

Submission Number	Name	Submission Point	VOLUME	Subject area	Submission Type	Detail	Relief sought
1	Ag Research	1	Rural	Access	Oppose in part	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 established land use issues. Amend B2.1.12 so that it applies to new activities and smaller sites only.
1	Ag Research	2	Rural	Access	Oppose	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.	Amend rule 4.5.1.6 so that (a) and (b) do not apply to arterial roads. Delete proposed rule 4.5.1.8.
1	Ag Research	3	Rural	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Oppose in part	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.
1	Ag Research	4	Township	Access	Oppose in part	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 established land use issues. Amend B2.1.12 so that it applies to new activities and smaller sites only.
1	Ag Research	5	Township	Maintenance of roads	support in part	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
1	Ag Research	6	Township	Access	oppose	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.
1	Ag Research	7	Township	High traffic generator	oppose	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
1	Ag Research	8	Township	Minimum Parking standards	oppose	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
1	Ag Research	9	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Oppose	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.	Delete rule 17.7.2

2	Plant and Food	1	Rural	Access	Oppose in part	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.	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.
2	Plant and Food	2	Rural	Access	Oppose	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.	Amend rule 4.5.1.6 so that (a) and (b) do not apply to arterial roads. Delete proposed rule 4.5.1.8.
2	Plant and Food	3	Rural	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Oppose in part	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.
2	Plant and Food	4	Township	Access	Oppose in part	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.
2	Plant and Food	5	Township	Maintenance of roads	support in part	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
2	Plant and Food	6	Township	Access	oppose	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.
2	Plant and Food	7	Township	High traffic generator	oppose	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
2	Plant and Food	8	Township	Minimum Parking standards	oppose	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

2	Plant and Food	9	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Oppose	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
3	Lincoln University	1	Rural	CRETS	Oppose in part	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.
3	Lincoln University	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.
3	Lincoln University	3	Rural	Effect of PC12 on established land uses.	Oppose in part	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.
3	Lincoln University	4	Rural	Heavy Traffic Bypass	Oppose	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
3	Lincoln University	5	Rural	Access to arterial roads	Oppose	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.
3	Lincoln University	5	Rural	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Oppose in part	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.
3	Lincoln University	6	Township	CRETS	Oppose in part	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.

3	Lincoln University	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.
3	Lincoln University	8	Township	Road Hierachy and access to arterial roads	Oppose in part	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.
3	Lincoln University	9	Township	CRETS	Oppose	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
3	Lincoln University	10	Township	Maintenance of roads	support in part	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
3	Lincoln University	11	Township	Access to arterial roads	oppose	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.
3	Lincoln University	12	Township	High traffic generator	oppose	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
3	Lincoln University	13	Township	Minimum Parking standards	oppose	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 inconsistant with policy direction to promote sustainable transport	Retain existing parking standards of 1 space per 2 staff and 1 space per 10 students.
2	Plant and Food	9	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Oppose	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, manoevrability etc are sufficient.	Delete rule 17.7.2
4	Kevin Chaney	1	Township	Access to lzone from railway road	Oppose	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to lzone from Railway Road
5	Mike Forrester	1	Township	Access to lzone from railway road	Oppose	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to lzone from Railway Road
6	Susan Chaney	1	Township	Access to lzone from railway road	Oppose	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
7	Therese Catherine Clarke	1	Township	Access to lzone from railway road	Oppose	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to lzone from Railway Road
8	Caronline Saunders	1	Township	Access to lzone from railway road	Oppose	Cites the denigration of lifestyle through noise pollution and dust pollution [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to lzone from Railway Road

9	Jaqueline Wellard	1	Township	Access to Izone from railway road	Oppose	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.
10	Jesse DeWys	1	Township	Access to Izone from railway road	Oppose	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road
11	Karyn and Geoff Mitchell	1	Township	Access to Izone from railway road	Oppose	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
12	John and Marilyn Ollett	1	Township	Access to Izone from railway road	Oppose	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].
13	Andrew Harris	1	Township	Access to Izone from railway road	Oppose	Cites the denigration of lifestyle [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road
14	Allan Harris	1	Township	Access to Izone from railway road	Oppose	Cites the denigration of lifestyle through noise pollution [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road
15	Nigel Fleck	1	Township	Access to Izone from railway road	Oppose	Cites the denigration of lifestyle through noise pollution [from existing railway activities]	Amend plan change to prevent access to Izone from Railway Road
16	Forli Ponies	1	Township	Integrated land use and transport, safety and efficiency	Oppose in Part	Integrated land use and transport, safety and efficiency	Decline Plan Change 12
17	Foodstuffs South Island Ltd	1	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Oppose	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.
18	Davie Lovell-Smith	1	Township	Access and subdivision design	Oppose in part	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
19	Selwyn Central Community Board	1	BOTH	All	Support	Supports the updating of the district plan so that it provides for more sustainable transport and caters for future transport networks	
20	Minister of Education	1	BOTH	Minimum Parking standards	Oppose in part	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.
20	Minister of Education	2	BOTH	Mobility impaired parking	Oppose in part	Considers rule 13.1.1.6 is unclear how many mobility impaired car parks are required for school sites.	Clarification on requirements

20	Minister of Education	3	BOTH	Existing Educational Activities / Existing land use	Oppose in part	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.
20	Minister of Education	4	BOTH	Objectives and policies	Support	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)
21	Karl Pouschek	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].
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	1	BOTH	Transport Choice	Support	Supports the encouragement of transport choice	
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	2	BOTH	Road Classifications	Supports	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.	
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	3	BOTH	Transport Choice	Support	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 and avoid adverse effects of development</u> ". Minor amendments to Object B2.1.3 to accentuate transport choice.
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	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> "
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	5	BOTH	State Highways and arterial roads	Support in part	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.
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	6	BOTH	Minimum Parking standards	Support	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 may reduce on-site car parking demand and have wider associated benefits. in limited situations where such options are viable and enforceable</u> "
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	7	BOTH	Access to roads	Support	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.
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	8	Township	Demand Management	Support	Supports policy B2.1.13 and B2.1.14	

22	New Zealand Transport Authority	9	BOTH	Site layout	Support	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
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	10	BOTH	Definition of state highways		Suggests amendment to definition of State Highway	Amend definition of State Highway
22	New Zealand Transport Authority	11	BOTH	Reverse Sensitivity	Support	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.
23	Canterbury Regional Council	1	BOTH		Support	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.	Uphold Plan Change 12
23	Canterbury Regional Council	2	BOTH		Support in part	Requests amendments to re-inforce strategic planning for public transport.	Amend Policy B2.1.7 and B2.1.18(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.
24	Broadfield Estates Ltd	1	BOTH	Minimum Parking standards	Oppose	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.	Amend table E13.1 to retain current parking requirement of 2 spaces per 100m2
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	1	BOTH	Rights of Way	Oppose	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.	Set maximum at 10 sites and define "potential site".
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	2	Rural	Access and subdivision design	Oppose	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
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	3	Rural	Access	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	4	Rural	Turning	Oppose	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.	
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	5	Rural	Cycling provision	Oppose	Considers cycle parking in the rural area is unnecessary	delete rule 4.6.3.3
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	6	Rural	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	7	BOTH	Disabled Parking	Oppose	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
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	8	Rural	Car Parking	Oppose	Notes there is a grammatical error in 10.1.5.4	Not specified
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	9	Rural	Rights of Way	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	10	Rural	State Highways	Oppose	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

25	Urbis TPD Ltd	11	BOTH	Vehicle crossings	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	12	Rural	Sight distances	Oppose	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
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	13	BOTH	Intersection spacing	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	14	Township	Rights of Way	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	15	Township	Vehicle crossings	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	16	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Support in part	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	17	Township	Parking standards	Oppose	Non compliance with rule 5.5.1 [vehicle crossing 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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	18	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	19	Township	Parking dimensions	Oppose	Considers that minimum car park dimensions have been incorrectly adopted from NZS2390.1:2004 which has been updated.	Amend table E13.2 in line with updated NZS2890.1:2004.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	20	Township	Rights of Way	Oppose	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
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	21	Township	Sight distances	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	22	Township	Road formation standards	Oppose	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.
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	23	Township	Local road hierarchy	Not stated	Notes that different categories of local road are not defined in table 13.8	Clarify table 13.8 or supporting information
25	Urbis TPD Ltd	24	Township	Road formation standards	Oppose	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.	Delete rules E13.3.1.4 and E13.3.1.5

26	Mark, Grant and Rose Crabbe Partnership	1	BOTH	Road hierarchy	Oppose	Concerned about the change in status of rural roads to arterial as promulgated in CRETS. 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.
27	Peter Townsend	1	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Oppose	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.
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	1	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Not stated	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
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	2	Township	Integrated land use and transport	Not stated	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.
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	3	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Not stated	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
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	4	Township	Access to arterial roads	Not stated	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.
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	5	Township	High traffic rules	Oppose	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.
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	6	Township	Sight distances	Support	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
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	7	Township	Road hierarchy	Support	Supports the changes to classification of some roads in the road hierarchy	retain the new hierarchy in Appendix E7
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	8	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Not stated	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.

28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	9	Township	Shared Parking	Oppose	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.
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	10	Township	Minimum Parking standards	support	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
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	11	Township	Parking area location	support	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 13.1.1.3
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	12	Township	Cycle parking	Not stated	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
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	13	Township	Loading and manoeuvring	Not stated	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
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	14	Township	Accessway widths	Not stated	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.
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	15	Township	Queueing spaces	Not stated	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).
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	16	Township	Vehicle crossings	Not stated	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.
28	Rolleston Retail Ltd	17	Township	Roading Standards	Not stated	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.
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	1	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Not stated	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
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	2	Township	Integrated land use and transport	Not stated	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.
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	3	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Not stated	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
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	4	Township	Access to arterial roads	Not stated	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.

29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	5	Township	High traffic rules	Oppose	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.
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	6	Township	Sight distances	Support	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
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	7	Township	Road hierachy	Support	Supports the changes to classification of some roads in the road hierachy	retain the new hierachy in Appendix E7
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	8	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Not stated	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.
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	9	Township	Shared Parking	Oppose	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.
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	10	Township	Minimum Parking standards	support	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
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	11	Township	Parking area location	support	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 13.1.1.3
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	12	Township	Cycle parking	Not stated	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
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	13	Township	Loading and manoevring	Not stated	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 manoevring should be designed for an 8m truck or maximum expected vehicle size
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	14	Township	Accessway widths	Not stated	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 manoevring 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.
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	15	Township	Queueing spaces	Not stated	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).
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	16	Township	Vehicle crossings	Not stated	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.
29	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	17	Township	Roading Standards	Not stated	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.
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	1	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Not stated	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
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	2	Township	Integrated land use and transport	Not stated	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.

30	Rolleston Square Ltd	3	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Not stated	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
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	4	Township	Access to arterial roads	Not stated	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.
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	5	Township	High traffic rules	Oppose	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.
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	6	Township	Sight distances	Support	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
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	7	Township	Road hierarchy	Support	Supports the changes to classification of some roads in the road hierarchy	retain the new hierarchy in Appendix E7
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	8	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Not stated	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.
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	9	Township	Shared Parking	Oppose	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.
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	10	Township	Minimum Parking standards	support	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
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	11	Township	Parking area location	support	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 13.1.1.3
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	12	Township	Cycle parking	Not stated	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
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	13	Township	Loading and manoeuvring	Not stated	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
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	14	Township	Accessway widths	Not stated	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.
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	15	Township	Queueing spaces	Not stated	Notes that table E13.1 provides that drive-throughs shall have 5 queueing spaces per booth, but Table E13.3 provide for queueing spaces based on the number of car parks.	Amend Table E13.3 so that it cross references with E13.1(a).

30	Rolleston Square Ltd	16	Township	Vehicle crossings	Not stated	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.
30	Rolleston Square Ltd	17	Township	Roading Standards	Not stated	Considers that table E13.9 would require the removal of parking on Rolleston Drive and Masfield 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.
31	Izone Project Team	1	Township	Car Parking	Oppose in part	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.
31	Izone Project Team	2	Township	Car Parking	Support in part	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
31	Izone Project Team	3	Township	Vehicle Crossings	Oppose	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.
32	Lincoln Land Development	1	Rural	Access	Oppose in part	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.
32	Lincoln Land Development	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.
32	Lincoln Land Development	3	Rural	Effect of PC12 on established land uses.	Oppose in part	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.
32	Lincoln Land Development	4	Rural	Heavy Traffic Bypass	Oppose	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

32	Lincoln Land Development	5	Township	CRETS	Oppose in part	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.
32	Lincoln Land Development	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	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.
32	Lincoln Land Development	7	Township	Road Hierachy and access to arterial roads	Oppose in part	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.	Various amendments to policy wording: Policies B2.1.3 and B2.1.4(a); and Policy B2.1.12 to provide increased recognition of the importance of land use issues.
32	Lincoln Land Development	8	Township	Access via Rights of Way	Oppose	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
32	Lincoln Land Development	9	Township	Pedestrian facilities in car parks	Oppose	Supports the thrust of the policy but questions the appropriateness of the 40 space threshold.	Delete Proposed rule 5.5.2
32	Lincoln Land Development	10	Township	Activity Status of land use / subdivision consents	Oppose	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
32	Lincoln Land Development	11	Township	Corner splays	Oppose in part	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 discourgae 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.
32	Lincoln Land Development	12	Township	Minimum Parking standards	Oppose in part	Considers that the revisions to table E13 are not justified in the section 32 analysis.	Delete amendments.
33	Lincoln Land Development	13	BOTH	Point Strips	Oppose	LLD opposes the provisions relating to the use of point strips	Not specified
34	Lincoln Land Development	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