

---

**From:** donotreply@waimakariri.govt.nz  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 6 September 2022 10:56 AM  
**To:** IM Staff  
**Subject:** Plan change submission

[THIS EMAIL IS FROM AN EXTERNAL SOURCE] DO NOT CLICK links or attachments unless you recognise the sender email

**Proposed plan change No.** Variation 1 To the proposed Waimakariri District Plan relating to residential intensification and rezoning of land in Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Woodend and Pegasus

**Name:** M [REDACTED] Day

**Organisation name:** N.A. (Private resident/ratepayer)

**Address:** [REDACTED]

**Postal Address:**

**Phone No.** [REDACTED]

**Fax No.**

**Email:** kelso90@xtra.co.nz

**Wish to be heard?** No

**Heard with others?** No

**Advantage in trade competition?** I could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission (go to Your Submission, you do not need to complete the rest of this section)

**If yes...**

**My submission is that ...**

While there may be many idealistic theories able to be expounded regarding the idealistic benefits of NPS-UD and the MDRS, intensification just for the sake of intensification of existing housing areas is both not just questionable in the terms of whether or not such actions could/would enhance the livability of a 'street, a suburb, or indeed a town such as Rangiora', or whether or not a move to impose such intensification 'ideas' would create not only the real potential for dismay/distress for property owners either immediately adjacent to such intensification developments but also for all of the towns citizens (including those moving into the new MDRS type developments). While individual intensification has the potential to create and cause a wide range of negative and detrimental impacts on surrounding properties. ( e.g. Such as, Loss of light, loss of privacy, increases in noise both in terms of Human & Vehicles, increased vehicle movements, parking problems, road use and road safety implications.) The MDRS does on the face of it allow for a territorial authority to determine where it maybe inappropriate to allow for the implementation in full. But how and by whom is the whether or not the 'qualifying matters' going to be paid for? Why of course the existing ratepayers! As councils seek to justify developments through the contracting out the 'justification process' to outside consultancies. Another set of questions that needs to be not just glossed over relates how the cost of both upgrading and providing the associated/required infrastructure at all levels and of all types, from whether a local school could cope with ever increasing roles, apart whether or not the existing horizontal

infrastructure could cope. And how does a territorial authority produce a feasible LTP when it can't control the impacts on its already in-place infrastructure. The MDRS proposals could however be implemented with controlled impact if such as proposed intensification was planned and allowed for in 'New Development' areas, where the Developer(s) would be required to fund in full (from design, to design review, to supply/installation and ongoing servicing, maintenance and management) of all required associated infrastructure both within the designated development 'Zone' and for any required infrastructure upgrades required to any impacted upon adjoining or headworks infrastructure. While many of the '3 WATERS' theories be questionable, the process has only served to confirm that many TA's LTPs are just produced to meet a governance requirement not as true guide to what the costs are truly likely to be. NZ is home the 'home of cost overruns & blowouts' especially a local authority level. Mark Day 28 George Street, Rangiora hile there may be many idealistic theories able to be expounded regarding the idealistic benefits of NPS-UD and the MDRS, intensification just for the sake of intensification of existing housing areas is both not just questionable in the terms of whether or not such actions could/would enhance the livability of a 'street, a suburb, or indeed a town such as Rangiora', or whether or not a move to impose such intensification 'ideas' would create not only the real potential for dismay/distress for property owners either immediately adjacent to such intensification developments but also for all of the towns citizens (including those moving into the new MDRS type developments). While individual intensification has the potential to create and cause a wide range of negative and detrimental impacts on surrounding properties. ( e.g. Such as, Loss of light, loss of privacy, increases in noise both in terms of Human & Vehicles, increased vehicle movements, parking problems, road use and road safety implications.) The MDRS does on the face of it allow for a territorial authority to determine where it maybe inappropriate to allow for the implementation in full. But how and by whom is the whether or not the 'qualifying matters' going to be paid for? Why of course the existing ratepayers! As councils seek to justify developments through the contracting out the 'justification process' to outside consultancies. Another set of questions that needs to be not just glossed over relates how the cost of both upgrading and providing the associated/required infrastructure at all levels and of all types, from whether a local school could cope with ever increasing roles, apart whether or not the existing horizontal infrastructure could cope. And how does a territorial authority produce a feasible LTP when it can't control the impacts on its already in-place infrastructure. The

MDRS proposals could however be implemented with controlled impact if such as proposed intensification was planned and allowed for in 'New Development' areas, where the Developer(s) would be required to fund in full (from design, to design review, to supply/installation and ongoing servicing, maintenance and management) of all required associated infrastructure both within the designated development 'Zone' and for any required infrastructure upgrades required to any impacted upon adjoining or headworks infrastructure. While many of the '3 WATERS' theories be questionable, the process has only served to confirm that many TA's LTPs are just produced to meet a governance requirement not as true guide to what the costs are truly likely to be. NZ is home the 'home of cost overruns & blowouts' especially a local authority level. Mark Day 28 George Street, Rangiora hile there may be many idealistic theories able to be expounded regarding the idealistic benefits of NPS-UD and the MDRS, intensification just for the sake of intensification of existing housing areas is both not just questionable in the terms of whether or not such actions could/would enhance the livability of a 'street, a suburb, or indeed a town such as Rangiora', or whether or not a move to impose such intensification 'ideas' would create not only the real potential for dismay/distress for property owners either immediately adjacent to such intensification developments but also for all of the towns citizens (including those moving into the new MDRS type developments). While individual intensification has the potential to create and cause a wide range of negative and detrimental impacts on surrounding properties. ( e.g. Such as, Loss of light, loss of privacy, increases in noise both in terms of Human & Vehicles, increased vehicle movements, parking problems, road use and road safety implications.) The MDRS does on the face of it allow for a territorial authority to determine where it maybe inappropriate to allow for the implementation in full. But how and by whom is the whether or not the 'qualifying matters' going to be paid for? Why of course the existing ratepayers! As councils seek to justify developments through the contracting out the 'justification process' to outside consultancies. Another set of questions that needs to be not just glossed over relates how the cost of both upgrading and providing the associated/required infrastructure at all levels and of all types, from whether a local school could cope with ever increasing roles, apart whether or not the existing horizontal infrastructure could cope. And how does a territorial authority produce a feasible LTP when it can't control the impacts on its already in-place infrastructure. The MDRS proposals could however be implemented with controlled impact if such as proposed intensification was planned and allowed for in 'New Development' areas, where the Developer(s) would be required to fund in full (from design, to design review, to supply/installation and ongoing servicing, maintenance and management) of all required associated infrastructure both within the designated development 'Zone' and for any required infrastructure upgrades required to any impacted upon adjoining or headworks infrastructure. While many of the '3 WATERS' theories be questionable, the process has only served to confirm that many TA's LTPs are just produced to meet a governance requirement not as true guide to what the costs are truly likely to be. NZ is home the 'home of cost overruns & blowouts' especially a local authority level. Mark Day 28 George Street, Rangiora hile there may be many idealistic theories able to be expounded regarding the idealistic benefits of NPS-UD and the MDRS, intensification just for the sake of intensification of existing housing areas is both not just questionable in the terms of whether or not such actions could/would enhance the livability of a 'street, a suburb, or indeed a town such as Rangiora', or whether or not a move to impose such intensification 'ideas' would create not only the real potential for dismay/distress for property owners either immediately adjacent to such intensification developments but also for all of the towns citizens (including those moving into the new MDRS type developments). While individual intensification has the potential to create and cause a wide range of negative and detrimental impacts on surrounding properties. ( e.g. Such as, Loss of light, loss of privacy, increases in noise both in terms of Human & Vehicles, increased vehicle movements, parking problems, road use and road safety implications.) The MDRS does on the face of it allow for a territorial authority to determine where it maybe inappropriate to allow for the implementation in full. But how and by whom is the whether or not the 'qualifying matters' going to be paid for? Why of course the existing ratepayers! As councils seek to justify developments through the contracting out the 'justification process' to outside consultancies. Another set of questions that needs to be not just glossed over relates how the cost of both upgrading and providing the associated/required infrastructure at all levels and of all types, from whether a local school could cope with ever increasing roles, apart whether or not the existing horizontal infrastructure could cope. And how does a territorial authority produce a feasible LTP when it can't control the impacts on its already in-place infrastructure. The MDRS proposals could however be implemented with controlled impact if such as proposed intensification was planned and allowed for in 'New Development' areas, where the Developer(s)

would be required to fund in full (from design, to design review, to supply/installation and ongoing servicing, maintenance and management) of all required associated infrastructure both within the designated development 'Zone' and for any required infrastructure upgrades required to any impacted upon adjoining or headworks infrastructure. While many of the '3 WATERS' theories be questionable, the process has only served to confirm that many TA's LTPs are just produced to meet a governance requirement not as true guide to what the costs are truly likely to be. NZ is home the 'home of cost overruns & blowouts' especially a local authority level. Mark Day 28 George Street, Rangiora hile there may be many idealistic theories able to be expounded regarding the idealistic benefits of NPS-UD and the MDRS, intensification just for the sake of intensification of existing housing areas is both not just questionable in the terms of whether or not such actions could/would enhance the livability of a 'street, a suburb, or indeed a town such as Rangiora', or whether or not a move to impose such intensification 'ideas' would create not only the real potential for dismay/distress for property owners either immediately adjacent to such intensification developments but also for all of the towns citizens (including those moving into the new MDRS type developments). While individual intensification has the potential to create and cause a wide range of negative and detrimental impacts on surrounding properties. ( e.g. Such as, Loss of light, loss of privacy, increases in noise both in terms of Human & Vehicles, increased vehicle movements, parking problems, road use and road safety implications.) The MDRS does on the face of it allow for a territorial authority to determine where it maybe inappropriate to allow for the implementation in full. But how and by whom is the whether or not the 'qualifying matters' going to be paid for? Why of course the existing ratepayers! As councils seek to justify developments through the contracting out the 'justification process' to outside consultancies. Another set of questions that needs to be not just glossed over relates how the cost of both upgrading and providing the associated/required infrastructure at all levels and of all types, from whether a local school could cope with ever increasing roles, apart whether or not the existing horizontal infrastructure could cope. And how does a territorial authority produce a feasible LTP when it can't control the impacts on its already in-place infrastructure. The MDRS proposals could however be implemented with controlled impact if such as proposed intensification was planned and allowed for in 'New Development' areas, where the Developer(s) would be required to fund in full (from design, to design review, to supply/installation and ongoing servicing, maintenance and management) of all required associated infrastructure both within the designated development 'Zone' and for any required infrastructure upgrades required to any impacted upon adjoining or headworks infrastructure. While many of the '3 WATERS' theories be questionable, the process has only served to confirm that many TA's LTPs are just produced to meet a governance requirement not as true guide to what the costs are truly likely to be. NZ is home the 'home of cost overruns & blowouts' especially a local authority level. Mark Day 28 George Street, Rangiora

**I/we seek the following decision from Council for the following reasons:**

That the Council does permit the proposed variation in its current proposed form.