
Submission on Waimakariri District Council - Proposed District Plan

Form 5 Submission on publically notified proposal for policy statement or plan, change or variation

Clause 6 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Waimakariri District Council - Development Planning Unit

Date received: 26/11/2021

Submission Reference Number #:119

This is a submission on the following proposed plan (the **proposal**): Waimakariri District Council - Proposed District Plan

Address for service:

S [REDACTED] Higgs

[REDACTED]
New Zealand

Email: tskv@xtra.co.nz

I wish to be heard: Yes

I am willing to present a joint case: Yes

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?

- No

Are you directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

(a) adversely affects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

- Yes

Submission points

Point 119.1

Section: KR - Kaiapoi Regeneration

Sub-section: SPZ(KR) - Special Purpose Zone - Kaiapoi Regeneration

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

This submission relates to rules in the Kaiapoi Special Purpose Zone.

I'm specifically referring to the zone on the south eastern side of Courtney Drive bounded by the Courtney Stream and the Natural Open Space zone to the north.

I was involved in the consultation on the regeneration plan some 5 years ago and was under the impression the land would remain rural. However i understand that the requirement to 'not be inconsistent with' the regeneration plan lapsed as of June this year and these provisions are now a 'consideration' for this Proposed Plan. This is a shame as i have enjoyed and benefited from the current open space and my first preference would be to maintain the open space on the eastern side of Courtney Drive.

However in respect of the current SPZ(KR):

I consider that use of this land for community activity (recreation/ social) is appropriate. I also support the use of the land bounded by the southern bank of the Kaiapoi river and extending to Courtney Lake being managed as a natural open space zone. That is a significant asset for Kaiapoi and with its walking/ cycling linkages to Burke's Point and to the Waimakariri River. I am therefore seeking that there is sufficient management that provides a good transition between the residential area, the special purpose area and the natural open space. I would therefore want future development to respect the high amenity we currently enjoy through planning and a high degree of openness

With that in mind i would like further consideration be given to the range of activities that might reasonably occur on the balance of the regeneration area - now proposed SPZKR and in particular how best to treat the with the boundary to the Natural Open Space Zone.

There are three key changes i would like the Council to consider:

- 1 - separation between the remaining residential areas adjoining the SPZ(KR)**
- 2 - the reasonableness of some activities in this location given the sensitivity of the land and surrounding amenity**
- 3 - intensification of development (subdivision)**

- 1 - separation between residences and the adjoining SPZ(KR)**

Maps.

OSZ extends to the south residences on the southern side of Courtney Drive between Oaks Reserve and to The Oak. This open space should be extended to include the remaining dwelling on the Oaks so there is a continuous buffer consistent with other properties adjoin the SPZ(KR).

2 - Activities

Rules:

SPZ(KR)-R32 - Motorised vehicles and

SPZ(KR)-R33 Motorised sports facility

These activities should be non-complying. There is limited ability to achieve sufficient separation distances with surrounding residential areas with such activities

Generally support the building sizes as permitted activities with exception of visitor accommodation. It should be of a similar scale to buildings related to other activities (200m2 - 250m2)

Retail activity areas does not seem to relate to the other activities. They are permitted only as an ancillary activity with a maxim area of 400m2 building area. It is not clear how that relates to the building areas of other typical activities and why the maximum area is so high.

Planting standards and setbacks

I support the planning standards requirement of 75% native species and 10% of area (for activities requiring buildings).

However for the zones adjoining the natural open space zone - there is no special recognition through building setbacks or landscape enhancement to enhance the natural areas along Courtney stream and Courtney Lake in particular. The stream in particular is a narrow strip which could easily be detracted from through buildings and more intensive activity in the Special Purpose Zone. Buildings can be set back 6m from internal boundaries which would be insufficient to affect the open space amenity. My suggestion would be for greater building setbacks and planing requirements within those setbacks along the NOPZ boundary of 20m

3. Development

The 500m2 minimum subdivision standard seems very intensive for land affected by the earthquakes. Presumably this is not the intention of the council to subdivide to that density. It is also unclear on Council's intention to sell land (or retain ownership and lease). I would welcome clarification on Council's future intention to retain or sell this land to private interests. .

Relief sought

Extend the Natural Open Space zone to include all of the South Eastern section of the land bounded between Courtney Drive/ Courtney Lake and Courtney Stream.

Or if the SPZ(KR) is retained then:

- Include motorised sports and events as non complying
- Visitor accommodation buildings maintained at residential scale (250m2)
- Potential retail activity size limited to the appropriate activity associated with the other dominant activities.
- Increased building setback between the SPZ(KR) and the NOPZ with planing requirements in recognition of high natural area amenity. Prefer a 20 metre setback with planting/ landscaping requirements.
- Extend the OSZ around the remaining residence on The Oaks to provide separation between the residential building and SPZ(KR) - NB have not checked with landowner - there maybe a reason why the reserve extends the way it does.

Point 119.2

Section: Planning Maps

Sub-section: General

Provision: General

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

There are three key changes i would like the Council to consider:

1 - separation between the remaining residential areas adjoining the SPZ(KR)

1 - separation between residences and the adjoining SPZ(KR)

Maps.

OSZ extends to the south residences on the southern side of Courtney Drive between Oaks Reserve and to The Oak. This open space should be extended to include the remaining dwelling on the Oaks so there is a continuous buffer consistent with other properties adjoin the SPZ(KR).

Relief sought

Extend the Natural Open Space zone to include all of the South Eastern section of the land bounded between Courtney Drive/Courtney Lake and Courtney Stream.

Or if the SPZ(KR) is retained then:

- Extend the OSZ around the remaining residence on The Oaks to provide separation between the residential building and SPZ(KR) - NB have not checked with landowner - there maybe a reason why the reserve extends the way it does.
-

Point 119.3

Section: KR - Kaiapoi Regeneration

Sub-section: Activity Rules

Provision:

SPZ(KR)-R32 Motorised vehicle events

Activity status: DIS

Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

There are three key changes i would like the Council to consider:

2 - the reasonableness of some activities in this location given the sensitivity of the land and surrounding amenity

2 - Activities

Rules:

SPZ(KR)-R32 - Motorised vehciles and

SPZ(KR)-R33 Motorised sports facility

These activities should be non-complying. There is limited ability to achieve sufficient separation distances with surrounding residential areas with such activities

Relief sought

Or if the SPZ(KR) is retained then:

- Include motorised sports and events as non complying
-

Point 119.4

Section: KR - Kaiapoi Regeneration

Sub-section: Activity Rules

Provision:

SPZ(KR)-R33 Motorised sports facility

Activity status: DIS

Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

There are three key changes i would like the Council to consider:

2 - the reasonableness of some activities in this location given the sensitivity of the land and surrounding amenity

2 - Activities

Rules:

SPZ(KR)-R32 - Motorised vehciles and

SPZ(KR)-R33 Motorised sports facility

These activities should be non-complying. There is limited ability to achieve sufficient separation distances with surrounding residential areas with such activities

Relief sought

Or if the SPZ(KR) is retained then:

- Include motorised sports and events as non complying

Point 119.5

Section: KR - Kaiapoi Regeneration

Sub-section: Activity Rules

Provision:

SPZ(KR)-R9 Visitor accommodation

Activity status: PER	Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS
----------------------	----------------------------------------------------

Where:

1. the maximum GFA of the activity on the site shall be 600m².

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

SPZ-KR-MD1 - Development design and scale

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

Generally support the building sizes as permitted activities with exception of visitor accommodation. It should be of a similar scale to buildings related to other activities (200m2 - 250m2)

Relief sought

Or if the SPZ(KR) is retained then:

- Visitor accommodation buildings maintained at residential scale (250m2)

Point 119.6

Section: KR - Kaiapoi Regeneration

Sub-section: Activity Rules

Provision:

SPZ(KR)-R24 Retail activity

Activity status: PER

Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS

Where:

1. the retail activity shall be ancillary to a primary activity on the same site; and
2. the retail activity shall cumulatively occupy a maximum of 400m² of GFA per building; or 10% of the GFA of all buildings on the same site used for the activity the retail is ancillary to, whichever is the lesser.

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

SPZ-KR-MD1 - Development design and scale

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

Retail activity areas does not seem to relate to the other activities. They are permitted only as an ancillary activity with a maxim area of 400m2 building area. It is not clear how that relates to the building areas of other typical activities and why the maximum area is so high.

Relief sought

Or if the SPZ(KR) is retained then:

- Potential retail activity size limited to the appropriate activity associated with the other dominant activities.

Point 119.7

Section: KR - Kaiapoi Regeneration

Sub-section: Built Form Standards, excluding sites identified in Appendix APP1

Provision:

SPZ(KR)-BFS8 Ecological enhancement planting

1. Ecological enhancement planting shall be provided for all activities involving buildings as follows:
 - a. a minimum of 10% of the delineated area for the activity associated with the building or buildings shall be planted and maintained with at least 75% being indigenous vegetation that is sourced from within the ecological district, comprising a combination of trees, shrubs and ground cover species. Planting may include some ancillary lawn or other amenity features not exceeding 10% of the planted area, set aside as landscaped or open space areas. This rule does not apply to outdoor recreation activities not involving buildings, or to public amenities.

Activity status when compliance not achieved: RDIS

Matters of discretion are restricted to:

SPZ-KR-MD7 - Ecological enhancement planting

Notification

An application for a restricted discretionary activity under this rule is precluded from being publicly or limited notified.

Sentiment: Support

Submission:

I support the planning standards requirement of 75% native species and 10% of area (for activities requiring buildings).

Relief sought

Point 119.8

Section: KR - Kaiapoi Regeneration

Sub-section: Built Form Standards, excluding sites identified in Appendix APP1

Provision: General

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

However for the zones adjoining the natural open space zone - there is no special recognition through building setbacks or landscape enhancement to enhance the natural areas along Courtney stream and Courtney Lake in particular. The stream in particular is a narrow strip which could easily be detracted from through buildings and more intensive activity in the Special Purpose Zone. Buildings can be set back 6m from internal boundaries which would be insufficient to affect the open space amenity. My suggestion would be for greater building setbacks and planing requirements within those setbacks along the NOPZ boundary of 20m.

Relief sought

Or if the SPZ(KR) is retained then:

- Increased building setback between the SPZ(KR) and the NOPZ with planing requirements in recognition of high natural area amenity. Prefer a 20 metre setback with planting/ landscaping requirements.

Point 119.9

Section: SUB - Wawahia whenua - Subdivision

Sub-section: Subdivision Standards

Provision:

SUB-S1 Allotment size and dimensions	
1. All allotments created shall comply with Table SUB-1.	Activity status when compliance not achieved: 1. In the Medium Density Residential Zone, any Industrial Zone and Special Purpose Zone (Kaiapoi Regeneration): DIS 2. In any other zone: NC

Sentiment: Oppose

Submission:

There are three key changes i would like the Council to consider:

3 - intensification of development (subdivision)

3. Development

The 500m2 minimum subdivision standard seems very intensive for land affected by the earthquakes. Presumably this is not the intention of the council to subdivide to that density. It is also unclear on Councils intention to sell land (or retain ownership and

lease). I would selcome clarification on Council's future intention to retain or sell this land to private interests.

Relief sought

There are three key changes i would like the Council to consider:

3 - intensification of development (subdivision)

3. Development

The 500m² minimum subdivision standard seems very intensive for land affected by the earthquakes. Presumably this is not the intention of the council to subdivide to that density. It is also unclear on Councils intention to sell land (or retain ownership and lease). I would selcome clarification on Council's future intention to retain or sell this land to private interests.