

No	Sub Point	Plan Vol	Subject area	Detail	Relief sought	Report Section	Rec No.	Recommendation
1	1	Rural	Access	Concerned about the effects of proposed policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b) and that these will diminish the ability of established activities to gain access to an arterial road and control the amount of traffic generated from the activity. Concerned that the policies do not provide for an integrated approach to transport management as they place too much emphasis transportation at the expense of land use and accessibility, and does not recognise the existing and unique nature of AgResearch facilities. Opposed to the road hierarchy inasmuch as it leads to restrictions on access to roads that are nominated as arterial. Supported by 25 Opposed by 22	Various amendments to policy wording: Policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b); and Policy B2.1.12 to provide increased recognition of the importance of established land use issues. Amend B2.1.12 so that it applies to new activities and smaller sites only.	4.2.1	2	Reject Reject Accept
	2	Rural	Access	Concerned about the cost and delay of resource consents under rule 4.5.1.6 where nature of existing use changes. Rule does not recognise that access to lower order roads may be impractical. Other standards in the plan, such as sight distance, are sufficient protection for arterial roads. Submitter is concerned about the effect on the rule should they wish to change the location of their accessways for their existing activity. Opposed by 22, 25	Amend rule 4.5.1.6 so that (a) and (b) do not apply to arterial roads. Delete proposed rule 4.5.1.8.	4.2.2	3	Reject Accept
	3	Rural	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Supports rule 4.6.6 as it relates to new development, but not to existing activities. Considers the need for a consent to changes to 5 or more spaces to be inefficient. Notes that car parks will need to meet standards on dimensions, manoeuvrability location etc. Supported by 25 Opposed by 22	Amend rule 4.6.6 to remove reference to redevelopment of car parks.	4.5.2	11	Accept in Part Accept in Part
	4	Township	Access	Concerned about the effects of proposed policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b) and that these will diminish the ability of established activities to gain access to an arterial road and control the amount of traffic generated from the activity. Concerned that the policies do not provide for an integrated approach to transport management as they place too much emphasis transportation at the expense of land use and accessibility, and does not recognise the existing and unique nature of AgResearch facilities. Opposed to the road hierarchy inasmuch as it leads to restrictions on access to roads that are nominated as arterial. Supported by 25 Opposed by 22	Various amendments to policy wording: Policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b); and Policy B2.1.12 to provide increased recognition of the importance of established land use issues. Amend B2.1.12 so that it applies to new activities and smaller sites only.	4.2.1	2	Reject Reject Accept
	5	Township	Maintenance of roads	Request that Policy B2.1.25 should be extended to protect nationally significant activities (like AgResearch) from the effects of construction and maintenance of roads.	Add "nationally and regionally important tertiary education and research facilities" to the list under policy B2.1.25	4.12	22	Reject
	6	Township	Access	Oppose application of rule 17.2.1.7 to business 3 zones. See DP2	add an exception to rule 17.2.1.7 to exclude business 3 zoned land.	4.2.2	3	Reject

7	Township	High traffic generator	Concerned that rule 17.3.6 could be triggered by a redevelopment of their site without any increase in effects Supported by 25	exclude business 3 zoned land	4.7	13	Reject Reject
8	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Opposes the increase in minimum parking in table 13.1 from 1 space per 2 staff members to 1.5 spaces per 2 staff members because it is not justified in the section 32 analysis and is not aware of any problems caused by the existing standard. Notes that increased parking is inconsistent with policy direction to promote sustainable transport Supported by 25	Retain existing parking standards of 1 space per 2 staff	4.4.2	8	Accept
9	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Notes that Ag research sites have long established car parking areas with no known concerns about functionality. Expresses concern that the definition of redevelopment is 5 spaces and the requirement for resource consent is onerous. Considers that standards in relation to dimensions, manoeuvrability etc are sufficient. Supported by 25 Opposed by 22	Delete rule 17.7.2	4.5.2	11	Reject Accept in Part
1	Rural	Access	Concerned about the effects of proposed policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b) and that these will diminish the ability of established activities to gain access to an arterial road and control the amount of traffic generated from the activity. Concerned that the policies do not provide for an integrated approach to transport management as they place too much emphasis transportation at the expense of land use and accessibility, and does not recognise the existing and unique nature of P+F facilities. Opposed to the road hierarchy inasmuch as it leads to restrictions on access to roads that are nominated as arterial. Supported by 25 Opposed by 22	Various amendments to policy wording: Policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b); and Policy B2.1.12 to provide increased recognition of the importance of established land use issues. Amend B2.1.12 so that it applies to new activities and smaller sites only.	4.2.1	2	Reject Reject Accept
2	Rural	Access	Concerned about the cost and delay of resource consents where nature of existing use changes. Rule does not recognise that access to lower order roads may be impractical. Other standards in the plan, such as sight distance, are sufficient protection for arterial roads. Submitter is concerned about the effect on the rule should they wish to change the location of their accessways for their existing activity. Opposed by 22 and 25	Amend rule 4.5.1.6 so that (a) and (b) do not apply to arterial roads. Delete proposed rule 4.5.1.8.	4.2.2	3	Accept in Part Accept
3	Rural	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Supports rule 4.6.6 as it relates to new development, but not to existing activities. Considers the need for a consent to changes to 5 or more spaces to be inefficient. Notes that car parks will need to meet standards on dimensions, manoeuvrability location etc. Supported by 25	Amend rule 4.6.6 to remove reference to redevelopment of car parks.	4.4.2	11	Reject Accept

2	4	Township	Access	Concerned about the effects of proposed policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b) and that these will diminish the ability of established activities to gain access to an arterial road and control the amount of traffic generated from the activity. Concerned that the policies do not provide for an integrated approach to transport management as they place too much emphasis transportation at the expense of land use and accessibility, and does not recognise the existing and unique nature of AgResearch facilities. Opposed to the road hierarchy inasmuch as it leads to restrictions on access to roads that are nominated as arterial.	Various amendments to policy wording: Policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b); and Policy B2.1.12 to provide increased recognition of the importance of land use issues.	4.2.1	2	Reject
				Opposed by 22				Accept
	5	Township	Maintenance of roads	Request that the policy should be extended to protect nationally significant activities (like Plant and Food) from the effects of construction and maintenance of roads.	Add "nationally and regionally important tertiary education and research facilities" to the list under policy B2.1.25	4.12	22	Reject
	6	Township	Access	Oppose application of rule 17.2.1.7 to business 3 zones. Concerned about the effects of proposed policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b) and that these will diminish the ability of established activities to gain access to an arterial road and control the amount of traffic generated from the activity. Concerned that the policies do not provide for an integrated approach to transport management as they place too much emphasis transportation at the expense of land use and accessibility, and does not recognise the existing and unique nature of P+F facilities. Opposed to the road hierarchy inasmuch as it leads to restrictions on access to roads that are nominated as arterial.	add an exception to rule 17.2.1.7 to exclude business 3 zoned land.	4.2.2	3	Reject
	7	Township	High traffic generator	Concerned that rule 17.3.6 could be triggered by a redevelopment of their site without any increase in effects	exclude business 3 zoned land	4.7	13	Reject
				Supported by 25				Reject
	8	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Opposes the increase in minimum parking in table 13.1 from 1 space per 2 staff members to 1.5 spaces per 2 staff members because it is not justified in the section 32 analysis and is not aware of any problems caused by the existing standard. Notes that increased parking is inconsistent with policy direction to promote sustainable transport	Retain existing parking standards of 1 space per 2 staff	4.4.2	8	Accept
				Supported by 25				
	9	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Notes that Plant and Food research sites have long established car parking areas with no known concerns about functionality. Expresses concern that the definition of redevelopment is 5 spaces and the requirement for resource consent is onerous. Considers that standards in relation to dimensions, manoeuvrability etc are sufficient.	Delete rule 17.7.2	4.5.2	11	Accept in Part
				Supported by 25 Opposed by 22				Accept in Part

1	Rural	CRETS	Supports the inclusion of the Issue 1 except that it may be used to lend credence to the southern bypass and the Christchurch, Rolleston and Environs Transportation Study (CRETS), which the university opposes due to the effects on its operations. Concerned about the inclusion of "effects of traffic on Gerald Street" in Issue 2 as an issue of concern to Council. Considers this may be used as justification for CRETS bypass. Opposes Issue 3 (Future Transport Networks) inasmuch as it references CRETS.	Amend paragraph 2 of Issue 1 to include the need to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of the transport network. Amend paragraph 2 of Issue to to remove references to Gerald Street. Make various amendments to Issue 3 to acknowledge that CRETS has not been prepared under the RMA.	4.12	18	Reject
			Opposed by 22				Accept
2	Rural	Emphasis on transport	Objectives B2.1.3 and B2.1.4 place too much emphasis on transport and not enough on social, cultural and economic well-being. Considers it does not give effect to RPS Objective 2 Chapter 15 which aim to avoid remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of transport networks; and 20.4 which aims to protect nationally significant physical resources from the adverse effects of transport networks	Amend Objective B2.1.3 to include protections for tertiary education and research facilities from future transport networks. Amend Objective B2.1.4 to include obligation to avoid (as well as remedy or mitigate) adverse effects.	4.13	19	Accept in Part
			Opposed by 22				Accept in Part
3	Rural	Effect of PC12 on established land uses.	Concerned about the effects of proposed policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b) and that these will diminish the ability of established activities to gain access to an arterial road and control the amount of traffic generated from the activity. Concerned that the policies do not provide for an integrated approach to transport management as they place too much emphasis transportation at the expense of land use and accessibility, and does not recognise the existing and unique nature of University facilities. Opposed to the road hierarchy inasmuch as it leads to restrictions on access to roads that are nominated as arterial.	Various amendments to policy wording: Policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b); and Policy B2.1.12 to provide increased recognition of the importance of established land use issues. Amend B2.1.12 so that it applies to new activities and smaller sites only.	4.2.1	2	Reject
			Opposed by 22				Accept
4	Rural	Heavy Traffic Bypass	Opposes policy B2.1.26 as it places too much emphasis on the effects of heavy traffic through townships and not enough on the effects on alternate routes.	Delete policy B2.1.26	4.14	19	Accept in Part
			Opposed by 22				Accept in Part
5	Rural	Access to arterial roads	Concerned about the cost and delay of resource consents where nature of existing use changes. Rule 4.5.1.6 does not recognise that access to lower order roads may be impractical. Other standards in the plan, such as sight distance, are sufficient protection for arterial roads. Submitter is concerned about the effect on the rule should they wish to change the location of their accessways for their existing activity.	Amend rule 4.5.1.6 so that (a) and (b) do not apply to arterial roads. Delete proposed rule 4.5.1.8.	4.2.2	3	Reject
			Opposed by 22				Accept
5	Rural	Pedestrian facilities	Supports rule 4.6.6 as it relates to new development, but not to existing activities. Considers the need for a consent to changes to 5 or more spaces to be inefficient. Notes that car parks will need to meet standards on dimensions, manoeuvrability location etc.	Amend rule 4.6.6 to remove reference to redevelopment of car parks.	4.5.2	11	Accept in part

		in car parks	Supported by 25 Opposed by 22				Accept in Part Accept in Part
6	Township	CRETS	Supports the inclusion of the Issue 1 except that it may be used to lend credence to the southern bypass and the Christchurch, Rolleston and Environs Transportation Study (CRETS), which the university opposes due to the effects on its operations. Considers this may be used as justification for CRETS bypass. Opposes Issue 3 (Future Transport Networks) inasmuch as it references CRETS.	Amend paragraph 2 of Issue 1 to include the need to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of the transport network. Make various amendments to Issue 3 to acknowledge that CRETS has not been prepared under the RMA and remove protection for future transport corridors.	4.12	18	Reject
7	Township	Emphasis on transport	Objectives B2.1.3 and B2.1.4 place too much emphasis on transport and not enough on social, cultural and economic well-being. Considers it does not give effect to RPS Objective 2 Chapter 15 which aim to avoid remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of transport networks; and 20.4 which aims to protect nationally significant physical resources from the adverse effects of transport networks	Amend Objective B2.1.3 to include protections for tertiary education and research facilities from future transport networks. Amend Objective B2.1.4 to include obligation to avoid (as well as remedy or mitigate) adverse effects.	4.13	19	Accept in part
8	Township	Road Hierachy and access to arterial roads	Concerned about the effects of proposed policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b) and that these will diminish the ability of established activities to gain access to an arterial road and control the amount of traffic generated from the activity. Concerned that the policies do not provide for an integrated approach to transport management as they place too much emphasis transportation at the expense of land use and accessibility, and does not recognise the existing and unique nature of University facilities. Opposed to the road hierachy inasmuch as it leads to restrictions on access to roads that are nominated as arterial.	Various amendments to policy wording: Policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3 and B2.1.4(a); and Policy B2.1.12 to provide increased recognition of the importance of land use issues.	4.2.1	2	Reject
9	Township	CRETS	Opposes CRETS as it encourages the location of a bypass through the university's landholdings	Delete the final paragraph under Explanation and reasons OR Make various amendments to same to acknowledge that CRETS has not been prepared under the RMA	4.12	18	Reject
10	Township	Maintenance of roads	Request that the policy should be extended to protect nationally significant activities (like the University) from the effects of construction and maintenance of roads.	Add "nationally and regionally important tertiary education and research facilities" to the list under policy B2.1.25	4.16	22	Reject
11	Township	Access to arterial roads	Oppose application of rule 17.2.1.7 to business 3 zones.	add an exception to rule 17.2.1.7 to exclude business 3 zoned land.	4.2.2	3	Reject
12	Township	High traffic generator	Concerned that rule 17.3.6 could be triggered by a redevelopment of their site without any increase in effects	exclude business 3 zoned land	4.7	13	Reject
13	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Opposes the increase in minimum parking from 1 space per 2 staff members to 1.5 spaces per 2 staff members because it is not justified in the section 32 analysis and is not aware of any problems caused by the existing standard. Notes that increased parking is inconsistent with policy direction to promote sustainable transport	Retain existing parking standards of 1 space per 2 staff and 1 space per 10 students.	4.4.2	8	Accept

				Supported by 25				
	14	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Notes that the university has long established car parking areas with no known concerns about functionality. Expresses concern that the definition of redevelopment is 5 spaces and the requirement for resource consent is onerous and that redevelopment may be protected by existing use rights. Considers that standards in relation to dimensions, manoeuvrability etc are sufficient.	Delete rule 17.7.2	4.5.2	11	Reject
4	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
5	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
6	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Considers that PC12 is being used to nullify previous agreements and legalize the use of the existing railway siding	Various physical works within the B2A zone to address existing issues	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
7	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
8	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Cites the denigration of lifestyle through noise pollution and dust pollution [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
9	1	Township	Access to Izone from railway	Noise pollution from shunting [from established railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road. Physical works within the B2A zone to address existing issues.	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
10	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
11	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Cites the denigration of lifestyle through noise pollution and dust pollution [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
12	1	Township	Access to Izone from railway road	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road and restrict operation of existing railway siding. Installation of bunding at boundary with local residents [of Armack Drive].	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
13	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
14	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Cites the denigration of lifestyle through noise pollution [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
15	1	Township	Access to Izone from	Cites the denigration of lifestyle through noise pollution [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
16	1	Township	Integrate land	Integrated land use and transport, safety and efficiency	Decline Plan Change 12	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 23				Accept

17	1	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Amenity issues should not be managed by a catch all traffic generation rule. Rule 17.7.1 gives the council unreasonable discretion to control the layout of entire developments based simply on the number of car parking spaces. This is not effects based and could lead to decisions being made in relation to the development of entire properties that are not sufficiently related to the effects of car parking. The wording of policy B3.4.18(b) does not provide clear direction for assessing applications and administrators of the District Plan will not have adequate knowledge in the broad range of matters at their discretion.	Reject Plan Change 12 or delete Rule 17.7.1 and Policy B3.4.18(b) or amend said policies to reflect the issues raised in this submission.	4.5.2	10 + 11	Accept in part
				Supported by 28, 29, 30 Partly supported by 25				Accept in Part Accept in Part
18	1	Township	Access and subdivision design	Notes that the revised requirement for any access onto any road to meet sight distances will be hard to meet. 45m site distance for any access onto local roads will be hard to meet for properties on short streets or near corners. This could result in poor subdivision design against the intent of Plan Change 7, which promotes good urban design. May also result in poor urban design outcomes due to orientation of properties to the road and the location of vehicle entranceways and garages.	Alter table 13.6 by removing the requirement for sightlines from all vehicle access for local roads in residential areas, or ensure that the requirement does not apply to Minor and Intermediate local roads as defined by table 13.8	4.8	14	Reject
				Supported by 25				
19	1	BOTH	All	Supports the updating of the district plan so that it provides for more sustainable transport and caters for future transport networks		4.1	1	Accept
				Supported by 22				Accept
20	1	BOTH	Minimum Parking standards	Wishes to encourage sustainable transport to schools. Seeks reassurance that a reduction in car parks would be acceptable if a travel management plan was in place. Notes that driving age is proposed to change to 16 and that plan change would not reflect legislative requirements.	Consideration of changes in legal driving age. Reduction in car parking requirements for educational activities or reassurance that a reduction in car parking numbers would be acceptable if a travel management plan was in place.	4.4.2	7 + 8	Accept
	2	BOTH	Mobility impaired parking	Considers rule 13.1.1.6 is unclear how many mobility impaired car parks are required for school sites.	Clarification on requirements	4.4.2	8	Accept in Part
	3	BOTH	Existing Educational Activities / Existing land use	Considers that parking space requirements are unclear for incremental growth. Unclear when rule 13.1.1.1 is triggered. Schools have a finite land capacity and the number of car parks is often at capacity.	Clarification on the application of car parking requirements for the roll growth or expansion of existing schools.	4.4.2	8	Accept in Part

	4	BOTH	Objectives and policies	Supports objectives B2.1.2 and B2.1.3 as they contribute to safety and ease of movement of pedestrians, cyclists and motorists. Supports Policy B2.1.6(c) as it allows initiatives that can reduce parking demand. Notes that the ministry may seek a reduction in the number of car parks required in favour of promoting alternative transport modes. Support Policies B2.1.7, B2.1.14 and B2.1.15 as these also provide for alternative forms of transport. Supports Policy B3.4.18(b) as it promotes pedestrians and cyclists over the number of car parks required.	Generally supports objectives and policies in particular Policy B2.1.6(c)	4.4.1	7 + 9 + 11	Accept
21	1	BOTH		Cites the denigration of lifestyle through noise pollution [from existing railway activities] in particular shunting at night.	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road. Install bunding and seal road [unspecified].	4.16	22	Reject
				Opposed by 31				Accept
22	1	BOTH	Transport Choice	Supports the encouragement of transport choice		4.1	1	Accept
	2	BOTH	Road Classifications	Considers it logical to de-couple the strategic networks into State Highway and local to recognise different jurisdiction and reflect CRETS. Changes to Hamptons and Weedons Road recognise the link functions of these roads and are consistent with Roads of National Significance. Suggests that Marshes Road (important link between Templeton and Prebbleton) be recognised.		4.15	21	TBA
				Partly Supported by 25				
	3	BOTH	Transport Choice	Supports Issue 1 Integrating land use and transport. Suggests that strategy relating to Integrating land use and transport should encourage positive outcomes rather than just concentrate on avoiding adverse effects. Requests amendments to Objective B2.1.3.	Amend Transport Network Strategy to read "Policies and rules that reflect the need for an integrated approach to land-use and transport planning to <u>enable transport choice</u> and avoid adverse effects of development". Minor amendments to Object B2.1.3 to accentuate transport choice.	4.12	18	Accept
				Supported by 23				Reject
	4	BOTH	Public transport	Supports Policy B2.1.4(a) but requests that explanation should identify how public transport routes are protected, by ensuring that there is sufficient public awareness of them.	requests amendment of explanation: "It is important to consider the location and design of new roads within the context of existing and anticipated transport networks and adjoining land-use patterns <u>and ensure these networks are protected and recognised, in particular for public transport routes</u> "	4.2.1	2	Reject
	5	BOTH	State Highways and arterial roads	Concerned that Policy B2.1.5 would allow for maximum permeability of state highways which have a more significant through function. Suggests that state highways and arterial roads are the most efficient routes for travelling between districts as well as across the district.	Amend policy B2.1.5 to include recognition of road hierarchy. Amend Anticipated Environmental Outcomes to also note that State Highways and Arterial roads are the most efficient routes for traffic travelling to adjoining districts.	4.2.1	2	Accept
	6	BOTH	Minimum Parking standards	Support Policy B2.1.6(a) as the provision of adequate on-site parking protects the safe and efficient movement of traffic. Support the intention of B2.1.16(c) but suggests alternative wording.	Amend policy B2.1.6(c) to "Encourage parking provision on alternative sites and or travel via sustainable modes or provision of workplace travel management plans <u>where it</u> may reduce on-site car parking demand and have wider associated benefits. in limited situations where such options are viable and enforceable "	4.4.1	8	Accept

	7	BOTH	Access to roads	Support Policy B2.1.12 but suggest that the explanation should mention efficient access to the road network and that activities near the state highway should also have good access to the road network.	Amend the new text added to the explanation by the plan change.	4.4.1		Accept
	8	Township	Demand Management	Supports policy B2.1.13 and B2.1.14		4.14	20	Accept
	9	BOTH	Site layout	Supports B3.4.18(b) and suggests that the effects of reductions in parking achieved through travel demand management also be included.	Amend Policy B3.4.18(b) and explanatory text	4.5.1	10	Accept in Part
	10	BOTH	Definition of state highways	Suggests amendment to definition of State Highway	Amend definition of State Highway	4.2.1	2	Accept in Part
	11	BOTH	Reverse Sensitivity	Supports Rules 4.9.3 and 4.9.4 in the Township volume to minimise reverse sensitivity from noise sensitive activities such as dwellings close to state highways. Requests the same rules in the rural volume.	Add new rules under C3.2 in the rural volume, equivalent to township volume rules 4.9.3 and 4.9.4.	4.16	22	Accept
23	1	BOTH		Considers that the plan change will give effect to chapters 12 and 15 of the RPS, the Regional Land Transport Strategy and to change 1 to the RPS. Supports the intention of the plan change to deliver integration of land use and transport; urban form that promotes efficient transport and accessibility; promotion of good quality subdivision and development; updated parking standards; safe and efficient transport; making the district plan easier to use; and ensuring development provides a range of transport options. Supported by 22	Uphold Plan Change 12	4.1	1	Accept
	2	BOTH		Requests amendments to re-inforce strategic planning for public transport.	Amend Policy B2.1.7 and B3.4.18(b) to include references to public transport. Amend policy B2.1.5(township) to include references to the Metro Strategy adopted by the Selwyn District Council.	4.2.1 and 4.5.1	2 + 10	Accept
24	1	BOTH	Minimum Parking standards	Opposes increase in minimum parking requirement from Business 1 zones. Urban traffic surveys of parking demand in Lincoln and Rolleston indicate that current on-site parking requirements of 2 spaces per 100m2 achieve the plan's objective of catering for parking over and above what is available on the road / public parking. Supported by 28, 29, 30	Amend table E13.1 to retain current parking requirement of 2 spaces per 100m2	4.4.2	8	Reject
								Reject
	1	BOTH	Rights of Way	Rule 4.5.1.7 limits shared access to 6 sites or potential sites. Considers no valid reason is given and notes that potential sites is not defined. Supported by 34 Opposed by 22	Set maximum at 10 sites and define "potential site".	4.3	5	Accept in Part
	2	Rural	Access and subdivision	Rule 4.5.1.8 requires roads with multiple frontage to have access to the lowest classified road frontage. Considers this approach is inconsistent with Township rule 5.2.1.2 where collector roads are afforded an exemption.	Exempt collector roads from rule 4.5.1.8	4.2.2	3	Reject

3	Rural	Access	Rules 4.5.4 and 4.5.5 require non-compliances with access design rules to be discretionary activities. Considers restricted discretionary would be more appropriate	Amend category status for non-compliances with rules 4.5.4 and 4.5.5 to restricted discretionary.	4.2.2	3	Accept
			Opposed by 22				Reject
4	Rural	Turning	Rule 4.6.2 requires on-site manoeuvring for any vehicle. Notes this term is not defined and considers should refer to vehicles in Appendix 10.		4.3	6	
5	Rural	Cycling provision	Considers cycle parking in the rural area is unnecessary	delete rule 4.6.3.3	4.4.2	9	Accept
6	Rural	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Considers there is an inconsistency between rules 4.6.6 where car parks with over 40 spaces are a controlled activity and 4.6.7 requiring assessment of any non-compliance as a restricted discretionary activity.	Correct inconsistency to a controlled status.	4.5.2	11	Accept
7	BOTH	Disabled Parking	Notes that there is a difference in required range of width of disabled parking between table E10.1 and table E13.2 and considers that it is only necessary to specify a minimum.	Minimum width of disabled parking spaces in both volumes should be 3.2m	4.5.2	11	Accept
8	Rural	Car Parking	Notes there is a grammatical error in 10.1.5.4	Not specified			
9	Rural	Rights of Way	Notes that a turning area is optional for ROW's that serve 2-3 sites in the urban area, but not in the rural area.	Amend rural volume table 10.2 to make a turning area optional for 2-3 users. Clarify what design vehicle should be accommodated in hammerhead specified in rule E10.2.1.3.	4.3	6	Reject
10	Rural	State Highways	Considers that use of Diagram E10.B2 is inappropriate as it is for highways with a capacity of over 10000 vehicles per day, which does not apply in the district.	Replace Diagram E10.B2 with diagram D from NZTA Planning Policy Manual	4.2.2	3	Reject
11	BOTH	Vehicle crossings	Considers the intersection distances for certain roads are inconsistent with those specified in the NZTA Planning Policy manual.	Amend setbacks in Table E10.3 (rural) and 13.5 (township) as follows: collector and local roads: 75m; 30m from intersecting arterial roads; the 60-75m setback for local roads should be less than that for collector roads.	4.10	16	Accept in Part
12	Rural	Sight distances	Considers the site distances are inappropriate and inconsistent with the NZTA Planning Policy Manual which states that the 85th percentile speed should be used. These equate to sight distances 50% of those specified in table E10.4.	Update table E10.4 and Diagram E10.A1 to match NZTA Planning Policy Manual	4.8	14	Reject
13	BOTH	Intersection spacing	Considers that spacings are not justified and that values for 50 and 90 kph roads follow ESD requirements in Austroads and would be applicable to arterial and strategic roads. Considers SISD requirements would be more appropriate for collector and local roads. 800m distance for 100kph roads not supported by Austroads and 500m would be more appropriate.	Amend table 10.6 (rural) and E13.9 (township) as described.	4.9	15	Accept
14	Township	Rights of Way	Rule 5.2.1.7 limits shared access to 6 sites or potential sites. Considers no valid reason is given and notes that potential sites is not defined. Considers rule 5.2.5 which classifies non-compliance as a non-complying activity is excessive as effects are internalised.	Set maximum in rule 5.2.1.7 at 10 sites and define "potential site". Amend status of non-compliance to restricted discretionary.	4.3	5	Accept in Part
			Supported by 34 Opposed by 22				Reject Accept

15	Township	Vehicle crossings	Non compliance with rule 5.3.1.3 [vehicle crossing standards] is discretionary. Considers this excessive as only the road controlling authority would be affected.	Amend status of non-compliance in rule 5.3.6 to restricted discretionary.	4.8	14	Accept
16	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Considers the intent of rule 5.5.2 has merit but that the threshold is too low at 40 spaces.	Increase threshold in rule 5.5.2 to 100 spaces.	4.5.2	11	Reject
17	Township	Parking standards	Non compliance with rule 5.5.1 [cycle parking standards] is discretionary. Considers this excessive as any non-compliance would be minor.	Amend status of non-compliance in rule 5.5.3 to restricted discretionary.	4.10	9	Reject
18	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Opposes increase in minimum parking requirement from Business 1 zones. Urbis traffic surveys of parking demand in Lincoln and Rolleston indicate that current on-site parking requirements of 2 spaces per 100m2 achieve the plan's objective of catering for parking over and above what is available on the road / public parking. Considers that increase in parking for pre-schools is excessive and would result in poor use of land through oversized car parks. Notes that table E13.1 does not define workbay	Amend table E13.1 to retain current parking requirement of 2 spaces per 100m2 in B1 zone. Set pre-school parking requirement at 1 space per 6 students. Define workbay.	4.4.2	8 + 9	Accept in Part
19	Township	Parking dimensions	Considers that minimum car park dimensions have been incorrectly adopted from NZS2390.1:2004 which has been updated. Supported by 28, 29, 30	Amend table E13.2 in line with updated NZS2890.1:2004.	4.5.2	11	Reject
20	Township	Rights of Way	Considers that rights of way carrying less than 30 vpd need not be sealed as it is not required to form an effective all weather surface	Not specified	4.3	6	Reject
21	Township	Sight distances	Considers sight spacing requirements in table E13.2.3 for the business zones are unrealistic given likely section sizes (notes that a distance of 113m will be hard to comply with).	Do not apply sight distances to living and business sites that are on collector and local roads with a 50-70kph limit.	4.8	14	Reject
22	Township	Road formation standard	Considers widths of collector and living 2 local roads are excessive	Reduce minimum widths in table E13.8 to 15m (collector) and 11.5 (Living 2) local.	4.6	12	Reject
23	Township	Local road hierarchy	Notes that different categories of local road are not defined in table 13.8	Clarify table 13.8 or supporting information	4.6	12	Reject
24	Township	Road formation standards	Considers that rule E13.3.1.4 limit to cul-de-sac length of 150m is not justified and that connectivity can be provided by other means. Considers that E13.3.1.5 preventing cul-de-sacs from accessing other cul-de-sacs is not justified. Supported by 34	Delete rules E13.3.1.4 and E13.3.1.5	4.6	12	Reject Reject

26	1	BOTH	Road hierarchy	Concerned about the change in status of rural roads to arterial as promulgated in CRET. Notes that Proposed Plan Change 17 and change 1 to the RPS suggest that rural residential should not require access from an arterial road or a state highway. Concerned about the change in status of Trices Road and that this will restrict rural residential development in the part of Prebbleton adjacent to this road. Considers that the number of arterials in close proximity to towns will result in rural residential development that turns its back on towns that it adjoins, which would be contrary to good urban design and change 1 to the RPS.	Amend Part E appendix 9 so that Trices Road remains a collector road. Delay any changes to road status until after Plan Change 17 has been heard.	4.15	21	Reject
				Opposed by 22				Accept
27	1	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Notes that the changes in parking requirements in table E13.1 would require an increase in parking spaces on the site of the Famous Grouse from 30 to 75. Considers that this: encourages unsustainable use of motor vehicles; encourages unsustainable built form; encourages large areas of unbuilt space to be positioned so that the relationship between buildings and street is lost; would undermine the characteristics of scale density and form in Lincoln Town Centre; would not discourage the individual use of motor vehicles to travel to hospitality venues	Amend table E13.1 to reduce parking requirements to below the levels in the current District Plan.	4.4.2	8	Reject
				Supported by 25				Reject
	1	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Notes that there are no methods listed under Policy B2.1.7	Amend policy to include methods, eg reference to an industry accepted document such as AS/NZS2890.1:2004	4.5.1	10	Reject
	2	Township	Integrated land use and transport	Considers that policy B2.1.13 should be aimed at reducing motorised travel rather than the demand for transport. Notes that there are no rules for Travel Management Plans.	Amend Policy B2.1.13 to refer to reducing the demand for motorised forms of transport. Introduce a rule specifying the criteria for when Travel Management Plans must be developed.	4.14	20	Reject
	3	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Considers that matters of amenity should not be addressed through a traffic policy and that safety, security and accessibility of pedestrians are addressed through Policy B2.1.7. Considers that rules 17.7.1 and 17.7.2 do not give a clear indication of what the Council is trying to achieve and that it has the effect of allowing Council to control the layout of entire developments.	Delete Policy B3.4.18(b) and (c) and rule 17.7	4.5.1 and 4.5.2	10 + 11	Accept in part
				Partially Supported by 25				Accept in Part

4	Township	Access to arterial roads	Considers it unreasonable for retail activities to have to access road with lowest classification. Lower order roads may not be designed to accommodate high and heavy traffic and there may be amenity effects from this.	Amend rule 17.2.1.7 as follows. Where an activity (site) has frontage to more than one road and exceeds a nominated trip generation threshold then the primary vehicle access shall be taken from the frontage located on the 'higher order' road. If the activity generates less traffic than the nominated trip generation threshold then vehicle access shall be limited to the frontage located on the 'lower order' road.	4.2.2	3	Reject
			Opposed by 25				Accept in Part
5	Township	High traffic rules	Considers that B1 zoning anticipates a certain level of traffic and that the rule is not required. Notes that it appears to be based on Christchurch City rule which is under review.	Delete rules 17.3.6 and 17.3.7 or review the trip generation threshold.	4.7	13	Reject
			Opposed by 25				Reject
6	Township	Sight distances	Supports rule as it elevates the importance of sight distances at vehicle crossings. Considers that distances in table 13.6 are in line with industry standards.	Retain rule 17.3.8	4.8	14	Accept
			Opposed by 25				Reject
7	Township	Road hierarchy	Supports the changes to classification of some roads in the road hierarchy	retain the new hierarchy in Appendix E7	4.15	21	Accept
			Supported by 22				Accept
8	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Considers that a reduced parking provision is appropriate in a town centre especially as the size of the centre increases. Notes that trip generation follows a logarithmic function as GFA increases. Supports the inclusion of a rate for Slow Trade and bulk retail but notes that it is not well defined.	Replace Rule 13.1.1 and Table E13.1(b) with a shopping centre requirement which reduces as the size of the centre increases. Retain provisions for Slow Trade and bulk retail but clarify the definition.	4.4.2	8	Reject
			Partially Supported by 25				Reject
9	Township	Shared Parking	Notes that the present rule 13.1.1.3 that allows for shared parking between activities are undertaken at different times is to be deleted. Notes that this encourages the efficient use of resources. But considers that the discretion the rule affords to approve joint use of car parking is inappropriate.	Re-instate rule E13.1.1.3 but remove Councils discretion to approve joint use of parking.	4.4.2	9	Accept in Part
			Opposed by 25				Accept
10	Township	Minimum Parking standard	Notes that rules 13.1.1.5 and 13.1.1.6 are an acceptable methodology as applied in other district plans.	Approve rules 13.1.1.5 and 13.1.1.6	4.4.2	8	Accept
			Supported by 25				Accept
11	Township	Parking area location	Considers rule 13.1.3.3 is appropriate as it provides flexibility in where parking is located whilst still ensuring pedestrian connectivity and convenience.	Approve rule 13.1.3.3	4.4.2	9	Accept in Part
			Supported by 25				Accept
12	Township	Cycle parking	Considers that the cycle parking rate (rule 13.1.4) is appropriate and the cap of 10 spaces ensures cycle parking is not onerous for large developments. The cap should apply to a centre as a whole rather than each activity in the centre. Notes that the issue date of the code of practice should be included in the rule.	Approve rule 13.1.4 with amendments	4.4.2	9	Reject
			Supported by 25				Reject

13	Township	Loading and manoeuvring	Considers that rule E13.1.5 is acceptable but notes that a larger truck than 8m may visit a site	Amend rule 13.1.5 to state that loading and manoeuvring should be designed for an 8m truck or maximum expected vehicle size	4.3	6	Reject
			Opposed by 25				Accept
	Township	Accessway widths	Considers the widths required in rule 13.2.1 are too wide especially if an accessway is one way and will not support pedestrian activity. Considers the rule is not consistent with rule 13.2.4.5 (rules for vehicle crossings). Notes that whilst manoeuvring space should be provided, it need not be in the form of a turning area.	Amend access width requirements and vehicle crossing widths. Include standards for a single living zone site.	4.3	6	Accept in Part
			Supported by 25				Accept in Part
	15	Township	Queueing spaces	Notes that table E13.1 provides that drive-throughs shall have 5 queuing spaces per booth, but Table E13.3 provide for queuing spaces based on the number of car parks.	Amend Table E13.3 so that it cross references with E13.1(a).	4.11	14
Supported by 25				Reject			
16	Township	Vehicle crossings	Notes that table E13.7 provides a maximum width of 8m for shared crossing, but considers that a wider crossing is sometimes required.	Amend table E13.7 to allow for wider crossings. Include a new rule to require sufficient visibility between pedestrians on the footpath and vehicles exiting the crossing point.	4.3	6	Reject
			Opposed by 25				Accept
17	Township	Road Standards	Considers that table E13.9 would require the removal of parking on Rolleston Drive and Masefield Drive to make way for cycle lanes and that roads in business zones should have parking on both sides.	Amend table E13.9 to provide separate standards for collector and business roads in business areas to ensure that parking is provided on both sides of the carriageway; or that all such roads provide parking on both sides.	4.6	12	Reject
1	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Notes that there are no methods listed under Policy B2.1.7	Amend policy to include methods, eg reference to an industry accepted document such as AS/NZS2890.1:2004	4.5.1	10	Reject
	Township	Integrated land use and transport	Considers that policy B2.1.13 should be aimed at reducing motorised travel rather than the demand for transport. Notes that there are no rules for Travel Management Plans.	Amend Policy B2.1.13 to refer to reducing the demand for motorised forms of transport. Introduce a rule specifying the criteria for when Travel Management Plans must be developed.	4.15	20	Reject
	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Considers that matters of amenity should not be addressed through a traffic policy and that safety, security and accessibility of pedestrians are addressed through Policy B2.1.7. Considers that rules 17.7.1 and 17.7.2 do not give a clear indication of what the Council is trying to achieve and that it has the effect of allowing Council to control the layout of entire developments.	Delete Policy B3.4.18(b) and (c) and rule 17.7	4.5.1 and 4.5.2	10 + 11	Accept in part
			Partially Supported by 25				Accept in Part

4	Towns hip	Access to arterial roads	Considers it unreasonable for retail activities to have to access road with lowest classification. Lower order roads may not be designed to accommodate high and heavy traffic and there may be amenity effects from this.	Amend rule 17.2.1.7 as follows. Where an activity (site) has frontage to more than one road and exceeds a nominated trip generation threshold then the primary vehicle access shall be taken from the frontage located on the 'higher order' road. If the activity generates less traffic than the nominated trip generation threshold then vehicle access shall be limited to the frontage located on the 'lower order' road.	4.2.2	3	Reject
			Opposed by 25				Accept in Part
5	Towns hip	High traffic rules	Considers that B1 zoning anticipates a certain level of traffic and that the rule is not required. Notes that it appears to be based on Christchurch City rule which is under review.	Delete rules 17.3.6 and 17.3.7 or review the trip generation threshold.	4.7	13	Reject
			Opposed by 25				Reject
6	Towns hip	Sight distances	Supports rule as it elevates the importance of sight distances at vehicle crossings. Considers that distances in table 13.6 are in line with industry standards.	Retain rule 17.3.8	4.8	14	Accept
			Opposed by 25				Reject
7	Towns hip	Road hierachy	Supports the changes to classification of some roads in the road hierachy	retain the new hierachy in Appendix E7	4.15	21	Accept
			Supported by 22				Accept
8	Towns hip	Minimum Parking standard s	Considers that a reduced parking provision is appropriate in a town centre especially as the size of the centre increases. Notes that trip generation follows a logarithmic function as GFA increases. Supports the inclusion of a rate for Slow Trade and bulk retail but notes that it is not well defined.	Replace Rule 13.1.1 and Table E13.1(b) with a shopping centre requirement which reduces as the size of the centre increases. Retain provisions for Slow Trade and bulk retail but clarify the definition.	4.4.2	8	Reject
			Partially Supported by 25				Reject
9	Towns hip	Shared Parking	Notes that the present rule 13.1.1.3 that allows for shared parking between activities are undertaken at different times is to be deleted. Notes that this encourages the efficient use of resources. But considers that the discretion the rule affords to approve joint use of car parking is inappropriate.	Re-instate rule E13.1.1.3 but remove Councils discretion to approve joint use of parking.	4.4.2	9	Accept in Part
			Opposed by 25				Accept
10	Towns hip	Minimum Parking standard	Notes that rules 13.1.1.5 and 13.1.1.6 are an acceptable methodology as applied in other district plans.	Approve rules 13.1.1.5 and 13.1.1.6	4.4.2	8	Accept
			Supported by 25				Accept
11	Towns hip	Parking area location	Considers rule 13.1.3.3 is appropriate as it provides flexibility in where parking is located whilst still ensuring pedestrian connectivity and convenience.	Approve rule 13.1.3.3	4.4.2	9	Accept in Part
			Supported by 25				Accept
12	Towns hip	Cycle parking	Considers that the cycle parking rate (rule 13.1.4) is appropriate and the cap of 10 spaces ensures cycle parking is not onerus for large developments. The cap should apply to a centre as a whole rather than each activity in the centre. Notes that the issue date of the code of practice should be included in the rule.	Approve rule 13.1.4 with amendments	4.4.2	9	Reject
			Supported by 25				Reject

	13	Township	Loading and manoeuvring	Considers that rule E13.1.5 is acceptable but notes that a larger truck than 8m may visit a site Opposed by 25	Amend rule 13.1.5 to state that loading and manoeuvring should be designed for an 8m truck or maximum expected vehicle size	4.3	6	Reject Accept
	14	Township	Accessway widths	Considers the widths required in rule 13.2.1 are too wide especially if an accessway is one way and will not support pedestrian activity. Considers the rule is not consistent with rule 13.2.4.5 (rules for vehicle crossings). Notes that whilst manoeuvring space should be provided, it need not be in the form of a turning area. Supported by 25	Amend access width requirements and vehicle crossing widths. Include standards for a single living zone site.	4.3	6	Accept in Part Accept in Part
	15	Township	Queueing spaces	Notes that table E13.1 provides that drive-throughs shall have 5 queuing spaces per booth, but Table E13.3 provide for queuing spaces based on the number of car parks. Supported by 25	Amend Table E13.3 so that it cross references with E13.1(a).	4.11	14	Reject Reject
	16	Township	Vehicle crossings	Notes that table E13.7 provides a maximum width of 8m for shared crossing, but considers that a wider crossing is sometimes required. Opposed by 25	Amend table E13.7 to allow for wider crossings. Include a new rule to require sufficient visibility between pedestrians on the footpath and vehicles exiting the crossing point.	4.3	6	Reject Accept
	17	Township	Road Standards	Considers that table E13.9 would require the removal of parking on Rolleston Drive and Masefield Drive to make way for cycle lanes and that roads in business zones should have parking on both sides.	Amend table E13.9 to provide separate standards for collector and business roads in business areas to ensure that parking is provided on both sides of the carriageway; or that all such roads provide parking on both sides.	4.6	12	Reject
30	1	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Notes that there are no methods listed under Policy B2.1.7	Amend policy to include methods, eg reference to an industry accepted document such as AS/NZS2890.1:2004	4.5.1	10	Reject
	2	Township	Integrated land use and transport	Considers that policy B2.1.13 should be aimed at reducing motorised travel rather than the demand for transport. Notes that there are no rules for Travel Management Plans.	Amend Policy B2.1.13 to refer to reducing the demand for motorised forms of transport. Introduce a rule specifying the criteria for when Travel Management Plans must be developed.	4.15	20	Reject
	3	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Considers that matters of amenity should not be addressed through a traffic policy and that safety, security and accessibility of pedestrians are addressed through Policy B2.1.7. Considers that rules 17.7.1 and 17.7.2 do not give a clear indication of what the Council is trying to achieve and that it has the effect of allowing Council to control the layout of entire developments. Partially Supported by 25	Delete Policy B3.4.18(b) and (c) and rule 17.7	4.5.1 and 4.5.2	10 + 11	Accept in part Accept in Part

4	Towns hip	Access to arterial roads	Considers it unreasonable for retail activities to have to access road with lowest classification. Lower order roads may not be designed to accommodate high and heavy traffic and there may be amenity effects from this.	Amend rule 17.2.1.7 as follows. Where an activity (site) has frontage to more than one road and exceeds a nominated trip generation threshold then the primary vehicle access shall be taken from the frontage located on the 'higher order' road. If the activity generates less traffic than the nominated trip generation threshold then vehicle access shall be limited to the frontage located on the 'lower order' road.	4.2.2	3	Reject
			Opposed by 25				Accept in Part
5	Towns hip	High traffic rules	Considers that B1 zoning anticipates a certain level of traffic and that the rule is not required. Notes that it appears to be based on Christchurch City rule which is under review.	Delete rules 17.3.6 and 17.3.7 or review the trip generation threshold.	4.7	13	Reject
			Opposed by 25				Reject
6	Towns hip	Sight distances	Supports rule as it elevates the importance of sight distances at vehicle crossings. Considers that distances in table 13.6 are in line with industry standards.	Retain rule 17.3.8	4.8	14	Accept
			Opposed by 25				Reject
7	Towns hip	Road hierachy	Supports the changes to classification of some roads in the road hierachy	retain the new hierachy in Appendix E7	4.15	21	Accept
			Supported by 22				Accept
8	Towns hip	Minimum Parking standards	Considers that a reduced parking provision is appropriate in a town centre especially as the size of the centre increases. Notes that trip generation follows a logarithmic function as GFA increases. Supports the inclusion of a rate for Slow Trade and bulk retail but notes that it is not well defined.	Replace Rule 13.1.1 and Table E13.1(b) with a shopping centre requirement which reduces as the size of the centre increases. Retain provisions for Slow Trade and bulk retail but clarify the definition.	4.4.2	8	Reject
			Partially Supported by 25				Reject
9	Towns hip	Shared Parking	Notes that the present rule 13.1.1.3 that allows for shared parking between activities are undertaken at different times is to be deleted. Notes that this encourages the efficient use of resources. But considers that the discretion the rule affords to approve joint use of car parking is inappropriate.	Re-instate rule E13.1.1.3 but remove Councils discretion to approve joint use of parking.	4.4.2	9	Accept in Part
			Opposed by 25				Accept
10	Towns hip	Minimum Parking standard	Notes that rules 13.1.1.5 and 13.1.1.6 are an acceptable methodology as applied in other district plans.	Approve rules 13.1.1.5 and 13.1.1.6	4.4.2	8	Accept
			Supported by 25				Accept
11	Towns hip	Parking area location	Considers rule 13.1.3.3 is appropriate as it provides flexibility in where parking is located whilst still ensuring pedestrian connectivity and convenience.	Approve rule 13.1.3.3	4.4.2	9	Accept in Part
			Supported by 25				Accept
12	Towns hip	Cycle parking	Considers that the cycle parking rate (rule 13.1.4) is appropriate and the cap of 10 spaces ensures cycle parking is not onerous for large developments. The cap should apply to a centre as a whole rather than each activity in the centre. Notes that the issue date of the code of practice should be included in the rule.	Approve rule 13.1.4 with amendments	4.4.2	9	Reject
			Supported by 25				Reject

13	Township	Loading and manoeuvring	Considers that rule E13.1.5 is acceptable but notes that a larger truck than 8m may visit a site	Amend rule 13.1.5 to state that loading and manoeuvring should be designed for an 8m truck or maximum expected vehicle size	4.3	6	Reject	
			Opposed by 25				Accept	
14	Township	Accessway widths	Considers the widths required in rule 13.2.1 are too wide especially if an accessway is one way and will not support pedestrian activity. Considers the rule is not consistent with rule 13.2.4.5 (rules for vehicle crossings). Notes that whilst manoeuvring space should be provided, it need not be in the form of a turning area.	Amend access width requirements and vehicle crossing widths. Include standards for a single living zone site.	4.3	6	Accept in Part	
			Supported by 25				Accept in Part	
15	Township	Queueing spaces	Notes that table E13.1 provides that drive-throughs shall have 5 queuing spaces per booth, but Table E13.3 provide for queuing spaces based on the number of car parks.	Amend Table E13.3 so that it cross references with E13.1(a).	4.11	14	Reject	
			Supported by 25				Reject	
16	Township	Vehicle crossings	Notes that table E13.7 provides a maximum width of 8m for shared crossing, but considers that a wider crossing is sometimes required.	Amend table E13.7 to allow for wider crossings. Include a new rule to require sufficient visibility between pedestrians on the footpath and vehicles exiting the crossing point.	4.3	6	Reject	
			Opposed by 25				Accept	
17	Township	Roadings	Considers that table E13.9 would require the removal of parking on Rolleston Drive and Masefield Drive to make way for cycle lanes and that roads in business zones should have parking on both sides.	Amend table E13.9 to provide separate standards for collector and business roads in business areas to ensure that parking is provided on both sides of the carriageway; or that all such roads provide parking on both sides.	4.6	12	Reject	
17	Township	Roadings	Considers that table E13.9 would require the removal of parking on Rolleston Drive and Masefield Drive to make way for cycle lanes and that roads in business zones should have parking on both sides.	Amend table E13.9 to provide separate standards for collector and business roads in business areas to ensure that parking is provided on both sides of the carriageway; or that all such roads provide parking on both sides.	4.6	12	Reject	
31	1	Township	Car Parking	Supports specific exemptions in B2A zone for parking non-compliances (restricted discretionary activity status and non-notification clause) but opposes increase in parking requirement in the industrial zone. Considers current parking requirements are in excess of what is required and represent an inefficient use of resources. Notes that other district plans have a specific category for warehousing and considers that new requirements are appropriate for general industrial activities.	Amend Table E13.1 to include a specific category for warehousing with a minimum parking requirement of 0.5 spaces per 100m2 GFA.	4.4.2	8	Reject
	Supported by 25		Reject					
	2	Township	Car Parking	Supports the opportunity to provide for shared car parking areas in the B1 and B2 zone and seeks for this to apply to the B2A zone.	Include the Business 2A zone in rule E13.1.3.3	4.4.2	9	Accept in Part

	3	Township	Vehicle Crossings	Rule E13.2.4.7 restricts the provision of vehicle crossings onto roads with a speed limit greater than 70km/h due to required setback distances in diagram E13.4. Notes that this would restrict provision of accesses onto Hoskyns Road. Considers that dispensation should be provided to Hoskyns Road to reflect agreed outcomes of Plan Change 5, that properties should front the road; or Council should undertake processes to reduce speed limit on Hoskyns Road so that the rule does not apply.	Amend rule E13.2.4.7 to exclude vehicle crossings on Hoskyns Road from having to comply with diagram E13.4; or reduce the speed limit on Hoskyns Road immediately so that this restriction will no longer apply.	4.2.2	3	Accept in Part
	1	Rural	Access	Supports the inclusion of the Issue 1 except that it may be used to lend credence to the southern bypass and the Christchurch, Rolleston and Environs Transportation Study (CRETS), which the university opposes due to the effects on its operations. Concerned about the inclusion of "effects of traffic on Gerald Street" in Issue 2 as an issue of concern to Council. Considers this may be used as justification for CRETS bypass. Opposes Issue 3 (Future Transport Networks) inasmuch as it references CRETS.	Amend paragraph 2 of Issue 1 to include the need to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of the transport network. Amend paragraph 2 of Issue 1 to remove references to Gerald Street. Make various amendments to Issue 3 to acknowledge that CRETS has not been prepared under the RMA.	4.12	18	Reject
				Opposed by 22				Accept
	2	Rural	Emphasis on transport	Objectives B2.1.3 and B2.1.4 place too much emphasis on transport and not enough on social, cultural and economic well-being. Considers it does not give effect to RPS Objective 2 Chapter 15 which aim to avoid remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of transport networks; and 20.4 which aims to protect nationally significant physical resources from the adverse effects of transport networks	Amend Objective B2.1.3 to include protections for tertiary education and research facilities from future transport networks. Amend Objective B2.1.4 to include obligation to avoid (as well as remedy or mitigate) adverse effects.	4.13	19	Accept in Part
				Opposed by 22				Accept
	3	Rural	Effect of PC12 on established land uses.	Concerned about the effects of proposed policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b) and that these will diminish the ability of established activities to gain access to an arterial road and control the amount of traffic generated from the activity. Concerned that the policies do not provide for an integrated approach to transport management as they place too much emphasis transportation at the expense of land use and accessibility, and does not recognise the existing and unique nature of University facilities. Opposed to the road hierarchy inasmuch as it leads to restrictions on access to roads that are nominated as arterial.	Various amendments to policy wording: Policies B2.1.2, B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b); and Policy B2.1.12 to provide increased recognition of the importance of established land use issues. Amend B2.1.12 so that it applies to new activities and smaller sites only.	4.2.1	2	Reject
				Opposed by 22				Accept
	4	Rural	Heavy Traffic Bypass	Opposes policy B2.1.26 as it places too much emphasis on the effects of heavy traffic through townships and not enough on the effects on alternate routes.	Delete policy B2.1.26	4.13	19	Accept in Part
				Opposed by 22				Accept in Part

5	Township	CRETS	Supports the inclusion of the Issue 1 except that it may be used to lend credence to the southern bypass and the Christchurch, Rolleston and Environs Transportation Study (CRETS), which the university opposes due to the effects on its operations. Considers this may be used as justification for CRETS bypass. Opposes Issue 3 (Future Transport Networks) inasmuch as it references CRETS.	Amend paragraph 2 of Issue 1 to include the need to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects of the transport network. Make various amendments to Issue 3 to acknowledge that CRETS has not been prepared under the RMA and remove protection for future transport corridors.	4.12	18	Reject
			Opposed by 22				Accept
	6	Township	Emphasis on transport	Objectives B2.1.3 and B2.1.4 place too much emphasis on transport and not enough on social, cultural and economic well-being. Considers it does not give effect to RPS Objective 2 Chapter 15 which aim to avoid remedy or mitigate the adverse effects of transport networks; and 20.4 which aims to protect nationally significant physical resources from the adverse effects of transport networks	4.13	19	Accept in Part
				Opposed by 22			Accept
	7	Township	Road Hierachy and access to arterial roads	Concerned about the effects of proposed policies B2.1.3, B2.1.4(a) and B2.1.4(b) and that these will diminish the ability of established activities to gain access to an arterial road and control the amount of traffic generated from the activity. Concerned that the policies do not provide for an integrated approach to transport management as they place too much emphasis transportation at the expense of land use and accessibility, and does not recognise the existing and unique nature of University facilities. Opposed to the road hierachy inasmuch as it leads to restrictions on access to roads that are nominated as arterial.	4.2.1	2	Reject
			Supported by 25				Reject
8	Township	Access via Rights of Way	Notes that Council is encouraging higher density (including terraced houses and multi-units typologies) and that increase in retirement age individuals could make retirement villages a more attractive living option. Requiring a legal road access may not be universally appropriate. Cites example of Dairy Block where access to up to 9 units was approved in 2009. Notes that Christchurch City Plan allows 15 units off a right of way.	Delete Proposed rule 5.2.1.7	4.3	5	Reject
			Supported by 25 Opposed by 22				Reject Accept
9	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car	Supports the thrust of the policy but questions the appropriateness of the 40 space threshold.	Delete Proposed rule 5.5.2	4.5.2	11	Accept in Part
			Supported by 25				Accept in Part

10	Township	Activity Status of land use / subdivision on consents	Notes 8 and 9 under Chapter 12 imply that land use consents should be bundled together with subdivision activity, which creates uncertainty with regard to notification status. Notes that subdivisions are restricted discretionary with a non-notification clause under rule 12.1. But small land use noncompliances such as corner splay requirements would change the status of the application. Considers it may be appropriate for subdivision and land use activities to be applied for concurrently under section 88 and decided jointly under section 104, they need not necessarily be considered jointly under section 95.	Delete proposed notes 8 and 9	4.16	22	Reject
			Supported by 33				Reject
11	Township	Corner splays	Notes that stages 1 and 2 of the dairy block subdivision in Lincoln have avoided the use of splays where low speed environments are to be achieved. New rules 12.1.4.2 and 12.2 do not include exceptions to discourage the use of splays in this instance.	Amend proposed rule 12.1.3.2 to include "except that where splays are to be specifically avoided (as a subdivision design element) to encourage slower vehicle speed environments and enhance pedestrian safety and residential amenity, no splay will be required.	4.16	22	Reject
			Supported by 33				Reject
12	Township	Minimum Parking standard	Considers that the revisions to table E13 are not justified in the section 32 analysis.	Delete amendments.	4.4.2	7	Reject
			Supported by 33				Reject
13	BOTH	Point Strips	LLD opposes the provisions relating to the use of point strips	Not specified	4.16	22	Reject
14	BOTH	Road Design Standards	LLD questions the need for Council to be exempt from complying with road design standards (rules 4.1.1 and 5.1.1) and seeks further explanation	Not specified			Reject
15 (LATE)	Townships	Vehicle crossings	Amendments to Appendix 13 are not consistent with urban design outcomes sought in Plan Change 7.	That standards in Appendix 13 be amended to align with Plan Change 7. That Table E13.5 be amended to reduce separation distances from intersections with roads having a speed limit of 50kph or less.	4.10	16	Accept