

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
Susan Gylls	67	1	Oppose	I go to Porters because it s different and I think unique in the world. Any significant change to one resort has the potential to negatively impact on the whole valley.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes
		2	Oppose	The existing Porters Ski Area does need to be upgraded. It provides excellent infrastructure, on of the best access roads in the region, affordable uncrowded skiing and friendly atmosphere.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes
		3	Oppose	There is no evidence that Porters is not viable now. Why would the Harvey's invest \$7 million if it was not a viable investment. One alternative would be to sell the resort.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes
		4	Oppose	Why would it be great if New Zealand had the type of on mountain facility you can get overseas? The reason I got to NZ skiing is exactly because it is not like resorts over seas.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes
		5	Support in part	I agree that not using the mountain access would be good. The construction of a Gondola would make the mountain safer.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		6	Oppose	Bring thousands of tourists to the mountain and Canterbury region would significantly change the nature of the region. Would turn Springfield and Castle Hill to a Methven or Queenstown. We need to preserve what is unique about the region.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes
		7	Oppose	This would not result in a great experience for New Zealanders and overseas skiers as it would be an experience the same as you would get anywhere else in the world.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes
		8	Oppose	It would allow more people to get enjoyment from accessing Crystal, but the beauty of going to Crystal is that there are not hundreds or thousands of people there.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes
		9	Oppose	It may bring more jobs to the region but it will also increase house prices, accommodation costs, lift lines, reduce available freshies, increase pressure on the environment, remove the small town feel of local towns, increase the number of bogan Australians.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes
		10	Oppose	Motivation by developers is to solely make money. Council has responsibility to balance an requests for development with what is best for community. A development of this nature has the potential to temporarily increase jobs but will be at the expense of intrinsic natural and tourist potential that the valley already possesses. There are already very few places like the Craigieburn Valley and the lack of a large scale resort development is one of the factors that gives it that value.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with changes
NZ Snow Sports Council	89	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Accept in part
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		4	Support	The Crystal Valley development and Porters Basin upgrade will result in further snow sports growth making Porters a very viable and attractive destination equal to any sports destination anywhere in the world	Accept in part
		5	Support	The Porters expansion will provide Canterbury with two large developed ski area destination as well and will be seen as a more attractive destination for snow sports and recreation on the same level as the Southern Lakes and Mt Ruapahu regions.	Accept in part
		6	Support	The access to Porters is good but the Porters expansion will improve it considerably with the addition of a short tar sealed road to the village and gondolas accessing the ski fields. This will result in increased growth especially in present and future times where participants want to arrive quickly, efficiently and safely as possible.	Accept in part
		7	Support	The Porters expansion with the new chairlifts in the Porters Basin and Crystal Valley will enable further growth attracting more snowboarders to the ski area, as the existing surface lifts (T-bars) are not liked by snowboarders.	Accept in part
		8	Support	Numbers of Australian tourists have increased dramatically with direct flights from Australia to Queenstown. Christchurch being the second largest international gateway and having more international flights in a perfect position to handle Australian visitors in the winter. The proposal will attract more Australians to Christchurch and being only a short distance from the ski area and village is ideally placed from an access point of view.	Accept in part
John Brent McKinnon	S134	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Accept in part
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s1722 - Nicola Lee Snoyink			Oppose and all other similar submissions - The submission and others like it, lack any substantial reasons to warrant a zone change within this Outstanding Natural Landscape area. These submissions are no more than a petition of signatures without any real thought put into what this proposal actually means for Crystal Valley and its environment.	Reject in Part in so far that the PC should be approved
Tania Webb	S137	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Accept in part

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s0910 - Rosalie Snoyink			Oppose and all other similar submissions - Contributes nothing substantial to the Plan Change Request. Indicates a low level understanding of RMA process and the adverse impacts of the proposal on the environment.	Reject in Part in so far that the PC should be approved
Daryl Collier	265	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change	Accept in part
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part
		3	Oppose in part	I am not in support of future proposed village development	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with recommended changes
Leah Avery	276	1	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area - ski field perspective.	Accept in part
		2	Support	Very happy for ski field area development, particularly for immediate skiers.	Accept in part
		3	Oppose in part	Not happy about accommodation and car parking, cinema, etc.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with recommended changes
Taissa Toune	322	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change.	Accept in part
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		4	Oppose in part	No major shopping malls	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with revommended changes
Anna Osharov	337	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Accept in part
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part
		4	Oppose in part	I do not support development of shopping malls in the area	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with revommended changes
Paul Corwin	503	1	Oppose	This private development seeks to remove an area of outstanding natural landscape. The corridor to the Torlesse Conservation Area must be preserved.	Accept in part in so far that the ONL status should remin and that there will be adverse effects to on the ONL

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Oppose	The concept of the village is crazy. The area generally gets the most inconsistent snowfall along the Craigieburn Range. The snow cover is generally very poor and the ski season often short. In the summer the area is often wind-blasted and desolate compared to many areas along the range.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with revommended changes
		3	Oppose	The idea of planting Beech trees is total fantasy as any botanist or local will tell you.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with revommended changes
		4	Oppose	If permission is granted and any development takes place I suspect it would soon go broke. This would leave an eyesore for the Council to look after or cleanup, something the rate payers cannot afford.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with revommended changes
		5	Oppose	The developers are looking for Australian investors. If this plan was such a great idea why are Canterbury skiers flocking to invest in this. Local skiers and investors know this is a speculators pipe dream.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with revommended changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		6	Oppose	Global warming has meant that NZ ski seasons have become shorter over the last 50 years. Lower ski areas such as the Mt Roberts ski area have been abandoned leaving a huge cleanup job for DoC and an eyesore for trampers. Lets not have similar eyesore on the Craigieburn Range	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with revommended changes
		7	Oppose	People desiring an alpine village have one a few miles from Porters, Castle Hill Village. Don't consider opening up other areas with conservation value until all stages of Castle Hill Village have been filled	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with revommended changes
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s1722 - Nicola Lee Snoyink			Support - I also live in New Zealand for the people and the land. Development such as this will ruin the land and destroy any inherent values the area has. It is totally inappropriate development. According to the Department of Conservation, this corridor linking the Southern Alps with the Canterbury Plains has an ecological unmodified altitude sequence of national importance (letter to editor Christchurch Press September 2010). It is not right that U turn be done as soon as the first big developer comes along. DOC made a promise to protect this land permanently. SDC should too.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with revommended changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
Sally Widdowson	504	1	Oppose	Although a keen skier I am also a conservationist and treasure the wilderness of Crystal Valley, especially the unique corridor between the Torlesse conservation area and the Craigieburn Forest park.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with recommended changes
		2	Oppose	I also consider the whole concept unrealistic. The snowfall in the Craigieburn's has been marginal for skiing and with global warming is not going to improve. The idea of skiing below the current car park for more than occasional days is fantasy. Having tried in vain for 8 years to establish Beech trees nearby, the vision of tree skiing through regenerating Beech forest is wonderful but totally unrealistic.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with recommended changes
		3	Oppose	The established nearby alpine villages at Castle Hill and Flock Hill Lodge are not fully subscribed and the idea 1000,s of guests wishing to stay on the barren, windswept site at Porters is ludicrous. Its proximity to Christchurch is touted as a draw card, but actually that just makes it more likely that skiers will make day trips from Christchurch, Springfield etc.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with recommended changes
		4	Oppose	I am not against development on principle but it needs to be realistic. Were it to go ahead the whole project is doomed to collapse leaving the ratepayers of Selwyn to clean up the scars. I urge the application be declined to save developers from themselves and Crystal Valley for conservation.	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with recommended changes
	Further			Support / opposes	

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	Submission				
	s1722 - Nicola Lee Snoyink			<p>Support - I also live in New Zealand for the people and the land. Development such as this will ruin the land and destroy any inherent values the area has. It is totally inappropriate development.</p> <p>According to the Department of Conservation, this corridor linking the Southern Alps with the Canterbury Plains has an ecological unmodified altitude sequence of national importance (letter to editor Christchurch Press September 2010). It is not right that U turn be done as soon as the first big developer comes along. DOC made a promise to protect this land permanently. SDC should too.</p>	Reject in part in so far that PC25 should be approved with recommended changes
Andrew Evans	506	1	Support in part.	Generally believe this project could be very positive economically and recreationally if it was successful. However would like to see more information on the heated paving proposed as this uses a large amount of energy. It should be allowed in life safety issue areas only such as uncovered stairs/steps, not roads or driveways. The applicant should qualify the extent they intend to snow melt.	Accept in Part in so far as the PC25 is recommended for approval. Details on specific design are more appropriate at RC stage

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Support in part	That the avalanche data and design criteria to be more rigorous than that supplied and that the proposed plan change amendment item 18 not be accepted. The information provided in the plan change on avalanche for the new café area relies on 10 years of avalanche data (2001-2009). The last 10 years have not been really big snow years (e.g. 1992), whilst no avalanche has reached the cafe area in this period the design criteria should be (for cafe and new base area) extended to a 1 in 50 year event or even 1 in 100 (same as earthquake design). There is a real possibility that such an event could see an avalanche run through the bush and into the cafe with major damage to it and potential loss of life. Page 7 item 18 of the plan change states <i>'the potential for damage from hazards was assessed for the ski area sub-zone (Porters) at the time the sub-zone was established'</i> . Yet the geotechnical report by URS section 6 introduction last paragraph states <i>'We recommend that risk analysis be undertaken at the detailed design stage when final development details are confirmed'</i> This change to the rules cannot be allowed to stand and must be altered to state further study will be required or the study be carried out and resubmitted. I support the plan change except clause 18 (as above) and either a full avalanche risk assessment using independent expert consultants be submitted and building locations revised if needed or revise clause 18 saying a full risk assessment will be required at a later stage using independent expert consultants be added to the plan change.	Accept in part in that avalanche risk has been identified. However it accepted that the risk level could be reduced to an appropriate level.
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support - A full avalanche risk assessment must be carried out as this matter has not been adequately assessed by the applicant and as a consequence the Council do not have sufficient information before them to determine the merits of the PC25	Accept in part
Steve Higgs, NZTA	508	1	Support in part	The inclusion of rule 25.4.3 will go to partly address the potential safety and efficiency concerns that will occur at the State Highway 73/Ski Access Road intersection resulting from the increased traffic generation attributed to this proposal. This rule should be retained. However although rule 25.4.3 addresses site lines the rule does not address the need for seal widening to provide safe effective right turn lane and left turn deceleration lane at the SH73/Ski Access Road intersection. NZTA seek that rule 25.4.3 be retained and amended to include the seal widening for the provision of a right turn lane and left turn deceleration lane on SH73 at the intersection with the /Ski Access Road.	Accept

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Amend	That rule 25.4.3 read as follows: Construction or earthwork activities in the Crystal basin Area or the Village Base Area shall only commence on completion of works which achieve the NZTA standard for sight-lines at the intersection of State Highway 73 and the Ski Area Access Road and achieves the NZTA standard for seal widening to provide a right turn lane and left turn deceleration lane at the intersection of State Highway 73 and the Ski Area Access Road	Accept
		3	Oppose in part	Matter of control 25.12.2.8. While the NZTA supports the provision recognising the need for sight line consideration at the SH at time of subdivision, NZTA opposes that provision be made only by way of a 'matter of control' (25.12.2.8). Further, the scope of 'provision' is too narrow to address all traffic safety and efficiency concerns for the SH73/Ski area access road intersection. Current provision as a 'matter of control' is opposed for the following reasons: i) Controlled subdivision cannot be declined. ii) Conditions cannot be imposed that 'frustrate' a consent. Consequently there is little ability to impose location and design conditions that meet NZTA concerns. iii) While matters for control address the concern regarding sight-lines it does not address the need for seal widening to provide for a safe and efficient right turn or left turn deceleration lane.	Accept in part in that the recommended rule should be included.
		4	Amend	NZTA seek the inclusion of a new subdivision rule that requires proper consideration of the design and location of the Ski Access Road and State Highway intersection and that the new rule be broadened to include NZTA's concern for seal widening. New Rule 25.12.2.8 be included as follows: <u>Prior to the grant of a resource consent for a subdivision creating any new allotments, the location and design of the intersection of the Ski Area Access Road with State Highway 73 shall be improved and/or relocated to achieve the NZTA standard for sight-lines and the NZTA standard for seal widening are to be achieved to provide for a right turn lane and left turn deceleration lane at the intersection of State Highway 73 and the Ski Area Access Road.</u>	Accept in part in that the recommended rule should be included.
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support - This submission does not go far enough to address traffic issues in an extreme mountain environment. East bound traffic also need a right turn lane and passing bay to enter the ski field access, as winter traffic doubles existing usage and 40% of vehicles will be travelling outside of winter peak season.	Accept in apt in so far that it supports the inclusion of the above recommended rule
Karen Boserio	527	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Accept in Part in so far as the PC25 is recommended for approval
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in Part in so far as the PC25 is recommended for approval
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in Part in so far as the PC25 is recommended for approval
		4	Oppose in part	I don't think there is the economy of scale, nature of attraction, numbers of people for a village development. Also the Craigieburn's represent a welfare of skiing unique to this area, i.e., vastly different to Coronet Peak, Mt Hutt, etc.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
Anna Walker	534	1	Oppose	It detracts from the low key, club atmosphere, relaxed friendly feel etc.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		2	Oppose	It represents greedy investors who are pro-development for the wrong reasons. NZ doesn't need to turn itself into a resort, its laid back nature is what attracts people.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		3	Oppose	The climate may not necessarily support the extra snow required.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		4	Oppose	Accommodation in Castle Hill would be more appropriate	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Graham Spencer Loveridge	548	1	Support in part	Submission relates to expansion of ski lifts & gondola into Crystal Valley. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Support in part	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		3	Support in part	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
Peter John Hayes	549	1	Support in part	Submission relates to development of ski area	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		2	Support in part	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		3	Support in part	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
Nick Loveridge-Easther	550	1	Support in part	Submission relates to increased ski area only - enlarge ski area only without increasing population too much	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		2	Support in part	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		3	Support in part	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
Julie Rae	577	1	Support in part	To approve & support the expansion of Porters ski area into Crystal Valley with access to it via a gondola. It appears there are large numbers of children on the ski field. This next generation are going to be accomplished at snow sports in the next 5 - 10 years and will be going up Alison's Peak and into Crystal Valley regardless. In the interests of their safety this area needs to be developed patrolled part of the ski field with access via a gondola.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
Fischer Sebastian	665	1	Oppose	Not a good idea at all	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
Sue Stokes	751	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		4	Oppose in part	Support idea of ski field development, but object to the village development.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Ann Christine Stokes	752	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		4	Oppose in part	Not keen on the "village development" - natural expansion of ski field sounds good.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Jules Jan Snoyink	909	1	Oppose	I oppose this as this again sets a precedent for other developers to apply. This land belongs to the public	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
			Oppose	Any multi-storey housing is a recipe for pollution which will find its way into waterways.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
			Oppose	Tasteful village like accommodation as in Methven should be situated in Springfield	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Rosalie Joy Snoyink	910	1	Oppose	The whole plan change request. The land in question provides a continuous corridor of protected land and has outstanding natural values that should remain under the management of and protection by the Department of Conservation	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		2	Oppose	The land was purchased with financial support of the Nature Heritage Fund to enable permanent protection for present and future generations of New Zealanders in perpetuity. The protection should not be removed at the request of a mostly foreign owned company.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		3	Oppose	Crystal valley is part of the Canterbury Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) as indicated in the 2010 Canterbury Landscape Review. Under the RMA ONLs are recognised as having national importance and are to be protected from inappropriate subdivision and development. I oppose the plan change which seeks the ONL be removed. To do so ignores previous public processes and assessments which recognised the outstanding conservation values and provided for their permanent protection. The proposed change is in breach of Part 2, Section 6(b) of the RMA.	Accept in part in so far as it is recommended to retain the ONL status
		4	Oppose	The village type development proposed by Blackfish Ltd will degrade the Porter River and other streams in the area which are in near pristine state. Sewage and waste water disposal systems necessary for the expected population increase will have an adverse effect on highly valued rivers and streams in the area. After the recent Christchurch earthquake broken sewage pipes resulted in raw sewage and other contaminants flowing into the Waimakariri river. the Porters fault line is in close vicinity to the proposed fault line. The Alpine fault could also cause significant damage to pipelines and infrastructure resulting in contamination of a pristine area.	Reject if CRC consents. If CRC consent declined then this submission point should be accepted and the PC declined.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		5	Oppose	Decline the plan change. I oppose development in Crystal Valley because it will seriously impact on the biodiversity. The Canterbury Plains within Selwyn have probably suffered the highest level of bio diversity loss of any ecological region in New Zealand. I understand that there is less than 55 indigenous biodiversity remaining on the Canterbury Plain. This is an appalling loss and in indictment on local authorities. The SDC by approving this plan change would further encourage biodiversity loss in the Canterbury foothills region. The SDC website has the following quote "The uniqueness of New Zealand's biodiversity means the responsibility for its continued existence is entirely up to us".	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support - Land should remain as conservation estate with Outstanding Natural Landscape zoning retained.	Accept in part in so far as it is recommended to retain the ONL status
Jane Gosden	911	1	Oppose	The biggest threat to biodiversity worldwide is habitat destruction and disturbance. New Zealand has already lost vast areas of primary natural habitat with the two main waves of human colonisation. Therefore what little natural habitat we have remaining should be protected.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		2	Oppose	Habitat disturbance is also known to facilitate the invasion of exotic weed species that can then drive the loss of natural biodiversity through process such as competition for shared resources. This is a major issue in New Zealand where exotic plant species now well out number the native flora. Habitat disturbance is also known to increase by hybridisation between closely related species, which can lead to the loss of endemic species.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		3	Oppose	The proposed area for development is potentially one of the few remaining eastern most locations where lea now live. Kea are already threatened species. Much of this threat comes from interaction with humans and human structures.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		4	Oppose	The proposal ahs also been promoted as increasing access to summer activities such as mountain biking and walking. However these activities are already available within the Craigieburn range and surrounding area. Further more increase in people and buildings will detract from the experience that recreational users gain from visiting the area in its current state. I believe that the resort style complex that is currently being proposed is completely inappropriate in the High Country that is relatively free fro Human interference.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		5	Oppose	I am concerned the development will not gain the investment and support from people buying properties in the resort. This could result in the abandonment of the resort after the destruction to the environment has already occurred. There is already an alpine village (castle Hill) within he basin where people can buy/rent property when visiting the area.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Lesley Shand	914	1	Oppose	Crystal Valley was brought with public money from the nature Heritage Fund because of its outstanding natural values. It also provided a linkage of natural values. It was brought of the public and not intend to be flicked into private hands for private enterprise. The sacrificial area intended for development was Castle Hill, which has the infrastructure.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		2	Oppose	The proposal Is inconsistent with the RMA section 6 and Part 2..The proposal is not sustainable and will have adverse effects. The area is an Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) and should remain this way and with this designation. The removal of the ONL is not consistent with the RMA Part 2.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
	Further		Support / opposes		

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	Submission				
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support - Land was purchased to complete the conservation estate with DoC management to secure public assets, and the landscape and natural values. This submission address matters which have not been adequately covered in PC25 and as a consequence Council do not have satisfactory information before them to determine whether this plan change can be considered.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Joshua William Smith	1613	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		4	Oppose in part	Not in support of village - ski field expansion only!	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		5	Amend	Remove village from proposal	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Josie Vogel	1614	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change. It will provide major public recreation, social and economic benefits to the local community and wider region.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		4	Oppose in part	In favour of expansion of ski field, but not the big village (movies, shopping malls, etc)	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		5	Amend	Remove village from proposal	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Edward John Cook	1692	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		2	Support	It is a logical addition to the existing Porters Ski Area.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		3	Support	Replanting of native beech forest will be great for the local environment.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval
		4	Oppose in part	I support the extension of ski area in to Crystal Valley - however I oppose the Village Plan as being inappropriate in a fragile alpine environment and of limited year round use. Castle Hill Development caters adequately.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
Roger Brian Keey	1705	1	Opposed	Decline proposed plan change	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		2	Opposed	The proposed ski-area subzone extends into a conservation area of outstanding ecological significance that was bought with monies of the Nature Heritage Fund and possible ski field developments under the plan change are incompatible with the ecological values of the area.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		3	Opposed	The proposed subzone is an important link in the public conservation estate, of which there are few, if any, between the Korowai-Torlesse Tussock land park and the Craigieburn Forest Park.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support -Ski area zone is an incomplete use of land, when the ecological values of the area are considered and land is already public conservation estate.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Royal Forest & Bird Protection Society of NZ	1708	1	Oppose	Decline proposed plan change	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Oppose	Forest and Bird considers that inadequate consideration has been given to the potential adverse effect on the high natural state of both the Crystal and Porters Streams. Any hearing on Plan Change 25 should be deferred until such time as the necessary consents in respect to water have been applied for and a joint hearing should then be held pursuant to s.102 RMA.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval and a joint hearing has been held
		3	Oppose	The Plan Change as proposed will have a significant impact on the currently pristine cirque basin and its high natural values. Controls in respect to effects as a result of the proposal such as extensive earthworks and roading infrastructure are inadequate and will not avoid, remedy or mitigate the significant adverse effects	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		4	Oppose	Plan change 25 is inconstant with a number of objectives, policies and rules in the Operative Selwyn District Plan including: Objective B1.4.1, Policy B1.4.23 (Outstanding Natural Features & Landscapes), Objectives B1.2.1, B1.2.3 and Policies B1.2.2, B1.2.5 and B1.2.6 and Objective B4.1.1 and Policy B4.1.1	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		5	Oppose	The proposal is contrary to objectives and policies within the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, including: Chapter 8 Objective 2, Objective 3 and related policies.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		6	Oppose	The Plan Change has not given proper regard to the Waimakariri Regional River Plan. As noted earlier the Porter River and Crystal Stream have high natural values and have been indentified as the Plan as water bodies to be maintained in a natural state.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with reccomended changes to Porters Stream setback
		7	Oppose	The Plan Change is inconsistent with Part 2 RMA and in particular s6(b), (c), s7(b), (c), (d), (f) and s7(g)	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
	Further Submission			Support/Opposition	
	s0910 - Rosalie Snoyink			Support - Fully address the similar concerns listed in my original submission.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
	s1720 - Eugenie Meryl Sage			Support - Process for considering submission is consistent with RMA. Submission highlights effects of Plan Change on indigenous biodiversity and landscapes. Submission highlights specific provisions in Selwyn District Plan, Waimakariri River Regional Plan and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which are relevant including under s104 RMA.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support - Inadequate consideration of potential adverse effects on high natural values of location. Contrary development to objectives, policies and rules of District Plan and a joint hearing should be held with Ecan to address effects resulting from discharge and water takes.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Andrew Bygraves	1713	1	Oppose	I do not approve the Plan Change	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		2	Oppose	Existing Porters Ski Area does not need to be upgraded	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		3	Oppose	This would not necessarily ensure Porters remains viable	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		4	Oppose	NZ already has the type of on mountain facility you can get overseas	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		5	Oppose	It would be of limited benefit if we did not have to use our mountain access road	Reject
		6	Oppose	This will not necessarily bring thousands of tourists to the mountain and the Canterbury region	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		7	Oppose	This would not be a great experience for New Zealander's and overseas skiers.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
		8	Oppose	This will not necessarily bring many jobs into the region and they will be only seasonal this proposed expansion would be the thin end of the wedge for expansion into pristine mountain environments. It is unnecessary and against the culture of skiing in NZ. Crystal is already accessible and the pleasure largely comes from skiing terrain free of visual & noise pollution caused by lifts.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval
Environment Canterbury	1714	1	Oppose	The Canterbury Regional Council recognises the potential for the proposal to make a significant contribution to the economic well being of the Canterbury region but considers the Plan Change would fail to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on the environment and achieve sustainable management of natural and physical resources	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Oppose	The site is an Outstanding Natural Landscape (ONL) and was identified as part of a regionally outstanding landscape in the Canterbury Regional Landscape Study 1993 and the Canterbury Regional Landscape Study review 2010. The Plan Change seeks to exclude the site from the ONL and provides for inadequate control over activities likely to have significant adverse effects on the ONL leading to the degradation or loss of the presently high level of natural character in this landscape of regional importance.	Accept in part in so far that the ONL status should remain and that there will be adverse effects to on the ONL
		3	Oppose	The Plan Change site is considered to contain significant indigenous vegetation and habitats of indigenous fauna. The Plan Change is assessed to have adverse ecological effects that cannot be avoided or adequately mitigated on these areas, notably on a presently undeveloped and largely pristine alpine basin ('Crystal Basin').	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		4	Oppose	The Plan Change would allow a "village" accommodating more than 3000 people to be located in an alpine environment having a high level of potential natural hazard. It is considered that the proposal fails to adequately assess the risk from the natural hazards and whether or not mitigation of these hazards is necessary.	Accept in part in that natural hazards have been identified However it accepted that the risk level could be reduced to an appropriate level.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		5	Oppose	The Plan Change gives inadequate regard to the objectives and policies of the Waimakairiri River Regional Plan which identifies the Porters River and Crystal Stream as waters to be maintained in a state of naturalness'	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with changes
		6	Oppose	Plan change 25 is inconsistent with a number of objectives, policies and rules in the Operative Selwyn District Plan including: Objective B1.4.1, Policy B1.4.23 (Outstanding Natural Features & Landscapes), Objectives B1.2.1, B1.2.3 and Policies B1.2.2, B1.2.5 and B1.2.6 (vegetation and Ecosystems), Objective B2.2.3 and Policy 2.2.1 (Utilities), Objectives B3.1.1, B3.1.2 and B3.1.3 and Policy B3.1.2 and B3.1.6 (hazards) and Objective B4.1.1 and Policy B4.1.1 (Residential development in rural areas).	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with changes
		7	Oppose	Fails to give effect to the Objectives and Policies of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement including: Chapter 8 Objectives 2 and 3, Policies 3 & 4, Chapter 12: Objectives 1 and 4, Policies 2 and 6, chapter 16: Objective 1, Policy 1.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with changes
		8	Oppose	Fails to have regard to the Waimakariri River regional Plan including Objectives 6.1 and 7.1 and corresponding Policies 6.1 and 7.1	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		9	Oppose	Fails to have regard to the provisions of the "Biodiversity Strategy for the Canterbury Region".	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with changes
		10	Oppose	With regard to Part 2 of the RMA the Proposed Plan Change is contrary to the sections 6(b) & (c), 7(c), (d), (f) & (g) and will not constitute sustainable management as defined in section 5 of the RMA.	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with changes
	Further Submission			Support/Opposition	
	s0910 - Rosalie Snoyink			Support - Fully address the similar concerns listed in my original submission (Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	s1720 - Eugenie Meryl Sage			<p>Support - Submission identifies that site is in an Outstanding Natural Landscape identified in the 2010 Canterbury regional landscape study and potential effects of development in terms of s6(b) RMA.</p> <p>Submission correctly identifies that site is considered to have significant indigenous vegetation and habitat for indigenous fauna and that ecological effects cannot be adequately avoided or mitigated.</p> <p>Natural hazards associated with the site and accommodating around 3000 people have not been considered adequately by the applicant. Further information is needed as these effects are relevant as to whether the Plan Change promotes sustainable management.</p> <p>The submission highlights specific provisions in the Selwyn District Plan, Waimakariri River Regional Plan and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which are relevant, including under s104 RMA.</p> <p>The Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy is a relevant matter to consider in terms of s104 RMA</p>	Reject in part in so far as PC25 is recommended for approval with changes
Jennifer Gilchrist	1715	1	Support	Existing Porters Ski Area needs to be upgraded	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		2	Support	This would be great to ensure Porters remains viable	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		3	Support	It would be great if NZ had the type of on mountain facility you can get overseas	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		4	Support	It would be great if we did not have to use our mountain access road	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		5	Support	This will bring thousands of tourists to the mountain and the Canterbury region	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		6	Support	This would be a great experience for New Zealander's and overseas skiers.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		7	Support	This allows lots more people to get the enjoyment from accessing Crystal.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		8	Support	This will bring jobs into the Region	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
	Further Submission			Support/Opposition	

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	s1720 - Eugenie Meryl Sage			<p>Oppose and all similar submissions - Plan Change is not required for existing facilities (eg chairlifts) at Porters Ski Area to be upgraded.</p> <p>Greater economic viability for the ski area is not critical to determining whether a project promotes sustainable management under Part II RMA. Submission does not take account of potential adverse economic impact on Southern Lakes ski fields and infrastructure investment from diverting users to Porter Ski Area.</p> <p>Based on the analysis in the AEE the submission overstates the number of new tourists to NZ likely to be drawn to Canterbury as a result of the development.</p> <p>The additional convenience for skiers from using a gondola rather than the existing access road is not a matter of national importance or significance under Part II RMA.</p> <p>Submission does not take account of the potential for significant adverse effects on natural landscape, indigenous biodiversity and amenity values, and the increased natural hazard risk associated with subdivision and accommodating 3000 people overnight on the site, and the inability for these effects to be avoided, or adequately remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>Claims about increased employment are general and not supported by detail.</p>	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support - PC25 is inconsistent with the District Plan and incompatible with the Waimakariri River Regional Plan and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. Particularly with regard to ONL and features, significant indigenous vegetation, habitats of indigenous fauna and natural hazards.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
Federated Mountain Clubs of NZ	1716	1	Oppose in part	The proposed development raises concerns about the management of public conservation land and the degree to which the high country should be developed. The federated Mountain Club opposes in full the land swap with the Department of Conservation. We understand the proposal may not proceed without this approval. What we do not is that there is no time-limit on the proposal and as such we seek that if approved a ten year life span be placed on the plan change.	Reject
		2	Amend	That a 10 year lapse period be put over the Plan Change if not given effect to.	Reject

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Oppose in part	Oppose in full amendment 2 to the Plan Change. Federated Mountain Club opposes the additional wording in this amendment as not all ski areas require modification to the natural environment to create skiable terrain, infrastructure and amenities. There may be a case for earthworks on larger ski fields, but this should not be created by way of exception within an issue. opening up this exception will lessen the test required for wider scale earthworks on other more natural ski fields. The amendment also states that the plan change will enhance public accessibility but this Plan Change will in fact do the opposite. Currently this land has public access by virtue of its tenure and this will be lost and subdivided in part if the Plan Change proceeds. A better approach would be to simply state the exceptions to the issue are all areas defined as ski area sub-zones	Reject in part in that recommendations have been made to earwork rules to provide for better protection and that access is not being denied.
		3	Support in part	Support Amendment 3 to the Plan Change. This is a better approach to dealing with exceptions and this covers off the reality that ski areas exist, and have existed within outstanding landscapes in the Selwyn District for many years.	Accept in part
		4	Support in part	Opposes Amendment 5 to the Plan Change. The changes to the Issue in amendment 2 indicate that the mountain village supposedly enhances public access to the area, but this is not specifically mentioned. It enables accommodation, commercial activities and services but not enhanced access. The village will result in a loss of access to a large area of the high country that was formerly public conservation land	Reject in that that access is not being denied and for some people of the community actually improved.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		5	Oppose in part	Opposes Amendment 8 to the Plan Change. The policy is not strong enough to ensure that the design of the mountain village subdivision is in accordance with the values of the area. Using the word 'avoid' would provide a higher level of test for subdivision activities later seeking resource consent.	Reject in part in so far as the PC should be approved with recommended changes.
		6	Oppose in part	Oppose Amendment 11 to the Plan Change. Public access is easy to monitor and report on and as such is an easy subject to include in a list of anticipated environmental results. We seek the inclusion of a third point. as shown below.	Reject in that that access is not being denied and for some people of the community actually improved.
		7	Amend	That a third point be added to Amendment 11 as follows: <i>That public access to the conservation areas around the Porters Ski Area and the mountain village is maintained or enhanced.</i>	Reject in that that access is not being denied and for some people of the community actually improved.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		8	Supports in part	Support Amendment 13 to the Plan Change. For point iv) we agree that earthworks operating for the Porters Ski Area classified either as permitted or controlled activity is a fair approach and recognises the realities of managing a ski area.	Reject in that that it is recommended that changes be made to earthworks rules / status.
		9	Support in part	Support in part amendment 24. Do not believe that "international demand" is a sufficient for relaxing a planning zone, especially one that applies to the high country. The RMA specifically states that trade competition is not within its jurisdiction, and a District Plan is not a tourism or economic plan.	Support in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
	Further Submission			Support/Opposition	
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support - District Plan can accommodate new ski field developments within existing zoning framework and only minor change would be required. Oppose land swap to overseas interests with no consequent benefit to region and proposal should not restrict unfettered public access.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
Windwhistle Winter Sports Club	1717	1	Support	The six ski area in the Selwyn District would benefit from this change. The ski areas have completely different landuse from rural high country users. Ski area have their major activity in the winter, while rural high country is used for summer grazing. A ski area zone would allow for input from ski area operators into permitted activities in such areas.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Support	The 616ha is a very small area of the Craigieburn Range. Other recreational users will find plenty of other areas of 'outstanding natural landscapes' in particular the same general area.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		3	Support	The Plan Change will enhance the economic activity of the local area, including employment opportunities, supplementary small businesses (skier transporting). Some visitors like to also visit other ski fields which would benefit the other 5 ski areas.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		4	Support	The Selwyn District has a unique tourism asset with ski areas in close proximity. Porters leads the way in providing facilities for ski tourists. The proposed development will enable Porters to compete with the Southern Ski areas more effectively, while at the same time providing better facilities for local skiers. having the other ski areas near by will enable skiers to try club skiing.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
ChCh International Airport Ltd	1718	1	Support	Approve the Plan Change.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	support	The Christchurch International Airport is a major drover of the regional Canterbury economy. Initiatives by third parties which foster growth at CIAL will benefit the Canterbury economy.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		3	Support	Plan Change 25 aligns with CIALs own vision and goals. CIAL sees that the proposed redevelopment of Porters Basin will: foster growth in tourism in the Canterbury region, be particularly attractive to Australian tourists, increase the number of flights into Christchurch airport from Australia resulting in increased capacity and lower cost trans Tasman flights, fit with CIAL's expansion plans, provide a tourism experience that is not currently available in New Zealand.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		4	Support	Overall the Plan Change will: bring more jobs/money to local economy, strengthen Canterbury as tourist destination, bring more tourists and flights to Christchurch and be complementary, and support, CIAL's own vision and goals	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
Porters Ski Area Ltd	1719	1	Support	The reasons for support are outlined in the section 32 report accompanying the request for a private plan change but some amendments have been suggested as outlined below	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		2	Amend	Alter Rule 25.3.1.5 by reducing the height for the Crystal Chalets from 13m to 8m	Accept
		3	Amend	Add a new rule under 25.9 restricted Discretionary Activities for Crystal Chalets so that chalets over 8m, but under 13m in height be considered as a restricted Discretionary Activity.	Accept

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		4	Amend	Amend 25.11 Non-Complying Activities, Buildings so that it is clear that Crystal Chalets between 8m and 13m in height are not considered a Non-Complying Activity. Crystal Chalets over 13m would be a Non-Complying Activity - this retains the status quo as publicly notified.	Accept
		5	Amend	Ensure that the Ski Area Sub-Zone boundary is consistent with the legal boundary with Glenthorne Station (being Run 179, CB529/90).	Accept
		6	Amend	Porters is aware that there is divided opinion amongst stakeholder groups as to whether some or all of the proposed Ski Area Sub Zone should be included or excluded from the ONL. Porters acknowledges that there are valid considerations from both viewpoints. Porters does not object to an amendment to the Plan Change which alters the boundary of the ONL in response to consideration of submissions.	Accept in so far as it is recommended that the ONL status remain
	Further Submission		Support / opposes		
	s0910 - Rosalie Snoyink			Oppose - The amendments do not go far enough to reduce the adverse effects of the proposal. The village development is inappropriate for an area valued for its Outstanding Natural Landscape.	Reject in part in so far that PC 25 is recommended to be approved subject to changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	s1720 - Eugenie Meryl Sage			Oppose and all similar submissions - Poor process for the applicant to seek to amend the Plan Change retrospectively by way of submission and to weaken the controls on tall buildings above 8 metres by making these restricted discretionary . They have potentially significant impacts on landscape and amenity values depending on their location. Non complying status would help ensure that effects were "minor".	Reject in so far as the 8m RD status is more stringent than that notified with NC status remaining at 13m as per notification
Eugenie Meryl Sage	1720	1	Oppose	I seek that the District Council decline proposed Plan Change 25.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		2	Oppose	The Plan Change application is premature when the applicant does not own or have landholder permission to access all of the 616 ha. site affected by the Plan Change. The land owner, the Department of Conservation on behalf of the Crown has yet to give Blackfish Ltd permission to freehold public protected conservation land for the development. Moving to hear submissions on the proposed Plan Change before the landowner has granted access potentially wastes Council and submitters' time.	Reject
		3	Oppose	Notification is premature. The proposal involves water takes for potable water and snow making and stormwater and wastewater discharges. Resource consents are required from Environment Canterbury. The applications should have been jointly notified and should be jointly considered by both councils.	Accept

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		4	Oppose	Inadequate information is provided for the decision maker to exercise its responsibilities. Construction of the gondola and village and roading has potentially significant effects on landforms, landscape values, and vegetation cover and integrity. The lack of design detail means potential effects are understated. Further information is required on the landscape and ecological impacts of each element of the development, particularly the gondola, buildings in the village, the pipelines, and new roading; and on potential impacts on water quality from extensive earthworks.	Reject
		5	Oppose	The Plan Change would undermine the integrity and consistent administration of the Selwyn District Plan. The Plan Objectives, Policies and Methods including rules recognise and provide for social and cultural wellbeing, health and the needs of current and future generations for open space, healthy indigenous vegetation, unbuilt high country landscapes where natural landforms, and vegetation patterns predominant, rivers with high natural character and high water quality. Plan provisions for Outstanding Natural Landscapes help protect these values from inappropriate subdivision and development. Removal of ONL status would provide no certainty that adverse effects on the area's outstanding landscapes would be adequately avoided, remedied or mitigated.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes including the retention of the ONL
		6	Oppose	The District Plan seeks to strengthen townships and activity centres by encouraging new residential development in and around these existing settlement nodes. The Plan Change is contrary to the thrust and intent of the Plan. Rural residential subdivision to create 45 residential lots and an unlimited number of cross lease and strata titles to provide permanent residential accommodation for another 200 people and visitor accommodation for 3000 would promote sporadic, sprawling development in the Rural Zone. Castle Hill Village can accommodate any real demand for rural residential subdivision in the high country.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		7	Oppose	The applicant's proposal that it be able to develop and subdivide 50 % of the residential allotments before doing any ski field development risks the creation of an incomplete, poorly serviced subdivision if inadequate investment limits further development. No bond is proposed for removal of structures if the venture fails financially.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		8	Oppose	The applicant's proposal that it be able to develop and subdivide 50 % of the residential allotments before doing any ski field development risks the creation of an incomplete, poorly serviced subdivision if inadequate investment limits further development. No bond is proposed for removal of structures if the venture fails financially.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		9	Oppose	It would better provide for the efficient use and development of natural resources if residential subdivision, après ski services and services such as restaurants, bars, accommodation, non ski related activities such as tennis courts were provided in existing townships such as Darfield and Springfield. The Plan Change does not encourage use of existing community facilities and infrastructure in these townships and it makes economic development here to service skiers less likely.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		10	Oppose	The potential impacts of climate change and rising snowlines, less reliable snow and the implications for the viability of the development and skier use of the area are inadequately assessed.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		11	Oppose	The applicant has provided no evidence that the site lacks the outstanding natural landscape (ONL) values which would justify the removal of ONL status.	Accept in part in so far that it has been recommended to retain the ONL

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		12	Oppose	Rezoning 616 ha. of the Porter Valley, Crystal Basin area to Ski Area sub zone would remove or weaken the current Rural Zone (High Country) controls on earthworks, structures, building development, clearance of indigenous vegetation and other activities with potential adverse effects on natural character, outstanding natural landscapes and features, ecological functioning, significant indigenous vegetation and habitats, amenity values, intrinsic values, environmental quality and ecosystem functioning. This does not promote sustainable management as required by Part 2 RMA.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 recommended for approval in changes
		13	Oppose	The Plan Change proposes that buildings and structures, subdivision, earthworks, amenity plantings, and roading which complied with the layout in the Outline Development Plan be controlled activities. The Council cannot decline consent if significant adverse effects (e.g. from erosion, footprint and visual impact of gondola, building intensity, size and scale) cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated. Inadequate information is provided to enable such effects to be adequately assessed through the Plan Change process.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes including status changes
		14	Oppose	The proposed village, gondola construction, clearance of tussock and indigenous shrublands, landform modification, and the intensity and dominance of building development and site hardening are inconsistent with section 6(b) RMA. The Plan Change includes Design Principles which are not binding. This and controlled activity status mean it is uncertain that buildings and other facilities will be designed, located and constructed to a standard which avoids adverse impacts, particularly on an outstanding natural landscape and ecological values.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes including status changes and the retention of the ONL status

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		15	Oppose	Intensive building development, structures and pipelines close to and overlooking Porter River, Porter Stream and Crystal Stream would not preserve their current high natural contrary to section 6(a) RMA. It risks compromising public access to and along these rivers particularly as esplanade reserves are not set off.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes including increased setbacks to Porters Stream and the status of earthworks
		16	Oppose	Crystal Basin is an "excellent example of an alpine cirque basin ecosystem" in almost pristine condition. The village and associated ski field development including earthworks, roading, ski trail construction and wastewater disposal would destroy or degrade indigenous tussock and dracophyllum communities, significant alpine and sub alpine vegetation and habitats contrary to section 6(c).	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes including increased setbacks to Porters Stream and the status of earthworks

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		17	Oppose	The development would create the disturbed ground favoured by weeds. Weed species carried in by vehicles, roading gravel and equipment would spread from the site compromising habitat quality on and beyond the site	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes
		18	Oppose	Any increase in skiing related economic activity at and around Porters will potentially be at the expense of ski areas in Queenstown and Wanaka. The AEE (section 8.8) notes that: "It is expected that a significant proportion of the domestic and international skier days will be drawn from skiers who would otherwise have visited the Southern Lakes region." This is economically inefficient and does not make the best use of existing infrastructure investment further south.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes
		19	Oppose	The national scale economic output from accommodation and ski tourism from the Porters redevelopment is estimated at increasing by only \$8-\$15 million annually by year six. This does not justify the loss of nationally significant landscape, ecological and amenity values on the site.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes
		20	Oppose	The applicant Blackfish Ltd is 65 % Australian owned so the bulk of any profits would flow offshore and not benefit New Zealand.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		21	Oppose	Mitigation is inadequate. No environmental compensation is proposed of equivalent value to the permanent loss of nationally important dryland habitats and degradation of outstanding landscape and amenity values and environmental quality over up to 616 ha. The applicant cannot seek to double count the purchase of 15 ha. of Lord's Bush (originally purchased as part of an exchange of interests in conservation land with the Department of Conservation) to offset environmental damage caused by the development.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes, to allow for consideration of compensation in light of lack of mitigation and that the land swap has not been considered as environmental compensation

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		22	Oppose	The establishment of Korowai/Torlesse Conservation Park in the early 1990s protected a continuous east-west sequence of indigenous habitats and ecosystems. They extend from Otira's beech and rata forests in Arthur's Pass National Park characteristic of high rainfall areas west of the main divide, the alpine shrublands, rock fields, and beech forests of the national park and Craigieburn Forest Park, to the dryland habitats of the Torlesse and Big Ben Ranges with their distinctive scree communities. Crystal Basin supports an unbroken and unmodified altitudinal sequence of alpine habitats. It is important part of this corridor of public protected land. The village development would disrupt this ecological sequence through vegetation loss, buildings and earthworks and incursion of weeds.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes including status changes and the retention of the ONL status
		23	Oppose	The Plan Change is contrary to or inconsistent with planning instruments including: a. Selwyn District Plan b. Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in particular chapter 7 Soils and Land Use, chapter 8 Landscape, Ecology, and Heritage; chapter 9 Beds of Rivers, chapter 10 Settlement and Built Environment c. The Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes
		24	Oppose	I seek that the Selwyn District Council put the application on hold until: a) the Department of Conservation has notified its decision on the applicant's proposals to access conservation land and until the applicant has freehold title and/ or landholder permission to access all of the 616 ha. area subject to the proposed Plan Change; and b) Regional Council consent applications have been notified.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is being heard in conjunction with Regional Council consents

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		25	Oppose	I seek that the Selwyn District Council seek further information under s 92 and hold a joint hearing with Environment Canterbury.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is being heard in conjunction with Regional Council consents
	Further Submission			Support/Opposition	
	s0910 - Rosalie Snoyink			Support - Endorses submission point 2	Reject
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support PC 25 does not constitute or promote sustainable management as required by Part II of the RMA 1991 and is contrary to District Plan in all High Country zoning matters. Also application does not assess affects beyond the sub zone in any meaningful manner, or provide an adequate reason why a large part of the conservation estate needs to be sold by DoC to overseas investors. Joint Hearing with Ecan.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes and a joint hearing is being held
Nicola Lee Snoyink	1722	1	Oppose	I do not wish to see another subdivision happen in the Central Canterbury high country when the Castle Hill Village is already there and is a prime example of a botched development.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Oppose	It is difficult to understand how a development of this scale can be permitted in this area when only a few years ago the land in question was purchased by the Nature Heritage Fund for conservation purposes and given "Outstanding Natural Landscape" status. This proposed plan change ultimately undermines previous management decisions for the Crystal Basin Valley. I object to this plan change removing this status from this land and the undermining of the Nature Heritage Fund process.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes
		3	Oppose	Sets a dangerous precedence in the high country, giving any body the idea they can develop a subdivision where ever they want.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes
		4	Oppose	The Selwyn District Council should not consider this proposal until a review of the Conservation Management Plan for the area in concern, has taken place. Only when the public have spoken and indicated a need for further ski area development and if so, exactly what scale of development; should such a proposal be even considered	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes
		5	Oppose	It is Councils responsibility to not treat these kinds of applications too lightly. The impacts of such development must be given careful consideration to protect the natural places and little biodiversity we have left in Canterbury, first and foremost.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval in changes and it is Councils responsibility to consider the issues.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		6	Oppose	Is there any parallel between the Council's district plan with the Department of Conservation's management strategy? This would be beneficial in expanding appropriate tourism and recreational development on the public estate.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval and the CMS is a non-stat document for DoC purposes more than DP purposes.
		7	Oppose	I request that the Selwyn District Council put New Zealand's unique high country first and decline this application.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes
	Further Submission			Support/Opposition	
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support - insufficient public debate on whether the ski area lands should transfer from conservation estate and this location does not need another botched village development.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
Frank Dohmen	1723	1	Oppose	Although I am a snowboarder myself I do oppose the rezoning. The Craigieburn Mountain Range is a unique scenic environment and further developing will harm this fragile environment.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes
		2	Oppose	In Chapter 10 of the plan, environmental sustainability is discussed. In my opinion sustainability means that any adverse environmental consequences will be offset in order to preserve a ecosystem. The proposals in Chapter 10 will not offset the negative effects on the environment. In a best case scenario the proposals in Chapter 10 will mitigate some of the negative effects on the environment rather than offsetting them. Sustainability in this chapter is used as a fashion word and is without substance. The Craigieburn Mountain Range needs to be conserved for present and future generations.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes
Canterbury District Health Board	1724	1	Oppose	There is concern regarding the ability of the proposed Plan Change to meet the purpose set out in s5 Resource Management Act 1991, in terms of public health. Due to the nature of this development being highly hospitality driven and involving; catering for and accommodating a large number of people, essential services such as drinking water and wastewater management need to be thoroughly investigated for their feasibility and sustainability. Both these services are essential to maintaining a healthy, vibrant and productive Tourism Industry.	Reject if CRC consents. If CRC consent declined then this submission point should be accepted and the PC declined..
		2	Oppose	The Porter Heights Development presents many challenges in its geographical and geological location. There are concerns in relation to the ability to meet the objectives and policies of the Selwyn District Plan, in particular Policy B4.1.4. More specifically there are concerns in relation to the lack of information within the application regarding the provision of potable water to the proposed development, the treatment and disposal of waste, including sewage, and the constraints imposed by the location, terrain, temperature and weather extremes, and geological and hydro geological features. There are also concerns regarding the assumptions used in the Wastewater, Stormwater and Water Supply Infrastructural Options Assessment Report and the inconclusive nature of the adoption of options i.e. some options not providing the protection intended or being approved under current Standards.	Reject if CRC consents. If CRC consent declined then this submission point should be accepted and the PC declined..

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		3	Oppose	Further information on the nature of the accommodation proposed is required, so that a decision can be made as to determine what type of supplier category the drinking water for the proposed development will be. For new supplies commencing supplying drinking water after 1 July 2012, it is expected that they will comply with the Drinking Water Amendment Act 2007 from July 1st 2012.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes. Potable water would be required for a building consent
		4	Oppose	There are concerns on the details of the wastewater treatment such as (but not limited to): § The lack of information on seasonal variation on wastewater treatment and discharge; § The lack of information on microbial loading from this development and the variations in treatment over the different seasons; § The cumulative effect of microbial loading over time on relatively permeable soils and run-off effects; and § The establishment of planting on these soils would take considerable time to establish and contribute to the treatment process.	Reject if CRC consents. If CRC consent declined then this submission point should be accepted and the PC declined.
		5	Oppose	Due to the hospitality nature of this proposed development, provision of water supply and treatment and wastewater are essential services that need to be secured and sufficiently detailed before a plan change is granted and not waiting for detailed design commencement . If these essential services cannot be ascertained and provided public health will be compromised.	Reject if CRC consents. If CRC consent declined then this submission point should be accepted and the PC declined.
	Further Submission			Support/Opposition	

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	s0910 - Rosalie Snoyink			Support - Fully address the similar concerns listed in my original submission	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes. Service infrastructure can be provided but water takes will depend on CRC consents. If CRC consent declined then this submission point should be accepted and the PC declined.
	s1720 - Eugenie Meryl Sage			Support - Effective treatment of sewage and wastewater so that quality of streams on and close to the site and groundwater is central to protecting natural character of streams and healthy ecosystem functioning. The impacts on streams and groundwater of water takes for the development, particularly for snow making and village development were not adequately investigated in the AEE. Water quality in high country inter montane basins is generally high. The discharges associated with this development potentially degrade this	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes. Service infrastructure can be provided but water takes will depend on CRC consents. If CRC consent declined then this submission point should be accepted and the PC declined.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	s2308 - Castle Hill Ltd			Support - All of the submission	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes. Service infrastructure can be provided but water takes will depend on CRC consents. If CRC consent declined then this submission point should be accepted and the PC declined.
Quentin Forster	1851	1	Oppose	I do not approve the proposed plan. I love our country the way it is. The idea of conservation land being developed goes against everything I was brought up to believe in. Where does it stop?	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
Dale Muller	1902	1	Oppose	This is the headwater of a fragile river system. There is no need for large scale accommodation on the mountain and the Castle Hill area has been developed to fulfil this need.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
Hans van der Wal	1934	1	Support in part	<p>Supports the Plan Change with changes to the applicable objectives, policies, rules and other methods of the Selwyn District Plan in a manner that will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide for the expansion and upgrading of the Porter Heights Ski Area along the lines of the proposal behind the Plan Change • Ensure that modification of Conservation Estate is kept to the minimum extent and area necessary to accommodate the proposed upgrade • Protect the conservation and ecological values of the site of the proposal to the maximum extent practicable and provide an adequate environmental compensation package to off-set any loss of such values that cannot be adequately avoided or mitigated. Examples of such compensation could include, but would not be limited to pest eradication and habitat restoration in surrounding areas. • Ensure that all sewage and waste is treated and disposed of in a manner that has no adverse effects on soil or water quality • Require construction activities to be undertaken in a manner that prevents sediment or contaminant runoff into waterways • Require sealing and runoff treatment for access roads • Ensure complete revegetation, with appropriate native vegetation, of disturbed areas as soon as practicable • Maintain, to the extent practicable, public access to Conservation Estate affected by the proposal. • Provide for reduced-price family, club, group and school concessions for ski passes, in order to compensate for any loss or restriction of public access and to ensure that all socio-economic groups can enjoy the benefits of the proposal to their social and cultural wellbeing • Ensure the character of buildings and plantings is such that it is appropriate for the ecological and natural character values of the area. 	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Support in part	<p>If undertaken in a sensitive, ecologically appropriate and accessible manner, this project has the potential to enhance greatly the ability of the people and communities of Christchurch, Canterbury and New Zealand to provide for their social, economic and cultural health and wellbeing. Although certain adverse effects on amenity and natural character are inevitable, if the appropriate controls and compensation are required, these effects will be mitigated and off-set by the positive effects of the proposal, to the extent required by Part 2 of the Resource Management Act. In particular, it seems likely that the proposal will provide great benefits in terms of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Increased foreign revenue from Australian tourism - Increased revenue from higher numbers of domestic visitors - Flow-on economic benefits for the Selwyn District from the construction and operation phases - Further economic benefits for the wider Canterbury Region, including Christchurch and Christchurch International Airport - Benefits to the social wellbeing and health of Christchurch and Canterbury residents from improved access to better alpine sports facilities - An efficient and more sustainable use of existing infrastructure by being located close to Christchurch and surrounding towns with their existing major transport and tourism accommodation/facilities - Improvements to the safety of users of the ski-field by eliminating the risks associated with the use of the currently unsealed and potentially unstable access road. 	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		3	Support in part	<p>Subject to the relief sought, the changes will render the rules, policies and objectives as amended a more appropriate means of implementing Part 2 RMA than the current zoning, which fails to provide sufficiently for the additional benefits that would flow from a development along the lines proposed.</p>	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
James Gregg	2019	1	Support	Existing Porters Ski Area needs to be upgraded	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		2	Support	This would be great to ensure Porters remains viable	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		3	Support	It would be great if NZ had the type of on mountain facility you can get overseas	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		4	Support	It would be great if we did not have to use our mountain access road	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		5	Support	This will bring thousands of tourists to the mountain and the Canterbury region	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		6	Support	This would be a great experience for New Zealanders and overseas skiers	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		7	Support	This allows lots more people to get the enjoyment from accessing Crystal	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		8	Support	This will bring jobs into the region.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
	s1722 - Nicola Lee Snoyink			Oppose and all other similar submissions - The submission and others like it, lack any substantial reasons to warrant a zone change within this Outstanding Natural Landscape area. These submissions are no more than a petition of signatures without any real thought put into what this proposal actually means for Crystal Valley and its environment.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
Kylie Laurie	2118	1	Oppose	I ask that you reject the planned proposal on the basis of the negative impact this will have on the natural ecosystem in the area. It is of concern to read the extensive development of Crystal Valley proposed by Blackfish Limited. Extensive earthworks to re-contour areas of the valley for ski trails, build infrastructure and snowmaking reservoirs will result in the destruction of the significant inherent values of what we understand to be a pristine valley.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s1722 - Nicola Lee Snoyink			Support - I also live in New Zealand for the people and the land. Development such as this will ruin the land and destroy any inherent values the area has. It is totally inappropriate development. According to the Department of Conservation, this corridor linking the Southern Alps with the Canterbury Plains has an ecological unmodified altitude sequence of national importance (letter to editor Christchurch Press September 2010). It is not right that U turn be done as soon as the first big developer comes along. DOC made a promise to protect this land permanently. SDC should too.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
Tom Dunbar	2139	1	Support	Existing Porters Ski Area needs to be upgraded	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		2	Support	This would be great to ensure Porters remains viable	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		3	Support	It would be great if NZ had the type of on mountain facility you can get overseas	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		4	Support	It would be great if we did not have to use our mountain access road	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		5	Support	This will bring thousands of tourists to the mountain and the Canterbury region	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		6	Support	This would be a great experience for New Zealanders and overseas skiers	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		7	Support	This allows lots more people to get the enjoyment from accessing Crystal	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		8	Support	This will bring jobs into the region.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s0910 - Rosalie Snoyink			Oppose and all other similar submissions - Contributes nothing substantial to the Plan Change Request. Indicates a low level understanding of RMA process and the adverse impacts of the proposal on the environment.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
ChCh & Canterbury Tourism	2290	1	Support	Existing Porters Ski Area needs to be upgraded	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		2	Support	This would be great to ensure Porters remains viable	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		3	Support	It would be great if NZ had the type of on mountain facility you can get overseas	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		4	Support	It would be great if we did not have to use our mountain access road	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		5	Support	This will bring thousands of tourists to the mountain and the Canterbury region	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		6	Support	This would be a great experience for New Zealanders and overseas skiers	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		7	Support	This allows lots more people to get the enjoyment from accessing Crystal	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		8	Support	This will bring jobs into the region.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		9	Support	Tourism is important to the Canterbury region with 1 in 12 people employed in the industry. Further ski tourism is invaluable and helps ensure a consistent flow of visitors to the region. The Canterbury ski proposition works particularly well for the Australian market, the key market for Christchurch and Canterbury. The proposal would enhance the proposition of ski in the region and would complement Mt Hutt offering different options close to Christchurch International airport. It would bring an increase in the number of visitors to our ski areas which would be a benefit to all the community. The proposal would enable the region to compete on the world stage as a ski destination creating new jobs, which would be invaluable for the region. The proposal would also grow summer tourism by providing a base for mountain biking & walking.	Accept in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s1722 - Nicola Lee Snoyink			Oppose- It appears to be saying that the area has no value as it is (an Outstanding Natural Landscape) and needs development to give it value and attract visitors. I disagree with this whole heartedly and perish the thought of thousands of visitors trampling our sacred high country.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
Luke Wigram	2292	1	Oppose	I seek to have the council reject Plan Change 25. While wishing to see the business succeed the plan change is not appropriate and would create a precedent (land swap) that is unacceptable in its entirety if carried to other industries.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		2	Oppose	The proposal to impose a northern hemisphere resort upon the fragile ecosystem will not be in keeping with the cultural norms of local Iwi and pakeha. It will be unsustainable and environmentally damaging in the long term and issues such as rescue when lifts fail and storm bound are not catered for in the proposal.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		3	Oppose	This is a flawed a project being imposed on a landscape which is dear to my heart. If inappropriate development occurs it would be upsetting and create more reasons for myself not to provide my knowledge and expertise to the specialist health service I work for. Ruining the land is something I am opposed strongly to. An appropriate plan I would support, however this is not such.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
	Further Submission			Support / opposes	
	s1722 - Nicola Lee Snoyink			Support - I also live in New Zealand for the people and the land. Development such as this will ruin the land and destroy any inherent values the area has. It is totally inappropriate development. According to the Department of Conservation, this corridor linking the Southern Alps with the Canterbury Plains has an ecological unmodified altitude sequence of national importance (letter to editor Christchurch Press September 2010). It is not right that U turn be done as soon as the first big developer comes along. DOC made a promise to protect this land permanently. SDC should too.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
Castle Hill Ltd	2308	1	Oppose	That the application be declined in its entirety.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		2	Oppose	AS an adjoining High Country Station we have concerns the Stations farming activities, residential uses, and quiet enjoyment of our land will be adversely affected by the actual or potential effects from the scale, character and form of developments being proposed for the new ski-area sub-zone. The level of controls provided for in PPC 25 is inadequate to avoid, remedy, or mitigate the consequent significant adverse effects on this area of outstanding natural landscape and high natural values. There is a very real probability that Castle Hill Station's use of its land and farming activities is actually or potentially affected by any failure of, or any negative effect of new developments not performing or acting as anticipated by those controls proposed in PPC 25	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		3	Oppose	Insufficeint information.All of the reports submitted with the Plan Change are feasibility options with presumptive findings only and do not contain sufficient credible information to accurately assess the true nature or ability of the structures, buildings, and system designs.to successfully operate within the constraints imposed by the alpine location, the rugged and steep terrain, the extreme seasonal, climatic and temperature variations, and the geological and hydrological features of the locale. It is premature to make zoning decisions which will ultimately determine the veracity of building / structure / traffic safety and discharge outcomes for public assets, by relying solely on promises to provide further engineering assessment or detailed final design solutions once the Plan Change performance criteria have been determined and incorporated into the SDP, commonly as 'controlled activities' which limit discretion on additional concerns	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes including status changes
		4	Oppose	<p>Castle Hill Ltd is of the opinion PPC 25 would undermine the integrity and consistent governance of the following Plans and Statements, and fails to adequately give regard to the matters contained therein:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Operative Selwyn District Plan (SDP). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Protecting this location from inappropriate subdivision, use and development: this Plan Change is inconsistent with nearly all of the objectives, polices and rules which currently apply to areas of 'Outstanding Natural Landscape' within the SDP for the proposed ski-field sub-zone. - Water, vegetation and ecosystems, land use, natural hazards, transport, and residential density and growth at this location: this Plan Change is incompatible with most of the objectives, polices and rules which currently apply to the Rural (High Country) zone within the SDP which underlay the proposed ski-field sub-zone. 2. The Waimakariri River Regional Plan (WRRP), <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Waterbodies must be maintained in a natural state: this Plan Change is inconsistent with the objectives, polices and rules within the WRRP which currently apply to the Porter River, and the Porter and Crystal Streams which are classified as in a high 'natural state' with very 'high aquatic habitat'. 3. The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRP) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Beds of rivers, soils and land use, landscape, ecology and heritage, and settlement patterns: this Plan Change is contrary to or incompatible with the objectives and policies within the CRP as they relate to residential density, access and location, and protecting the high levels of naturalness, biological diversity, and natural character of the landscape that are present over the proposed ski-field sub-zone. 	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		5	Oppose	Any disposal of such lands for a strictly commercial purpose (i.e. not for pastoral or conservation use) requires a transparent public consultation process and Castle Hill Ltd believe it is premature for PPC 25 to be considered by the Selwyn District Council until robust public debate has occurred on the merits or otherwise of removing the ski area sub-zone from the conservation estate, which as a consequence would curtail free public access and use.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		6	Oppose	PPC 25 postulates 600,000 visitor's per annum to the ski field area, with 40% visiting the Castle Hill basin outside of the peak winter ski season . This 1,200 % increase in visitor numbers coming into the basin will incrementally increase visits to the other adjacent DOC conservation areas This will exacerbate the demands on the existing DOC ablution facilities and carparking areas at Kura Tawhiti and Cave Stream to service this increased public accessibility onto conservation lands. In addition, Castle Hill village also lacks any form of Council amenity services and ablutions, and the State Highway between Lake Lyndon and Cave Stream has only one formed road reserve pull-off area for vehicular use. Castle Hill Ltd are of the opinion there has been no consideration within the proposed Plan Change of the consequences and likely adverse effects from the amplified visitor numbers generated by the proposed ski area developments within the Castle Hill basin globally, particularly with regard to the lack of adequate itinerant pull-off parking on the State Highway carriage-way, trespass and the interference of the legitimate farming activities of adjoining Stations, and the lack of adequate public amenities to cope with the inevitable surge in visitor numbers.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		7	Oppose	<p>The Plan Change also grossly underestimates the impact of doubling the traffic generation on the State Highway to service the expansion developments proposed (average – 1,684 vpd increasing to 3,669 vpd at winter peak) . The ski area access is within an alpine pass renowned for winter road closures (15% of the 2009 ski season), continually iced and snowbound roads, poor road visibility (fog, low cloud and whiteout), gale force winds, no mobile phone reception or signal, 24/7 road clearing and surface maintenance, difficulties using helicopters in inclement weather, and problematic emergency vehicle access with no viable alternative routes out of the basin.</p> <p>As the closest permanent residence in the Castle Hill basin we are regularly required to respond 24/7 to the numerous unreported vehicle accidents / incidents in this locality and we believe the risk and hazard analysis on the State Highway in PPC 25 for crash exposure, traffic management, sight line distances, turning lane and pull-off lane requirements (both east and west bound traffic), the affect of extreme climatic effects, and emergency response abilities, are grossly understated, particularly during the peak winter ski season.</p>	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes including changes to access to SH73
		8	Oppose	<p>The nominal human footprint of the existing Porter Heights ski field structures / infrastructure is already widely visible from State Highway 73 and within the Castle Hill basin (as are the Cheeseman, Broken River, Craigieburn Valley ski fields). The further imposition of multi-storey accommodation and residential buildings, gondola's and chairlifts, infrastructure pipework and galleries in existing watercourses, roading / bridges and tracking, and wastewater and stormwater structures and buildings, resultant from developments proposed in PPC 25 will be dominantly conspicuous in this mountain landscape and as a consequence will intensify the loss of landscape intactness, character, naturalness and alpine sequencing, on this region of outstanding high country landscape</p>	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		9	Oppose	The site being promoted is identified as an 'Outstanding Natural Landscape' and PPC 25 seeks to remove and change this zoning in the SDP. The lifting of the current SDP controls with the new controls as proposed in PPC 25 to accommodate do not address any of the actual or potential effects of activities in a manner which will mitigate, avoid or remedy the significant adverse effects on this high value landscape with national, regional and local significance. Castle Hill Ltd are of the opinion the lessening of the environmental performance standards and bulk and location controls currently in the SDP proposed within the Plan Change will in all certainty set an inescapable precedent for those other under-developed ski areas located on conservation estate land in the Castle Hill basin as they all share the same intrinsic landscape and natural values, and site characteristics with the Porter ski-area sub-zone.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes including the retention of the ONL
		10	Oppose	The Crystal and Porter Streams, and the Porter River (above SH73) are classified in the WRRP as high 'natural state' with very 'high aquatic habitat', which is a rarity now in the Canterbury high country. As such, any risk of improperly treated discharges or bulk flows being carried into these fragile and pristine waterways would have significant adverse effects, and the maintenance of the 'state of naturalness' required by the WRRP could not be achieved. In addition, the natural character and ecological values of the indigenous vegetation and habitat of indigenous fauna present in this locality have already been recognised as regionally and nationally significant in the WRRP, the CRP Statement, the Canterbury Biodiversity Strategy, Department of Conservation Canterbury Conservation Management Strategy / Plans, and the Operative SDP. PPC 25 also freely admits the large scale disturbance of the Crystal basin as a permanent ski area is a significant adverse effect and represents a large scale negative ecological and biodiversity outcome of this ski-field sub-zone development proposal which cannot be mitigated, remedied or avoided. The Castle Hill basin cannot sustain the loss of the second largest unmodified alpine basin environment along with several rare pristine sub-alpine valley headwater aquatic environments, which cannot be replaced in the Torlesse/Craigieburn ecological District. PPC 25 offers no effective or viable 'environmental compensation' or commensurate 'public benefit' to offset the loss of these 616 hectares of conservation land with intrinsic landscape and natural values.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes including the retention of the ONL, increased setbacks to Porters Stream, and high activity status to allow for compensation consideration

Appendix 2

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Decision
		11	Oppose	Castle Hill Ltd has to ask why we need to further pollute the pristine land and sky-scapes of the Castle Hill basin to service the fickle overseas tourism market for purely commercial gain, especially where the ski field profits will not be retained in the Selwyn District or directly support local businesses. This locale does not need another partially completed township. Would it not be more beneficial to complement the existing Castle Hill village development with the on-mountain commercial and residential developments being proposed in PPC 25? The ski-area improvements could then be assessed within the framework of the existing SDP to ensure they complement the established visual character and natural values of this unique high country basin.	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		12	Oppose	Any expansion of existing residential developments and tourism resorts can only occur within the confines of the original approved development plan. Otherwise new developments should only occur in or around existing townships, where the utility services are already present and amenity values are appropriate for the increased activity and densities. PPC 25 proposes a dedicated on-mountain village with 45 freehold residential chalets, accommodation for 3,700 people with commercial, retail and entertainment centre's. The majority of these commercial, residential and accommodation structures proposed by the Plan Change will be large multi-storey buildings, and globally the development area has an elevated level of potential natural hazards	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.
		13	Oppose	When regard is given to Part II of the Resource Management Act 1991, Castle Hill Ltd considers that this Plan Change is contrary to sections 6 (b) and (c), and 7 (b) (c) (d) (f) (g) and (h), and having particular regard to public health and safety and the well-being of people and communities and the natural environment, it will not constitute sustainable management as defined in section 5 of the Resource Management Act 1991	Reject in part in so far as PC 25 is recommended for approval with changes.