submission in full	While Waka Kotahi do not expressly oppose the point raised by the submitter in terms of a catch-all provision being included. However, removal of this matter of discretion would potentially leave a gap in terms of properly addressing effects on transport infrastructure.	If the submission is to be accepted and MD14 removed, further consideration should be given to ensure effects on the transport network and existing infrastructure are appropriately captured.

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Transpower New Zealand Limited – Ainsley McLeod	195.25	EI-O2	Support in part	Accept the submission in full and consider original submission points made by Waka Kotahi	Waka Kotahi support the change proposed by the submitter to refer to the management of effects as opposed to avoid, remedy or mitigate, however, as per the original submission request that the functional and operational needs are also incorporated into the objective.	Accept the submission and make additional amendments requested by Waka Kotahi in its original submission.
Resource Management Group – Melanie Foote	249.52	EI-O1	Support in part	Accept intention, however, wording should be considered further to provide consistency across the plan	Waka Kotahi support the intent of this submission point, however, for consistency it would be better to refer to the functional and operational requirements.	Accept the submission in part
Resource Management Group – Melanie Foote	249.53	EI-O2	Support	Accept the submission in full	The point raised by the submitter reflects those raised by Waka Kotahi in its original submission, such that Waka Kotahi supports this submission point.	Accept the submission
Christchurch International Airport - Amy Hill	254.27	EI-O2	Support	Accept the submission in full	The point raised by the submitter reflects those raised by Waka Kotahi in its original submission, such that Waka Kotahi supports this submission point.	Accept the submission
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities – Brendon Liggett	325.21	EI-O3	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	This objective recognises the effects of other activities on existing infrastructure. The amendments proposed by the submitter are not supported by Waka Kotahi as the intent of the objective will be altered and it is unclear what level of effects would be considered acceptable.	Reject the submission
Royal Forest and Bird Protection	192.39	EI-P5	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi consider that the clause proposed to be deleted by the submitter should be retained as in some instances it is not possible to avoid certain locations due to operational and functional	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Society Inc. – Nicky Snoyink					requirements, such that offsetting should be considered.	
Christchurch International Airport – Amy Hill	254.30	EI-P5	Support in part	Accept intention, however, wording should be considered further to provide consistency across the plan.	Waka Kotahi support the intent of this submission point, however, for consistency it would be better to refer to the functional and operational requirements.	Accept the submission in part
TRAN – Ranga waka – Transport						
Boffa Miskell – Stephanie Styles on behalf of Summerset Retirement Villages	207.9	TRAN-R20	Oppose	Oppose an increase to the threshold under Table TRAN-1 for retirement villages to 250vmpd.	Waka Kotahi opposes an increase to the threshold as this has the potential to have an adverse effect on the state highway network. Waka Kotahi seeks to reserve the control to provide comment on an activity that generates high traffic volumes.	Reject the submission
Christchurch Internal Airport – Amy Hill	254.36	TRAN-P15	Support	Support the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supports the wording proposed by the submitter to strengthen the need to avoid adverse effects on infrastructure.	Accept the submission
George Jason Smith	270.13	TRAN-R2	Support	Amend TRAN-R2 to include the provisions of TRAN-R8 for new roads. Elevate the Activity Status of this rule to a level that will make departure from its provisions difficult. Amend all related Objectives, Rules and Matters of Discretion accordingly.	Waka Kotahi supports the provisions in TRAN-R8 to be included in TRAN-R2 for new road connections to be onto the lowest classification road.	Accept the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Beca – Hugh Loughnan	277.21 277.22 277.23	TRAN-20 Table TRAN-1 Table TRAN-2	Support	Retain TRAN-20, Table TRAN-1 and Table TRAN-2 as notified	Waka Kotahi supports retaining these tables as they require an Integrated Transport Assessment for high traffic generating activities.	Accept the submission
Forme Planning Limited – Kay Panther Knight	282.81 282.140	Table TRAN-1 TRAN-R20	Oppose	Increase high traffic generation threshold	Waka Kotahi opposes an increase to the threshold as this has the potential to have an adverse effect on the state highway network. Waka Kotahi seeks to reserve the control to provide comment on an activity that generates high traffic volumes.	Reject the submission
4SIGHT CONSULTING LIMITED - Joy Morse	286.22 286.23	Table TRAN-1 TRAN-20	Oppose	TRAN-R20(1) and (2) shall not apply to service stations	Waka Kotahi opposes the exclusion of service stations from this rule and table as service stations are high traffic generators and could have adverse effects on the environment.	Reject the submission
Beca - Louisa Armstrong	303.24	TRAN-R6	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The submitter seeks to retain the rule as notified. However, while Waka Kotahi supports the access requirements as notified, this rule should include a notification clause so that any new accessway onto the state highway requires written approval from Waka Kotahi so that the potential effects on the state highway can be properly considered.	Reject submission
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities - Brendon Liggett	325.81	TRAN-05	Support	Limited notification to road controlling authority	Waka Kotahi supports those amendments which would require written approval from Waka Kotahi where the consent authority considers it is necessary.	Accept the submission
Kainga Ora – Homes and	325.83	TRAN-R20	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi considers that the ITA should not be specified to only 'non-residential activities' as	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Communities - Brendon Liggett					residential activities can be high traffic generators and an ITA would assess the effects of the activity.	
Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc. - Peter Wilson	414.91	TRAN-R22	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Retain the restricted discretionary status to determine whether there will be an adverse effect on the safety and structure of the road corridor.	Reject the submission
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities - Brendon Liggett	325.82	Table TRAN-17	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi consider that separation distances are necessary to manage effects of vehicles crossings within close proximity to road intersections.	Reject the submission
Christchurch International Airport Limited - Amy Hill	254.32	Introduction	Support	Land use and subdivision is managed to protect Waimakariri District's land transport corridors and infrastructure from incompatible activities that could undermine the provision of an integrated, safe, responsive, and sustainable land-based transport system, which includes the Strategic Transport Network and relevant infrastructure	Waka Kotahi supports the submission point around managing land use and subdivision to protect transport corridors and other infrastructure.	Accept the submission
Kainga Ora – Homes and	325.88	TRAN-MD2	Oppose	Oppose the removal of point 2	Waka Kotahi considers point 2, which addresses cumulative effects, should remain as notified as cumulative effects can have an adverse effect of	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Communities - Brendon Liggett					the safety and efficiency of the state highway network.	
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities - Brendon Liggett	325.90	TRAN-MD4	Oppose	Oppose the removal of points 4 and 10	Waka Kotahi considers that points 4 and 10 should be retained to address the potential effects vehicle crossings may have on pedestrian facilities and road frontages.	Reject the submission
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities - Brendon Liggett	325.91	TRAN-MD5	Oppose	Oppose the removal of point 1	Waka Kotahi considers that pedestrian and cyclist movements across site frontages should be considered to assess potential effects on pedestrian and cyclist safety.	Reject the submission
KiwiRail Holdings Limited - Sheena McGuire	326.129	TRAN-MD22	Support	Retain TRAN-MD22 as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports TRAN-MD22. The safety and structure of the road corridor is essential for the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.	Accept the submission
KiwiRail Holdings Limited – Sheena McGuire	373.45	TRAN-MD19	Support	Retain TRAN-MD19 as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports TRAN-MD19. Assessment of extent of adverse effects on land transport infrastructure is essential for the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.	Accept the submission
KiwiRail Holdings – Sheena McGuire	373.100	TRAN-MD11	Support	Retain TRAN-MD11 as notified.	Waka Kotahi supports TRAN-MD11 as this will aid to identify and manage the adverse effects of high traffic generating activities on the transport system.	Accept the submission
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities – Brendon Liggett	325.67	TRAN-O4	Oppose	The relief sought to delete 'avoided' in the notified provisions.	Waka Kotahi supports avoiding and managing adverse effects on the district's transport system from activities, including reverse sensitivity. However, Waka Kotahi consider that "avoided" should not be deleted from the objective. It is	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					considered that removing the word "avoided" only requires adverse effects to be managed rather than avoided and that the effects should sought to be avoided in the first instance and if this is not possible, then measures for management should be considered.	
Christchurch International Airport – Amy Hill	254.35	TRAN-O4	Support in part	Support the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supports the changes proposed by the submitter.	Consider the changes proposed by the submitter in conjunction with the changes proposed by Waka Kotahi in its original submission.
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities – Brendon Liggett	325.76	TRAN-P2	Oppose	Relief sought to amend TRAN-P2	Waka Kotahi considers that the amendments proposed by the submitter are difficult to interpret and apply in practice. Further consideration should be given to the strength of wording in this policy and the outcomes sought.	Further consider the wording proposed in conjunction with the original submission point made by Waka Kotahi in relation to clauses 6-8.
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities – Brendon Liggett	325.79	TRAN-P15	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supports avoiding and managing adverse reverse sensitivity effects on the transport system. However, Waka Kotahi consider that "avoided" should not be deleted from the policy. It is considered that removing the word "avoided" only requires adverse effects to be managed rather than avoided and that the effects should sought to be avoided in the first instance and if this is not possible, then measures for management should be considered. Consistency with TRAN-O4 is sought in terms of retaining the use of avoid, remedy or	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					mitigate so there is a clear hierarchy in the management of effects.	
Waimakariri District Council – Jim Harland	367.33	TRAN-P9	Support in part	Support changes to causes 1 and 2	Waka Kotahi supports the proposed changes to clauses 1 and 2 to reference the entire transport network and acknowledge the need for new development to design for active transport modes, however Waka Kotahi does not support the proposed changes to clause 3 which limit end of journey cycle facilities to specific zones.	Accept the submission in part
Beca – Hugh Loughnan	277.24	Table TRAN-3	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Educational facilities should be required to provide cycle parking and while Waka Kotahi does agree that in an ideal situation the market (educational facilities) should be able to dictate how much cycle parking is required and provided, this does not happen in practice and little cycle parking is provided.	Reject the submission
Kainga Ora – Homes and Communities – Brendon Liggett	325.84 325.85	Table TRAN-3 and Table TRAN-4	Oppose	Further consideration required on this submission point	The submitter seeks to delete Tables TRAN-3 and TRAN-4 in their entirety. Further investigation into what changes could be made to these tables is suggested.	Further consideration required on these submission points
Hazards and Risks						
NH – Matepā māhorahora - Natural Hazards						
Resource Management Group Limited	249.172	NH-P14	Support	The relief sought to amend the wording of clause 2 and 3(a) to recognise an operational need or functional need for new critical infrastructure, and the	Waka Kotahi supports those amendments seeking to better recognise and provide for the operational and functional needs of critical infrastructure.	Accept the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
				upgrade of existing critical infrastructure, in the fault overlays		
Canterbury Regional Council	316.79	NH-R4	Oppose	The relief sought to amend the provision to prevent any filling up to 0.25 metres above ground that is in an overland flow path	Critical infrastructure, by definition, includes the strategic transport network. Waka Kotahi considers that the amendment sought, to avoid filling in an overland flood path, would not always be achievable for the strategic transport network, given its linear nature.	Reject the submission
Canterbury Regional Council	316.80	NH-R5	Oppose	The relief sought to amend the provision to prevent any filling up to 0.25 metres above ground that is in an overland flow path	The amendment sought would prevent filling up to 0.25 m above ground level next to existing infrastructure. Waka Kotahi considers that this amendment could prevent the localised extension of existing infrastructure, like the state highway, which may be necessary to address a localised safety issue.	Reject the submission
Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc	414.96	NH-P18	Oppose	Reject the submission in full	Waka Kotahi considers policy NH-P18 should not be deleted, as it seeks to manage the vehicle crash risk on roads, including state highways, affected by ice hazard through restrictions on planting of woodlots and shelterbelts. Waka Kotahi agrees with the submitter that plantation forestry and carbon forestry may also contribute to this risk and suggests that the provision be expanded to include them.	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
NFL- Āhuatanga o te whenua - Natural Features and Landscapes						
Transpower New Zealand Limited	195.84	General	Support	The relief sought to amend rule guidance section 'Other potentially relevant District Plan provisions' to specifically address infrastructure.	Waka Kotahi considers that it would assist Plan users to interpret and implement the Plan if this section, which lists other Plan chapters, also addressed the relationship between the provisions of the NFL and EI and TRAN chapters.	Accept the submission
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	192.77	NFL-R4	Oppose	The relief sought to amend the rule to exclude public amenities that are not buildings from having permitted activity status under this rule	Waka Kotahi opposes the exclusion of structures that are public amenities, including cycleways and walkways, from this permitted activity rule, because this would consequently necessitate a resource consent to be obtained for these activities. We are of the view that additional conditions could be added to the permitted activity rule to manage the effects of larger scale cycleways and walkways.	Reject the submission
Royal Forest and Bird Protection Society of New Zealand Inc	192.74	NFL-P1	Oppose	The relief sought to add a further clause requiring 'avoiding any loss of indigenous biodiversity identified in policy ECO-P7'	Waka Kotahi is concerned that the absolute nature of this suggested amendment does not acknowledge that some activities, when considered in the context of the wider outcomes sought across the proposed Plan as a whole, might necessarily detract from the indigenous biodiversity values of Outstanding Natural Features. There may be instances where, in providing for the transport system, effects on indigenous biodiversity have been avoided, remedied or mitigated as far as practicable, but there is still some adverse effect on values of an outstanding natural features. Waka Kotahi consider a more nuanced approach is required.	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Incite on behalf of Chorus New Zealand, Spark New Zealand Trading Limited and Vodafone New Zealand Limited	62.49	NFL-P4	Support	The relief sought to amend the provision to include consideration of EI-P5.	Waka Kotahi is supportive of the proposed amendment as policy EI-P5 provides a framework for managing the adverse effects of infrastructure within specified areas, and consider it appropriate that it is taken into account in this policy so that the relationship between EI-P5 and NFL-P4 is clear.	Accept the submission
Subdivision						
SUB - Wāwāhia whenua - Subdivision						
Horticulture New Zealand – Ailsa Robertson	295.100	SUB-MCD10	Support	The amendment to include consideration of reverse sensitivity effects	Waka Kotahi supports the inclusion of reverse sensitivity effects as part of the matter of control or discretion. However, the reverse sensitivity effects should also consider noise and vibration in addition to effects on rural production on surrounding land.	Accept part of the submission point to consider reverse sensitivity effects
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities – Brendon Liggett	325.187	SUB-MCD10	Oppose	The relief seeks to amend the matter of control or discretion so that it only relates to effects in the rural environment	Waka Kotahi opposes the relief sought as it requests that the matters of control or discretion only relate to reverse sensitivity effects in the rural environment. Subdivision can occur in residential zones where reverse sensitivity effects, such as noise, are relevant and should also be considered.	Reject the submission
Waimakariri District Council – Jim Harland	367.64	SUB-MCD3	Support	The relief sought to include consideration of traffic safety effects	Waka Kotahi supports the relief sought that traffic safety should be included as a matter of control or discretion as it relates to property access.	Accept the submission
Christchurch International	254.43	SUB-O1	Support	The relief seeks to acknowledge that subdivision shall not give rise to adverse	The submission point is supported as Waka Kotahi agrees that any subdivision should not adversely	Accept the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Airport Limited – Amy Hill				effects on strategic infrastructure	affect strategic infrastructure, which includes the state highway.	
Chapman Tripp - Jo Appleyard / Lucy Forrester - on behalf of Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited	160.5	SUB-P6	Oppose	The relief seeks to exclude Outline Development Plans in Ohoka to comply with the 15 lots or households per hectare requirement.	Waka Kotahi opposes the submitters request for the Ohoka area to be excluded from the 15 lots or households per hectare density requirement, which is the agreed density requirement for Greater Christchurch. The full reasons are set out in the Waka Kotahi submission on Proposed Plan Change 31.	Reject the submission
Fiona Aston	183.7	SUB-P6	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete the reference to 'no less than 12 households per hectare'	Waka Kotahi opposes the deletion of 'no less than 12 households per hectare' when there are demonstrated constraints. Any reduction in density would not be consistent with the outcomes sought by the Greater Christchurch Partnership.	Reject the submission
Fiona Aston	223.8	SUB-P6	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete the reference to 'no less than 12 households per hectare'	Waka Kotahi opposes the deletion of 'no less than 12 households per hectare' when there are demonstrated constraints. Any reduction in density would not be consistent with the outcomes sought by the Greater Christchurch Partnership.	Reject the submission
Fiona Aston	236.10	SUB-P6	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete the reference to 'no less than 12 households per hectare'	Waka Kotahi opposes the deletion of 'no less than 12 households per hectare' when there are demonstrated constraints. Any reduction in density would not be consistent with the outcomes sought by the Greater Christchurch Partnership.	Reject the submission
Fiona Aston	242.7	SUB-P6	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete the reference to 'no less than 12 households per hectare'	Waka Kotahi opposes the deletion of 'no less than 12 households per hectare' when there are demonstrated constraints. Any reduction in density	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					would not be consistent with the outcomes sought by the Greater Christchurch Partnership.	
Fiona Aston	246.8	SUB-P6	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete the reference to 'no less than 12 households per hectare'	Waka Kotahi opposes the deletion of 'no less than 12 households per hectare' when there are demonstrated constraints. Any reduction in density would not be consistent with the outcomes sought by the Greater Christchurch Partnership.	Reject the submission
Kainga Ora	325.156	Subdivision – Policies	Support	Relief seeks to insert a new policy to provide for subdivision in accordance with a land use or building consent.	Waka Kotahi is comfortable with the proposed policy that seeks to provide for subdivision in accordance with a land use or building consent. The effects associated to the use of these sites can be managed at the land use consent stage.	Accept the submission
Ngāi Tahu Property – Tanya Stevens	411.31	SUB-P6	Oppose	The relief to include 'where possible' for each of the density requirements	The relief sought is opposed as if 15 lots or households per hectare cannot be achieved, and if there are demonstrated constraints, then 12 lots or households is appropriate. It is considered that to amend the policy to include the wording 'where possible' would not achieve the density requirements sought by the Greater Christchurch Partnership.	Reject the submission
General District-wide matters						
EW – Ketuketu whenua - Earthworks						
Chapman Tripp on behalf of Waimakariri Irrigation Limited	210.54	EW-S1	Support	The relief seeks to amend the standard to provide for earthworks for linear infrastructure	Waka Kotahi is supportive of the changes sought by the submitter, as they better provide for linear infrastructure and regionally significant infrastructure including state highways.	Accept the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
NZ Pork	169.22	EW-O1	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete the direct reference to earthworks being undertaken in a manner that minimises adverse effects on infrastructure	Waka Kotahi support the wording of this provision as notified.	Reject the submission
Horticulture New Zealand	295.101	EW-O1	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete the direct reference to earthworks being undertaken in a manner that minimises adverse effects on infrastructure	Waka Kotahi support the wording of this provision as notified.	Reject the submission
Fulton Hogan	41.35	EW-P6	Support	The relief seeks to require adverse effects on ground and surface water quality to be avoided, remedied or mitigated, as opposed to avoided entirely	Waka Kotahi agrees with the submitter that the notified wording of the policy requires absolute avoidance of adverse effects on water resources, without any consideration as to the type, scale or significance of the effects and the potential for those effects to be remedied or mitigated.	Accept the submission
LIGHT – Tūramarama - Light						
Woodend Sefton Community Board	155.6	General	Oppose	The relief seeks to require footpath lighting to be triggered by sensors	Waka Kotahi is concerned that streetlights turning on and off unpredictably could cause a distraction, and thereby safety risk, to highway motorists.	Reject the submission
NZ Pork	169.27	LIGHT-S1	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete LIGHT-S1 as it relates to new road corridors	Waka Kotahi opposes the changes sought by the submitter, as they seek to exclude light spill limits on activities adjacent to new road corridors, which do not take into consideration that excessive light	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					spill onto roads can adversely affect the safe, efficient and effective functioning of the land transport network.	
NZ Pork	169.28	LIGHT-S2	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete LIGHT-S2 as it relates to existing roads, footpaths and cycle paths	Waka Kotahi opposes the changes sought by the submitter, as they seek to exclude measures to control glare from outdoor lighting on properties adjacent to roads, footpaths and cycleways, which does not take into consideration that glare from lighting can adversely affect the safe, efficient and effective functioning of the land transport network.	Reject the submission
Horticulture New Zealand	295.107	LIGHT-S1	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete LIGHT-S1 as it relates to new road corridors	Waka Kotahi opposes the changes sought by the submitter, as they seek to exclude light spill limits on activities adjacent to new road corridors, which do not take into consideration that excessive light spill onto roads can adversely affect the safe, efficient and effective functioning of the land transport network.	Reject the submission
Horticulture New Zealand	295.108	LIGHT-S2	Oppose	The relief seeks to delete LIGHT-S2 as it relates to existing roads, footpaths and cycle paths	Waka Kotahi opposes the changes sought by the submitter, as they seek to exclude measures to control glare from outdoor lighting on properties adjacent to roads, footpaths and cycleways, which do not take into consideration that glare from lighting can adversely affect the safe, efficient and effective functioning of the land transport network.	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
NOISE Te orooro – Noise						
KiwiRail Holdings Limited – Sheena McGuire	373.74	Noise	Support	The relief seeks to mitigate noise and vibration effects on all noise sensitive activities	Waka Kotahi supports the proposed amendment to the rule to include all noise sensitive activities not just residential activities.	Accept the submission
KiwiRail Holdings Limited – Sheena McGuire	373.74	NOISE-R16	Support	The amendment to extend the 80m distance to 100m in NOISE-R16	Waka Kotahi supports the distance being extended to 100m as noted in its primary submission, noise effects can cause negative effects on human health within 100m of the road corridor.	Accept the submission
Kainga Ora - Homes and Communities – Brendon Liggett	325.149	Noise – General	Oppose	Oppose the removal of additional requirements for indoor noise design	Waka Kotahi supports provisions relating to indoor noise design as a suitable measure to mitigate noise effects on human health.	Reject the submission
KiwiRail Holdings Limited – Sheena McGuire	373.75	NOISE-MD1	Support	Accept the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supports NOISE-MD1 as notified which includes effects on human health and well-being from noise generating activities	Accept the submission
KiwiRail Holdings Limited – Sheena McGuire	373.76	NOISE-MD2	Support	Accept the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supports NOISE-MD2 as notified as it considers the means specified for reducing noise effects to be adequate measures to mitigate effects of noise on human health.	Accept the submission
KiwiRail Holdings	373.77	NOISE-MD3	Support	Accept the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supports the consideration of other means of mitigation such as alternative	Accept the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
Limited – Sheena McGuire					technologies and materials, reporting from an acoustic specialist.	
Kiwi Rail Holdings Limited – Sheena McGuire	373.101	Noise – Matters of control/disc rection	Support	The relief seeks to amend provisions to include all noise sensitive activities	Waka Kotahi agrees that noise sensitive receivers are not limited to residential activities and that the provisions should be amended to include all noise sensitive activities.	Accept the submission
Horticulture New Zealand Limited – Ailsa Robertson	295.111	NOISE-O2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi supports the notified version of NOISE-O1 particularly the wording relating to noise and its effect on human health.	Reject the submission
SIGN – Ngā tohu – Signs						
Canterbury District Health Board – Edward Griffiths	68.2	SIGN - R6	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	As per the original submission by Waka Kotahi, there should be appropriate standards related to this rule to manage the content of on-site signs. The submitter seeks to retain the rule as notified with no standards which Waka Kotahi does not agree with.	Reject the submission in full and further consider appropriate standards.
Go Media Limited – Resource Management Group	234.7	SIGN – R7	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	The submitter seeks to widen the scope of R7 (any off-site sign) to provide for a permitted activity pathway and for those signs that do not comply with relevant standards to fall to a restricted discretionary activity status (non-complying currently proposed). Waka Kotahi do not support this submission point and request that the rule be retained as notified to adequately control potential adverse effects from off-site signs, particularly adverse effects of safety on the transport network	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					if located at inappropriate locations. The standards proposed by the applicant for new rules do not align with conditions sought by Waka Kotahi to manage signage, particularly digital billboards.	
Ravenswood Developments Limited (RDL) – Sarah Everleigh-Anderson Lloyd	347.19	SIGN – R7	Support in part	Support further consideration of activity status amendment subject to appropriate standards	Waka Kotahi is not opposed to this submission point and consideration of a restricted discretionary activity status for off-site signs in commercial zones, however, appropriate matters of control including traffic safety should be imposed.	Consider imposing appropriate standards to control off-site signs in a commercial zone
Aurecon New Zealand Limited – Mark Allan	408.29	SIGN – R9	Support	Support further consideration of activity status amendment subject to appropriate standards	While Waka Kotahi agree that the non-complying activity status for subdivision development entrance signs is restrictive. However, Waka Kotahi does not support a permitted activity status as this could lead to a proliferation of signs visible from the state highway at each site. Consideration to appropriate standards and cumulative effects should be given if the activity status is to be amended.	Further consider appropriate controls and matters of discretion
Go Media Limited – Resource Management Group	234.4	SIGN – P1	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi seeks that this submission point be rejected as the policy seeks to enable specific signs of which off-site signs (excluding directional signs) are not included. Other off-site signs are subject to the other policies proposed.	Reject this submission
Go Media Limited – Resource Management Group	234.5	SIGN – P3	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	As per its original submission, Waka Kotahi sought to alter this provision to reference the safe, efficient and effective operation of the transport system. The submitter seeks to amend the provision to remove the reference to limiting digital signs and	Reject this submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					managing or avoiding signs in industrial or other zones. Waka Kotahi do not think this is appropriate.	
Go Media Limited – Resource Management Group	234.8	SIGN – S2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Sign standard – S3 manages digital signs and Waka Kotahi considers it more appropriate for signs to be managed through this standard as opposed to being incorporated into Sign standard - S2.	Reject this submission
Go Media Limited – Resource Management Group	234.9	SIGN – S3	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi do not support the submitters points to remove the maximum area, number of images/messages and the display time as the submitter has not proposed any alternative standards rather, proposes to delete them entirely.	Reject this submission
Aurecon New Zealand Limited – Mark Allan	267.20	SIGN – S2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi do not support specific exemptions for supermarket signage and do not consider that this type of signage should be treated differently to other commercial signage as the potential effects are no different.	Reject this submission
Forme Planning Limited – Kay Panther Knight	282.80	SIGN – S2	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi do not support specific standards for supermarket signage and do not consider it should be treated differently to other commercial signage as the potential effects are no different.	Reject this submission
TEMP – Ngā mahi taupua - Temporary activities						
Clayton Tikao	28.1	TEMP-R4	Oppose	The relief sought to increase the vehicle movements per day for filming activities	Waka Kotahi opposes the changes sought by the submitter as this would double the number of vehicle movements permitted under this rule. The number of vehicle movements sought by the submitter is significant and the effects of this number of vehicle movements from a site onto a	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					state highway could significantly adversely impact the safe, efficient and effective functioning of the highway.	
New Zealand Defence Force	166.25	TEMP-R5	Oppose	The relief sought to delete TEMP-MD2 Transport as a matter of discretion if a consent is required	Waka Kotahi seeks to ensure that any effects on the state highway arising from a temporary military training activity extending beyond 31 days duration are appropriately managed, which the notified provision sought to do and for this reason it should be retained.	Reject the submission
Beca – Louise Armstrong	303.49	General	Oppose	The relief sought for a new rule to allow Emergency Services Training Activity, and specifically no restriction on vehicle movements per day	Waka Kotahi is not generally opposed to the new permitted activity rule sought by the submitter, but would seek to ensure that the vehicle movements were restricted to 250 per day beyond which a requirement for resource consent would be triggered. This threshold for vehicle movements aligns with the limit imposed in other TEMP rules.	Reject the submission, unless a vehicle movement limit of 250 veh/day is included
Part 3 – Area specific matters						
Zones						
RURZ – Whaitua Taiwhenua - Rural Zones						
George Jason Smith	270.8	GRUZ-R2	Support	The relief sought to replace 'paved' with 'formed' public road	Waka Kotahi support the change sought by the submitter as typically Waka Kotahi would refer to a road as being 'sealed' or 'formed' as opposed to 'paved'.	Support the submission
Federated Farmers of New Zealand Inc	414.45	RURZ-MD4	Oppose	Oppose the submission in full	Waka Kotahi opposes the deletion of this provision as suggested by the submitter, as, in clause (4) it seeks to manage the shading effects of forestry, carbon forest and woodlots on the transport network. Shading effects can pose a safety risk on	Reject the submission

Submitter Name/Contact	Submission Number	Chapter/ Provision	Support or oppose	The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:	The reasons for my/our support or opposition are:	I seek that the whole or part (describe part) of the submission be allowed or disallowed:
					the state highway and Waka Kotahi supports the retention of this provision to ensure such effects are appropriately considered.	
Wāhanga waihanga - Development Areas						
New Development Areas						
WR – West Rangiora						
Ruth and Bruno Zahner	213.3 213.5	Development Areas WR-West Rangiora	Oppose	Request for a reduced minimum density of 12 households per hectare	The Greater Christchurch Partnerships agreed to a minimum of 15 households per hectare unless there are demonstratable infrastructure constraints. The submitter has not provided evidence to demonstrate that there are infrastructure constraints, such that the 15 households per hectare standard should be retained.	Reject that part of the submission that seeks to reduce the minimum density of households per hectare from 15 to 12.