

The summary of submissions is also available ordered by theme / provision, at <https://www.ecan.govt.nz/your-region/plans-strategies-and-bylaws/canterbury-regional-policy-statement/change-chapter-6/>.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-26.2	199 Johns Road Ltd	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to the 'Explanation and reasons' in Policy 6.3.1 - Development within the Greater Christchurch area	<p>The inclusion of the new Future Development Area in Map A was identified by the Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update in 2018/2019. It is proposed, in conjunction with other RPS policy, methods and reasoning amendments, to enable Waimakariri District Council to re-zone the additional Future Development Area land as part of the Waimakariri District Plan review within an Outline Development Plan.</p> <p>199 Johns Road Limited submitted in support of the original Settlement Pattern Update in 2019 to include the additional Future Development Area and have since been liaising with Waimakariri District Council on the draft Rangiora West Structure Plan concepts for the Future Development Area and Greenfield Priority Area. Waimakariri District Council intends to include both in an integrated and comprehensive approach to Western Rangiora in accordance with RPS Policy 6.3.3. On this basis the amendment to the “principal reasons and explanation” for Policy 6.3.1 - Development within the Greater Christchurch area - is supported.</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to the explanation and reasons of Policy 6.3.1 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.03	PCCH6-26.3	199 Johns Road Ltd	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.3 - Development in accordance with outline development plans.	The inclusion of the new Future Development Area in Map A was identified by the Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update in 2018/2019. It is proposed, in conjunction with other RPS policy, methods and reasoning amendments, to enable Waimakariri District Council to re-zone the additional Future Development Area land as part of the Waimakariri District Plan review within an Outline Development Plan.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.3 as notified are recommended to be retained.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					199 Johns Road Limited submitted in support of the original Settlement Pattern Update in 2019 to include the additional Future Development Area and have since been liaising with Waimakariri District Council on the draft Rangiora West Structure Plan concepts for the Future Development Area and Greenfield Priority Area. Waimakariri District Council intends to include both in an integrated and comprehensive approach to Western Rangiora in accordance with RPS Policy 6.3.3. On this basis the amendment to Policy 6.3.3 - Development in accordance with outline development plans is supported.		
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-26.4	199 Johns Road Ltd	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 - Residential location, yield and intensification.	Proposed Change 1 does not propose to increase the minimum net density from 10 houses to 12 houses per hectare that was recommended as part of the Urban Settlement Pattern update documentation. The submitter previously supported the change from 10 to 12 houses per hectare for the Waimakariri District and considers the increased minimum density continues to be appropriate. Given the density is proposed is a minimum, Policy 6.3.7 is supported on the basis that Waimakariri District Council may require 12 houses per hectare be achieved at the time of their District Plan review.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 as notified are recommended to be retained.
7 MapA	PCCH6-26.1	199 Johns Road Ltd	Support in part	Confirm the correct Projected Infrastructure Boundary, Future Development Area and Greenfield Priority Area boundaries in the vicinity of the Southbrook for South West Rangiora as part of the change to Map A. Confirm the	<p>Previously, the Projected Infrastructure Boundary for Rangiora has coincided with the Southbrook Stream. The change to Map A for the zoned greenfield Priority Area no longer coincides with the Southbrook boundary [refer to figure provided in the original submission].</p> <p>The proposed Greenfield Priority Area boundary does not coincide with either the current Residential/Rural zone boundary in the Greenfield Priority Area or the Southbrook.</p> <p>It is difficult to distinguish whether the change to the</p>	Reject	Changes to Map A are confined to the identified Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change. It is noted that the correct Greenfield Priority Area boundary is as shown on the layer published on Canterbury Maps website alongside the Proposed Change. Whilst the proposed change to Map A identifies the FDAs to the full extent of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in Rangiora, Rolleston and Kaiapoi, there are flood risk constraints in a number of locations that will impact on the actual developable area within the FDAs.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				subsequent Map A update.	<p>Greenfield Priority Area on Map A is intentional as a result of revised flood modelling (historically high risk but reassessed as medium risk) or whether it is simply an error. The FDA to the west of the GPA appears to closely follow the Southbrook boundary while having the same potential for flooding constraints.</p> <p>Any change to the Greenfield Priority Area on Map A as part of PC1 must be correct. Alternatively, if the only change to Map A is to add the new Future Development Area, its corresponding boundary adjacent to the Southbrook should also take account hazard constraints when being considered to be extended to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (or not as the case may be).</p>		These constraints will necessarily be considered through the development of detailed structure plans and at the time of rezoning and subdivision and in accordance with operative CRPS and district plan provisions which seek to avoid or mitigate development in flood prone locations.
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-24.2	Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to the 'Explanation and reasons' in Policy 6.3.1 - Development within the Greater Christchurch area.	<p>The inclusion of the new Future Development Area in Map A was identified by the Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update in 2018/2019. It is proposed, in conjunction with other RPS policy, methods and reasoning amendments, to enable Waimakariri District Council to re-zone the additional Future Development Area land as part of the Waimakariri District Plan review within an Outline Development Plan.</p> <p>Allan Downs Ltd submitted in support of the original Settlement Pattern Update in 2019 to include the additional Future Development Area and have since been liaising with Waimakariri District Council on the draft Rangiora West Structure Plan concepts for the Future Development Area and Greenfield Priority Area. Waimakariri District Council intends to include both in an integrated and comprehensive approach to Western Rangiora in accordance with RPS Policy 6.3.3. On this basis the amendment to the "principal reasons and explanation" for Policy 6.3.1 -</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to the explanation and reasons of Policy 6.3.1 as notified are recommended to be retained.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					Development within the Greater Christchurch area - is supported.		
6 Pol 6.3.03	PCCH6-24.3	Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.3 - Development in accordance with outline development plans.	<p>The inclusion of the new Future Development Area in Map A was identified by the Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update in 2018/2019. It is proposed, in conjunction with other RPS policy, methods and reasoning amendments, to enable Waimakariri District Council to re-zone the additional Future Development Area land as part of the Waimakariri District Plan review within an Outline Development Plan.</p> <p>Allan Downs Ltd submitted in support of the original Settlement Pattern Update in 2019 to include the additional Future Development Area and have since been liaising with Waimakariri District Council on the draft Rangiora West Structure Plan concepts for the Future Development Area and Greenfield Priority Area. Waimakariri District Council intends to include both in an integrated and comprehensive approach to Western Rangiora in accordance with RPS Policy 6.3.3. On this basis the amendment to Policy 6.3.3 - Development in accordance with outline development plans is supported.</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.3 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-24.4	Allan Downs Ltd	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 - Residential location, yield and intensification.	Proposed Change 1 does not propose to increase the minimum net density from 10 houses to 12 houses per hectare that was recommended as part of the Urban Settlement Pattern update documentation. The submitter previously supported the change from 10 to 12 houses per hectare for the Waimakariri District and considers the increased minimum density continues to be appropriate. Given the density is proposed is a minimum, Policy 6.3.7 is supported on the basis that Waimakariri District Council may require 12 houses per hectare be achieved at the time of their District Plan review.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 as notified are recommended to be retained.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
7 MapA	PCCH6-24.1	Allan Downs Ltd	Support in part	Confirm the correct Projected Infrastructure Boundary, Future Development Area and Greenfield Priority Area boundaries in the vicinity of the Southbrook for South West Rangiora as part of the change to Map A. Confirm the subsequent Map A update.	<p>Previously, the Projected Infrastructure Boundary for Rangiora has coincided with the Southbrook Stream. The change to Map A for the zoned greenfield Priority Area no longer coincides with the Southbrook boundary [refer to figure provided in the original submission].</p> <p>The proposed Greenfield Priority Area boundary does not coincide with either the current Residential/Rural zone boundary in the Greenfield Priority Area or the Southbrook.</p> <p>It is difficult to distinguish whether the change to the Greenfield Priority Area on Map A is intentional as a result of revised flood modelling (historically high risk but reassessed as medium risk) or whether it is simply an error. The FDA to the west of the GPA appears to closely follow the Southbrook boundary while having the same potential for flooding constraints.</p> <p>Any change to the Greenfield Priority Area on Map A as part of PC1 must be correct. Alternatively, if the only change to Map A is to add the new Future Development Area, its corresponding boundary adjacent to the Southbrook should also take account hazard constraints when being considered to be extended to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (or not as the case may be).</p>	Reject	Changes to Map A are confined to the identified Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change. It is noted that the correct Greenfield Priority Area boundary is as shown on the layer published on Canterbury Maps website alongside the Proposed Change. Whilst the proposed change to Map A identifies the FDAs to the full extent of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in Rangiora, Rolleston and Kaiapoi, there are flood risk constraints in a number of locations that will impact on the actual developable area within the FDAs. These constraints will necessarily be considered through the development of detailed structure plans and at the time of rezoning and subdivision and in accordance with operative CRPS and district plan provisions which seek to avoid or mitigate development in flood prone locations.
4.1 Other	PCCH6-43.2	Anderson, E	Oppose in part	Amend Proposed Change 1 to clearly outline how each piece of legislation (e.g. the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2020; the Canterbury Regional	The relationship between the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, the Regional Policy Statement for Canterbury and the District Plans is unclear. In some places in the document reference is made to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity 2016 which has now been superseded by the 2020 National Policy Statement. There is also the proposed reform of the Resource Management Act	Reject	We understand the submitter's view that the relationship between different documents and statutes can be unclear. This is covered to some extent in Chapter 1 of the CRPS however it is not considered necessary to further address this through the Proposed Change.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				Policy Statement, and district plans) mandates or guides the planning, development and monitoring of urban and rural development and how any conflicts that arise in interpretation of these documents are managed and resolved.	<p>and how this would fit into the framework.</p> <p>It appears to me that there is a “grey area” in terms of how private plan changes are dealt with: there is currently an overwhelming number of private plan changes that have been lodged since the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 was published, requesting the Selwyn District Council to rezone vast swathes of rural land for intensive urban development that are not actually identified as Future Development Areas nor Greenfield Areas in Map A but are being interpreted as such by the developers.</p> <p>There does not appear to be any provision in the Proposed Change to outline how Private Plan changes to district councils are managed to ensure that the goals expressed in all the relevant legislation that applies are actually met.</p>		
4.1 Other	PCCH6-43.3	Anderson, E	Oppose in part	No specific decision requested.	The submitter attached documents including the draft AS/NZS 4282:2018 Control of the obtrusive effects of outdoor lighting, and information with regards to light levels at West Melton and the observatory.	N/A	The submission point is supported in so far as this additional information is received and noted. Recommendations on the related decisions requested are outlined elsewhere in this summary table.
4.1 Other	PCCH6-43.1	Anderson, E	Oppose in part	Amend the provisions in Proposed Change 1 to include specific mention of the current and proposed future requirements for protection of the night sky, and the procedures by which any proposed development would seek to mitigate the impact of night glow and light pollution,	Consideration of adverse effects arising from development; urban and rural residential design and development, and policies for development, monitoring and review currently do not consider the environmental issues relating to the night sky. There is no mention of the requirement to assess the impact of any proposed development on land designated within the West Melton Observatory Zone, where there are existing rules relating to the West Melton Observatory Lighting Area, and general lighting and glare rules in Selwyn. Map A does not show the areas under the West Melton Observatory Zone. Nor is there any recognition of Selwyn District Council's desire to reduce light pollution and create	Reject	The Proposed Change does not cover the issue of light pollution and the protection of the night sky and so this topic and the requested amendment is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. Some of the points raised by the submitter are more appropriate to district plans and to be considered through any rezoning or consenting processes. The matter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS. It is noted however

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				and provision for the District Councils to reject any proposed development on the basis of the further degradation of the night sky.	<p>dark sky zones in the high country, along the coast and around the West Melton Observatory, located at 218 Bells Road, West Melton. The West Melton Observatory (run by the Canterbury Astronomical Society and under the umbrella of the Royal Astronomical Society of New Zealand) plays an important role in teaching children and the general public about the wonders of our night sky, in celebrating Matariki and our heritage of navigation via the stars, and it is vital that skies around the observatory are kept dark.</p> <p>Avoiding or minimising light pollution is supported by central government, and something that all Councils should be taking seriously in planning future development. The Ministry for Environment's Environmental Monitoring Series "Our Air" now includes monitoring of light pollution.</p>		that none of the Future Development Areas are located within the West Melton Observatory Zone.
7 MapA	PCCH6-43.4	Anderson, E	Oppose in part	Amend Map A to show areas that are in the West Melton Observatory Zone, where additional development would impact negatively on the functioning of the observatory and the ability to have skies dark enough to enable the public to view and learn about the dark skies.	Consideration of adverse effects arising from development; urban and rural residential design and development, and policies for development, monitoring and review currently do not consider the environmental issues relating to the night sky. There is no mention of the requirement to assess the impact of any proposed development on land designated within the West Melton Observatory Zone, where there are existing rules relating to the West Melton Observatory Lighting Area, and general lighting and glare rules in Selwyn. Map A does not show the areas under the West Melton Observatory Zone. Nor is there any recognition of Selwyn District Council's desire to reduce light pollution and create dark sky zones in the high country, along the coast and around the West Melton Observatory, located at 218 Bells Road, West Melton. The West Melton Observatory (run by the Canterbury Astronomical Society and under the umbrella of the Royal Astronomical Society of New Zealand) plays an important role in teaching children and the general	Reject	The Proposed Change does not cover the issue of light pollution and the protection of the night sky and so this topic and the proposed amendment is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. Some of the points raised by the submitter are more appropriate to district plans and to be considered through any rezoning or consenting processes. The matter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS. It is noted however that none of the Future Development Areas are located within the West Melton Observatory Zone.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					<p>public about the wonders of our night sky, in celebrating Matariki and our heritage of navigation via the stars, and it is vital that skies around the observatory are kept dark.</p> <p>Avoiding or minimising light pollution is supported by central government, and something that all Councils should be taking seriously in planning future development. The Ministry for Environment's Environmental Monitoring Series "Our Air" now includes monitoring of light pollution.</p>		
7 MapA	PCCH6-20.1	B.A. Freeman Family Trust	Oppose	Amend Map A to include all of Lot 1000 DP 545059 within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and Greenfield Priority Area.	<p>Lot 1000 DP 545059 has recently been subdivided through RC205317. As the triangular parcel is excluded from the Greenfield Policy [sic] Area, it has become a redundant, inefficient pocket of land, which is too small for rural purpose and unable to accommodate a residential dwelling. The parcel is suitable for development, having recently been subdivided. Services can be extended into the parcel for residential purpose.</p> <p>A map showing the site is attached to the submission</p>	Reject	Changes to Map A are confined to the identified Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change. Consideration of amendments to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and identification of additional Greenfield Priority Areas are considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The single parcel of land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of the full review of the CRPS or through a resource consent application to the relevant territorial authority.
1.2 General	PCCH6-52.4	Babe, D	Oppose	Delete the proposed changes in their entirety so that further development can happen in the places that benefit society the most.	<p>Environment Canterbury declared a climate emergency, and this proposal to provide for more housing in Rangiora and Rolleston is completely at odds with such a statement.</p> <p>It is understood that transport emissions produce a large amount of our emissions and are increasing rapidly.</p> <p>There are further reasons why carbon sequestering pasture should not be replaced with heat reflecting roads, roofs and driveways. Healthy agricultural</p>	Reject	Land use planning such as the consolidated urban form promoted through Chapter 6 can support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. This objective must also be balanced with other functions and requirements placed on regional councils, including Section 30 (ba) to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in relation to housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the region.



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					practices have more hope of locking up carbon than low density housing.		
3.01 Urban Form	PCCH6-52.3	Babe, D	Oppose in part	Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide for further housing in areas where people are more likely to use active transport for their journey to work, and discourage further housing in areas where there are few alternatives to their private motor car.	There is extensive discussion and evidence presented in an attachment to the submission.	Reject	As outlined in the main summary report, the Future Development Areas identified in the Proposed Change represent one element of the wider strategy for meeting medium to long-term development capacity needs. Our Space anticipates that 45% of future housing needs will be achieved through redevelopment of existing urban areas in Christchurch City. The Council acknowledges however that there continues to be demand for new housing in greenfield locations and seeks to ensure a range of housing options are available in accordance with Objective 6.2.2. Identification of greenfield land within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary supports consolidated urban growth and alignment with the infrastructure plans and programmes of local authorities, including the investment in public transport infrastructure and services to key towns encourage more sustainable forms of travel.
5 Obj 6.2.2	PCCH6-52.1	Babe, D	Oppose	Amend Objective 6.2.2.4 to make it more attractive for housing development to occur in Christchurch than in the surrounding settlements.	There are sufficient areas within Christchurch to meet the increased demand for housing for most of the time period.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Objective aside from minor consequential amendments so requested changes to Objective 6.2.2 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that Our Space and the provisions in Chapter 6 already encourage and facilitate greater urban growth within Christchurch City than in the surrounding settlements. This matter can also be reconsidered as part of future

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.03	PCCH6-52.2	Babe, D	Oppose in part	Amend Policy clause 6.3.3.3 to make it more attractive for housing developments to locate in Christchurch than in the surrounding settlements.	Land in Christchurch City already has a lot of these amenities nearby therefore do not require government funding to make new ones.  Particularly concerning is the emphasis on roads so all future developments will be for car-dependent residents.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy aside from a minor consequential amendment so requested changes to Policy 6.3.3 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that Our Space and the provisions in Chapter 6 already encourage and facilitate greater urban growth within Christchurch City than in the surrounding settlements. This matter can also be reconsidered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
1.1 General	PCCH6-1.1	Bathurst, L	Support	Retain RPS Change 1 in its entirety	Expediting residential land zoning is necessary for the efficient and effective growth of Canterbury	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
4.2 Other	PCCH6-16.1	Beachvale Farm Partnership	Support in part	Require that the property at 245 Clifford Rd, The Pines Beach (Lot 3 DP4102) does not become landlocked in the event of rezoning of 404B Williams St Kaiapoi (Lot 800 DP452661).	Supports the sections of the RPS as they relate to Waimakariri provided that the property at 245 Clifford Rd, The Pines Beach (Lot 3 DP4102) does not become landlocked in the event of rezoning of 404B Williams St Kaiapoi (Lot 800 DP452661).	Accept in part	The submission point is accepted in so far as it supports changes in Waimakariri District as outlined in the Proposed Change. It is noted that the matter raised by the submitter appears to relate to development of the proposed Future Development Area and is best considered by the territorial authority as part of a plan change seeking rezoning of the land and addressed by the Outline Development Plan at that time.
4.2 Other	PCCH6-16.4	Beachvale Farm Partnership	Support in part	Amend any proposed medium density housing to classify any properties at the minimum lot size as	We have reservations on potential minimum lot sizes being close to our work area (barn, workshop, vehicle storage, forestry) with increased security concerns to our facilities and additional fire risk to our 21ha tree plantations.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not address minimum lot sizes or seek to restrict development to certain housing types (i.e. over 60s housing) and the submission point appears to relate to matters covered in the draft Kaiapoi Structure Plan so the decision

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				'over 60s' housing units.			requested is considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. This matter is best considered by the territorial authority as part of a plan change seeking rezoning of the land and addressed by the Outline Development Plan and rules package at that time.
6 Pol 6.3.03	PCCH6-16.2	Beachvale Farm Partnership	Support in part	Require that any developer considers the placement of Reserves on the existing Retention Ponds and do not establish retention ponds on the Beachvale Farm Partnership Clifton Road title.	Current retention ponds located to the east of the existing Sovereign Palms residential subdivision - Waimakiriri District Council have indicated that there may be some flexibility for a future developer in the location of Reserves of the [Kaiapoi] Structure Plan.  We would be averse to any of our remaining Clifford Rd title taken for the establishment of retention ponds to service the needs arising from any future proposed development in this [proposed] Change.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy aside from a minor consequential amendment so requested changes to Policy 6.3.3 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The matter raised by the submitter is best considered by the territorial authority as part of a plan change seeking rezoning of the land and addressed by the Outline Development Plan at that time.
6 Pol 6.3.09	PCCH6-16.3	Beachvale Farm Partnership	Support in part	Require that the improved stormwater system proposed by WDC engineers enable a better transmission of stormwater by way of drainage pipes rather than the current McIntosh's stream, from Woodend south to Kaiapoi, and that it meet current and increased residential capacity from this [proposed] Change with no adverse effects to Beachvale	With regard to WDC Engineers proposed solutions for McIntosh Drain and ongoing stormwater management plans with particular relevance to 'one off' adverse events.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy aside from a minor consequential amendment so requested changes to Policy 6.3.9 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that the matter raised by the submitter appears to relate more to development of the proposed Future Development Area rather than rural residential development but irrespective it is best considered by the territorial authority as part of a plan change seeking rezoning of the land and addressed by the Outline Development Plan at that time.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				Farm Partnership's 70 ha farmland on Clifford Rd.			
1.1 General	PCCH6-19.1	Bellgrove Rangiora Limited	Support	Retain Proposed Change 1 as notified, except as sought to be amended by the submitters other submission points.	BRL supports Proposed Change 1 as it implement[s] Our Space 2018-2048 and gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD). The inclusion of Future Development Areas at Rangiora will respond to the projected shortfall of housing and address the housing capacity issues for the Waimakariri District over the medium to long term. Proposed Change 1 provides clear guidance for Waimakariri District Council to rezone land within Future Development Areas through their district planning process.	Accept in part	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. Responses to the submitter's other submission points are addressed elsewhere in this summary table.
6 Pol 6.3.11	PCCH6-19.3	Bellgrove Rangiora Limited	Support in part	Retain Policy 6.3.11 as notified, but amend clause 5 as follows:  "Any change resulting from a review of the extent, and location of land for development, any alteration to the Greenfield Priority Areas, <u>Future Development Areas</u> , or provision of new greenfield priority areas, shall commence only under the following circumstances:..."	Amendments to Policy 6.3.11 that recognise the short, medium and long term availability of residential and business land, and the requirements of the NPS-UD are supported. Given Proposed Change 1 introduces 'Future Development Areas', in addition to the existing Greenfield Priority Areas, it is appropriate that the Future Development Areas are similarly referenced in Policy 6.3.11(5).	Accept	The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.11 as notified are recommended to be retained together with some further minor amendments in response to this submission point. Policy 6.3.11 is intended to apply to both the recovery period and the longer term timeframes set out in the NPS-UD. We accept that the additional wording requested by the submitter to clause 5 to reference Future Development Areas is therefore appropriate. We also recommend further consequential amendments to the Explanations and Reasons as follows: " <i>Policy 6.3.11 is intended to ensure enough land is available and in the right locations to facilitate recovery through to 2028 and ensure <u>sufficient development capacity is identified</u>. Anticipating the number of <del>relocated or</del> new households and the business activity to be accommodated, as well as the form that these are likely to take, indicates the land areas required for successful recovery</i> "

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							<i>and longer term urban growth. Policy 6.3.11 also provides that the circumstances for altering the <del>priority</del> areas identified for urban development on Map A provisions of this chapter are: a. There is determined to be insufficient land within the Priority Areas and Future Development Areas to meet anticipated demand over the recovery period;"</i>
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-19.4	Bellgrove Rangiora Limited	Support in part	<p>Retain Method 1 for Territorial Authorities as notified. Retain Methods 1 and 2 for Local authorities as notified.</p> <p>Capture method 3 for Local authorities under the 'Will' chapeau by amending the clause as follows:            "2. Undertake regular monitoring of housing and business development capacity and sufficiency and core urban development indicators in accordance with Policy 6.3.11 and the requirements of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020.  <del>Should</del>            3. Co-ordinate the sequencing, provision and funding of</p>	The NPS-UD (Part 3: Implementation) requires that local authorities 'must' provide sufficient development capacity (3.2(1)) that 'must' be 'infrastructure-ready'. Consistency with the NPS-UD requires that local authorities 'will' co-ordinate the sequencing, provision and funding of infrastructure to enable the orderly and efficient development of Future Development Areas.	Reject	We concur with the submitter's summary of aspects of the NPS-UD, and local authorities will need to give effect to such national direction, but note that Method 3 differs slightly in that it pertains to the "orderly and efficient development" of FDAs. In addition, the Council does not consider it appropriate for the CRPS to require actions be undertaken in instruments and strategies made in accordance with other statutes, such as those made in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002 (LGA). It recognises the importance of enabling the co-ordination of infrastructure planning under the RMA and LGA, and considers that Method 3 is an appropriate method of achieving Policy 6.3.12. The change sought by the submitter is therefore not supported.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				infrastructure in Long Term Plans, or other infrastructure plans, to enable the orderly and efficient development of Future Development Areas."			
7 MapA	PCCH6-19.2	Bellgrove Rangiora Limited	Support in part	Retain Amended Map A as notified, but amend Map title as follows: 'Map A - Greenfield Priority Areas <u>and Future Development Areas</u> '.	The areas identified on Amended Map A are considered appropriate for integrated development that will meet shortfalls in housing capacity, and provide clear guidance for Waimakariri District Council to rezone land within these areas through their district planning process. Given Amended Map A contains more than just Greenfield Priority Areas, Future Development Areas should also be referenced in the Map title for clarity and consistency with the associated policies.	Accept	We consider it is appropriate to amend the Map title as follows: 'Map A - Greenfield Priority Areas <u>and Future Development Areas</u> ' to reflect the FDAs identified by the Proposed Change.
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-27.2	Carolina Homes Ltd	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to the 'Explanation and reasons' in Policy 6.3.1 - Development within the Greater Christchurch area.	<p>The inclusion of the new Future Development Area in Map A was identified by the Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update in 2018/2019. It is proposed, in conjunction with other RPS policy, methods and reasoning amendments, to enable Waimakariri District Council to re-zone the additional Future Development Area land as part of the Waimakariri District Plan review within an Outline Development Plan.</p> <p>Carolina Homes Ltd submitted in support of the original Settlement Pattern Update in 2019 to include the additional Future Development Area and have since been liaising with Waimakariri District Council on the draft Rangiora West Structure Plan concepts for the Future Development Area and Greenfield Priority Area. Waimakariri District Council intends to include both in an integrated and comprehensive approach to Western Rangiora in accordance with RPS Policy 6.3.3. On this basis the</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to the explanation and reasons of Policy 6.3.1 as notified are recommended to be retained.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					amendment to the “principal reasons and explanation” for Policy 6.3.1 - Development within the Greater Christchurch area - is supported.		
6 Pol 6.3.03	PCCH6-27.3	Carolina Homes Ltd	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.3 - Development in accordance with outline development plans.	<p>The inclusion of the new Future Development Area in Map A was identified by the Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update in 2018/2019. It is proposed, in conjunction with other RPS policy, methods and reasoning amendments, to enable Waimakariri District Council to re-zone the additional Future Development Area land as part of the Waimakariri District Plan review within an Outline Development Plan.</p> <p>Carolina Homes Ltd submitted in support of the original Settlement Pattern Update in 2019 to include the additional Future Development Area and have since been liaising with Waimakariri District Council on the draft Rangiora West Structure Plan concepts for the Future Development Area and Greenfield Priority Area. Waimakariri District Council intends to include both in an integrated and comprehensive approach to Western Rangiora in accordance with RPS Policy 6.3.3. On this basis the amendment to Policy 6.3.3 - Development in accordance with outline development plans is supported.</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.3 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-27.4	Carolina Homes Ltd	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 - Residential location, yield and intensification.	Proposed Change 1 does not propose to increase the minimum net density from 10 houses to 12 houses per hectare that was recommended as part of the Urban Settlement Pattern update documentation. The submitter previously supported the change from 10 to 12 houses per hectare for the Waimakariri District and considers the increased minimum density continues to be appropriate. Given the density is proposed is a minimum, Policy 6.3.7 is supported on the basis that Waimakariri District Council may require 12 houses per hectare be achieved at the time of their District Plan review.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 as notified are recommended to be retained.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
7 MapA	PCCH6-27.1	Carolina Homes Ltd	Support in part	Confirm the correct Projected Infrastructure Boundary, Future Development Area and Greenfield Priority Area boundaries in the vicinity of the Southbrook for South West Rangiora as part of the change to Map A. Confirm the subsequent Map A update.	<p>Previously, the Projected Infrastructure Boundary for Rangiora has coincided with the Southbrook Stream. The change to Map A for the zoned greenfield Priority Area no longer coincides with the Southbrook boundary.</p> <p>The proposed Greenfield Priority Area boundary does not coincide with either the current Residential/Rural zone boundary in the Greenfield Priority Area or the Southbrook.</p> <p>It is difficult to distinguish whether the change to the Greenfield Priority Area on Map A is intentional as a result of revised flood modelling (historically high risk but reassessed as medium risk) or whether it is simply an error. The FDA to the west of the GPA appears to closely follow the Southbrook boundary while having the same potential for flooding constraints.</p> <p>Any change to the Greenfield Priority Area on Map A as part of PC1 must be correct. Alternatively, if the only change to Map A is to add the new Future Development Area, its corresponding boundary adjacent to the Southbrook should also take account hazard constraints when being considered to be extended to the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (or not as the case may be).</p>	Reject	Changes to Map A are confined to the identified Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change. It is noted that the correct Greenfield Priority Area boundary is as shown on the layer published on Canterbury Maps website alongside the Proposed Change. Whilst the proposed change to Map A identifies the FDAs to the full extent of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in Rangiora, Rolleston and Kaiapoi, there are flood risk constraints in a number of locations that will impact on the actual developable area within the FDAs. These constraints will necessarily be considered through the development of detailed structure plans and at the time of rezoning and subdivision and in accordance with operative CRPS and district plan provisions which seek to avoid or mitigate development in flood prone locations.
1.1 General	PCCH6-45.2	Carter Group Limited	Support	Supports the proposed change.	Carter Group is generally supportive of the Plan Change and is interested in the whole proposal.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-45.6	Carter Group Limited	Oppose in part	Require that the proposed change give effect to the NPS-UD.	Carter Group considers that more land should be identified as Future Development Areas (FDAs) in order to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD 2020). Increasing the housing supply will be crucial in tackling the issues faced in New Zealand around	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					<p>housing availability and affordability. Setting aside sufficient land with development capacity is critical. The NPS-UD 2020 reinforces this view and makes it clear that the Government is directing regional councils to adopt such an approach.</p> <p>Should Carter Group's relief not be accepted, then developers will face significant hurdles in the provision and consenting of new residential developments, particularly in places such as Rolleston and Lincoln, where current supply of land for residential growth has largely been developed already. This would not be consistent with the objectives sought to be achieved through the NPS-UD 2020.</p> <p>The NPS-UD 2020 provides a clear directive from the Government. Councils must ensure that plans allow for growth both 'up' and 'out' and that rules do not unnecessarily constrain growth. To support productive and well-functioning cities there must be adequate opportunities for land to be developed to meet housing needs.</p> <p>Our Space identified FDAs in the context of the NPS-UDC 2016. The NPS-UD 2020 has since come into effect and provides much stronger and clearer objectives around urban growth and development. Carter Group submits that as proposed, the Plan Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD 2020 in that it does not identify sufficient development capacity. The Plan Change, as it is drafted with Map A, will not meet the Canterbury region's housing needs in the long term as required by the NPS-UD 2020.</p>		<p>future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. Bringing forward development capacity significantly beyond that required to meet housing targets is considered inappropriate and less likely to achieve the wider NPS-UD objective to establish a well-functioning urban environment, not the overarching purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Any changes necessary to implement other aspects of the NPS-UD will be addressed through</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-45.4	Carter Group Limited	Support in part	Supports FDA areas to meet housing demand. Supports additional land being classified as FDAs.	<p>Increasing the housing supply will be crucial in tackling the issues faced in New Zealand around housing availability and affordability. Setting aside sufficient land with development capacity is critical. The NPS-UD 2020 reinforces this view and makes it clear that the Government is directing regional councils to adopt such an approach.</p> <p>This Plan Change provides an opportunity to respond to the housing crisis and plan ahead for future development in the region. This response is vital to the region's long term growth. Appropriate and adequate land must be identified for future urban use in the Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>A housing shortage is currently affecting New Zealand, and the Canterbury region is not immune. Property prices have risen significantly and the availability of adequate and affordable housing is limited. COVID-19 and the resulting lockdown have also had an adverse economic impact on the region with the loss of jobs and the dissolution of small businesses.</p> <p>In this context, it is entirely appropriate to identify further FDAs through this Plan Change. Should Carter Group's relief be accepted, it would have the potential to provide significant economic benefits to the region through an increase in the supply of housing, and the provision of employment. It is noted that all of the land proposed by Carter Group to be included in the FDAs has sufficient infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>Should Carter Group's relief not be accepted, then developers will face significant hurdles in the provision and consenting of new residential developments, particularly in places such as Rolleston and Lincoln, where current supply of land for residential growth has largely been developed already. This would not be consistent with the</p>	Accept in part	<p>The submission point is supported in so far as the submitter considers it appropriate to identify Future Development Areas through the Proposed Change to increase housing supply. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure.</p> <p>The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD. Therefore, we do not support the identification of further FDAs, including the additional land proposed by the submitter, and considers this part of the submission point to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					objectives sought to be achieved through the NPS-UD 2020.		
7 MapA	PCCH6-45.1	Carter Group Limited	Support in part	<p>Amend Map A to include the land identified in the maps contained in Appendix 1 attached to the original submission as FDAs. These areas of land border Rolleston and Lincoln.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Amend Map A to include the land identified in the map contained in Appendix 2 attached to the original submission as an FDA (for business/commercial activities). These areas of land border Rolleston.</p>	<p>Carter Group is generally supportive of the Plan Change and is interested in the whole proposal. However, Carter Group does not consider Map A goes far enough in identifying land required to enable future development. Carter Group considers that more land should be identified as Future Development Areas (FDAs) in order to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD 2020).</p> <p>The land areas identified in Appendix 1 attached to the original submission are areas subject to a number of proposed plan changes under the Operative Selwyn District Plan for appropriate residential rezoning.</p> <p>The land identified in Appendix 2 attached to the original submission borders the Rolleston township. This land is also subject to a proposed plan change for business rezoning.</p> <p>In the context of a housing shortage, it is entirely appropriate to identify further FDAs through this Plan Change. Should Carter Group's relief be accepted, it would have the potential to provide significant economic benefits to the region through an increase in the supply of housing, and the provision of employment. It is noted that all of the land proposed by Carter Group to be included in the FDAs has sufficient infrastructure capacity.</p> <p>Finally it is noted that Our Space clearly states the proposed locations of FDAs are intended to provide "some direction" to inform future RMA processes and are "indicative only." There is nothing preventing the inclusion of further FDAs to Map A in</p>	Reject	<p>The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new Future Development Areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional housing land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change.</p> <p>In addition, we are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change, including the finding that there is currently sufficient business development capacity to meet demand. The Proposed Change</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					this Plan Change and in fact Our Space contemplated that future planning processes would do so.		does not therefore cover business land matters and so this topic and the additional business land proposed by the submitter is also considered to be out of scope for this reason. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.03	PCCH6-2.3	Chen, X	Oppose in part	<p>Delete clause 1(c) of Policy 6.3.3:</p> <p>6.3.3 Development in accordance with outline development plans</p> <p>Development in greenfield priority areas or Future Development Areas and rural residential development is to occur in accordance with the provisions set out in an outline development plan or other rules for the area. Subdivision must not proceed ahead of the incorporation of an outline development plan in a district plan. Outline development plans and associated rules will:</p>	<p>1. Outline Development Plan (ODP) should only include the Greenfield Priority Area and Future Development Area which can be well defined in the District Plan, not include the Rural Residential Development Area.</p> <p>2. The Rural Residential Development Area should only be restricted by the relevant policies and rules, not be marked in the ODP. It is to provide flexibility to the Rural Residential Development and to reduce the works associated with updating the ODP. It is also to reduce the work and cost required for plan changes which gives advantage to the development in certain areas (included in the ODP) and other areas (not marked in the ODP).</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy (aside from a minor consequential amendment) and does not seek to address rural residential areas or activities linked to the submitter's requested changes. Changes to Policy 6.3.3 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>1. Be prepared as:</p> <p>a. a single plan for the whole of the priority area or Future Development Area; or</p> <p>b. where an integrated plan adopted by the territorial authority exists for the whole of the priority area or Future Development Area and the outline development plan is consistent with the integrated plan, part of that integrated plan; or</p> <p>c. <del>a single plan for the whole of a rural residential area; and</del></p> <p>...</p>			
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-2.1	Chen, X	Support in part	<p>Amend Policy 6.3.7 by inserting a new clause:</p> <p>6.3.7 Residential location, yield and intensification</p> <p>In relation to residential development opportunities in Greater Christchurch:</p> <p>...</p> <p><u>The density of Rural</u></p>	Development should be up to 5 householders per hectare (average 2000 square meters per lot) which is a well sought-after size in the house market. It is to fill the gap between the proposed Urban and Rural development density.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not cover rural residential matters so the requested changes to Policy 6.3.7 in this regard are best considered comprehensively with other aspects of rural residential development as part of future strategic planning exercises, including the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<u>Residential Development is up to 5 householders per hectare (average 2000 square meters per lot).</u>			
6 Pol 6.3.09	PCCH6-2.2	Chen, X	Support in part	<p>Delete clause 6 of Policy 6.3.9 as follows:</p> <p>6.3.9 Rural residential development</p> <p>In Greater Christchurch, rural residential development further to areas already zoned in district plans as at 1st January 2013 can only be provided for by territorial authorities in accordance with an adopted rural residential development strategy prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 2002, subject to the following:</p> <p>...</p> <p>6. An outline development plan is prepared which sets out an integrated design for subdivision and land use, and</p>	<p>1. Outline Development Plan (ODP) should only include the Greenfield Priority Area and Future Development Area which can be well defined in the District Plan, not include the Rural Residential Development Area.</p> <p>2. The Rural Residential Development Area should only be restricted by the relevant policies and rules, not be marked in the ODP. It is to provide flexibility to the Rural Residential Development and to reduce the works associated with updating the ODP. It is also to reduce the work and cost required for plan changes which gives advantage to the development in certain areas (included in the ODP) and other areas (not marked in the ODP).</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy aside from a minor consequential amendment. The Proposed Change does not cover rural residential matters and is not making any changes to these policies so requested changes to Policy 6.3.9 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. This matter can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<del>provides for the long-term maintenance of rural residential character.</del>			
8 Def Outline Development Plan	PCCH6-2.4	Chen, X	Oppose in part	<p>Amend definition of Outline development plan as follows:</p> <p>means a plan prepared for the development of a Greenfield Priority Area, <del>and/or</del> Future Development Area, <del>or</del> Rural Residential Development in the manner outlined in Policy 6.3.9. <del>It shall include maps, plans, and other descriptive and illustrative material as necessary to convey the information referred to in Policy 6.3.9.</del></p>	Outline Development Plan (ODP) should only include the Greenfield Priority Area and Future Development Area which can be well defined in the District Plan, not include the Rural Residential Development Area.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this definition aside from a minor consequential amendment to refer to Future Development Areas. The issue of rural residential development is not part of the Proposed Change and so requested changes on this topic (including where rural residential development is addressed in the definitions of Chapter 6) are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information.
8 Def Rural Residential Activities	PCCH6-2.5	Chen, X	Oppose in part	<p>Amend definition of Rural residential activities as follows:</p> <p>means residential units outside the identified Greenfield Priority Areas and Future Development Areas at an average density of between 1</p>	The Rural Residential Development Area should only be restricted by the relevant policies and rules, not be marked in the ODP. It is to provide flexibility to the Rural Residential Development and to reduce the works associated with updating the ODP. It is also to reduce the work and cost required for plan changes which gives advantage to the development in certain areas (included in the ODP) and other areas (not marked in the ODP).	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this definition. The issue of rural residential development is not part of the Proposed Change and so requested changes on this topic (including where rural residential development is addressed in the definitions of Chapter 6) are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				and 2 5 households per hectare.			
1.1 General	PCCH6-37.1	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Support in part	No specific decision requested.	Supports the current balance under the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (RPS) between the need for new development while ensuring that strategic infrastructure is enabled and protected [and] is not affected	Accept	The submission point is noted and accepted in so far as the Proposed Change does not alter the balance between the need for new development while ensuring that strategic infrastructure is enabled and protected.
3.07 Infrastructure	PCCH6-37.2	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Oppose in part	Amend Proposed Change 1 to recognise the Airport as a Key Transport and Economic Node (KTEN).	<p>This is a proposed new form of notation that recognises the unique characteristics of the Airport as a major employment, tourism and transport activity centre in the Canterbury region and South Island.</p> <p>CIAL acknowledges that the Airport is different in character to a Key Activity Centre (KAC) and cannot seek recognition as one. However, this should not be an excuse for not recognising the significant activities carried out, or generated by, CIAL which are equally as important as KACs.</p> <p>The creation of the KTEN notation provides a signal that the Airport is an important, but somewhat different, component of the Greater Christchurch business fabric. This reality should be reflected in regional planning documents such as the RPS and not simply ignored because it doesn't "fit" as a KAC. The RPS should recognise the fact that, as well as KACs, there are unique hubs such as the Airport (and the Port and Inland Ports).</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not cover the identification of activity centres (or in this case a Key Transport and Economic Node (KTEN)) or any associated policy provisions and so this topic and the proposed amendment is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The matter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-37.6	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Oppose in part	<p>Amend clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7 to include a reference to Policy 6.3.5, as follows:</p> <p>Subject to Policy 5.3.4, <u>Policy 6.3.5</u>,</p>	CIAL considers that further amendment should be made to the provisions proposed in PC1 to recognise the importance of the strategic transport network and to ensure that any future development will not give rise to any constraints or adverse effects on the strategic transport network. The efficient movement	Accept	Chapter 6 is to be read as a whole and Policy 6.3.5 will apply regardless. Nevertheless, the effective integration of land use and infrastructure is a critical element to residential greenfield development and so reference to Policy 6.3.5 in clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7 is supported



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				and Policy 6.3.12, residential greenfield priority area development shall occur in accordance with Map A.	of goods and services is essential to prosperity and realising employment growth.		(in addition to the proposed insertion of Policy 6.3.12 as notified). It is noted that Policy 6.3.5 pertains more broadly to transport and other infrastructure. We therefore recommend that clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7 is amended to read: "Subject to Policy 5.3.4, <u>Policy 6.3.5</u> , and Policy 6.3.12, residential greenfield development shall occur in accordance with Map A."
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-37.4	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Oppose in part	If PCCH6-37.3 is not accepted, amend Proposed Change 1 to only allow commercial or other non-noise sensitive activities within the 50 dB Ldn Air Noise Contour in Kaiapoi.	<p>If residential activities were established in this area, it would allow noise sensitive activities to establish within the noise contour.</p> <p>Policy 6.3.5(4) requires that noise sensitive activities are to be avoided within the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour unless they are within an existing residentially zoned urban area, residential greenfield area in Kaiapoi, or residential greenfield area identified in Map A of the RPS. Greenfield priority areas were identified to facilitate earthquake recovery, hence the exception. FDAs, by contrast, are identified to provide for future urban growth in a 'normal' long-to-medium context. There is no exception for this type of area in Policy 6.3.5.</p> <p>Policy 6.3.9(5)(a) further requires that the location and design of rural residential development shall avoid noise sensitive activities occurring within the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour.</p> <p>The 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour protects the Airport's ongoing safe and efficient operation from the encroachment of noise sensitive development and simultaneously ensures that people's amenity is not adversely impacted by enabling new noise sensitive activities to establish in a location where they are exposed to an undesirable level of noise. Such constraints are vital in the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Accept in part	We support this submission point in so far as development underneath the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contours (in particular the proposed Future Development Area in Kaiapoi) would need to comply with Policy 6.3.5 and so would be limited to non-noise sensitive activities. The FDAs are areas identified for urban growth within Waimakariri District Council strategic planning and infrastructure strategy documents and are supported by the Proposed Change, albeit subject to such development constraints. We do not consider that any changes are required through the Proposed Change however as this matter is already addressed in Chapter 6 so the amendment requested (but not specified in detail) is not supported. It is noted that remodelling of the airport noise contours is being undertaken and this could inform future changes to the CRPS, including the evidence base for the full review.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					<p>The land identified for inclusion within an FDA under the Contour in Kaiapoi should therefore only be confirmed as an FDA through PC1 if the use of that land is restricted to non-sensitive activities, such as commercial or industrial development</p> <p>The submitter provides evidence from the Christchurch Replacement District Plan hearings to support the relief sought.</p>		
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-37.7	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Oppose in part	<p>Amend clause 3 of Policy 6.3.12 as follows:</p> <p>The timing and sequencing of development is appropriately aligned with the provision <u>and protection of infrastructure, and is appropriately aligned with the provision and protection of the strategic transport network</u>, in accordance with Objective 6.2.4 and Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5</p>	CIAL considers that further amendment should be made to the provisions proposed in PC1 to recognise the importance of the strategic transport network and to ensure that any future development will not give rise to any constraints or adverse effects on the strategic transport network. The efficient movement of goods and services is essential to prosperity and realising employment growth.	Accept in part	We foresee circumstances where inappropriate timing and sequencing of development could place unnecessary pressure on existing infrastructure. In that regard, and in support of Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5, insertion of wording to 6.3.12(3) to read “the provision <u>and protection</u> of infrastructure” is supported. Additional wording requested by the submitter referring to the strategic transport network is considered duplicatory and, given the existing references in 6.3.12(3) to both Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5, is not supported.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-37.8	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Support in part	Retain the reference to Policy 6.3.5 in clause 3 of Policy 6.3.12.		Accept	We recommend retaining Policy 6.3.12 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. Reference to Policy 6.3.5 in clause (3) of Policy 6.3.12 as notified is recommended to be retained.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
7 MapA	PCCH6-37.3	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	Oppose	Delete all Future Development Areas within the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour in Kaiapoi.	<p>If residential activities were established in this area, it would allow noise sensitive activities to establish within the noise contour.</p> <p>Policy 6.3.5(4) requires that noise sensitive activities are to be avoided within the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour unless they are within an existing residentially zoned urban area, residential greenfield area in Kaiapoi, or residential greenfield area identified in Map A of the RPS. Greenfield priority areas were identified to facilitate earthquake recovery, hence the exception. FDAs, by contrast, are identified to provide for future urban growth in a 'normal' long-to-medium context. There is no exception for this type of area in Policy 6.3.5.</p> <p>Policy 6.3.9(5)(a) further requires that the location and design of rural residential development shall avoid noise sensitive activities occurring within the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour.</p> <p>The 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour protects the Airport's ongoing safe and efficient operation from the encroachment of noise sensitive development and simultaneously ensures that people's amenity is not adversely impacted by enabling new noise sensitive activities to establish in a location where they are exposed to an undesirable level of noise. Such constraints are vital in the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects.</p> <p>The submitter provides evidence from the Christchurch Replacement District Plan hearings to support the relief sought.</p>	Reject	We accept in part the alternative relief sought by this submitter in relation to this matter as outlined in a separate submission point in this summary table. The FDAs are areas identified for urban growth within Waimakariri District Council strategic planning and infrastructure strategy documents and are supported by the Proposed Change so deleting the FDAs within the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contour is not supported. Nevertheless, development underneath the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contours (in particular the proposed Future Development Area in Kaiapoi) would need to comply with Policy 6.3.5 and so would be limited to non-noise sensitive activities. We do not consider that any changes are required as part of the Proposed Change as this matter is already addressed in Chapter 6. It is noted that remodelling of the airport noise contours is being undertaken and this could inform future changes to the CRPS, including the evidence base for the full review.
7 MapA	PCCH6-46.1	Colensco, G	Oppose in part	Amend the map to update Greenfield priority areas and add additional Future	No Future Development Areas have been identified for Christchurch, and residential development has effectively surrounded Part Rural Section 1705 and	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				Development Areas for Christchurch, particularly located at Part Rural Section 1705.	adjoining properties, compromising the ability of the land to be used for rural purposes.		of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new Future Development Areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. No FDAs have been identified for Christchurch because the capacity assessment confirmed sufficient development capacity in existing urban areas and greenfield locations. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional housing land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
1.1 General	PCCH6-28.1	Community Housing Aotearoa	Support	Supports the proposed change in its entirety.	<p>The on-going monitoring of Housing (and Business) Development Capacity as required by the NPS is an important mechanism to ensure sufficient capacity exists to meet housing needs across household types and income ranges.</p> <p>The proposed amendments are consistent with the recommendations made in our Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan Report to the Greater</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. We note that the submitter considers the proposed amendments are consistent with the recommendations made in the Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan Report prepared by the

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					Christchurch Partnership in September 2020. As noted in the report, land supply on its own will not automatically lead to affordability for all households, lack of supply increases pressure across the market area. Therefore we support the proposed amendments as important components of the regional effort to ensure warm, safe, dry and affordable homes for all residents.		submitter for the Greater Christchurch Partnership.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-28.2	Community Housing Aotearoa	Support	Support clause [2](a) of Policy 6.3.12 as notified.	<p>The on-going monitoring of Housing (and Business) Development Capacity as required by the NPS is an important mechanism to ensure sufficient capacity exists to meet housing needs across household types and income ranges.</p> <p>The proposed amendments are consistent with the recommendations made in our Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan Report to the Greater Christchurch Partnership in September 2020. As noted in the report, land supply on its own will not automatically lead to affordability for all households, lack of supply increases pressure across the market area. Therefore we support the proposed amendments as important components of the regional effort to ensure warm, safe, dry and affordable homes for all residents.</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Policy 6.3.12 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. Clause (2)(a) of Policy 6.3.12 as notified and cited by the submitter is recommended to be retained.
3.01 Urban Form	PCCH6-8.4	Crofts, V	Support in part	No specific decision requested	<p>Although there is already large industrial development to the West of Christchurch, I would not agree that the land pattern for the district of Weedons has been established.</p> <p>I would also find it doubtful that the Rolleston Izone, or the Lyttelton Iport require more land to be put aside for future development.</p> <p>If more land is however to be set aside for Industrial growth including quarrying, I submit it should be moving away from the city and the Greater Christchurch Area, not be taking up prime housing</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not cover business land matters and so this topic and the location of additional industrial land and quarrying is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The matter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					opportunities for the growing population, especially within easy reach of the new Film Studio. This would also have to be taken into account with regards to the proposed Roydon Lodge quarry, that is being appealed at the moment.		
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-8.3	Crofts, V	Support	No specific decision requested	<p>I would like the Selwyn District Plan (or the Greater Christchurch plan) to be amended to see all Rural Inner City Plains land rezoned into rural residential, or smaller.</p> <p>This would free up hundreds of larger sections for housing instantly, with perhaps minimum of half acre - 1 acre lots in some areas.</p> <p>My submission particularly relates to the parcels of land zoned as Rural Inner city Plains around the township of Rolleston and specifically the district of Weedons.</p> <p>The new Southern Motorway gives Weedons and its residents the closest and fastest access to the central city coming right to Weedons Ross Road is easily accessible , and with only a 20 minute drive time to Christchurch City has reduced travel time, emissions, and fuel usage.</p>	Reject	The submission point seeks changes to the Selwyn District Plan and not the CRPS. The Proposed Change does not cover rural residential matters and is not making any changes to these policies. As such we consider this submission point to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The matter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
3.07 Infrastructure	PCCH6-8.2	Crofts, V	Support	No specific decision requested	<p>I would like the Selwyn District Plan (or the Greater Christchurch plan) to be amended to see all Rural Inner City Plains land rezoned into rural residential, or smaller.</p> <p>This would free up hundreds of larger sections for housing instantly, with perhaps minimum of half acre - 1 acre lots in some areas.</p> <p>My submission particularly relates to the parcels of land zoned as Rural Inner city Plains around the township of Rolleston and specifically the district of Weedons.</p>	Reject	The submission point seeks changes to the Selwyn District Plan and not the CRPS. The Proposed Change does not cover rural residential matters and is not making any changes to these policies. As such we consider this submission point to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The matter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					The Rolleston town water and sewerage services are now practically on the doorstep of this district, [Weedons] so it could easily be extended to accommodate this area.		
7 MapA	PCCH6-8.1	Crofts, V	Support	Retain Future Development Areas in or around Rolleston as notified.	<p>I would like the Selwyn District Plan (or the Greater Christchurch plan) to be amended to see all Rural Inner City Plains land rezoned into rural residential, or smaller.</p> <p>This would free up hundreds of larger sections for housing instantly, with perhaps minimum of half acre - 1 acre lots in some areas.</p> <p>My submission particularly relates to the parcels of land zoned as Rural Inner city Plains around the township of Rolleston and specifically the district of Weedons</p> <p>Enabling private land owners with 5-10 acres lots and above, to go to smaller lots without the huge cost, red tape and insane timeframes associated with private plan changes, would be hugely beneficial for housing developments that are needed in the short term.</p>	Accept in part	No changes are recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A therefore the submission point is supported in this regard. The submitter also seeks changes to the Selwyn District Plan and to rural residential matters not covered by the Proposed Change and therefore this aspect of the submission point is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The matter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
1.1 General	PCCH6-54.1	Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Support	Supports the proposed change in its entirety, particularly the inclusion of Dalkeith Holdings' land as follows: 19 hectares of land and located at 63 Oxford Road (CB384/134, 6.0703ha) and 212 Johns Road Eastern Title (CB384/133, 4.069ha) and 212 Johns Road Western Title (CB360/931 8.8906ha) that is currently within the Future Development Area/ Proposed District Infrastructure. This land is immediately adjacent to the current urban boundary and can be readily serviced. These 2 factors make it a logical choice for	We are writing to confirm our strong support for the Rangiora West Structure Plan as proposed by the Waimakariri District Council. We would like to see this plan inserted in the proposed Waimakariri District Plan. Dalkeith Holdings owns 19 hectares of land and located at 63 Oxford Road (CB384/134, 6.0703ha) and 212 Johns Road Eastern Title (CB384/133, 4.069ha) and 212 Johns Road Western Title (CB360/931 8.8906ha) that is currently within the Future Development Area/ Proposed District Infrastructure. This land is immediately adjacent to the current urban boundary and can be readily serviced. These 2 factors make it a logical choice for	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No change is recommended to the Rangiora West FDA as notified.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				4.069ha) and 212 Johns Road Western Title (CB360/931 8.8906ha) that is currently within the Future Development Area	<p>residential development.</p> <p>We have had a close look at the proposed concept plans and are very supportive of the development. We value that there is provision for community, commercial and green areas as well as both medium density and general residential housing options. We are aware of a large development in the East and appreciate that it is important to balance this with developments of smaller magnitude and also in the West.</p> <p>We are also aware that these properties are earmarked as future urban housing in the Streamlined Process ECan has highlighted to land owners in the area as part of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Committee. We have made the same Submission to them.</p>		
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-54.2	Dalkeith Holdings Ltd	Support	Supports the proposed change as a means to satisfy demand for housing.	<p>We are aware that there is a housing shortage in the Waimakariri District in the medium term (3-10 years) and this would help meet that need.</p> <p>The West is known as a desirable part of Rangiora to live and with new schools near by, demand for new housing is likely to be strong. Rangiora in particular has seen exponential population growth, with census figures for some areas increasing almost tenfold between 2006 and 2018 in Rangiora's northwest.</p>	Accept	The submission point is noted and supported in so far as the submitter identifies the proposed change as helping meet the medium term housing need in Waimakariri.
1.2 General	PCCH6-21.6	Doncaster Developments Ltd	Oppose	Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more responsive and flexible urban growth management approach. This could include (but not be limited to): - enabling	The submitters oppose Change 1 in its entirety. The submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs [land situated at North West Rangiora] - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater	Reject	We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Chapter 6 provides important planning



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>consideration of development proposals, private plan change requests and submissions on Plan Reviews which are outside the Change 1 Map A FDAs, priority greenfield and existing urban areas; and/or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- which exceed the minimum targets in Table 6.2.1a; and</li> <li>- are consistent with and give effect to the NPS-UD; and</li> <li>- amendments to Policy 6.3.11 Monitoring and Review, Policy 6.3.12 Future Development Areas; and</li> <li>- change the status of FDAs to Greenfield Areas, with no restrictions on the quantum or timing of development; and the changes outlined below; and/or</li> <li>- in the case of resource consents, are of a minor nature (including zoning anomalies) and do not offend the overall strategic planning</li> </ul>	<p>competition and supply to land and housing markets.</p> <p>Change 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form.</p> <p>The submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context. There has been a 'flood' of private plan change applications lodged seeking urban rezoning since the NPS-UD was gazetted. They consider there is clearly strong 'pent up' demand for further housing and business land, unable to be progressed prior to this due to the very restrictive CRPS urban growth management 'regime'. Comprehensive change to the RPS policy framework is needed now to enable private plan change requests and [district plan] reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p>		<p>certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response proposed through this Proposed Change. Bringing forward development capacity significantly beyond that required to meet housing targets is considered inappropriate and less likely to achieve the wider NPS-UD objective to establish a well-functioning urban environment, not the overarching purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD. Any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>intent of the Chapter 6.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.</p>			
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-21.1	Doncaster Developments Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more responsive and flexible urban growth management approach. This could include (but not be limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- enabling consideration of development proposals, private plan change requests and submissions on Plan Reviews which are outside the Change 1 Map A FDAs, priority greenfield and existing urban areas; and/or</li> <li>- which exceed the minimum targets in Table 6.2.1a; and</li> </ul>	<p>Change 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways [summarised as follows] and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form:</p> <p>A minimum targets approach is not consistent with the intent of the NPS-UD to "improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets"; provide "<u>at least</u> sufficient development capacity to meet demand"; and being "responsive, in particular to proposals that would supply significant development capacity".</p> <p>A 'fixed non contestable boundary' is retained and is clearly contrary to the NPS-UD 'responsive planning approach'.</p> <p>The piecemeal and incomplete approach to addressing the requirements of the NPS-UD is not sound planning and is opposed.</p> <p>The NPS-UD seeks to achieve well functioning environments and growth in locations close to employment, that are well serviced with public transport (existing or planned) and where there is high demand for housing and business land relative to other areas. The proposed FDAs in comparison to alternative locations have not been assessed against</p>	Reject	<p>The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>- are consistent with and give effect to the NPS-UD; and</p> <p>- amendments to Policy 6.3.11 Monitoring and Review, Policy 6.3.12 Future Development Areas; and</p> <p>- change the status of FDAs to Greenfield Areas, with no restrictions on the quantum or timing of development; and the changes outlined below; and/or</p> <p>- in the case of resource consents, are of a minor nature (including zoning anomalies) and do not offend the overall strategic planning intent of the Chapter 6.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.</p>	these criteria – the s32 assessment is silent on such assessment.		<p>capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. Bringing forward development capacity significantly beyond that required to meet housing targets is considered inappropriate and less likely to achieve the wider NPS-UD objective to establish a well-functioning urban environment, not the overarching purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. We consider that the responsibilities under section 32 have been discharged with an assessment that has an appropriate level of detail. Any changes necessary to implement other aspects of the NPS-UD will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.</p> <p>We also recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non contestable rural/urban boundary.</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
7 MapA	PCCH6-21.4	Doncaster Developments Ltd	Oppose	Amend Map A by including the submitter's site (shown in Appendix 1 of the submission) as a Future Development Area.	<p>The PIB has been in place for 13 years and predates the Canterbury 2010/11 earthquakes and significant shift of Greater Christchurch westwards onto land less at risk of natural hazards. It was not been subject to rigorous testing. Rangiora has continued to grow rapidly and accessibility to the City has also been enhanced by the Northern Motorway and extension.</p> <p>Doncaster Developments are the owner of approximately 7.8ha of land situated on the north-west edge of Rangiora. The land is physically well situated to develop for housing and can be serviced. Road locations, siting limitations and servicing are provided for in the Outline Development Plan. There are no unusual infrastructure issues. The land is close to amenities (preschool, church) and the new shopping centre (Sandown/Huntingdon), and its development would complement recent residential developments on adjacent properties and road and reserve connections. The land is within 200m of the proposed public transport stop/route (Huntingdon Drive). The land is already zoned for low density residential development (Residential 4A). The land is suitable for housing and can accommodate between 40-160 residential units. Within the Rangiora context the land represents one of the few areas where ground conditions are geotechnically good, the land links with or is close to the popular west Rangiora growth area and can deliver home and section packages at reasonable cost.</p>	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional housing land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
9.1 Section32	PCCH6-21.7	Doncaster Developments Ltd	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	The Change 1 s32 assessment does not assess the identified options against the NPS-UD objectives and policies, even though its purpose is to give effect to NPS-UD directions. It is inadequate and incomplete. Proposed Change 1 is contrary to the RMA, including Part 2 and s32 and does not constitute sound resource management practice.	Reject	The purpose of the Proposed Change is to give effect to Policy 2 and clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD and enable sufficient land to be rezoned for the medium term (10 years) and identified for the long term (30 years) by identifying and enabling additional development capacity within the Projected

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							Infrastructure Boundary shown on Map A and also to provide flexibility for Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to consider rezoning such land to meet medium term housing demands where a sufficiency shortfall is identified. The objectives and policies of the NPS-UD are addressed in the section 32 report. We consider that the responsibilities under section 32 have been discharged with an assessment that has an appropriate level of detail. This is outlined in the summary report, including Appendix 5 which also sets out alignment with the RMA and national direction.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-17.4	Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose in part	No specific decision requested.	The National Policy Statement for Urban Development has objectives and policies that require local authorities to provide sufficient development capacity to meet demand over the short, medium and long term (Policy 2). We consider that the RPS is restrictive and does not provide the flexibility to be consistent with Policy 2 as it does not provide for sufficient development capacity in the medium or long term. Clause 3.4 of the NPS-UD explains that development capacity should be plan-enabled. In the long term, this means identifying land for future urban use or urban intensification in a Future Development Strategy or any other relevant plan or strategy. It is considered that the proposed changes to Chapter 6 do not alleviate the issue of the supply of developable land. If the RPS was more enabling and flexible with greenfield priority areas and future development areas, then more development capacity would be available out-of-sequence to meet growing demand if required. Currently residential development in Greater Christchurch is restricted to the infrastructure boundary and greenfield priority areas in Map A, with no flexibility for other developable land, which does not enable	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. Chapter 6 provides important planning

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					development of other developable land in the long term.		certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-17.8	Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose in part	No specific decision requested.	<p>We consider that the proposed changes to the CRPS do not go far enough in bringing forward enough land and enabling development in Greater Christchurch. Demand for land has increased rapidly in the last few years seemingly at a rate where there is not enough supply of land identified to meet it.</p> <p>There is a need for the policies relating to rural-residential strategies to be flexible, much like the PIB, GPA, and FDA areas.</p> <p>We understand the intent of the infrastructure boundary and understand the adverse effects of urban sprawl and effects on rural productive land if residential development is not appropriately managed. However greater flexibility is needed to provide for development capacity to meet the current growing demand.</p>	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework, including for rural residential development, will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-17.5	Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose in part	No specific decision requested	The infrastructure boundary has not been reassessed in the proposed changes to Chapter 6, meaning that only a small area of land has been able to be identified as Future Development Areas. Greater flexibility, or a staged approach, for the	Reject	We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					<p>infrastructure boundary and consequential development priority areas should be considered. For example, short-term, medium-term, and long-term future development areas could be identified to enable land to come forward for development more easily and more quickly when it is required. This would also enable land to come forward that is out of sequence or not anticipated to meet demand where it can meet certain criteria.</p> <p>If the RPS was more enabling and flexible with greenfield priority areas and future development areas, then more development capacity would be available out-of-sequence to meet growing demand if required.</p>		<p>and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. The purpose of the Proposed Change is to give effect to Policy 2 and clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD and enable sufficient land to be rezoned for the medium term (10 years) and identified for the long term (30 years) by identifying and enabling additional development capacity within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary shown on Map A and also to provide flexibility for Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to consider rezoning such land to meet medium term housing demands where a sufficiency shortfall is identified. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change and that flexible staging of this capacity is appropriately linked to identified shortfalls identified through capacity assessments. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will</p>



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-17.3	Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose in part	No specific decision requested.	We note that areas of land, particularly around Rangiora and Kaiapoi, are identified as greenfield priority areas and as future development areas however have significant hazard constraints for developing the sites for residential use. These sites require significant engineering and consultation with district and regional council to enable residential development. In light of this the density these areas are expected to provide may not be readily achievable.	Reject	Whilst the proposed change to Map A identifies the FDAs to the full extent of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in Rangiora, Rolleston and Kaiapoi, there are flood risk constraints in a number of locations that will impact on the actual developable area within the FDAs. These constraints will necessarily be considered through the development of detailed structure plans and at the time of rezoning and subdivision and in accordance with operative CRPS and district plan provisions which seek to avoid or mitigate development in flood prone locations. Should these constraints reduce the anticipated development capacity of FDAs this will be identified in subsequent capacity assessments and factored into the findings in relation to sufficiency at that time.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-17.1	Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose in part	Amend clause 1 of proposed Policy 6.3.7 as follows:  1. Subject to Policy 5.3.4 and Policy 6.3.12, residential greenfield development <del>shall</del> <u>should</u> occur in <u>general</u> accordance with Map A.	Our submission relates to the proposed Future Development Areas. We submit that the proposed changes to Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement do not enable enough developable land to become available. We submit that development within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary (PIB) needs to be prioritised, however the PIB needs to be flexible to enable more developable land to become available for residential rezoning and development to meet the growing housing demand and economic need. The infrastructure boundary has not been reassessed in the proposed changes to Chapter 6, meaning that only a small area of land has been able to be identified as Future Development Areas.  Demand for land has increased rapidly in the last few	Reject	It is noted that Policy 6.3.7 specifically relates to residential location, yield and intensification. The requested relief would broaden the intent of the policy and seeks changes that would be inconsistent with the locational direction for greenfield development set out in Policy 6.3.1. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					years seemingly at a rate where there is not enough supply of land identified to meet it. Amendments to policies and strategies can be a long and expensive process, which further delays the supply of developable land. We consider that while Chapter 6 of the CRPS is under review, steps should be taken now to ensure that there is greater flexibility to allow further development capacity for Greater Christchurch in the medium to long-term. We note that the recent confirmation of the repeal of the RMA introduces further uncertainties for the CRPS, and its eventual format under new legislation in the future. This influences the ability or further desire of the Regional Council to make further amendments in the meantime, in addition to those necessary under the NPS Freshwater in the interim.		and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-17.6	Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose in part	<p>Amend Policy 6.3.7 by inserting a new clause as follows:</p> <p><u>2. Any residential greenfield development that occurs outside of the projected infrastructure boundary or outside of a greenfield priority or future development area must:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Be adjacent to the infrastructure boundary or greenfield priority or future development area;</u></p> <p><u>and</u></p> <p><u>(b) Demonstrate the</u></p>	<p>To enable greater flexibility to allow medium and long-term development capacity and housing choice to become available to meet the growing demand for residential but also consequently for rural-residential. The decision sought is to allow greater flexibility in the objectives and policies of Chapter 6 of the CRPS, in relation to the infrastructure boundary and priority areas.</p> <p>Residential development of land adjoining the infrastructure boundary, or greenfield priority areas, or future development areas shall be considered on its merits.</p> <p>Greater flexibility, or a staged approach, for the infrastructure boundary and consequential development priority areas should be considered.</p> <p>For example, short-term, medium-term, and long-term future development areas could be identified to enable land to come forward for development more easily and more quickly when it is required.</p> <p>This would also enable land to come forward that is out of sequence or not anticipated to meet demand where it can meet certain criteria.</p>	Reject	It is noted that Policy 6.3.7 specifically relates to residential location, yield and intensification. The requested relief would broaden the intent of the policy and seeks changes that would be inconsistent with the locational direction for greenfield development set out in Policy 6.3.1. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<u>economic demand and need for the development over other development areas; and</u> <u>(c) Have service connections reasonably available to the site.</u>			
6 Pol 6.3.09	PCCH6-17.2	Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose in part	<p>Amend proposed Policy 6.3.9 as follows:</p> <p>6.3.9 Rural residential development In Greater Christchurch, rural residential development further to areas already zoned in district plans as at 1st January 2013 <del>can only</del> <u>may</u> be provided for by territorial authorities in <u>general</u> accordance with an adopted rural residential development strategy prepared in accordance with the Local Government Act 2022, subject to the following:</p>	<p>Further flexibility is needed to allow for rural-residential development, which currently can only be provided if the land is identified in an approved rural residential development strategy. Rural-residential development needs to reflect the flexibility of the PIB line for residential purposes, because flexibility within the FDA, GPA and PIB areas will affect the areas and extent of rural-residential.</p> <p>In the case of rural-residential development, we are aware of many proposed residential developments, in areas such as Prebbleton, on land that is currently identified in a rural residential strategy. If these are to be approved and developed, then there will be a loss of land identified as rural-residential and the rural-residential strategy would be out of date. The supply of rural-residential land to provide housing choice will need to be met somewhere else, but currently cannot because it would not be in accordance with the rural-residential strategy and the CRPS currently does not allow for any other rural-residential development not within a rural-residential strategy. This reinforces the need for the policies relating to rural residential strategies to be flexible, much like the PIB, GPA, and FDA areas.</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy aside from a minor consequential amendment. The Proposed Change does not cover rural residential matters and is not making any changes to these policies so requested changes to Policy 6.3.9 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. Any additional flexibilities to the planning framework, including for rural residential development, will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
6 Pol 6.3.09	PCCH6-17.7	Eliot Sinclair and Partners	Oppose in part	<p>Amend Policy 6.3.9 by inserting a new clause as follows:</p> <p><u>1. Each rural residential development proposal and ODP shall be considered on its merits. Every rural residential development proposal shall be assessed on:</u></p> <p><u>[a] Demand for rural residential; and</u>  <u>[b] Reasonable connections for servicing and utilities; and</u>  <u>[c] Effects on rural growth and production.</u></p>	The decision sought is to allow greater flexibility in the objectives and policies of Chapter 6 of the CRPS, in relation to the infrastructure boundary and priority areas. Residential development of land adjoining the infrastructure boundary, or greenfield priority areas, or future development areas shall be considered on its merits.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy aside from a minor consequential amendment. The Proposed Change does not cover rural residential matters and is not making any changes to these policies so requested changes to Policy 6.3.9 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. Any additional flexibilities to the planning framework, including for rural residential development, will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-49.5	Fisher, J	Oppose	Opposes the proposed change on the grounds that it does not give effect to the NPS-UD.	The submitter opposes the proposed changes to the CRPS. It is considered that rigid compliance with Map A (plus the proposed extensions) is not consistent with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020 as it does not allow for flexibility that would open the door for sensible realignment of urban boundaries, as well as providing for adequate land to meet housing land needs.	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-49.1	Fisher, J	Oppose in part	Opposes restricting development to the areas in Map A in	<p>The rigid compliance with 'hard lines' on Map A is not consistent with providing for growth and relocation.</p> <p>The critical reason for this submission is that the</p>	Reject	It is noted that Policy 6.3.7 specifically relates to residential location, yield and intensification. The requested relief would broaden the intent of the policy and seeks changes that would be inconsistent with

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7.</p> <p>The location of the submitters site is shown on the map attached to the original submission. The area is the only remaining land within the Prebbleton side of the Shands Road boundary that is zoned for rural use. The land to the south, east and north has been developed for large lot residential living, while the land to the south-west allows for an increased density of residential dwellings. Several areas of residential development surrounding the submitters site fall outside of Map A.</p> <p>It is considered that rigid compliance with Map A (plus the proposed extensions) is not consistent with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development 2020 as it does not allow for flexibility that would open the door for sensible realignment of urban boundaries, as well as providing for adequate land to meet housing land needs.</p>	<p>submitter has sought, under the Selwyn District Plan review, that land be rezoned for large lot residential. It is considered that this zoning would better reflect the surrounding area and provide a sensible urban boundary. Any amendments to the CRPS are therefore relevant to the submitter's interest.</p>		<p>the locational direction for greenfield development set out in Policy 6.3.1. The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS</p>
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-49.2	Fisher, J	Support in part	Supports deletion of the second sentence of clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7.	The removal of the reference to meeting sufficient growth and residential relocation through to 2028 is supported, as the proposal only addresses the minimum requirements of the NPS.	Accept in part	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The submission point is supported in so far as the proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 as notified are recommended to be retained, however the

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							reason for the proposed amendment does not fully align with the supporting statements provided by the submitter.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-49.3	Fisher, J	Support in part	Amend the proposed policy to remove reference to the Future Development Areas.	<p>Generally, this new policy is appropriate as it enables urban development subject to relevant controls. However, in line with the submission point [PCCH6-49.4] on the proposed Map A, it is not supported that this policy only apply in Future Development Areas. It would be more appropriate if the policy contemplated urban growth outside the overlay where it met the requirements of the policy. This is giving effect to something that identified land needs in 2007, not reflective of the current environment.</p> <p>Only providing minimum, question consistency with NPS-UD.</p> <p>Allow Council to consider practicality of particular land continuing as rural, when already surrounded by development.</p>	Reject	<p>The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and reflect the evidence base and findings from the Our Space future development strategy prepared in 2019.</p> <p>The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is however currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context.
7 MapA	PCCH6-49.4	Fisher, J	Oppose	<p>Delete proposed Future Development Areas from Map A.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>If Map A is amended, allow for urban development in areas where the land use has changed since the introduction of Map A.</p>	The proposed Future Development Areas are opposed. It would be more appropriate if individual sites were assessed as part of applications, against proposed Policy 6.3.12. It is also important that if Map A is to be altered, then it contemplates areas where the land use has changed significantly on surrounding land since Map A was first introduced and allows for 'infill' to create sensible urban boundaries.	Reject	Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Policy 6.3.12 is a specific policy to enable additional development capacity to be brought forward through urban zoning of identified Future Development Areas on Map A. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS. This would also represent an opportunity to consider the land identified by the submitter, the large lot residential zoning form of urban development being sought, and best to address or show on Map A where urban development has already occurred in Greenfield Priority Areas (but is not considered within the purpose of the Proposed Change).



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
7.1 AddLand	PCCH6-49.6	Fisher, J	Oppose	Align urban boundary to Shands Road.	Suggests rezoning land near to Prebbleton, [shown on the map attached to the original submission] to large lot residential	Reject	We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
1.2 General	PCCH6-36.1	Goulds Development and Four Star Developments Ltd	Oppose	Oppose Proposed Change 1 in its entirety. [See specific relief sought under other submission points]	The submitters oppose Change 1 in its entirety. The submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs [land situated at Rolleston] - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to land and housing markets. Change 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form. The submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context. There has been a 'flood' of private plan change applications lodged seeking urban rezoning since the NPS-UD was gazetted. They consider there is clearly strong 'pent up' demand for further housing and business land, unable to be progressed prior to this due to the very restrictive CRPS urban growth management 'regime'. Comprehensive change to the RPS policy framework is needed now to enable private plan change requests and [district plan] reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					UD.		programme infrastructure investment. Bringing forward development capacity significantly beyond that required to meet housing targets is considered inappropriate and less likely to achieve the wider NPS-UD objective to establish a well-functioning urban environment, not the overarching purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-36.2	Goulds Development and Four Star Developments Ltd	Oppose	Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more flexible and responsible growth management approach. This could include:	Change 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, as follows, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form: A minimum targets approach is not consistent with the intent of the NPS-UD to "improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land and development markets"; provide "at least sufficient	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>-enabling consideration of development proposals, private plan change requests and submissions on Plan Reviews which are outside the Change 1 Map A FDAs, priority greenfield and existing urban areas; and/or</p> <p>-which exceed the minimum targets in Table 6.2.1a; and</p> <p>-are consistent with and give effect to the NPS-UD; and</p> <p>-amendments to Policy 6.3.11 Monitoring and Review, Policy 6.3.12 Future Development Areas; and</p> <p>-change the status of FDAs to Greenfield Areas, with no restrictions on the quantum or timing of development; and</p> <p>-the changes outlined below [see separate submission points]; and</p> <p>-and/or in the case of resource consents, are of a minor nature (including zoning</p>	<p>development capacity to meet demand"; and being "responsive, in particular to proposals that would supply significant development capacity".</p> <p>A 'fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary' is contrary to the NPS-UD 'responsive planning approach'. There is no ability for land outside the FDAs to be considered, even though the NPS-UD is clear that a fixed 'immoveable' urban/rural boundary is contrary to the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The piecemeal and incomplete approach to addressing the requirements of the NPS-UD is not sound planning and is opposed.</p> <p>The NPS-UD seeks to achieve well functioning environments and growth in locations close to employment, that are well serviced with public transport (existing or planned) and where there is high demand for housing and business land relative to other areas. The proposed FDAs in comparison to alternative locations have not been assessed against these criteria – the s32 assessment is silent on such assessment.</p> <p>The NPS-UD requires a consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative spatial scenarios for the achieving the NPS-UD (s 3.14 (b)). Change 1 has not undertaken any such work, simply relying on the planning and infrastructure work undertaken when the PIB was first introduced 13 years ago.</p>		<p>Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is however currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				anomalies) and do not offend the overall strategic planning intent of the Chapter 6.			considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. We also recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non contestable rural/urban boundary.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-36.6	Goulds Development and Four Star Developments Ltd	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	The submitter attached an assessment of the Submitter's site against the NPS-UD 2020 objectives and policies that they submitted on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan.	N/A	This additional information is received and noted. Recommendations on the related decisions requested are outlined elsewhere in this summary table.
5 Obj 6.2.1	PCCH6-36.4	Goulds Development and Four Star Developments Ltd	Oppose	<p>Delete clause 3 of Objective 6.2.1 as follows:</p> <p>Recovery, rebuilding and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that:</p> <p>...</p> <p><del>3. avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas unless expressly provided for in the CRPS;</del></p>	A fixed uncontestable urban/rural boundary as shown on Map A and associated RPS objective and policies does not give effect to the NPS-UD which requires a responsive planning approach (Objective 6c) and Policy 8). The Ministry for Environment Responsive Planning Guidance specifically states: <i>a hard rural urban boundary without the ability to consider change or movement of that boundary would not meet the requirements of the responsive planning policy.</i>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not make amendments to Objective 6.2.1 aside from referencing the new Policy 6.3.12 so this submission point is considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. We recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non contestable rural/urban boundary. Any changes necessary to

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-36.5	Goulds Development and Four Star Developments Ltd	Oppose	<p>If the proposed Future Development Areas are retained amend clause 3 [incorrectly referenced in the submission as clause 4] of Policy 6.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:...</p> <p>4. Enable development of existing urban areas and greenfield priority areas and <u>Future Development Areas</u>, including intensification in appropriate locations; <del>where is supports the recovery of Greater Christchurch.</del></p>	<p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs [land situated at Rolleston] - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to land and housing markets.</p> <p>The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>	Reject	The inclusion of reference to Future Development Areas in Policy 6.3.1(3) would create a potential inconsistency with Policy 6.3.12 as Policy 6.3.1 is specifically focused on the recovery period through to 2028, whereas the purpose of identifying Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change is to ensure sufficient development capacity over the medium to long term (i.e. through to 2048).
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-36.7	Goulds Development and Four Star Developments Ltd	Oppose	<p>If the proposed Future Development Areas are retained amend clause 4 [incorrectly referenced in the</p>	<p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs [land situated at Rolleston] - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately</p>	Reject	The inclusion of reference to Future Development Areas in Policy 6.3.1(4) would create a potential inconsistency with Policy 6.3.12 as Policy 6.3.1 is specifically focused on the recovery period through to 2028, whereas the purpose of identifying

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>submission as clause 5] of Policy 6.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:...</p> <p>5. Ensure new urban activities only occur within existing urban areas, <del>or</del> identified greenfield priority areas <u>and/ or Future Development Areas</u> as shown on Map A....</p>	<p>located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to land and housing markets.</p> <p>The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>		<p>Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change is to ensure sufficient development capacity over the medium to long term (i.e. through to 2048). An amendment to Policy 6.3.1(4) is not required as it contains the caveat "unless they are otherwise expressly provided for in the CRPS" which would apply to Policy 6.3.12.</p>
7 MapA	PCCH6-36.3	Goulds Development and Four Star Developments Ltd	Oppose	<p>If Map A is retained in its current form, amend Map A by including the submitter's site (shown in Figure 1 of the submission) as a Future Development Area - Residential.</p>	<p>The Submitters are a landowner group who are working together on rezoning proposals for their land in Rolleston. They have lodged a private plan change request and submission on the Selwyn District Plan Review seeking rezoning for residential purposes (53.9ha).</p> <p>The Site is an ideal and logical location for further urban growth of Rolleston and will achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with excellent connectivity by multiple transport modes as well as bridging the existing urban area to the proposed Council reserve to the east. It is far closer to the existing town centre, and I-zone and I-Port employment areas, than other new growth areas further south, towards Selwyn Road. The rezoning will accommodate a further 660 dwellings which represents the equivalent of 15% of the 2018 housing stock at Rolleston; it will supply significant additional capacity and contribute to a well-</p>	Reject	<p>The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					functioning urban environment, meeting the NPS-UD Objective 6 c and Policy 8 criteria for 'unanticipated' (in an RMA document) plan changes. Whilst a portion of the Site (less than 1/3rd) is under the current 50 dBA Ldn Christchurch International Airport noise contour but this is likely to move off the Site when the revised airport noise contours are released to the public. This land can be rezoned for residential purposes, but with the status of urban subdivision and housing non complying until the airport noise contour moves off the land. A high amenity master planned development is proposed. There is no additional cost to the Council in re-zoning the Site as there is capacity in the public utilities and the existing road network, including planned upgrades.		the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional housing land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
9.1 Section32	PCCH6-36.8	Goulds Development and Four Star Developments Ltd	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	The Change 1 s32 assessment does not assess the identified options against the NPS-UD objectives and policies, even though its purpose is to give effect to NPS-UD directions. It is inadequate and incomplete. Proposed Change 1 is contrary to the RMA, including Part 2 and s32 and does not constitute sound resource management practice.	Reject	The purpose of the Proposed Change is to give effect to Policy 2 and clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD and enable sufficient land to be rezoned for the medium term (10 years) and identified for the long term (30 years) by identifying and enabling additional development capacity within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary shown on Map A and also to provide flexibility for Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to consider rezoning such land to meet medium term housing demands where a sufficiency shortfall is identified. The objectives and policies of the NPS-UD are addressed in the section 32 report. We consider that the responsibilities under section 32 have been discharged with an assessment that has an appropriate level of detail. This is outlined in the summary report, including Appendix 5 which also sets out alignment with the RMA and national direction.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
9.2 Consequential	PCCH6-36.9	Goulds Development and Four Star Developments Ltd	Oppose	Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.		Reject	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
1.2 General	PCCH6-44.1	Grigg, J	Oppose	Opposes rezoning land for residential use.	<p>My understanding is that both Environment Canterbury and the Government have declared a Climate Emergency. I also understand that the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management introduces an objective of “maintaining or improving” the overall quality of freshwater within a region. Also under Te Mana o te Wai, all freshwater management must now proceed in a way that prioritises (in order)</p> <p>The health and well-being of water The health needs of people The ability of people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well being.</p> <p>I will endeavour to show that with the Climate declaration and the NPS it will be exceedingly difficult and cost prohibitive to grant rezoning to add more houses .Under the current NPS legislation coupled with the Climate Emergency Declaration there is no provision for ethically rezoning land for residential use. Rezoning for residential use will only add to the total population and is contra to the climate emergency declaration.</p>	Reject	Land use planning such as the consolidated urban form promoted through Chapter 6 can support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. This objective must also be balanced with other functions and requirements placed on regional councils, including Section 30 (ba) to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in relation to housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the region. With regard to the NPS-FM, we consider the effects of discharges to water, and land where they may enter water, are adequately addressed through the CRPS and the Land and Water Regional Plan.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-44.3	Grigg, J	Oppose	Opposes rezoning land for residential development because it is contrary to the requirements of the	I understand that in a medium density residential development 60-70% of the land is covered by hard surface. This means that 60-70% of the rainfall will not be able to reach the earth in its natural state. So to meet the requirement of Te mana o te Wai all the	Reject	Policy 6.3.12 contains directions to enable the alignment of development with the provision of infrastructure to manage the effects of diffuse discharges which could occur as a result of housing development.



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				NPS for freshwater management.	<p>run off water would need to be decontaminated and returned to the ground in the same area. Ground water was specifically mentioned as coming under the NPS [for Freshwater Management].</p> <p>Each household wash contains 700,000 microplastic beads, multiply this by 2 washes per week and then by 52 weeks the total output of microplastic beads is 36,400,000 per year per household. These beads last a long time in the environment and I believe will be known as the DDT of this generation.</p> <p>This is totally at odds with the health and well-being of water. I don't believe that pumping the problem 4 kilometres out to sea would meet the Te Mana o te Wai expectations.</p>		More detailed planning to ensure the provision of appropriate infrastructure to manage any adverse effects of housing developments on the wellbeing of water will take place through district planning processes. The effects of discharges to water, and land where they may enter water, are adequately addressed through the CRPS and the Land and Water Regional Plan.
3.06 Climate Change	PCCH6-44.2	Grigg, J	Oppose	Opposes rezoning land for residential development because it will add to climate change.	<p>The recent draft report of the Parliamentary Environment Commission showed a pathway to meeting our net Zero Carbon emissions. We as farmers have to reduce our stock numbers by 15%. However there was one glaring omission from that report. That is the mention of population growth. Since 1990 the population of this country has increased by approx 66%. Whilst our stock numbers have actually declined and the nett increase of Carbon emission of Cattle, Sheep and Deer has only increased by 5.8% (MBIE figures).</p> <p>New Zealand's per capita Carbon emissions (2018) are 7.33t/year</p> <p>Multiply this by 2,000,000 extra people and the increase is 14.66mt/year</p> <p>The per capita emission in 1990 was 7.07t/yr which gave a total for 3 million people of 21mt/yr (<a href="https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC?locations=NZ">https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC?locations=NZ</a>)</p> <p>The total for 5 million people is 36mt/yr, ( NZ's total output is 78.9mt/yr)</p> <p>The increase is a staggering 71.43%</p> <p>Rezoning for residential will only add to the total</p>	Reject	Land use planning such as the consolidated urban form promoted through Chapter 6 can support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. This objective must also be balanced with other functions and requirements placed on regional councils, including Section 30 (ba) to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in relation to housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the region.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					population and is contra to the climate emergency declaration.		
7 MapA	PCCH6-10.1	GW Wilfield Ltd	Oppose in part	<p>Amend Map A to incorporate the land indicated in the Outline Development Plan attached to the original submission, and including Rural Section 10802, Lot 707 Deposited Plan 508829, Lot 709 Deposited Plan 531293, Lot 163 Deposited Plan 508829 and Lot 708 Deposited Plan 531293</p> <p>and,</p> <p>Such further or other consequential relief, to the identified provisions or to other provisions under the Proposal as may be necessary to give full effect to the relief sought in this submission.</p>	Map A does not provide for future growth areas around West Melton, where the availability of vacant allotments for new residential builds is now extremely limited. Proposed Plan Change 67 to the Selwyn District Plan provides for new growth areas adjoining the existing township but this is not reflected in Map A.	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. West Melton has not been identified as a key growth area in strategic planning documents and currently has certain infrastructure constraints. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional housing land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-7.1	Hawke, D	Oppose in part	Amend Policy 6.3.12 by inserting a phrase	Policy 6.3.12 does not presently meet the expectations of [clause 16 of section] 6.4	Reject	Land use planning such as the consolidated urban form promoted through Chapter 6

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				that requires no net change in total private vehicle use across each of the towns where the Future Development Areas are identified.	<p>[anticipated environmental results], which states "Transport infrastructure appropriately manages network congestion, dependency of private vehicles is reduced, emissions and energy use from vehicles is reduced, and transport safety is enhanced."</p> <p>Focusing on the changes affecting Rolleston, the new greenfield areas are even further from the town centre than existing developments, and there is no formal provision for either active transport (eg separated cycleways) or public transport. Consequently, dependency on private vehicles will be increased (not reduced), vehicles emissions &amp; energy use from vehicles will increase, and safety of those biking or walking will suffer.</p> <p>[Granting the decision requested] will incentivise councils and developers to come up with innovative approaches that meet the expectations of [anticipated environmental results] 6.4.16. Without the amendment to [Policy] 6.3.12 the amendments to "Our Space 2018-48" will not meet the requirements of Objective 8a of the NPS on Urban Development 2020.</p>		can support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. This objective must also be balanced with other functions and requirements placed on regional councils, including Section 30 (ba) to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in relation to housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the region. It is not, in our view, practicable or appropriate to require no net change in private vehicle use.
7 MapA	PCCH6-7.2	Hawke, D	Support	Retain the Christchurch City boundary in Map A as notified.	Christchurch city has spread through Halswell in a way that increases both traffic density and reliance on private motor vehicles, and makes walking and biking unpleasant and dangerous. The pace of development post 2011 has also diminished community connectedness, and placed the load for managing this squarely on voluntary community organisations.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-48.3	Herrick, M	Support	Require that more land around Rolleston be earmarked for future residential development.	Rolleston is a desirable place to work, live and play. It has great shops, schools, parks, infrastructure and facilities. The land prices are also more affordable than Christchurch City. There is currently little to no residential land available to build on in Rolleston. Rolleston has good public transport, which will only	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					get better as there are proposals for buses to run more frequently and a business case around mass rapid transit (light rail) is due to be released later this year. Once the Hughes Developments (1,000 homes), Gould Group (660 homes), Carter Group (2,100 homes) subdivisions are complete there will be very little future residential development land left around Rolleston.		future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Any further changes necessary to respond to the demand will be guided by subsequent capacity assessment under 6.3.12(1) and can inform future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-48.1	Herrick, M	Oppose in part	Require more greenfield areas around Rolleston to be added to Map A.	Rolleston requires more residential greenfield development areas in Map A. In February 2021 there was little to no land available in Rolleston for new residential builds. The orange coloured areas [Future Development Areas] in Map A around Rolleston will likely be developed and sold within the next five years or so, which will mean that there will be no residential greenfield areas left to develop around Rolleston. Further residential greenfield development areas around Rolleston should be identified now.	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-48.4	Herrick, M	Oppose in part	Amend clause 1 of Policy 6.3.12 to allow Selwyn District Council to be able to identify future development areas [not the GCP].	<p>The Christchurch City Council is a partner in the Greater Christchurch Partnership, yet made a submission in November 2020 opposing a proposed residential land subdivision and development in Rolleston. If this proposed subdivision was declined, residential land prices in Christchurch and Selwyn would increase, which would worsen the housing affordability crisis. The land had been earmarked for future development back in the 2009 Rolleston Structure Plan.</p> <p>If the Christchurch City Council (CCC) is found to be unreasonably opposing future developments in the Selwyn District, especially when those developments have been planned for more than 10 years, then perhaps the Greater Christchurch Partnership (of which CCC is a member) should not be in charge of deciding if more development areas and the rezoning of additional land are required in the Selwyn District. The Selwyn District Council should be able to decide this for itself.</p>	Reject	The NPS-UD identifies Canterbury Regional Council as well as Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council Waimakariri District Council as Tier 1 local authorities comprising the Christchurch urban area. NPS-UD, Subpart 5, section 3.19(3) states "If more than one tier 1 or tier 2 local authority has jurisdiction over a tier 1 or tier 2 urban environment, those local authorities are jointly responsible for preparing an HBA [Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment] as required by this subpart". This clearly conveys that monitoring is a collaborative endeavour and so this submission point is not supported.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
7 MapA	PCCH6-48.2	Herrick, M	Oppose in part	Amend Map A to identify and add further residential greenfield development areas around Rolleston.	<p>For Rolleston, Map A is very similar to the 2009 Rolleston Structure Plan. With the rapid development and expansion of Rolleston over the last 12 years, Map A and the Rolleston Structure Plan should be updated to allow for more growth in the future, otherwise Rolleston could run out of residential greenfield land in the next five years or so.</p> <p>Rolleston requires more residential greenfield development areas in Map A. In February 2021 there was little to no land available in Rolleston for new residential builds. The orange coloured areas in Map A around Rolleston will likely be developed and sold within the next five years or so, which will mean that there will be no residential greenfield areas left to develop around Rolleston. Further residential greenfield development areas around Rolleston should be identified now.</p>	Reject	<p>The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes.</p> <p>Identification of the additional housing land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. Any further changes necessary to respond to demand will be guided by subsequent capacity assessment under clause 6.3.12(1) and the land identified by the submitter could be considered as part of future strategic</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
1.2 General	PCCH6-3.1	Hess, A	Oppose in part	No specific decision requested	<p>Future urbanisation needs to consider the possibility that we will not have affordable personal transportation to increasingly disparate suburbs. In order to create truly resilient cities, this rezoning should be for medium-density residential apartments, rather than sprawling single dwellings and land parcels.</p> <p>If this is not possible, then please consider incorporating bike lanes that are separated from traffic by a kerb to allow residents to choose not to contribute to climate change by using an alternative transportation method other than their car.</p>	Reject	Policy 6.3.12 (2) already requires that development within any FDAs promotes the efficient use of urban land, provides opportunities for higher density living environments, including appropriate mixed use development, and housing choices that meet the needs of people and communities for a range of dwelling types. A minimum density of 12 households per hectare within FDAs has already been agreed to by the Greater Christchurch Partnership councils in adopting Our Space and will be given effect to through subsequent district planning processes. Constraining development however to medium density residential apartments alone is not supported. We note that provision for and design of bike lanes is a district council matter and can be considered as part of further planning processes and associated detailed design work linked to Policy 6.3.3.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-42.4	Hughes Development Limited	Oppose in part	Require the proposed change to give effect to the NPS-UD	The NPS-UD requires the provision of at least sufficient feasible development capacity to meet expected demand over the short, medium and long term. "Sufficient" in that context means "plan-enabled". It is the strong view of the submitter that consistent with the requirements of the NPS-UD, a demonstrated "need" to provide further capacity through the zoning of additional land in the relevant district plans to address that shortfall has already been demonstrated. This approach provides significant scope for the Greater Christchurch Partnership to relitigate the sufficiency or otherwise of development capacity which will inevitably result in:	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- further delays in the rezoning of the FDAs for housing;</li> <li>- intensifying pressure on the housing market in these areas which will in turn result in increased housing prices;</li> <li>- the loss of any efficiencies in the provision of affordable housing gained through interventions such as the Housing Accords and Special Housing Areas Act;</li> <li>- the erosion of any process gains provided by the streamlined plan process.</li> </ul> <p>Such outcomes are unacceptable in the context of the current national housing shortage, and potentially unlawful in terms of the NPS-UD.</p>		Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change. It is noted that the NPS-UD requires development capacity to be plan-enabled for the medium term and identified over the longer term. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Any changes necessary to implement other aspects of the NPS-UD will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
5 Obj 6.2.1a	PCCH6-42.3	Hughes Development Limited	Oppose in part	Opposes the targets for housing capacity as listed in proposed Table 6.1.	Objective 6.2.1a and Table 6.1 are not consistent with this [NPS-UD] intended outcome.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not make amendments to Objective 6.2.1 aside from referencing the new Policy 6.3.12 so this submission point is considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The Proposed Change implements Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change. Any changes necessary to implement other aspects of the NPS-UD will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-42.2	Hughes Development Limited	Oppose in part	Delete clause 1 of proposed Policy 6.3.12.	The NPS-UD requires the provision of at least sufficient feasible development capacity to meet expected demand over the short, medium and long term. Capacity assessments undertaken through the Our Space process identified a shortfall in housing	Reject	Policy 6.3.12 enables additional development capacity to be brought forward through urban zoning of identified Future Development Areas. Clause 6.3.12(1) is an important trigger that would



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					<p>capacity over the medium term in Waimakariri and very marginal medium term capacity for Selwyn. The streamlined planning process has been used because of the urgency of the required response to the shortfall. Clause 1 of Policy 6.3.12 does not respond to the already identified shortfall but simply establishes another process by which a capacity shortfall might be demonstrated. This defeats the purpose of the fast-tracked change.</p> <p>Hughes Development Limited has significant concerns with the references within the proposed policy to the targets in Table 6.1. In particular, the submitter is concerned that the drafting enables these targets to be treated as limits or maximums on available capacity, rather than as the bottom lines or minimums as required under the NPS-UD. Guidance documents for the NPS-UD identify the expectations for Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessments to ensure there is at least a minimum provision of supply, and encouraging supply beyond this minimum bottom line as needed.</p>		<p>initiate such a planning response to a demonstrated medium term development capacity shortfall. As stated in the summary report, and considering the functions of regional councils, we consider a balance is needed between enabling development capacity and ensuring development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Bringing forward development capacity significantly beyond that required to meet housing targets is considered inappropriate and less likely to achieve the wider NPS-UD objective to establish a well-functioning urban environment, nor the overarching purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Nevertheless, in addressing a capacity shortfall a territorial authority could consider the appropriate quantum of development capacity that should be enabled factoring in available evidence at that time including the merits of any additional capacity beyond the identified shortfall. Policy 6.3.12 is also an enduring policy to enable additional development capacity to be brought forward through urban zoning of identified Future Development Areas. The identified FDAs are considered sufficient to cater for anticipated housing demand over the medium to long term. Clause 6.3.12(1) is therefore an important trigger that would apply over time upon completion of three-yearly capacity assessments that would demonstrate any need for such a planning response to address medium term development capacity shortfalls.</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
7 MapA	PCCH6-42.1	Hughes Development Limited	Support in part	Supports Map A as notified.	HDL supports the identification of the proposed FDAs as areas which would support feasible residential development. HDL is concerned that the proposed policy drafting will not enable the timely release of the identified FDAs for housing.	Accept in part	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A. The submitter's view that the proposed policy drafting will not enable the timely release of the identified FDAs for housing is not supported and is also addressed through responses to other submission points. Policy 6.3.12 is an enduring policy to enable additional development capacity to be brought forward through urban zoning of identified Future Development Areas. The identified FDAs are considered sufficient to cater for anticipated housing demand over the medium to long term. Clause 6.3.12(1) is therefore an important trigger that would apply over time upon completion of three-yearly capacity assessments that would demonstrate any need for such a planning response to address medium term development capacity shortfalls.
1.1 General	PCCH6-51.13	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	Supports the intent of the proposed change.	Kāinga Ora supports the intent of the proposed change to enable district councils to zone additional land in the areas identified, if required to meet demand in the medium term. Kāinga Ora has sought amendments to provisions to improve clarity and readability.	Accept in part	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A as notified. The submitter's suggested amendments to provisions to improve clarity and readability are addressed through responses to other submission points.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
2.1 National Direction	PCCH6-51.14	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	Supports proposed change.	Kāinga Ora supports ECan's proposal to introduce Future Development Areas that can be rezoned by district councils if required to meet a shortfall in housing capacity in the medium term, as this potential shortfall has already been identified by Our Space 2018-2048. Kāinga Ora considers the proposed change provides a partial response to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD that requires councils to provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand for housing over the short, medium and long term. Kāinga Ora is therefore supportive of the further amendments and review of the CRPS signalled by ECan to respond to other requirements of the NPS-UD and has an interest in participating in these future changes.	Accept in part	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A. The submitter's suggested amendments to provisions to improve clarity and readability are addressed through responses to other submission points.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-51.10	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	Require that additional Future Development Areas are added in the event that the currently identified areas do not provide sufficient land for development capacity required by the NPS-UD.	Kāinga Ora considers it is currently unclear whether these areas provide enough land to account for the capacity requirements of the NPS-UD.	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. No changes are therefore recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD.
5 Obj 6.2.2	PCCH6-51.1	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain proposed Objective 6.2.2 as notified	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the objective to reflect the inclusion of Future Development Areas in the CRPS as notified.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Objective 6.2.2 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.03	PCCH6-51.2	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain proposed Policy 6.3.3 as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the policy to reflect the inclusion of Future Development Areas in the CRPS as notified.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.3 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.05	PCCH6-51.3	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain proposed Policy 6.3.5 as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the policy to reflect the inclusion of new Policy 6.3.12.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.5 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.09	PCCH6-51.4	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain proposed Policy 6.3.9 as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the policy to reflect the inclusion of Future Development Areas in the CRPS as notified	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendment to

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							Policy 6.3.9 as notified is recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.11	PCCH6-51.12	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	Amend clause 5 of proposed Policy 6.3.11 to also refer to Future Development Areas.	If the policy cross references are retained in clauses 3 to 6 of proposed policy 6.3.12, with regard to the reference to Policy 6.3.11(5) in clause 5 of Policy 6.3.12, it is noted that Policy 6.3.11(5) has not been amended to refer to Future Development Areas. If the policy cross reference is retained, including a reference to Future Development Areas may assist plan users in understanding that this policy also specifically applies to these areas (similar to amendments to Policy 6.3.3).	Accept	<p>The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.11 as notified are recommended to be retained together with some further minor amendments in response to this submission point. Policy 6.3.11 is intended to apply to both the recovery period and the longer term timeframes set out in the NPS-UD. We accept that the additional wording requested by the submitter to clause 5 to reference Future Development Areas is therefore appropriate.</p> <p>We also recommend further consequential amendments to the Explanations and Reasons as follows: "<i>Policy 6.3.11 is intended to ensure enough land is available and in the right locations to facilitate recovery through to 2028 <u>and ensure sufficient development capacity is identified.</u></i></p> <p><i>Anticipating the number of <del>relocated or</del> new households and the business activity to be accommodated, as well as the form that these are likely to take, indicates the land areas required for successful recovery and longer term urban growth.</i></p> <p><i>Policy 6.3.11 also provides that the circumstances for altering the <del>priority areas identified for urban development on Map A provisions of this chapter</del> are: a. There is determined to be insufficient land within the Priority Areas <u>and Future Development Areas to meet anticipated demand over the recovery period;</u>".</i></p>
6 Pol 6.3.11	PCCH6-51.5	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain proposed Policy 6.3.11 as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the policy to include references to the NPS-UD.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.11 as notified are recommended to be retained with some further minor amendments accepted from submission points related to this policy.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-51.6	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	<p>Amend clause 1 of proposed Policy 6.3.12 as follows:</p> <p>It is demonstrated, through monitoring of housing and business development capacity and sufficiency carried out collaboratively by the Greater Christchurch Partnership <u>or the relevant local authority</u>, that there is a need to provide further feasible development capacity through the zoning of additional land in a district plan to address a shortfall in the sufficiency of feasible residential development capacity to meet the minimum term targets set out in Table 6.1, Objective 6.2.1a; and</p>	<p>Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of the new policy and alignment with the direction of the Minister set out in the streamlined planning process notice.</p> <p>Amendments to clause 1 of the policy are sought to provide an allowance for the housing and business capacity study to be undertaken by a local authority (acknowledging that this is typically done as part of the Greater Christchurch Partnership).</p>	Accept in part	We see merit in this amendment as it more clearly identifies the statutory body referred to in the NPS-UD in addition to the Greater Christchurch Partnership. The NPS-UD identifies Canterbury Regional Council as well as Christchurch City Council, Selwyn District Council Waimakariri District Council as Tier 1 local authorities comprising the Christchurch urban area. NPS-UD, Subpart 5, section 3.19(3) states "If more than one tier 1 or tier 2 local authority has jurisdiction over a tier 1 or tier 2 urban environment, those local authorities are jointly responsible for preparing an HBA [Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment] as required by this subpart". This clearly conveys that monitoring is a collaborative endeavour and so it is recommended that 6.3.12(1) is amended to read "the Greater Christchurch Partnership <u>or the relevant local authorities</u> ".
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-51.7	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	Amend clause 2 of proposed Policy 6.3.12 as follows:	Kāinga Ora generally supports the intent of the new policy and alignment with the direction of the Minister set out in the streamlined planning process	Accept in part	We understand the rationale provided by submitter, reasoning that Chapter 6 is to be read as a whole and these objectives

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>2. The development would promote the efficient use of urban land and support the pattern of settlement and principles for future urban growth <del>set out in Objectives 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 and related policies</del> including by:</p> <p>a. Providing opportunities for higher density living environments, including appropriate mixed use development, and housing choices that meet the needs of people and communities for a range of dwelling types; and</p> <p>b. <del>Supporting</del> <u>Enabling</u> the efficient provision and use of network infrastructure; and</p>	<p>notice. Amendments are sought to remove unnecessary cross references to Objectives 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 and related policies, as Chapter 6 is to be read as a whole and these objectives and policies will apply regardless.</p> <p>Amendments are sought to improve clarity of language in sub-clause (b), noting that the use of 'enable' is consistent with the minister's direction.</p>		and policies will apply regardless, but consider the references helpful to assist CRPS users and draw specific attention to key related policies in the CRPS. It also is consistent with the cross-referencing used in the rest of Chapter 6. This matter can however be reconsidered as part of the review of the CRPS. The relief sought to amend the wording in Clause 2(b) from supporting to " <u>Enabling</u> the efficient provision and use of network infrastructure" is accepted as this aligns with wording in the statement of expectations with regard to the Minister's Direction.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-51.8	Kāinga Ora	Oppose	<p>Delete clause 3 of proposed Policy 6.3.12 as follows:</p> <p>6.3.12 Future Development Areas</p> <p>Enable urban</p>	<p>Amendments are sought to remove unnecessary cross references to other objectives and policies in Chapter 6, as Chapter 6 is to be read as a whole and these objectives and policies will apply regardless. It is further noted that the plan change proposes amendments to some of the policies referenced in clauses 3-6, which makes it clear that the policies apply to Future Development Areas.</p>	Reject	We understand the rationale provided by the submitter, reasoning that Chapter 6 is to be read as a whole and these objectives and policies will apply regardless, but consider the references helpful to assist CRPS users and draw specific attention to key related policies in the CRPS. It is also consistent with the cross-referencing used

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				development in the Future Development Areas identified in Map A, in the following circumstances: ... 3. The timing and sequencing of development is appropriately aligned with the provision of infrastructure, in accordance with Objective 6.2.4 and Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5; and...			in the rest of Chapter 6. This matter can however be reconsidered as part of the review of the CRPS.
7 MapA	PCCH6-51.9	Kāinga Ora	Support in part	Amend Map A to include additional Future Development Areas if the proposed Future Development Areas do not provide sufficient land for development capacity as required under the NPS-UD.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to Map A to identify the Future Development Areas. Kāinga Ora considers it is currently unclear whether these areas provide enough land to account for the capacity requirements of the NPS-UD.	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							over 70,000 homes. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. No changes are therefore recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD.
8 Def Development capacity	PCCH6-51.11	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Development capacity" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Development Capacity as notified in the Proposed Change.
8 Def Feasible	PCCH6-51.15	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Feasible" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Feasible as notified in the Proposed Change.
8 Def Future Development Areas	PCCH6-51.16	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Future Development Areas" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							to the definition of Future Development Areas as notified in the Proposed Change.
8 Def Housing and business development capacity assessment	PCCH6-51.17	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Housing and business development capacity assessment" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment as notified in the Proposed Change.
8 Def Long term	PCCH6-51.18	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Long term" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Long Term as notified in the Proposed Change.
8 Def Medium term	PCCH6-51.19	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Medium term" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Medium Term as notified in the Proposed Change.
8 Def Outline Development Plan	PCCH6-51.20	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Outline development plan" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Outline Development Plan as notified in the Proposed Change.
8 Def Rural Residential Activities	PCCH6-51.21	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Rural residential activities" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Rural Residential Activities as notified in the Proposed Change.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
8 Def Sufficient	PCCH6-51.22	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Sufficient" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Sufficient as notified in the Proposed Change.
8 Def Urban activities	PCCH6-51.23	Kāinga Ora	Support	Retain definition of "Urban activities" as notified.	Kāinga Ora supports the amendments to the CRPS definitions to include reference to the NPS-UD and reflect the introduction of Future Development Areas to the CRPS.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Urban Activities as notified in the Proposed Change.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-9.1	Long, A	Oppose in part	<p>Amend clause 6 of Policy 6.3.12 as follows:</p> <p>6.3.12 Future Development Areas</p> <p>Enable urban development in the Future Development Areas identified on Map A, in the following circumstances:</p> <p>...</p> <p>6. The effects of natural hazards are avoided or appropriately mitigated in accordance with the objectives and policies set out in Chapter 11, <u>including by:</u></p>	<p>I note that my key concern is in fact with Policy 6.2.1a and Map A, which provide for a further 30650 households outside Christchurch and the additional vehicle trips per day that will generate.</p> <p>Enabling additional vehicle trips for dormitory towns is contrary to aspects of Part 2 of the RMA and to Policy 25 of the NZCPS. It is out of step with other objectives and policies in the RPS and with objectives and policies in (at least) the Christchurch District Plan and those parts of the Christchurch City Plan which remain in force.</p> <p>It is, in my view, incumbent upon the Regional Council and its partners to be strong with respect to planning to avoid climate change, whereas Policy 6.3.12 can have no other outcome other than increase emissions and exacerbate climate change and sea level rise. It is my view that the partners failed to address environmental concerns prior to insertion of Map A and Policy 6.2.1a and that the proposed 6.3.12 is too enabling given Part 2 and the NZCPS.</p> <p>In order for proposed Policy 6.3.12 to be consistent</p>	Reject	Land use planning such as the consolidated urban form promoted through Chapter 6 can support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. This objective must also be balanced with other functions and requirements placed on regional councils, including Section 30 (ba) to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in relation to housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the region. The clauses proposed by the submitter would arguably be unable to be met by any development and do not therefore appropriately balance the respective functions of the Regional Council nor its responsibilities under the NPS-UD. See Appendix 5 for further assessment of compliance with national direction.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p><u>a. Avoid residential activities that cannot be supported by existing business and/or existing or demonstrable future employment opportunities.</u></p> <p><u>b. Avoiding residential development that contribute to emissions, climate change and sea level rise.</u></p> <p><u>c. Avoiding residential development in areas that result in significant private car dependency, that result in greater travelling distances to employment and education in particular, where there are few opportunities for active or public transport, including to access employment and education, and which would result in greater overall energy consumption.</u></p>	with the RMA, NZCPS, and the RPS as a whole, it must be amended.		
1.1 General	PCCH6-15.6	Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Support	Supports the proposed change in its entirety.	Generally, LPC supports the proposal to change Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (RPS). The proposed Future Development Areas (FDAs) will contribute to the future growth	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					and prosperity of the wider Canterbury region. PC1 is also an opportunity to update urban zoning in the Canterbury region to provide for large developments that are to be completed in the coming years.		outlined in response to other decisions requested.
3.07 Infrastructure	PCCH6-15.4	Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Support in part	Require that sensitive activities are not located in close proximity to strategic infrastructure including the strategic transport network and Lyttelton Port Company's facilities.	It is essential that LPC's facilities are not adversely affected by reverse sensitivity effects. LPC processes cargo through both rail and road freight, day and night. This can create a level of noise and amenity that is incompatible with sensitive activities. The RPS policy framework should ensure that sensitive activities are not located in close proximity to this strategic infrastructure. The risk of adverse reverse sensitivity effects on Midland Port in Rolleston is of particular concern. This facility is recognised as strategic infrastructure and it is vital that its operations are uninterrupted. Rolleston is a growing centre and any future development areas for residential development need to be appropriately located. The proposed FDAs in the south of Rolleston are appropriately located away from LPC's facilities. However LPC would be strongly opposed to any additional FDAs being identified to enable residential development in proximity to Midland Port.	Accept in part	The CRPS has a strong policy framework relating to the protection of strategic infrastructure, including Policy 6.3.5. The Proposed Change does not seek to change this policy aside from a minor consequential amendment so requested changes to Policy 6.3.5 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. A separate submission point is supported in relation to a recommended minor change to Policy 6.3.12 to recognise protection of strategic infrastructure. It is noted that no additional Future Development Areas are proposed in proximity to Midland Port.
3.07 Infrastructure	PCCH6-15.5	Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Support in part	No specific decision requested.	The Lyttelton Port Company attached to their submission, a statement of evidence on Transport, by Courtney Groundwater to the Greater Christchurch Partnership Hearings Panel.	N/A	This additional information is received and noted. Recommendations on the related decisions requested are outlined elsewhere in this summary table.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-15.2	Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Support in part	Amend clause 1 of proposed Policy 6.3.7 as follows:  Subject to Policy 5.3.4, <u>Policy 6.3.5</u> , and Policy 6.3.12, residential greenfield development shall occur in accordance	It is important that transport infrastructure is properly integrated with land use and future development. LPC seeks further amendment to Chapter 6 to provide greater recognition and protection of the strategic transport network. LPC also seeks that recognition of the need to protect strategic infrastructure is properly built into the proposed amendments. This is to ensure that any future development will not give rise to any	Accept	Chapter 6 is to be read as a whole and Policy 6.3.5 will apply regardless. Nevertheless, the effective integration of land use and infrastructure is a critical element to residential greenfield development and so reference to Policy 6.3.5 in clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7 is supported (in addition to the proposed insertion of Policy 6.3.12 as notified). It is noted that Policy 6.3.5 pertains more broadly to

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>with Map A.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Any other similar relief that would deal with LPC's concerns set out in their submission.</p>	constraints or adverse effects on the strategic transport network.		<p>transport and other infrastructure. We therefore recommend that clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7 is amended to read: "Subject to Policy 5.3.4, <u>Policy 6.3.5</u>, and Policy 6.3.12, residential greenfield development shall occur in accordance with Map A."</p>
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-15.3	Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Support in part	<p>Amend clause 3 of proposed Policy 6.3.12 as follows:</p> <p>The timing and sequencing of development is appropriately aligned with the provision <u>and protection of infrastructure, and is appropriately aligned with the provision and protection of the strategic transport network</u>, in accordance with Objective 6.2.4 and Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Retain the references to Policies 6.3.5 and 6.3.4 in clause 3 of Policy 6.3.12.</p> <p>And</p>	<p>LPC considers that further amendment should be made to the provisions proposed in PC1 to recognise the importance of the strategic transport network and to ensure that any future development will not give rise to any constraints or adverse effects on the strategic transport network. Strategic road and rail links are critical to the timely and efficient distribution of freight within Greater Christchurch, as well as to neighbouring regions and the rest of New Zealand. It is essential that the strategic transport network, including key freight routes, is protected. LPC supports the reference to Policy 6.3.5 and Policy 6.3.4 in proposed Policy 6.3.12(3) and seeks that those references are retained.</p>	Accept in part	<p>We foresee circumstances where inappropriate timing and sequencing of development could place unnecessary pressure on existing infrastructure. In that regard, and in support of Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5, insertion of wording to 6.3.12(3) to read "the provision <u>and protection of infrastructure</u>" is supported. Additional wording requested by the submitter referring to the strategic transport network is considered duplicatory and, given the existing references in 6.3.12(3) to both Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5, is not supported. Reference to Policy 6.3.5 in clause (3) of Policy 6.3.12 as notified is recommended to be retained.</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				Any other similar relief that would deal with LPC's concerns set out in their submission.			
7 MapA	PCCH6-15.1	Lyttelton Port Company Limited	Support in part	<p>Amend Map A to include land identified in map attached to the original submission within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and Existing Urban Area. This is current and future reclaimed land at Lyttelton Port.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Any other similar relief that would deal with LPC's concerns set out in their submission.</p>	The reclamation project is ongoing and will result in a significant extension of Port facilities eastwards within the next 10 years, and this should be recognised in regional planning documents. LPC has obtained regional resource consents and land use consent for this reclamation. At present around 10ha of land has already been reclaimed and surveyed, with around 20ha further land to be reclaimed in the next 30 years. This area is not presently shown as 'land' on planning maps such as in the RPS (Map A) and is therefore not zoned. Identifying this new land area on Map A and extending the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and "Existing Urban Area" over this area is an essential first step to updating district planning maps so that this land can be zoned for industrial and port activities. LPC is concerned to ensure that the RPS accurately reflects reality and future land requirements for strategic infrastructure in Lyttelton Port. Therefore, it is appropriate for this to be addressed through the PC1 process.	Reject	Changes to Map A are confined to the identified Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change. Consideration of amendments to the Project Infrastructure Boundary are considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. This matter could however be considered as part of the full review of the CRPS.
1.1 General	PCCH6-29.1	Madeley, D	Support	No specific decision required	Indicates support for the proposed change.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
7.1 AddLand	PCCH6-29.2	Madeley, D	Support in part	Require land on the edge of Kaiapoi, east of Island Road, from William Coup Road to the Northern motorway to be	The submitter recognises the need for urban growth around Kaiapoi as the local population increases. They would like to see development on the western side of Kaiapoi where, unlike on the eastern side, there was little liquefaction following the Christchurch earthquake. The land they would like	Reject	We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional housing land proposed by the submitter is

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				rezoned from rural to residential. The area of land is shown on the map attached to the original submission.	included in the FDA is close to Kaiapoi township and the High School. This would promote active transport options that would not contribute to climate change. The development of Silverstream village shows that productive land in the area has already been developed. The land in question is in small blocks used for hobby farming and is not particularly productive. The land is already serviced with water and sewerage and will soon be a part of the 5G network.		considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
1.2 General	PCCH6-41.1	Marama Te Wai Ltd	Oppose	Oppose Proposed Change 1 in its entirety.	The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as their private plan change request (PPC74 to the Selwyn District Plan) - which give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development (NPS-UD) and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to the land and housing markets.	Reject	We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. Consideration of meritorious proposals, the need for additional land, and any further flexibilities to the planning framework is best addressed through future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-41.2	Marama Te Wai Ltd	Oppose	Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more flexible and responsive urban growth management	The Submitter has an interest in a 50ha site located on the western edge of West Melton. They have lodged a private plan change request and submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan seeking General Residential rezoning.	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>approach, including enabling full consideration of plan changes, including the Submitter's rezoning submission, which are outside the Map A FDAs, priority greenfield, and existing urban areas, but are consistent with the NPS-UD.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.</p>	<p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development (NPS-UD) and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to the land and housing markets.</p>		<p>additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is however currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-13.1	Markham Trust	Oppose	<p>Delete clause 1 of proposed Policy 6.3.12 and insert it as a method as follows:</p> <p>6.3.12 Future Development Areas Enable urban development in the Future Development Areas identified on Map A, in the following circumstances:</p> <p>1. <del>It is demonstrated, through monitoring of housing and business development capacity and sufficiency carried out collaboratively by the Greater Christchurch Partnership, that there is a need to provide further feasible development capacity through the zoning of additional</del></p>	<p>The NPS-UD sets minimum capacity requirements. There is no NPS reason to prevent District Plans from providing more capacity than the minimum required, provided such areas are able to be appropriately serviced and integrated. The Policy 6.3.12(1) trigger that enables development only where monitoring undertaken by the Greater Christchurch partnership (GCP) has identified a need for further development capacity places an unnecessary barrier to the timely delivery of growth in Map A locations that have long been identified as being suitable for urbanisation. Clause (1) is better framed as a method to implement that policy i.e. Councils be required to monitor capacity and if there is a clear shortfall then proactively bring forward urban zoning. The NPS-UD minimum capacity requirements are a direction to Councils to provide at least the minimum necessary, not as a direction to prevent more than the minimum from occurring.</p> <p>Proposed Policy 6.3.12 places an unnecessary barrier to the timely delivery of housing capacity. The block in question has already been identified as being appropriate in principle for urbanisation. A private plan change (PC64) is currently being processed by Selwyn Council to develop this block for housing.</p>	Reject	Policy 6.3.12 enables additional development capacity to be brought forward through urban zoning of identified Future Development Areas. Clause 6.3.12(1) is an important trigger that would initiate such a planning response to a demonstrated medium term development capacity shortfall. As stated in the Recommendations Report, and considering the functions of regional councils, we consider a balance is needed between enabling development capacity and ensuring development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Bringing forward development capacity significantly beyond that required to meet housing targets is considered inappropriate and less likely to achieve the wider NPS-UD objective to establish a well-functioning urban environment, nor the overarching purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. Nevertheless, in addressing a capacity shortfall a territorial authority could consider the appropriate quantum of development capacity that should be enabled factoring in available evidence at that time including the merits

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>land in a district plan to address a shortfall in the sufficiency of feasible residential development capacity to meet the medium term targets set out in Table 6.1, Objective 6.2.1a; and</p> <p>...</p> <p>Methods</p> <p>...</p> <p>Local Authorities:</p> <p>Will</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. It is demonstrated, <u>through monitoring of housing and business development capacity and sufficiency carried out collaboratively by the Greater Christchurch Partnership, that there is a need to provide further feasible development capacity through the zoning of additional land in a district plan to address a shortfall in the sufficiency of feasible residential development capacity to meet the medium term targets set out in Table 6.1, Objective 6.2.1a; and</u></p>			<p>of any additional capacity beyond the identified shortfall. Policy 6.3.12 Method 2 already requires local authorities to undertake regular monitoring of housing and business development capacity and this provides the evidence base to inform an assessment under 6.3.12(1). Clause 6.3.12(1) is an important trigger that would initiate an appropriate planning response in alignment with the rest of Policy 6.3.12. It is therefore not a method itself but the result of the existing Method 2.</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
7 MapA	PCCH6-13.2	Markham Trust	Support in part	Amend Map A to identify the Future Development Areas within Rolleston as Greenfield [Priority Areas].	<p>Support the identification of 545 East Maddisons Road, Rolleston as an area that is suitable in principle for urbanisation. 545 East Maddisons Road, Rolleston has long been identified as being within an 'infrastructure boundary'.</p> <p>There is very limited 'development-ready' capacity within Rolleston, certainly within a medium term / 10 year timeframe. Rolleston has experienced high rates of growth over the past decade. There is currently a waiting time of approximately one year to secure titled, serviced, and development-ready sections. There is a considerable lag period between identifying a capacity need, undergoing a plan change process, undergoing a subdivision consent process, construction tendering, undertaking bulk earthworks and infrastructure delivery and undertaking final survey and titling, before sections can truly be described as being development ready and able to be built on to contribute towards a physical increase in housing capacity. Given the lag in getting land rezoned and serviced in order to ensure necessary capacity is achieved, the Future Development [Area] relevant to 545 East Maddisons Road, Rolleston should be shown as Greenfield [Priority Areas].</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change identifies Future Development Areas on Map A and inserts Policy 6.3.12 to enable territorial authorities to enable additional development capacity to be brought forward through urban zoning to meet any demonstrated medium term capacity shortfalls. This approach is distinct from the identified Greenfield Priority Areas and supporting policies that were part of the initial insertion of Chapter 6 through the Land Use Recovery Plan to support a period of recovery following the earthquakes. Nevertheless, the time lag concerns expressed by the submitter would in part apply equally to GPAs and areas of FDAs needed to meet any identified shortfalls as these would both still require the same territorial authority urban zoning processes to occur to enable development to proceed. As such the submission point is not supported.
7 MapA	PCCH6-13.3	Markham Trust	Oppose	Amend Map A to show existing or consented urban areas on either side of 545 East Maddisons Road, Rolleston as either [Existing Urban Area] (grey shading) or [Greenfield Priority	<p>Map A does not recognise existing urban areas that have already been consented and are in the process of being developed for residential activities under the former Housing Accord and Special Housing Areas legislation. These areas are shown white, as if they are rural land.</p> <p>The land on either side of 545 East Maddisons Road, Rolleston has been consented as Special Housing Areas and are currently under development.</p>	Reject	We understand the view expressed by the submitter that Map A does not show land consented (but not zoned) under Housing Accord and Special Housing Areas legislation or the urban development that has occurred in Greenfield Priority Areas on Map A. This matter can be considered as part of the full review of the CRPS but is not considered within the purpose of the Proposed Change.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				Areas] (green shading).	Showing them as 'rural' in Map A therefore miscommunicates the developing urban form of Rolleston. The majority of the [Greenfield Priority Areas] shown on Map A have likewise been physically developed or have granted subdivision consents in place. Showing what is in reality an existing urban environment as greenfield potential severely overstates the current capacity in Rolleston.		
7 MapA	PCCH6-13.4	Markham Trust	Oppose	Amend Map A to show already developed or consented [Greenfield Priority Areas] as grey/ [Existing Urban Areas].	For Map A to be a genuine representation of development capacity then the already developed or subdivision consented greenfield areas should be shown as grey/ existing urban [areas]. Such a change to the map to accurately reflect the current environment would enable a much more accurate graphic representation of potential development capacity and would illustrate that there is in practice very little 'greenfield' land remaining in Rolleston.	Reject	We understand the view expressed by the submitter that Map A does not show land consented (but not zoned) under Housing Accord and Special Housing Areas legislation or the urban development that has occurred in Greenfield Priority Areas on Map A. This matter can be considered as part of the full review of the CRPS but is not considered within the purpose of the Proposed Change.
7 MapA	PCCH6-12.1	McDonald, Y	Oppose in part	Require no additional development before carbon neutral transport is available.	Climate change will require a reduction in the use of personal motorised vehicles. Allowing additional low density residential development well separated from Christchurch City, without providing for carbon neutral transport or requiring higher density to foster walking or cycling to work, does not support the Governments Climate Emergency statement or follow the recommendations of the Climate Change Commission	Reject	Land use planning such as the consolidated urban form promoted through Chapter 6 can support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. This objective must also be balanced with other functions and requirements placed on regional councils, including Section 30 (ba) to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in relation to housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the region. It is not, in our view, practicable or appropriate to require no net change in private vehicle use, prohibit development ahead of the availability of carbon neutral transport, limit housing development as a means to stall population growth, or avoid development that contributes to emissions.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-5.1	McLachlan, C	Support	Retain insertion of text into the 'Principal reasons and explanations' to Policy 6.3.1 as notified.	It is important urban expansion and development is planned in a coordinated manner, centralising the urban expansion to the identified locations, as this this will 1) allow strengthening of Key Activity Centres, 2) reduce urban sprawl across the plains and associated loss of open space, productive farmland, and rural character, and 3) improve carbon emissions by centralising residential areas and making public transport options more viable, and by reducing travel distances for work, leisure and recreation.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.1 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-5.2	McLachlan, C	Support	Retain clause 1 to Policy 6.3.7 as notified.	It is important the urban expansion and development is planned in a coordinated manner, centralising the urban expansion to the identified locations, as this this will 1) allow strengthening of Key Activity Centres, 2) reduce urban sprawl across the plains and associated loss of open space, productive farmland, and rural character, and 3) improve carbon emissions by centralising residential areas and making public transport options more viable, and by reducing travel distances for work, leisure and recreation.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-5.3	McLachlan, C	Support	Retain insertion of the following text into the 'Principal reasons and explanation' to Policy 6.3.12 as notified:  <i>Principal reasons and explanation</i>  ...  It is essential that development takes	Maintaining quality of life for existing and new residents, safety, equity (for example, access to schools which are not overcrowded) and reduction in carbon emissions are supported by this statement.	Accept	We recommend retaining Policy 6.3.12 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The text cited by the submitter from the principal reasons and explanation section of Policy 6.3.12 as notified is recommended to be retained.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				place in a coordinated way and the staging and timing of future development is managed to ensure transport and other infrastructure planning is integrated with the provision of additional housing. ...			
7 AER	PCCH6-5.4	McLachlan, C	Support	Retain insertion of text into clause 2 of section 6.4 Anticipated Environmental Results	It is important the urban expansion and development is planned in a coordinated manner, centralising the urban expansion to the identified locations, as this this will 1) allow strengthening of Key Activity Centres, 2) reduce urban sprawl across the plains and associated loss of open space, productive farmland, and rural character, and 3) improve carbon emissions by centralising residential areas and making public transport options more viable, and by reducing travel distances for work, leisure and recreation.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The consequential amendment to 6.4 Anticipated Environment Effects is recommended to be retained.
1.1 General	PCCH6-30.2	Michell, S M	Support	No specific decision requested.	Indicates support for the proposed change	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
7.1 AddLand	PCCH6-30.1	Michell, S M	Support in part	Require land on the edge of Kaiapoi, east of Island Road, from William Coup Road to the Northern motorway to be rezoned from rural to residential. The area of land is shown on the map attached to	The submitter recognises the need for urban growth around Kaiapoi as the local population increases. They would like to see development on the western side of Kaiapoi where, unlike on the eastern side, there was little liquefaction following the Christchurch earthquake. The land they would like included in the FDA is close to Kaiapoi township and the High School. This would promote active transport options that would not contribute to climate change. The development of Silverstream village shows that productive land in the area has	Reject	We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				the original submission.	already been developed. The land in question is in small blocks used for hobby farming and is not particularly productive. The land is already serviced with water and sewerage and will soon be a part of the 5G network.		planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
1.1 General	PCCH6-31.2	Morgan, G	Support	No specific decision requested.	Indicates support for the proposed change	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
7.1 AddLand	PCCH6-31.1	Morgan, G	Support in part	Require land on the edge of Kaiapoi, east of Island Road, from William Coup Road to the Northern motorway to be rezoned from rural to residential. The area of land is shown on the map attached to the original submission.	The submitter recognises the need for urban growth around Kaiapoi as the local population increases. They would like to see development on the western side of Kaiapoi where, unlike on the eastern side, there was little liquefaction following the Christchurch earthquake. The land they would like included in the FDA is close to Kaiapoi township and the High School. This would promote active transport options that would not contribute to climate change. The development of Silverstream village shows that productive land in the area has already been developed. The land in question is in small blocks used for hobby farming and is not particularly productive. The land is serviced with water and sewerage and will soon be a part of the 5G network.	Reject	We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.03	PCCH6-18.2	New Zealand Defence Force	Support	Retain proposed Policy 6.3.3 as notified.	Requiring development in a future development area to occur in accordance with an outline development plan is appropriate to achieve coordinated and considered development.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.3 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.05	PCCH6-18.3	New Zealand Defence Force	Support	Retain proposed Policy 6.3.5 as notified	The inclusion of the future development areas into this policy is appropriate. NZDF supports the retention of subpoint 5(e) which requires rural residential development to not compromise the operational capacity of the Burnham Military Camp and the West Melton Military Training Area, and	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.5 as notified are recommended to be retained.



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					requests that its other facilities are also included to ensure operational capacity is not compromised by inappropriate development.		
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-18.4	New Zealand Defence Force	Support	Retain proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 as notified	Including a policy directing residential greenfield development to occur within the areas identified on Map A – Greenfield Priority Areas is appropriate.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.09	PCCH6-18.5	New Zealand Defence Force	Support in part	Amend clause 5(e) of proposed Policy 6.3.9 as follows:  e. not compromise the operational capacity of the Burnham Military Camp, West Melton Military Training Area, <u>RNZAF Weedons Depot and Communications Site, Glentunnel Ammunitions Storage Depot</u> or Rangiora Airfield.	The inclusion of the future development areas into this policy is appropriate. NZDF supports the retention of subpoint 5.e. which requires rural residential development to not compromise the operational capacity of the Burnham Military Camp and the West Melton Military Training Area, and requests that its other facilities are also included to ensure operational capacity is not compromised by inappropriate development.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy aside from a minor consequential amendment so requested changes to Policy 6.3.9 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. This matter can however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-18.6	New Zealand Defence Force	Support	Retain proposed Policy 6.3.12 as notified	This policy will avoid premature development prior to there being an adequate demand. It will also facilitate coordinated development which considers the required supporting infrastructure.	Accept	We recommend retaining Policy 6.3.12 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The intent of Policy 6.3.12 is unaltered and is recommended to be retained with only minor additional text for clarification and alignment with other relevant policies in Chapter 6.
7 MapA	PCCH6-18.1	New Zealand Defence Force	Support	Retain Map A as notified.	There are no NZDF sites in the vicinity of Rangiora or Kaiapoi that will be impacted by the future development areas. Weedons Depot and	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					Communications Site and Burnham Military Camp are located near Rolleston. Residential growth in the Rolleston future development area is unlikely to affect NZDF's operations or result in reverse sensitivity effects to the operation of Burnham Military Camp or the Weedons Depot and Communications Site.		requested. No changes are recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A.
8 Def Future Development Areas	PCCH6-18.7	New Zealand Defence Force	Support	Retain definition as notified	NZDF supports the mapped areas as shown on the amended Map A – Greenfield Priority Areas.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the definition of Future Development Areas as notified in the Proposed Change, nor the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A.
3.07 Infrastructure	PCCH6-14.4	Orion New Zealand Limited	Support in part	No specific decision requested.	<p>Orion, for the most part, supports the proposal to change the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (RPS). Orion's primary concern is ensuring that there will be effective integration and protection of infrastructure in the proposed Future Development Areas (FDAs). Orion will play a central role in developing and integrating the necessary electricity distribution network in these areas.</p> <p>Orion supports the inclusion of provisions in PC1 that provide for the need to integrate any development in the FDAs with the availability of infrastructure and the planning for delivery of infrastructure. It is important that PC1 and the RPS generally ensure that any new development is integrated with existing infrastructure (particularly critical and strategic infrastructure, such as the electricity distribution network) in an effective manner. Coordination and forward planning will be crucial in this endeavour.</p> <p>Alongside provisions for integration of development</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The submitter's primary concern is with regard to the integration and protection of strategic infrastructure and these are addressed through the existing policies within the CRPS, the amendments that are part of the Proposed Change and the minor amendments recommended in response to submission points, including from Orion NZ.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					and infrastructure, it is also important to ensure continued policy direction for the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on strategic infrastructure.		
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-14.1	Orion New Zealand Limited	Support in part	<p>Amend clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7 as follows:</p> <p>6.3.7 Residential location, yield and intensification</p> <p>In relation to residential development opportunities in Greater Christchurch:</p> <p>1. Subject to Policy 5.3.4 and <u>Policy 6.3.5</u> and Policy 6.3.12, residential greenfield development shall occur in accordance with Map A. ...</p> <p>...</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Any other similar relief</p>	<p>Orion's primary concern is ensuring that there will be effective integration and protection of infrastructure in the proposed Future Development Areas (FDAs).</p> <p>Policy 6.3.5 is an important policy in the RPS. That policy recognises that infrastructure should not be compromised by urban growth and intensification, and provides direction for the integration of land use and infrastructure. The proposed changes in PC1 must not displace the current policy direction that development is appropriately integrated with infrastructure.</p>	Accept	<p>Chapter 6 is to be read as a whole and Policy 6.3.5 will apply regardless. Nevertheless, the effective integration of land use and infrastructure is a critical element to residential greenfield development and so reference to Policy 6.3.5 in clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7 is supported (in addition to the proposed insertion of Policy 6.3.12 as notified). It is noted that Policy 6.3.5 pertains to transport and other infrastructure.</p> <p>We therefore recommend that clause 1 of Policy 6.3.7 is amended to read: "Subject to Policy 5.3.4, <u>Policy 6.3.5</u>, and Policy 6.3.12, residential greenfield development shall occur in accordance with Map A."</p>
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-14.2	Orion New Zealand Limited	Support in part	<p>Amend clause 3 of Policy 6.3.12 as follows:</p> <p>6.3.12 Future Development Areas</p>	<p>Orion's primary concern is ensuring that there will be effective integration and protection of infrastructure in the proposed Future Development Areas (FDAs).</p> <p>The supply of electricity is critical to the Canterbury region. Both businesses and the larger community</p>	Accept	We foresee circumstances where inappropriate timing and sequencing of development could place unnecessary pressure on existing infrastructure. In that regard, and in support of Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5, insertion of wording to 6.3.12(3) to

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>Enable urban development in the Future Development Areas identified on Map A, in the following circumstances:</p> <p>...</p> <p>3. The timing and sequencing of development is appropriately aligned with the provision <u>and protection of</u> infrastructure, in accordance with Objective 6.2.4 and Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5; and</p> <p>...</p> <p>OR</p> <p>any other similar relief</p>	<p>rely on the availability of electricity to function. It is of the utmost importance to provide for the protection of strategic infrastructure such as the electricity distribution network in the RPS.</p> <p>Orion [submits] that Policy 6.3.12 make reference to protection of infrastructure, as well as integration. New development should be enabled in a way that protects infrastructure from adverse effects.</p>		read “the provision <u>and protection</u> of infrastructure” is supported.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-14.3	Orion New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain the reference in clause 3 of Policy 6.3.12 to Policy 6.3.5	Policy 6.3.5 is an important policy in the RPS. That policy recognises that infrastructure should not be compromised by urban growth and intensification, and provides direction for the integration of land use and infrastructure. The proposed changes in PC1 must not displace the current policy direction that development is appropriately integrated with infrastructure.	Accept	We recommend retaining Policy 6.3.12 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. Reference to Policy 6.3.5 in clause (3) of Policy 6.3.12 as notified is recommended to be retained.
7 MapA	PCCH6-53.1	PCCH6-53	Support in part	Amend the boundaries for the housing development in the Rolleston area	Good rural farm land is currently being developed in the Selwyn District into housing. This should stop. We need land for food production and with our increasing population, the need for food will	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				to retain the current proposed area but also include the area bounded by Dunns Crossing Road, Brookside Road, and Ellesmere Junction Road.	proportionately increase. Once housing is established on good rural land, that can't be reverted. Land in Rolleston that is of poor soils should be used for housing only. Your current south-western boundary should be extended to include the triangled area from Dunns Crossing Road, Brookside Road, Ellesmere Junction Road. The land there is Lismore Loam, stony and with very little top soil. It takes a massive amount of irrigated water to farm. This would accommodate hundreds of houses. There is already a reticulated water supply down Edwards Rd/Brookside Rd/Ellesmere Junction Road.		of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of additional housing land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that the area identified by the submitter is significant (approximately 745ha) and is best considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-35.1	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Oppose Proposed Change 1 in its entirety.	Change 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, as follows, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form: The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD. The existing supply of business land (Map A priority greenfield business areas and existing urban areas) is treated as sufficient to meet demand for business land, even though Our Space accepted that there were inadequacies with the business capacity assessment; and other evidence (attached to submission) further identifies the inadequacies of the existing supply. A 'fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary' is contrary to the NPS-UD 'responsive planning approach'. There is no ability for land outside the FDAs to be considered, even though the NPS-UD is clear that a fixed 'immoveable' urban/rural boundary is contrary to the NPS-UD. The NPS-UD seeks to achieve well functioning	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. We also recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					environments and growth in locations close to employment, that are well serviced with public transport (existing or planned) and where there is high demand for housing and business land relative to other areas. The proposed FDAs in comparison to alternative locations have not been assessed against these criteria – the s32 assessment is silent on such assessment. The NPS-UD requires a consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative spatial scenarios for the achieving the NPS-UD (s 3.14 (b)). Change 1 has not undertaken any such work, simply relying on the planning and infrastructure work undertaken when the PIB was first introduced 13 years ago.		direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non-contestable rural/urban boundary. We also consider that the responsibilities under section 32 have been discharged with an assessment that has an appropriate level of detail. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Any changes necessary to implement other aspects of the NPS-UD will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-35.9	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more flexible and responsive urban growth management approach, including enabling consideration of plan changes which are outside the Map A FDAs, priority greenfield and existing urban areas, but are consistent with the NPS-UD (including but not limited to amendments to Policy 6.3.11 Monitoring and Review).	The Submitters own the vast majority (77ha) of a 98ha block of rural land north of Rolleston township which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD. The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							<p>that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment.</p> <p>The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is however currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. We also recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non contestable rural/urban boundary.</p>
5 Obj 6.2.1	PCCH6-35.4	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Delete clause 3 of Objective 6.2.1 as follows:</p> <p>Recovery, rebuilding and development are</p>	A fixed uncontestable urban/rural boundary as shown on Map A and associated RPS objective and policies does not give effect to the NPS-UD which requires a responsive planning approach (Objective 6c) and Policy 8). The Ministry for Environment Responsive Planning Guidance specifically states: <i>a</i>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not make amendments to Objective 6.2.1 aside from referencing the new Policy 6.3.12 so this submission point is considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that:</p> <p>...</p> <p><del>3. avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas unless expressly provided for in the CRPS;</del></p>	<p><i>hard rural urban boundary without the ability to consider change or movement of that boundary would not meet the requirements of the responsive planning policy.</i></p>		<p>information. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. We recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non contestable rural/urban boundary. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.</p>
5 Obj 6.2.6	PCCH6-35.15	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend the principal reasons and explanation for [Objective 6.2.6 - incorrectly referenced in the submission as 6.3.6] as follows:</p> <p>Principal reasons and explanation ...While there is some capacity for the demand for further industrial business land to be met through the redevelopment of</p>	<p>The Submitters own the vast majority (77ha) of a 98ha block of rural land north of Rolleston township which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD. The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban</p>	Reject	<p>The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Objective aside from referencing the new Policy 6.3.12 so requested changes to Objective 6.2.6 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.</p>



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>existing zoned land, particularly [with]in Christchurch City, the greenfield priority areas for business <u>and Future Development Areas – Business</u> provide for the accommodation of new, primarily industrial business activities.</p> <p>[Text in square brackets indicates existing wording in the CRPS not explicitly shown as a change by way of strikethrough or underlining in the submission.]</p>	environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].		
5 Obj 6.2.6	PCCH6-35.5	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend clause 1 of [Objective 6.2.6 - incorrectly referenced in the submission as 6.3.6] as follows:</p> <p>1. The greenfield priority areas for business <u>and Future Development Areas – Business</u> in Christchurch [City] provide primarily for the accommodation of new business [industrial] activities;</p>	<p>The Submitters own the vast majority (77ha) of a 98ha block of rural land north of Rolleston township which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Objective aside from referencing the new Policy 6.3.12 so requested changes to Objective 6.2.6 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				[Text in square brackets indicates existing wording in the CRPS not explicitly shown as a change by way of strikethrough or underlining in the submission.]	environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].		
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-35.6	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend clause 3 [incorrectly referenced in the submission as clause 4] of Policy 6.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:...</p> <p>4. Enable development of existing urban areas and greenfield priority areas and <u>Future Development Areas</u>, including intensification in appropriate locations; <del>where is [sic] supports the recovery of Greater Christchurch.</del></p>	<p>The Submitters own the vast majority (77ha) of a 98ha block of rural land north of Rolleston township which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>	Reject	The inclusion of reference to Future Development Areas in Policy 6.3.1(3) would create a potential inconsistency with Policy 6.3.12 as Policy 6.3.1 is specifically focused on the recovery period through to 2028, whereas the purpose of identifying Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change is to ensure sufficient development capacity over the medium to long term (i.e. through to 2048).
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-35.17	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Amend clause 4 [incorrectly referenced in the submission as clause 5] of Policy 6.3.1 as	<p>The Submitters own the vast majority (77ha) of a 98ha block of rural land north of Rolleston township which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch</p>	Reject	The inclusion of reference to Future Development Areas in Policy 6.3.1(4) would create a potential inconsistency with Policy 6.3.12 as Policy 6.3.1 is specifically focused on the recovery period through to

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>follows:</p> <p>In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:...</p> <p>5. Ensure new urban activities only occur within existing urban areas, <del>or</del> identified greenfield priority areas <u>and / or Future Development Areas</u> as shown on Map A, unless they are otherwise expressly provided for in the CRPS;</p>	<p>context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>		2028, whereas the purpose of identifying Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change is to ensure sufficient development capacity over the medium to long term (i.e. through to 2048). An amendment to Policy 6.3.1(4) is not required as it contains the caveat "unless they are otherwise expressly provided for in the CRPS" which would apply to Policy 6.3.12.
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-35.18	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend Principal reasons and explanation as follows:</p> <p><u>...New residential and business development is provided for within Future Development Areas where the circumstances set out in Policy 6.3.12 are met.</u></p>	<p>The Submitters own the vast majority (77ha) of a 98ha block of rural land north of Rolleston township which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>	Reject	<p>The Proposed Change does not address business land matters and no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change. Additional wording to include reference to business development being part of Policy 6.3.12 is therefore not appropriate. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
6 Pol 6.3.06	PCCH6-35.16	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend clause 5 [incorrectly referenced in the submission as clause 6] of Policy 6.3.6 as follows:</p> <p>To ensure that provision, recovery and rebuilding of business land in Greater Christchurch maximises business retention, attracts investment, and provides for healthy working environments, business activities are to be provided for in a manner which:</p> <p>...</p> <p>6. Recognises that new greenfield priority areas <u>and Future Development Areas</u> for business in Christchurch City are primarily [for] industrial activities, and that commercial use in these areas is restricted;...</p>	<p>The Submitters own the vast majority (77ha) of a 98ha block of rural land north of Rolleston township which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy so requested changes to Policy 6.3.6 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change therefore the requested wording change is not appropriate. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.06	PCCH6-35.7	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend clause 1 of Policy 6.3.6 as follows:</p> <p>To ensure that</p>	<p>The Submitters own the vast majority (77ha) of a 98ha block of rural land north of Rolleston township which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy so requested changes to Policy 6.3.6 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>provision, recovery and rebuilding of business land in Greater Christchurch maximises business retention, attracts investment, and provides for healthy working environments, business activities are to be provided for in a manner which:</p> <p>1. Promotes the utilisation and redevelopment of existing business land, and provides <u>at least</u> sufficient additional greenfield priority area <u>and Future Development Area – Business</u> for business land through to 2028 as provided for in Map A;</p>	<p>context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>		<p>information. It is noted that no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change therefore the requested wording change is not appropriate. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.</p>
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-35.8	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Amend Policy 6.3.12 as follows:</p> <p>Enable urban development in the Future Development Areas identified on Map A, in the following circumstances:</p> <p>1. <u>Future Development Areas –</u></p>	<p>The Submitters own the vast majority (77ha) of a 98ha block of rural land north of Rolleston township which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context, because Selwyn and Waimakariri District Plans are under review now / to be notified in March 2021, and changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable these reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of</p>	Reject	<p>The suggested amendment relates to the inclusion of Future Development Areas for Business. No Business FDAs are identified by the Proposed Change therefore the requested change is not considered necessary. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<u>Residential</u> – It is demonstrated through monitoring of housing <del>and</del> <del>business</del> development capacity and sufficiency carried out collaboratively by the Greater Christchurch Partnership, ....	fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].		
7 MapA	PCCH6-35.10	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	No specific decision requested	Submitter attached a copy of their submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan, which requests the rezoning of land to industrial.	N/A	This additional information is received and noted. Recommendations on the related decisions requested are outlined elsewhere in this summary table.
7 MapA	PCCH6-35.2	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Amend Map A by adding the land outlined in Figure 1 of the submission in purple as a Future Development Area - Business.	<p>The proposed Rolleston FDA – Business is ideally located adjacent to the fast growing Rolleston industrial and residential ‘hub’ to meet ongoing present and future business needs in this location, including the shortage of freight related industrial land identified in submissions on Our Space.</p> <p>It is ideally suited for industrial development, including freight related development given: The proximity and ready access to Rolleston township (i.e. a large and growing employment base to draw from) and regional transport routes (road and rail);The land quality is poor (Lismore stoney silts which are very difficult to irrigate). Give its dryland status, it does not have any realistic high level productive potential. Limits on nitrate fertilizer use under Environment Canterbury rules severely limit any scope for further intensification of rural production. In contrast, the as yet unzoned land (for business) but within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary at North Rolleston, is almost entirely on Class 2 land – and its development for urban purposes conflicts with the Proposed NPS-Highly</p>	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change, including the finding that there is currently sufficient business development capacity to meet demand. The Proposed Change does not therefore cover business land matters and no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change. Identification of the business land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. Any identification of business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					Productive Land; The Site can be efficiently serviced given its location adjoining the existing Rolleston township; Reverse sensitivity effects will not arise with industrial development given the nature of surrounding land uses (industrial, rural and Rolleston Prison on the west side of Walkers Road).		
7 MapA	PCCH6-35.3	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Amend Map A Legend by identifying the orange Future Development Areas as Future Development Areas – Residential, and adding to the legend Future Development Areas – Business with a different colour (suggest purple).	Since 2019, Rolleston has continued to grow at a pace. Further business land, including in different ownership in order to support more competition in the market, is required at Rolleston. If Rolleston is to continue to become more sustainable and self sufficient, in accordance with Policy 6.2.2.5 of the RPS, then more appropriately located business is required to support local employment opportunities.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not cover business land matters and so this topic, the additional business land proposed by the submitter and the changes sought to the legend on Map A by this submission point are considered to be out of scope. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
9.1 Section32	PCCH6-35.11	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	The Change 1 s32 assessment does not assess the identified options against the NPS-UD objectives and policies, even though its purpose is to give effect to NPS-UD directions. It is inadequate and incomplete. For all of the above reasons, Proposed Change 1 is contrary to the RMA, including Part 2 and s32 and does not constitute sound resource management practice.	Reject	The purpose of the Proposed Change is to give effect to Policy 2 and clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD and enable sufficient land to be rezoned for the medium term (10 years) and identified for the long term (30 years) by identifying and enabling additional development capacity within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary shown on Map A and also to provide flexibility for Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to consider rezoning such land to meet medium term housing demands where a sufficiency shortfall is identified. The objectives and policies of the NPS-UD are addressed in the section 32 report. We consider that the responsibilities under section 32 have been discharged with an assessment that has an appropriate level of detail. This is outlined in the summary report, including Appendix 5 which also

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							sets out alignment with the RMA and national direction.
9.2 Consequential	PCCH6-35.12	Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.		Reject	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
1.1 General	PCCH6-22.1	Sanders, E & A	Support	Supports the proposed change in its entirety	We support the proposed changes to create Future Development Areas on the west of Rangiora (Map A). We consider these changes will enable the Waimakariri Council to provide suitable land for urban development in an efficient and sustainable way.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-39.2	Singh, M	Oppose	Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more flexible and responsive urban growth management approach, including enabling full consideration of plan changes, including theirs, which are outside the Map A FDAs, priority greenfield and existing urban areas, but are consistent with the National Policy Statement – Urban Development or its predecessor the	<p>The Submitters are part of a landowners group which jointly own a 17ha site at South Lincoln, within the future growth overlay of the Proposed Selwyn District Plan (but identified for rural residential development). They have lodged a submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan seeking Residential General rezoning [attached to original submission].</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs [submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan regarding the rezoning of their site at South Lincoln within the future growth overlay] - which give effect to the National Policy Statement Urban Development (NPS-UD) and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing</p>	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>National Policy Statement – Urban Development Capacity.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.</p>	types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to the land and housing markets.		<p>the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment.</p> <p>The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is however currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.</p>
3.04 Housing Demand,	PCCH6-39.3	Singh, M	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	Submitter attached their submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan.	N/A	This additional information is received and noted. Recommendations on the related

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
Sufficiency and Flexibility							decisions requested are outlined elsewhere in this summary table.
1.1 General	PCCH6-32.2	Skerten, G W	Support	No specific decision requested.	Indicates support for the proposed change	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
7.1 AddLand	PCCH6-32.1	Skerten, G W	Support in part	Require land on the edge of Kaiapoi, east of Island Road, from William Coup Road to the Northern motorway to be rezoned from rural to residential. The area of land is shown on the map attached to the original submission..	The submitter recognises the need for urban growth around Kaiapoi as the local population increases. They would like to see development on the western side of Kaiapoi where, unlike on the eastern side, there was little liquefaction following the Christchurch earthquake. The land they would like included in the FDA is close to Kaiapoi township and the High School. This would promote active transport options that would not contribute to climate change. The development of Silverstream village shows that productive land in the area has already been developed. The land in question is in small blocks used for hobby farming and is not particularly productive. The land is already serviced with water and sewerage and will soon be a part of the 5G network.	Reject	We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Identification of the additional land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
1.2 General	PCCH6-55.1	Smith A, Boyd D, Blanchard J	Oppose in part	Oppose Proposed Change 1 to the extent that amendments are necessary to give effect to the intent of, and the relief sought by, the submission.	The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as their submission on the proposed Selwyn District Plan regarding the rezoning of their site at South West Rolleston (Dunns Crossing Road / Selwyn Road corner) seeking General Residential zoning - which give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development (NPS-UD) and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to the land and housing markets.	Reject	Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. Consideration of meritorious proposals, the need for additional land, and any further flexibilities to the planning framework is best addressed through future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-55.2	Smith A, Boyd D, Blanchard J	Oppose in part	<p>Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more flexible and responsive urban growth management approach, including enabling full consideration of plan changes, including the Submitter's rezoning submission, which are outside the Map A FDAs, priority greenfield, and existing urban areas, but are consistent with the NPS-UD.</p> <p>And</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.</p>	The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as their submission on the proposed Selwyn District Plan regarding the rezoning of their site at South West Rolleston (Dunns Crossing Road / Selwyn Road corner) seeking General Residential zoning - which give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development (NPS-UD) and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to the land and housing markets.	Reject	<p>The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change.</p> <p>Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
7 MapA	PCCH6-55.3	Smith A, Boyd D, Blanchard J	Oppose in part	If Proposed Change 1 is retained in its current form, amend Map A by including the submitter's 48.64 ha site at South West Rolleston, Dunns Crossing Road / Selwyn Road corner, (shown in 'Submission on Proposed Selwyn District Plan - Appendix A to the submission) as a Future Development Area on Map A.	The submitters have lodged a submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan seeking General Residential rezoning.	Reject	Identification of the additional housing land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitters could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-40.2	Stewart L & M, Townsend L & C, Fraser R & D	Oppose	Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more flexible and responsive urban growth management approach, including enabling full consideration of plan changes, including the Submitter's rezoning submission [on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan], which are outside the Map A FDAs, priority greenfield and existing urban areas, but are consistent with the NPS-UD.	<p>The Submitters are a landowner group which owns land at north west Lincoln, adjoining the current Lincoln urban boundary. The Submitters have lodged a submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan seeking General Residential rezoning, or in the alternative Large Lot Residential, General Industrial or an appropriate zoning 'mix' [attached to original submission].</p> <p>The submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development (NPS-UD) and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to the land and housing markets.</p>	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>And</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.</p>			<p>the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment.</p> <p>The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is however currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.</p>
3.04 Housing Demand,	PCCH6-40.3	Stewart L & M, Townsend L & C, Fraser R & D	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	The submitter attached their submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan, which requests their site (identified within the submission) be rezoned as	Accept	The submission point is supported in so far as this additional information is received and noted. Recommendations on the

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
Sufficiency and Flexibility					General Residential, or alternatively as Large Lot Residential.		related decisions requested are outlined elsewhere in this summary table.
1.1 General	PCCH6-38.1	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Retain the proposed amendments to objectives, policies and map A.	We support proposed Plan Change 1 as the best means to achieve the efficient and sustainable development of future urban land in and around Rangiora as part of a sensible, planned approach by the partner councils to release sufficient land to meet the needs of urban development in the medium to longer term. We support an integrated approach that allows councils to plan land use and associated infrastructure with a high standard of urban design, variety in yield, and sufficient green space.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-38.3	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports proposed Policy 6.3.1 as notified	We support proposed Plan Change 1 as the best means to achieve the efficient and sustainable development of future urban land in and around Rangiora as part of a sensible, planned approach by the partner councils to release sufficient land to meet the needs of urban development in the medium to longer term. We support an integrated approach that allows councils to plan land use and associated infrastructure with a high standard of urban design, variety in yield, and sufficient green space.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.1 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.02	PCCH6-38.6	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports proposed Policy 6.3.2 as notified	We support the development of sufficiently large areas of urban land so the District Council is enabled to facilitate high quality developments with a high level of urban design and amenity, including areas of intensification, green space and community facilities.	Accept	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy so requested changes to Policy 6.3.2 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted however that the submitter is in support of the existing policy provision and this is supported.
6 Pol 6.3.03	PCCH6-38.7	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports proposed Policy 6.3.3 as notified	We agree it is important that this development takes place guided by structure plans and outline development plans that the affected communities have had a chance to help develop.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							Policy 6.3.3 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.04	PCCH6-38.10	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports proposed Policy 6.3.4 as notified	We agree that it is very important that future urban land use aligns with transport infrastructure and future low-carbon options such as rail, walking and cycling. The designated Future Development Areas in Rangiora are in close proximity to the expanded motorway system south and current investment is improving local linkages and bus services. The areas are also within walking and cycling distance of the Rangiora town centre, railway station and existing schools.	Accept	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy so requested changes to Policy 6.3.4 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted however that the submitter is in support of the existing policy provision and this is supported.
6 Pol 6.3.05	PCCH6-38.11	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports proposed Policy 6.3.5 as notified	We agree that it is very important that future urban land use aligns with transport infrastructure and future low-carbon options such as rail, walking and cycling. The designated Future Development Areas in Rangiora are in close proximity to the expanded motorway system south and current investment is improving local linkages and bus services. It is important that the District Council is enabled to provide three-waters infrastructure in an efficient and ecologically sound manner.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.5 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.07	PCCH6-38.8	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports proposed Policy 6.3.7 as notified	We support the development of sufficiently large areas of urban land so the District Council is enabled to facilitate high quality developments with a high level of urban design and amenity, including areas of intensification, green space and community facilities.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.7 as notified are recommended to be retained.
6 Pol 6.3.10	PCCH6-38.9	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports proposed policy 6.3.10 as notified	We agree it is important that this development takes place guided by structure plans and outline development plans that the affected communities have had a chance to help develop. We also support the inclusion of Ngai Tahu in the process of urban planning and development.	Accept	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy so requested changes to Policy 6.3.10 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted however that the submitter is in support of the existing policy provision and this is supported.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
6 Pol 6.3.11	PCCH6-38.5	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports proposed Policy 6.3.11 as notified	We support a strategic approach utilising monitoring and review of progress to provide housing and urban infrastructure that has proven, positive outcomes for the social and economic wellbeing of people and communities.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The proposed amendments to Policy 6.3.11 as notified are recommended to be retained with some further minor amendments accepted from submission points related to this policy.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-38.4	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports proposed Policy 6.3.12 as notified	We support proposed Plan Change 1 as the best means to achieve the efficient and sustainable development of future urban land in and around Rangiora as part of a sensible, planned approach by the partner councils to release sufficient land to meet the needs of urban development in the medium to longer term. We support an integrated approach that allows councils to plan land use and associated infrastructure with a high standard of urban design, variety in yield, and sufficient green space.	Accept	We recommend retaining Policy 6.3.12 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The intent of Policy 6.3.12 is unaltered and is recommended to be retained with only minor additional text for clarification and alignment with other relevant policies in Chapter 6.
7 MapA	PCCH6-38.2	Taylor, C N and PK	Support	Supports Map A as notified	We support proposed Plan Change 1 as the best means to achieve the efficient and sustainable development of future urban land in and around Rangiora as part of a sensible, planned approach by the partner councils to release sufficient land to meet the needs of urban development in the medium to longer term. We support an integrated approach that allows councils to plan land use and associated infrastructure with a high standard of urban design, variety in yield, and sufficient green space.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A as notified.
1.1 General	PCCH6-6.1	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Supports proposed change in its entirety	Alongside operative Policy 16.3.4 in the CRPS, the proposal gives effect to Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET. No National Grid assets are located in the identified Future Development Areas and [Transpower] has no immediate plans to develop infrastructure in those areas.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. It is noted that no National Grid assets are located in the identified Future Development Areas.



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
1.2 General	PCCH6-33.8	Trices Road Rezoning Group	Oppose	Oppose Proposed Change 1 in its entirety.	<p>The Submitters are a landowner group who are working together on a rezoning proposal for their land at Trices Road, Prebbleton.</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in addressing the current housing crisis by releasing more appropriately located land for a variety of housing types in response to demand, adding greater competition and supply to the land and housing markets.</p>	Reject	<p>The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. Bringing forward development capacity significantly beyond that required to meet housing targets is considered inappropriate and less likely to achieve the wider NPS-UD objective to establish a well-functioning urban environment, not the overarching purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD. The Proposed Change</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-33.1	Trices Road Rezoning Group	Oppose	Oppose Proposed Change 1 in its entirety.	<p>Change 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, as follows, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· A minimum targets approach is not consistent with the NPS-UD which requires “<u>at least</u> sufficient development capacity to meet demand”.</li> <li>· The Council HCAs overestimate the ability for infill to occur.</li> <li>· The fixed non-contestable urban boundary is contrary to the NPS-UD 'responsive planning approach'.</li> <li>· The NPS-UD seeks to achieve well functioning environments and growth in locations close to employment, that are well serviced with public transport (existing or planned) and where there is high demand for housing and business land relative to other areas. The proposed FDAs in comparison to alternative locations have not been assessed against these criteria – the s32 assessment is silent on such assessment.</li> <li>· The NPS-UD requires a consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative spatial scenarios for the achieving the NPS-UD (s 3.14 (b)). Change 1 has not undertaken any such work, simply relying on the planning and infrastructure work undertaken when the PIB was first introduced 13 years ago.</li> </ul>	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							practicable. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to implement other aspects of the NPS-UD will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS. We also recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non contestable rural/urban boundary. The objectives and policies of the NPS-UD are addressed in the section 32 report. We consider that the responsibilities under section 32 have been discharged with an assessment that has an appropriate level of detail. This is outlined in the summary report, including Appendix 5 which also sets out alignment with the RMA and national direction.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-33.2	Trices Road Rezoning Group	Oppose	Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more flexible and responsive urban growth management approach.  This could include: -enabling consideration of	The NPS-UD builds on the NPS-UDC with both NPSs requiring a responsive and timely approach to urban growth management, which ensures an ongoing ample release of land for housing, with sufficient development capacity to meet needs, and to facilitate competition in the market. A key objective is to address the current housing crisis, in particular by improving housing affordability. Councils are to set minimum housing and business land targets/bottom lines in order to ensure there is at	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>development proposals, private plan change requests and submissions on Plan Reviews which are outside the Proposed Change 1 Map A FDAs, priority greenfield, and existing urban areas; and/or</p> <p>-which exceed the minimum targets in Table 6.1; and</p> <p>-are consistent with and give effect to the NPS-UD; and</p> <p>-amendments to Policy 6.3.11 Monitoring and Review, Policy 6.3.12 Future Development Areas; and</p> <p>-change the status of FDAs to Greenfield Areas, with no restrictions on the quantum or timing of development; and</p> <p>-the changes outlined below; and -</p> <p>-and/or in the case of resource consents, are of a minor nature (including zoning anomalies) and do not offend the overall strategic planning</p>	<p>least sufficient development capacity over the short, medium and long term. The NPS-UD refines the HCDA required methodology and adds a specific requirement for a responsive approach to 'unanticipated' rezoning proposals which add significant development capacity.</p> <p>There has been a 'flood' of private plan change applications lodged seeking urban rezoning since the NPS-UD was gazette in August 2020 - 13 to date in Selwyn District, in addition to a further 2 lodged prior to this; cumulatively capable of delivering 872 ha of further urban development (approximately 10 000 households). There is clearly strong 'pent up' demand for further housing and business land, unable to be progressed prior to this due to the very restrictive CRPS urban growth management 'regime'.</p> <p>A minimum targets approach will fail to deliver if the targets underestimate demand. The targets were prepared for Our Space 2018-2048 and are already out of date. They are also very sensitive to assumptions made regarding what is feasible development and to the methodology employed, as recognized and acknowledged by the Our Space Commissioners.</p>		<p>land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change. and that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is however currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				intent of the Chapter 6.			considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
5 Obj 6.2.1	PCCH6-33.4	Trices Road Rezoning Group	Oppose	<p>Delete clause 3 of Objective 6.2.1 as follows:</p> <p>Recovery, rebuilding and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that:</p> <p>...</p> <p><del>3. avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas unless expressly provided for in the CRPS;</del></p>	A fixed uncontestable urban/rural boundary as shown on Map A and associated RPS objective and policies does not give effect to the NPS-UD which requires a responsive planning approach (Objective 6c) and Policy 8). The Ministry for Environment Responsive Planning Guidance specifically states: <i>a hard rural urban boundary without the ability to consider change or movement of that boundary would not meet the requirements of the responsive planning policy.</i>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not make amendments to Objective 6.2.1 aside from referencing the new Policy 6.3.12 so this submission point is considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. We recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non contestable rural/urban boundary. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-33.5	Trices Road Rezoning Group	Oppose	If the proposed Future Development		Reject	The inclusion of reference to Future Development Areas in Policy 6.3.1(3)

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>Areas are retained amend clause 3 [incorrectly referenced in the submission as clause 4] of Policy 6.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:...</p> <p>4. Enable development of existing urban areas and greenfield priority areas and <u>Future Development Areas</u>, including intensification in appropriate locations, <del>where is supports the recovery of Greater Christchurch.</del></p>			would create a potential inconsistency with Policy 6.3.12 as Policy 6.3.1 is specifically focused on the recovery period through to 2028, whereas the purpose of identifying Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change is to ensure sufficient development capacity over the medium to long term (i.e. through to 2048).
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-33.7	Trices Road Rezoning Group	Oppose	<p>If the proposed Future Development Areas are retained amend clause 4 [incorrectly referenced in the submission as clause 5] of Policy 6.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:...</p>		Reject	The inclusion of reference to Future Development Areas in Policy 6.3.1(3) and (4) would create a potential inconsistency with Policy 6.3.12 as Policy 6.3.1 is specifically focused on the recovery period through to 2028, whereas the purpose of identifying Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change is to ensure sufficient development capacity over the medium to long term (i.e. through to 2048). An amendment to Policy 6.3.1(4) is also not required as it contains the caveat "unless they are otherwise expressly provided for

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				5. Ensure new urban activities only occur within existing urban areas, <del>or</del> identified greenfield priority areas <u>and/ or Future Development Areas</u> as shown on Map A....			in the CRPS" which would apply to Policy 6.3.12.
7 MapA	PCCH6-33.3	Trices Road Rezoning Group	Oppose	Amend Map A by including the submitter's site (shown in Figure 1 of the submission) as a Future Development Area - Residential.	The Submitters are a landowner group who are working together on a rezoning proposal for their land at Trices Road, Prebbleton. The Site is an ideal and logical location for further urban growth of Prebbleton and will achieve a compact, and efficient, urban form with excellent connectivity by multiple transport modes as well as bridging the existing urban area to the proposed Birchs Road reserve to the south. It is located on the Birchs Road bus route; the route of the cycle Rail Trail which connects the city, Prebbleton and Lincoln; and is within walking distance of Prebbleton town centre. The rezoning will accommodate a further 290+ households which represents the equivalent of 20% of the current housing stock (1497 households 2018 Census) at Prebbleton; it will supply significant additional capacity and contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, meeting the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) Objective 6 c and Policy 8 criteria for 'unanticipated' (in an RMA document) plan changes. A high amenity master planned development is proposed. There is no additional cost to the Council in re-zoning the Site as there is capacity in the public utilities and the existing road network, including planned upgrades.	Reject	Identification of the additional housing land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
9.1 Section32	PCCH6-33.6	Trices Road Rezoning Group	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	The Change 1 s32 assessment does not assess the identified options against the NPS-UD objectives and policies, even though its purpose is to give effect to NPS-UD directions. It is inadequate and incomplete. Proposed Change 1 is contrary to the RMA, including	Reject	The purpose of the Proposed Change is to give effect to Policy 2 and clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD and enable sufficient land to be rezoned for the medium term (10 years) and identified for the long term (30 years)

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					Part 2 and s32 and does not constitute sound resource management practice.		by identifying and enabling additional development capacity within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary shown on Map A and also to provide flexibility for Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils to consider rezoning such land to meet medium term housing demands where a sufficiency shortfall is identified. The objectives and policies of the NPS-UD are addressed in the section 32 report. We consider that the responsibilities under section 32 have been discharged with an assessment that has an appropriate level of detail. This is outlined in the summary report, including Appendix 5 which also sets out alignment with the RMA and national direction.
9.2 Consequential	PCCH6-33.9	Trices Road Rezoning Group	Oppose	Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.		Reject	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-47.1	Urban Estates Ltd	Oppose in part	Require that the proposed change give effect to the NPS-UD.	Urban Estates Ltd does not agree that the currently proposed changes to Chapter 6 give effect to the requirements set down in the National Policy Statement. Their submission is that the land will not satisfy market demands as the NPS requires. Urban Estates believes the NPS calls for all zone changes to be given the opportunity to be heard so as to assess each specific application on its merits.	Reject	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. It is acknowledged that the Proposed Change does not give full effect to the NPS-UD. However, it does give effect to it in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							<p>councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enable in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes.</p> <p>The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Any changes necessary to implement other aspects of the NPS-UD will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.</p>

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-47.2	Urban Estates Ltd	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	The land [identified in the proposed change] will not satisfy market demands. It is clear the numbers predicted in the CRPS will be used up well in advance. The NPS requires the CRPS to be better prepared for the future. Urban Estates believes the NPS calls for all zone changes to be given the opportunity to be heard so as to assess each specific application "on its merits". There should be no mechanism to hold back zone change applications being able to be heard.	Reject	Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. The FDAs identified in the Proposed Change could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes and this is in addition to the development capacity already enabled in District Plans estimated to be sufficient for over 70,000 homes. We are therefore satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
7 MapA	PCCH6-47.4	Urban Estates Ltd	Support	Supports the [proposed Future Development Areas identified in Map A] for Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Rolleston.	It is well known that the owner of Farringdon (in Rolleston) is actively planning & engineering their new areas now. This is an obvious example that that developer expects the market to use up the supply faster than predicted.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The submission point is supported in so far as it supports the identified FDAs as notified.
7.1 AddLand	PCCH6-47.3	Urban Estates Ltd	Oppose in part	Require that additional land be added to the Future Development Areas	Urban Estates supports all the proposed Future Development Areas included in the proposed plan change. They would like to see additional land included, particularly around Prebbleton. There are two particular private changes to the Selwyn District Plan that they would like to see included - PC68 and PC72. Land near Prebbleton should be included	Reject	We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change and that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas. Identification of the additional land

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					because it is closer to the Christchurch CBD than Rangiora, Kaiapoi or Rolleston. In general, Urban Estates would like a plentiful supply of development land without unnecessary restrictions as they believe a lack of supply is causing increased section prices and that the Future Development Areas will be rapidly used up.		proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
1.1 General	PCCH6-25.1	Waimakariri District Council	Support	Support the proposed change in its entirety.	The submitter would like to see the plan change become operative as soon as possible to enable the Future Urban Development Areas (FUDA) to be included in the 2nd Generation Waimakariri District Plan. The FUDA fall within the infrastructure boundary in the RPS. The population of the district is expected to grow and the NPS-UD requires sufficient development capacity to meet demand for residential and business land.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
3.07 Infrastructure	PCCH6-25.3	Waimakariri District Council	Support	Supports proposed change in its entirety.	<p>Traffic flows until 2028 from the Future Urban Development Areas have been modelled in two studies attached to the original submission. The studies show that the traffic flows can be accommodated in the existing network and that these are lower than those forecast in the CTM to which recent network capacity upgrade and related mode shift (i.e. Park n Ride) enhancements are oriented. There has been no increase of traffic into Christchurch city because job growth in the district has kept pace with population growth.</p> <p>In light of recently available 2018 Census results, yet to be factored into the Christchurch Transport Model (CTM), the overarching Cross Boundary Traffic Flow Analysis indicates that the CTM is unsuitable at present without significant changes to address the land use forecasts and the sensitivity of the model to development in Waimakariri District.</p> <p>The second piece of analysis in the report attached</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. It is noted that the additional information provided by the submitter shows traffic flows can be accommodated within the transport network and that these are lower than those forecast in the Christchurch Transport Model (CTM).

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					to the original submission specifically addresses traffic impacts of the development of some 5,500 households within the FDAs using an alternative methodology (regression analysis).		
3.07 Infrastructure	PCCH6-25.4	Waimakariri District Council	Support	No specific decision requested.	Waimakariri District Council included a report by Abley "Cross Boundary Traffic Flow Analysis" as an attachment to their submission.	N/A	This additional information is received and noted. Recommendations on the related decisions requested are outlined elsewhere in this summary table.
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-25.2	Waimakariri District Council	Support	No specific decision requested.	<p>The submitter endorses the proposal to achieve higher housing densities. Council has collaboratively reviewed densities and has endorsed a position of achieving higher densities and density changes are under consideration within the review of the Waimakariri District Plan, including a new Medium Density Zone with a greater spatial extent. The population of the district is expected to grow and there is also a projected change in household types with more one person and couple-only households, partly as a result of an aging population. An example Waimakariri District Council draft structure plan is attached to the original submission. A significant component of the structure plans is addressing density and housing typologies. This shows areas of proposed higher density residential development than is provided for in the current district plan.</p> <p>Waimakariri District Council (Council), in its response to the Minister for the Environment's letter on the Streamlined Planning Process (SPP) of 21 January 2020 stated that, in broad terms, Council strongly supports the Change proceeding as expeditiously as possible. This is to enable Council to notify its 2nd Generation District Plan that incorporates FUDAs to provide for reasonably foreseeable housing needs over the life of that Plan. This remains the position of Council. Council, at that time also commented on the collaborative development of the FDS and noted that the then proposed statement of expectations</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Policy 6.3.12 (2) which requires that development within any FDAs promotes the efficient use of urban land, provides opportunities for higher density living environments, including appropriate mixed use development, and housing choices that meet the needs of people and communities for a range of dwelling types. A minimum density of 12 households per hectare within FDAs has already been agreed to by the Greater Christchurch Partnership councils in adopting Our Space and will be given effect to through subsequent district planning processes.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					suggested the Change includes a policy direction regarding FUDAs, providing for higher density living environments including mixed use developments and a greater range of housing types.		
1.1 General	PCCH6-23.1	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Supports proposed change in its entirety.	Overall Waka Kotahi supports the proposed amendments to the CRPS to provide Future Development Areas at Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora to fulfil the NPS-UD.	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
2.1 National Direction	PCCH6-23.3	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Supports the proposed amendments to the RPS to fulfil the NPS-UD.	<p>The NPS-UD recognises the importance of businesses and community services located in urban environments that are well serviced by existing or planned public transport (Objective 3) and active transport options (Policy 1). The three identified locations for future urban growth are located adjacent to existing urban areas that are serviced by public transport (bus services), thus reducing the need for longer trips. There are also better multi-modal transport options now, than were available when modelling was previously undertaken to identify greenfield priority areas which will help support Objective 8 of the NPS.</p> <p>The proposed changes will not restrict the ability for Waimakariri and Selwyn District Councils to engage with Waka Kotahi to achieve integrated land use and infrastructure planning (Policy 10). Waka Kotahi considers that the proposed areas of further development are 'infrastructure-ready' as the existing transport networks (including public transport, cycle and pedestrian facilities) have adequate capacity to support additional urban growth at these three locations (Clause 3.4.3).</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.
3.07 Infrastructure	PCCH6-23.4	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	No specific decision requested	The land identified or future urban housing development within the FDAs at Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi is located within the projected infrastructure boundary. Waka Kotahi is satisfied that there is appropriate policy provision in place	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. It is noted that the submitter is satisfied that there is appropriate policy

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					<p>through the proposed amendments to the RPS to ensure that development considers strategic infrastructure, including the state highway network and pedestrian, cycle and public transport infrastructure.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the RPS seek to provide for additional development at these locations to meet demand. Our Space considers the likely availability of appropriate infrastructure provision, and Waka Kotahi is satisfied that the proposed changes will not alter the availability of suitable infrastructure provision (in terms of the state highway network), and that the only amendment is to the timeframes in which there is expected to be network capacity. Our Space also considers the likely availability of appropriate infrastructure to support projected development, integrating land use and transport planning to ensure safe and accessible urban areas. Waka Kotahi does not consider that the proposed changes will affect these outcomes.</p>		provision in place through the proposed amendments to the CRPS to ensure that development considers strategic infrastructure, and the Proposed Change will not alter the availability of suitable infrastructure provision (in terms of the state highway network).
3.07 Infrastructure	PCCH6-23.5	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Supports proposed changes	<p>Given that the areas identified for future urban development are located within the projected infrastructure boundary, the transport effects are similar to those that have been previously modelled by Waka Kotahi. There is adequate capacity available on the transport network, including the state highway, pedestrian, cycle and public transport networks, such that they will provide for additional development at the proposed locations. Overall, the effects on the transport network are similar to those anticipated by waka Kotahi, albeit at a faster rate of growth and Waka Kotahi is assured that the strong policy recognition of strategic infrastructure will suitably manage future urban development so that land use and transport infrastructure are successfully integrated and the potential transport effects appropriately considered.</p>	Accept	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. It is noted that the submitter considers there is adequate capacity available on the transport network and the effects on the transport network are similar to those anticipated by Waka Kotahi, albeit at a faster rate of growth.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-23.2	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Support	Supports proposed Policy 6.3.12 as notified.	Waka Kotahi considers that Proposed Policy 6.3.12 - Future Development Areas, will adequately require future urban development to be integrated with the strategic infrastructure (including the highway network) and require there to be capacity in the network to support future urban development. Proposed Policy 6.3.12 is consistent with Objective 6.2.4 - Integration of transport infrastructure and land use. As a result of this direction, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils will be required to give effect to the RPS and release additional land for future urban development, provided that it is well integrated with strategic infrastructure.	Accept	We recommend retaining Policy 6.3.12 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. The intent of Policy 6.3.12 is unaltered and is recommended to be retained with only minor additional text for clarification and alignment with other relevant policies in Chapter 6.
1.2 General	PCCH6-34.11	Williams, K & B	Oppose	Oppose Proposed Change 1 in its entirety. [See specific relief sought under other submission points]	The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self-sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market. Change 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form. The Submitters do not consider the approach taken is sound planning in the Greater Christchurch context because changes to the RPS policy framework are required now to enable [district plan] reviews to respond to and implement the NPS-UD. The existing supply of business land (Map A priority greenfield business areas and existing urban areas) is treated as sufficient to meet demand for business land, even though Our Space accepted that there were inadequacies with the business capacity assessment; and other evidence [attached to submission] further identifies the inadequacies of the existing supply.	Reject	The Change responds to an identified housing shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional housing development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment. Bringing forward development capacity significantly beyond that required to meet housing targets is considered inappropriate and less likely to achieve the wider NPS-UD objective to establish a well-functioning urban environment, not the overarching purpose of the RMA to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change, including the finding that there is currently sufficient business development capacity to meet demand. The next capacity assessment will update and review development capacity and guide any need to identify additional land in accordance with the NPS-UD. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
2.2 National Direction	PCCH6-34.1	Williams, K & B	Oppose	Oppose Proposed Change 1 in its entirety. [See specific relief sought under other submission points]	Change 1 does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form. A 'fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary' is contrary to the NPS-UD 'responsive planning approach'. The piecemeal and incomplete approach to addressing the requirements of the NPS-UD is not sound planning and is opposed.	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					<p>The NPS-UD seeks to achieve well functioning environments and growth in locations close to employment, that are well serviced with public transport (existing or planned) and where there is high demand for housing and business land relative to other areas. The proposed FDAs in comparison to alternative locations have not been assessed against these criteria – the s32 assessment is silent on such assessment.</p> <p>The NPS-UD requires a consideration of the advantages and disadvantages of alternative spatial scenarios for the achieving the NPS-UD (s 3.14 (b)). Change 1 has not undertaken any such work, simply relying on the planning and infrastructure work undertaken when the PIB was first introduced 13 years ago.</p>		Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Any changes necessary to implement other aspects of the NPS-UD will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-34.09	Williams, K & B	Oppose	Amend Proposed Change 1 to provide a more flexible and responsive urban growth management approach, including enabling consideration of plan changes which are outside the Map A FDAs, priority greenfield and existing urban areas, but are consistent with the NPS-UD (including but not limited to amendments to Policy 6.3.11 Monitoring and Review).	<p>The Submitters own a 55ha site between Templeton and Prebbleton which is ideally suited for industrial development.</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>	Reject	The Change responds to an identified shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. The change enables additional development capacity in new future development areas identified on Map A in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. It provides Selwyn and Waimakariri Councils the flexibility to consider rezoning land to meet medium term housing demands as part of their district planning processes. The identification of areas within the existing Projected Infrastructure Boundary will contribute to well-functioning urban environments in accordance with Policy 1 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that sufficient development capacity is enabled through the identified Future Development Areas as part of the Proposed Change. We are cognisant of the functions of regional councils under section 30 (ba) and (gb) of

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
							<p>the RMA that necessitate a policy approach that strikes a balance between the need to enable development capacity and the need to ensure development is appropriately integrated with the efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Chapter 6 provides important planning certainty to landowners, developers and the wider community regarding future urban growth in Greater Christchurch. We consider this remains a key aspect of strategic planning in the sub-region and enables infrastructure providers to efficiently and effectively plan and programme infrastructure investment.</p> <p>The Proposed Change gives effect to the NPS-UD in part and to the extent that is reasonably practicable. Environment Canterbury is however currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. We also recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non contestable rural/urban boundary.</p>
5 Obj 6.2.1	PCCH6-34.4	Williams, K & B	Oppose	<p>Delete clause 3 of Objective 6.2.1 as follows:</p> <p>Recovery, rebuilding</p>	A fixed uncontestable urban/rural boundary as shown on Map A and associated RPS objective and policies does not give effect to the NPS-UD which requires a responsive planning approach (Objective 6c) and Policy 8). The Ministry for Environment	Reject	The Proposed Change does not make amendments to Objective 6.2.1 aside from referencing the new Policy 6.3.12 so this submission point is considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that: ... <del>3. avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas unless expressly provided for in the CRPS;</del>	Responsive Planning Guidance specifically states: <i>a hard rural urban boundary without the ability to consider change or movement of that boundary would not meet the requirements of the responsive planning policy.</i>		section on Procedural Matters for further information. Environment Canterbury is currently formulating criteria (in response to the responsive planning policies of the NPS-UD Policy 8 and Part 3, subpart 2, clause 3.8) to determine what plan changes are considered significant in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. We recognise that the NPS-UD is a higher order document under the RMA and decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of such national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6. We therefore reject submissions that perceive there to be a fixed and non contestable rural/urban boundary. Any changes necessary to respond to the responsive planning policies in the NPS-UD and consideration of any additional flexibilities to the planning framework will be addressed through future processes, including the full review of the CRPS.
5 Obj 6.2.6	PCCH6-34.13	Williams, K & B	Oppose	Amend the principal reasons and explanation for [Objective 6.2.6 - incorrectly referenced in the submission as 6.3.6] as follows:  Principal reasons and explanation ...While there is some capacity for the demand for further industrial business land to be met through the	The Submitters own a 55ha site between Templeton and Prebbleton which is ideally suited for industrial development. The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market. The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Objective aside from referencing the new Policy 6.3.12 so requested changes to Objective 6.2.6 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>redevelopment of existing zoned land, particularly [with]in Christchurch City, the greenfield priority areas for business and <u>Future Development Areas – Business</u> provide for the accommodation of new, primarily industrial business activities.</p> <p>[Text in square brackets indicates existing wording in the CRPS not explicitly shown as a change by way of strikethrough or underlining in the submission.]</p>	development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].		
5 Obj 6.2.6	PCCH6-34.5	Williams, K & B	Oppose	<p>Amend clause 1 of [Objective 6.2.6 - incorrectly referenced in the submission as 6.3.6] as follows:</p> <p>Identify and provide for Greater Christchurch's land requirements for the recovery and growth of business activities in a manner that supports the settlement pattern brought about by</p>	<p>The Submitters own a 55ha site between Templeton and Prebbleton which is ideally suited for industrial development.</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritous proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Objective aside from referencing the new Policy 6.3.12 so requested changes to Objective 6.2.6 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<p>Objective 6.2.2, recognising that:</p> <p>1. The greenfield priority areas for business <u>and Future Development Areas – Business</u> in Christchurch [City] provide primarily for the accommodation of new [industrial] activities.</p> <p>[Text in square brackets indicates existing wording in the CRPS not explicitly shown as a change by way of strikethrough or underlining in the submission.]</p>	development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].		
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-34.14	Williams, K & B	Oppose	<p>Amend [clause 4 - incorrectly referenced in the submission as clause 5] of Policy 6.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:...</p> <p>5. Ensure new urban activities only occur within existing urban areas, <del>or</del> identified greenfield priority areas <u>and / or Future</u></p>	<p>The Submitters own a 55ha site between Templeton and Prebbleton which is ideally suited for industrial development.</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient</p>	Reject	The inclusion of reference to Future Development Areas in Policy 6.3.1(4) would create a potential inconsistency with Policy 6.3.12 as Policy 6.3.1 is specifically focused on the recovery period through to 2028, whereas the purpose of identifying Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change is to ensure sufficient development capacity over the medium to long term (i.e. through to 2048). An amendment to Policy 6.3.1(4) is not required as it contains the caveat "unless they are otherwise expressly provided for in the CRPS" which would apply to Policy 6.3.12.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<u>Development Areas</u> as shown on Map A, unless they are otherwise expressly provided for in the CRPS;	development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].		The Proposed Change does not address business land matters.
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-34.15	Williams, K & B	Oppose	<p>Amend the proposed changes to principal reasons and explanations for Policy 6.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>Principal reasons and explanations: ... <u>New residential and business development is provided for within Future Development Areas where the circumstances set out in Policy 6.3.12 are met.</u></p>	<p>The Submitters own a 55ha site between Templeton and Prebbleton which is ideally suited for industrial development.</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not address business land matters and no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change. Additional wording to include reference to business development being part of Policy 6.3.12 is therefore not appropriate. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
6 Pol 6.3.01	PCCH6-34.6	Williams, K & B	Oppose	<p>Amend clause 3 [incorrectly referenced in the submission as clause 4] of Policy 6.3.1 as follows:</p> <p>In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:...</p>	<p>The Submitters own a 55ha site between Templeton and Prebbleton which is ideally suited for industrial development.</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market.</p>	Reject	Policy 6.3.1 is specifically focused on the recovery period through to 2028, whereas the purpose of identifying Future Development Areas in the Proposed Change is to ensure sufficient development capacity over the medium to long term (i.e. through to 2048). The requested deletion of reference to recovery in clause 3 is therefore not supported.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				4. Enable development of existing urban areas and greenfield priority areas and Future Development Areas, including intensification in appropriate locations, <del>where is [sic]</del> supports the recovery of Greater Christchurch.	The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].		
6 Pol 6.3.06	PCCH6-34.12	Williams, K & B	Oppose	<p>Amend clause 5 [incorrectly referenced in the submission as clause 6] of Policy 6.3.6 as follows:</p> <p>To ensure that provision, recovery and rebuilding of business land in Greater Christchurch maximises business retention, attracts investment, and provides for healthy working environments, business activities are to be provided for in a manner which:</p> <p>...</p> <p>6. Recognises that new greenfield priority areas <u>and</u> <u>Future Development</u></p>	<p>The Submitters own a 55ha site between Templeton and Prebbleton which is ideally suited for industrial development.</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy so requested changes to Policy 6.3.6 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change therefore the requested wording change is not appropriate. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				<u>Areas</u> for business in Christchurch City are primarily [for] industrial activities, and that commercial use in these areas is restricted;...			
6 Pol 6.3.06	PCCH6-34.7	Williams, K & B	Oppose	<p>Amend clause 1 of Policy 6.3.6 as follows:</p> <p>To ensure that provision, recovery and rebuilding of business land in Greater Christchurch maximises business retention, attracts investment, and provides for healthy working environments, business activities are to be provided for in a manner which:</p> <p>...</p> <p>1. Promotes the utilization and redevelopment of existing business land, and provides <u>at least</u> sufficient additional greenfield priority area <u>and</u> <u>Future Development Area – Business</u> for business land through</p>	<p>The Submitters own a 55ha site between Templeton and Prebbleton which is ideally suited for industrial development.</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>	Reject	The Proposed Change does not seek to change this Policy so requested changes to Policy 6.3.6 are considered outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. It is noted that no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change therefore the requested wording change is not appropriate. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.



Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				to 2028 as provided for in Map A:			
6 Pol 6.3.12	PCCH6-34.8	Williams, K & B	Oppose	<p>Amend Policy 6.3.12 as follows:</p> <p>Enable urban development in the Future Development Areas identified on Map A, in the following circumstances:</p> <p>1. <u>Future Development Areas – Residential</u> – It is demonstrated through monitoring of housing <del>and business</del> development capacity and sufficiency carried out collaboratively by the Greater Christchurch Partnership, ...</p>	<p>The Submitters own a 55ha site between Templeton and Prebbleton which is ideally suited for industrial development.</p> <p>The Submitters are concerned to ensure that Proposed Change 1 provides an appropriate planning framework for meritorious proposals such as theirs - which give effect to the NPS-UD and will assist in enabling the increased sustainability and self sufficiency of neighbouring townships, and facilitating a more competitive industrial land and development market.</p> <p>The Submitters consider that the Proposed Change does not give effect to the NPS-UD in a number of fundamental ways, and in this respect cannot be supported in its current form [for the reasons set out in the submission in relation to sufficient development capacity, fixed non contestable rural/urban boundary, well functioning urban environments, FDAs - different spatial scenarios, Our Space, Future Development Areas, Business Capacity Assessment, Section 32 Assessment, and RMA].</p>	Reject	The suggested amendment relates to the inclusion of Future Development Areas for Business. No Business FDAs are identified by the Proposed Change therefore the requested change is not considered necessary. The identification of any additional business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
7 MapA	PCCH6-34.10	Williams, K & B	Oppose	No specific decision requested.	Submitter attached a copy of their submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan, which requests the rezoning of land to General Industrial.	N/A	This additional information is received and noted. Recommendations on the related decisions requested are outlined elsewhere in this summary table.
7 MapA	PCCH6-34.2	Williams, K & B	Oppose	Amend Map A by inserting the land outlined in Figure 1 of the submission in purple as a Future Development Area - Business.	<p>The Site is ideally suited for industrial development, given:</p> <p>It borders land that is already zoned industrial. As such it would contribute to a well functioning urban environment, meeting Objective 6c) in the NPS-UD and the policy 8 criteria for "unanticipated" plan changes. Surrounding land uses would not lead to</p>	Reject	The Change responds to an identified housing shortfall in development capacity as required by clause 3.7 of the NPS-UD so that the councils can give effect to Policy 2 of the NPS-UD. We are satisfied that the current capacity assessment is sufficiently robust to guide the planning response promoted through this Proposed Change,

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					<p>any reverse sensitivity issues. There would be opportunities for employment of people from nearby towns.</p> <p>The development of this land would contribute to the intended outcome of CRPS Chapter 6 Policy 6.2.2.5 - Urban form and settlement pattern. This policy specifically mentions Prebbleton.</p>		including the finding that there is currently sufficient business development capacity to meet demand. The Proposed Change does not therefore cover business land matters and no Future Development Areas for Business are identified by the Proposed Change. Identification of the business land proposed by the submitter is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. Any identification of business land as FDAs is matter that can be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
7 MapA	PCCH6-34.3	Williams, K & B	Oppose	Amend Map A Legend by labelling the orange Future Development Areas as Future Development Areas – <u>Residential</u> , and adding to the legend <u>Future Development Areas – Business</u> with a different colour (suggest purple).	Eastern Selwyn District, including Prebbleton, Rolleston, and Lincoln, has continued to grow at a pace since the earthquakes. Notwithstanding, there is no industrial business land at Prebbleton. Further business land, including in different ownership to the IH land adjoining on the north side of Marshs Road (which is concentrated in the ownership of one major owner), in order to support more competition in the market, is required locally. If Prebbleton is to continue to become more sustainable and self sufficient, in accordance with Policy 6.2.2.5 of the RPS, then business land is required to support local employment opportunities.	Reject	The Proposed Change does not cover business land matters and so this topic, the additional business land proposed by the submitter and the changes sought to the legend on Map A by this submission point are considered to be out of scope. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The land identified by the submitter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
9.2 Consequential	PCCH6-34.16	Williams, K & B	Oppose	Any consequential amendments and such other additional or alternative relief as gives effect to the intent of this submission and is consistent with the interests of the Submitter.		Reject	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested.

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-4.1	Woods, H	Support	Supports availability of land being increased around existing towns, by extending residential zoning into what is currently rural zoning.	Rural activities close to residential areas is problematic anyway due to noise (e.g. machinery & stock) especially close to densely populated areas like the Silverstream Sub-division. With the new roading in place this is an ideal area for zone change to residential. The submitter has been hearing about housing shortages for years, and supports this effort to address the issue. It is practical, economical, and sensible to increase land availability by rezoning to enable more housing to be developed.	Accept in part	The submission point is noted and accepted in so far as the Proposed Change identifies some rural land as Future Development Areas as one element of the wider strategy for meeting projected medium to long-term development capacity shortfalls. Issues raised in relation to rural activities close to residential areas and proposed zoning change close to the Silverstream subdivision are not addressed by this recommendation.
3.04 Housing Demand, Sufficiency and Flexibility	PCCH6-4.2	Woods, H	Support	Supports more creativity and flexibility regarding facilities that provide affordable housing such as transportable home parks	There is a need for affordable housing options - under \$130,000 for a 2 bedroom home, and under \$100,000 for a 1 bedroom home suitable for a disabled person to use. We have an aging population, and many people have not been able to secure a freehold home or extra savings or income. Relationship breakdowns have also contributed to this problem. By enabling the establishment of transportable home parks, with strict guidelines to ensure neat appearance and adequate facilities would ease poverty and provide affordable accommodation.	Reject	The submission point is noted and supported in so far as the submitter seeks that affordable housing options are advanced, however the Proposed Change does not cover the specific issues being raised (specific mechanisms, price points and locations discussed) and so the submission point is considered to be outside the scope of the Proposed Change. Refer to the section on Procedural Matters for further information. The matter could however be considered as part of future strategic planning exercises and the full review of the CRPS.
7 MapA	PCCH6-11.1	Yoursection Ltd	Support	Retain the Future Development Area on Map A, where it identifies the same land as Plan Change 75 to the Selwyn District Plan, including Lot 1 Deposited Plan 50631 and Lot 1 Deposited Plan 357634.  And	The submitter has lodged a private plan change application to the Selwyn District Plan, providing for redevelopment of land adjoining Lincoln-Rolleston Road at Rolleston, as residential greenfield. Map A as proposed, appropriately reflects that plan change application (PC75), with the subject land identified as a Future Development Area.	Accept in part	We recommend retaining Proposed Change 1 with only minor amendments as outlined in response to other decisions requested. No changes are recommended to the locations and extent of the identified Future Development Areas shown on Map A. The submission point is accepted in so far as the submitter's land is within one of these FDAs. The detailed requests contained in the associated plan change will be considered by the territorial

Plan Provision / Issue	Point No	Submitter	Support / Oppose	Summary of Decision Requested	Reason / Comment	Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				Such further or other consequential relief, to the identified provisions or to other provisions under the Proposal as may be necessary to give full effect to the relief sought in this submission.			authority as part of a process separate to this Proposed Change.