

Proposed Plan Change 29 - Design of Development in the Business 1 Zone

Summary of Decisions Sought

Introduction

The period for making submissions to Plan Change 29 to the District Plan closed on 28 April 2011. This is the second stage of the public submission process where people have the opportunity to make further submissions.

Further submissions give the opportunity for the public to either support or oppose the submissions received and summarised or aspects of these submissions. Please note it is not another opportunity to make fresh submissions on the Plan Change itself, as a further submission can only relate to a submission which has already been lodged.

The further submission Form 6 is available at all Council offices and online at: <http://www.selwyn.govt.nz/services/planning/planning-forms/form-6-further-submissions>

THE SUMMARY

Submission Number	Name	Submission Point	Subject area	Submission Type	Detail	Relief sought
1	Lincoln Envirotown Trust	1	Policy B3.4.23a	Support	Requests inclusion of references to cycling in policy B3.4.23a. Add new paragraph on environmental sustainability under explanation.	Amend policy to include references to cycling. Add new paragraph under explanation on environmentally sensitive design.
		2	Building lines	Support	Requests amendment of policy 16.10.3.1(b) relating to building lines, such that these are only continued where they are visually appealing and consistent with overall values of the community	Amend policy
		3	Landscaping	Support	Add a note under rules 16.10.3.7 and 17.7.1 to require use of eco-sourced native species unless there is a defined reason otherwise.	Add a note under rules 16.10.3.7 and 17.7.1 to require use of eco-sourced native species unless there is a defined reason otherwise.
		4	Buildings and external finish (rule 16.12)	Not Stated	With regard to rule 16.12.2.1 notes that light colour roofs reflect the sun's energy, reducing the heat island effect and the effect of building on global warming. Notes that green living roofs would be a better suggestion.	
		5	MDH	Support	Considers that rule 16.14.1.2(c) requiring a good level of glazing is unclear in its intent. Requests additions to rule 16.14.1.3 (dwelling design, position and orientation) with regard to orientation for greatest solar gain; and energy saving features. Supports rule 16.14.1.7(a)	Add new bullet points under rule 16.14.1.3 to ensure buildings are positioned for greatest solar gain in winter; and that houses incorporate energy saving features such as concrete heat sinks, double or triple glazing, solar water heating and rooftop water collection.
		6	Lighting	Not Stated	Considers that rule 17.6.1.1(b) on lighting in parking areas should require that this is energy efficient LED lighting and angled to reduce light pollution.	
2	Royal New Zealand Plunkett Society (Southbridge)	1	Whole of plan change	Oppose	Considers it inappropriate to impose provisions on historic childcare facilities or community facilities such as a town hall or swimming pool. Considers that design rules may have little relevance in small rural townships and that an attraction of small towns is their individual character. Considers strict design controls would stifle business and commercial activity.	Withdraw Plan Change 29; OR remove application of rules from small townships; OR Make exemption for childcare facilities and insert definition of childcare facilities.
		2	Policy B3.4.22	Oppose	Considers level of control is too restrictive for small townships and in particular for community facilities. Considers that restrictions on control and building materials in an area which is not located close to significant landscape or heritage features is beyond expectations of township.	Delete new wording to policy 3.4.22
		3	Policy B3.4.23(a)	Oppose	Considers that it would be difficult to achieve internalisation of car parking in Southbridge and that the level of commercial activity does not require it.	Delete third point relating to internalisation of car parking
		4	Small scale developments (rule 16.9)	Oppose	Considers that the commercial makeup of the business 1 zone and the orientation of development on the Plunkett site make the rules inappropriate. Considers that the cost of applying for resource consents would be onerous, as would discretionary status of applications that failed to meet the standards. Considers that third party input in subjective matters such as the colour of cladding may lead to inappropriate aesthetics.	Amend wording to make exception for childcare facilities AND/OR the Southbridge B1 zone; amend status of rule 16.9.2 to controlled or restricted discretionary with no requirement for third party input.
		5	Buildings and external finish (rule 16.12)	Oppose	Considers that rule would excessively limit the expression of the occupier of the site. Notes that childcare facilities require happy colours. Considers there is a risk that all townships will appear to be the same. Considers controls may deter businesses. Opposes non-complying status for security shutters.	Delete rule 16.12.1 OR amend non-complying status of rules 16.12.3 and 16.12.4.
		6	Parking and Landscaping (rule 17.7.1)	Oppose	Considers that this would create an unsafe environment for children and may make redevelopment unaffordable.	Delete rule 17.7.1 or provide an exemption for childcare facilities.
		7	Reasons for rules	Amend	Considers rules are onerous for childcare centre and inappropriate in Southbridge.	Add additional paragraph to reasons for rules to explain why childcare facilities are excluded.

Submission Number	Name	Submission Point	Subject area	Submission Type	Detail	Relief sought
		8	Definitions	Amend	Insert definition of childcare facilities to allow exception to be created for them.	Insert new definition of childcare facilities.
3	Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Ltd	1	Whole of plan change	Oppose	Notes that high quality development is not achieved by compliance with a rigid set of rules and that design and form of development in the business 1 zone would be better managed through an effects assessment on a site specific basis and if necessary through non-statutory measures. Considers that there is limited evidence that retail establishing out of a town centre will undermine its vitality to the extent that it results in significant adverse effects to the wellbeing of the wider community.	Reject Plan Change 29; Or amend policies and rules to reflect issues raised in this submission
		2	Parking and Landscaping (rule 17.7.1)	Oppose	Considers that preventing parking from being established between retail and roads overlooks the function of large format retail and may result in unintended consequences such as compromising pedestrian safety and undermining pedestrian flow. Considers this will be contrary to broader objectives of District Plan. Considers that design and form of business 1 land is not an appropriate way to manage the issue of car dependency and that this should be addressed through public transport and provision for public car parking.	Reject Plan Change 29; Or amend policies and rules to reflect issues raised in this submission
		3	Policy B3.4.22	Oppose	Notes that exceptions to this policy relate to natural features, landscapes and heritage and amenity values. Considers that control on design and form of town centres does not fit within this policy.	Reject Plan Change 29; Or amend policies and rules to reflect issues raised in this submission
		4	On-site public space (16.10.3.3)	Oppose	Considers that regulation of on-site public space is an inappropriate control on the use of private space and would result in the erosion of private property rights without necessary benefits.	Reject Plan Change 29; Or amend policies and rules to reflect issues raised in this submission
		5	Rules 16.9 and 16.10	Oppose	Considers that the assessment matters in rule 16.10.2 are so broad that they undermine restricted discretionary approach. Considers that rules 16.9 and 16.10 will act as a disincentive to business to establish in the district.	Reject Plan Change 29; Or amend policies and rules to reflect issues raised in this submission
4	Kelvin Taege	1	Whole of plan change	Oppose	Considers that the methods are not the most appropriate method for achieving the purpose of the act or the District Plan's policies and methods. Considers that rules may present a hurdle to achieving the most appropriate outcomes and may stifle economic development and vitality. Notes that high quality development is not achieved by compliance with a rigid set of rules and that design and form of development in the business 1 zone would be better managed through an effects assessment on a site specific basis and if necessary through non-statutory measures.	Reject Plan Change 29; Or amend policies and rules to reflect issues raised in this submission
		2	On-site public space (16.10.3.3)	Oppose	Considers that regulation of on-site public space is an inappropriate control on the use of private space and would result in the erosion of private property rights without necessary benefits.	Reject Plan Change 29; Or amend policies and rules to reflect issues raised in this submission
		3	Extent of discretion	Oppose	Considers the proposed discretion given to the council undermines the effects based approach that is required for individual developments	Reject Plan Change 29; Or amend policies and rules to reflect issues raised in this submission
5	Prebbleton Hotel Ltd	1	Rules 16.13, 16.14.15, 16.15.1	Not Stated	Notes concern about changes to rules	Not Stated
		2	Rules 17.6,17.7	Not Stated	Notes concern about changes to rules	Not Stated
		3	Rule 19.1.15	Not Stated	Notes concern about changes to rules	Not Stated
6	Canterbury Regional Council	1	Whole of plan change	Support	Considers PC29 provides a comprehensive and coherent package of amendments that achieves its stated purpose. Consequently considers that PC29 is consistent with purposes and principles of the RMA; appropriate in terms of section 32 of the Act; is an appropriate response to the effects of the relevant activities; will achieve urban design outcomes in Key Activity Centres consistent with Policy 7 to Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.	Uphold PC29.

Submission Number	Name	Submission Point	Subject area	Submission Type	Detail	Relief sought
7	CDL Land NZ Ltd	1	Whole of plan change	Not Stated	States general support for the intent of PC29 to better integrate commercial development with its surroundings and improve design. However, is concerned that some provisions are too prescriptive or lack flexibility. Considers that PC29 does not give effect to Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement because it will not achieve a built environment that has a sense of character and identity and will restrict the ability of business to be functionally efficient and economically vibrant (objective 2). Also considers that provisions do not provide for a high standard of visual interest and amenity (Policy 7).	Make requested amendments (see below) or reject PC29
		2	Large Developments (rule 16.10)	Oppose	Considers that the specific matters for discretion, especially rule 16.10.3.1 are overly restrictive and are in effect standards against which the development would be assessed Considers that 16.10.3.1(b) is inconsistent with itself as it seeks a varied street scene but then requires consistency with scale modules, building lines and detailing.	Delete the word "through" and the subsequent bullet points from rule 16.10.3.1(b)
		3	Buildings and external finish (rule 16.12)	Oppose	Considers the rules overly restrictive. Considers that restrictions on materials and roof colours have not been adequately assessed in the section 32 analysis; and that they will not achieve the policies and objectives of the plan (Objective B3.4.2 and Policy B3.4.4). Considers that a blanket approach to design in all business 1 zones is inappropriate and inconsistent with the existing character of the zone.	Delete rules 16.12.1, 16.12.2 and 16.12.3 and associated text in Reasons for Rules.
		4	Signage	Oppose	Considers that change to rule 19.1.1.6 would limit the amount of signage per site with little consideration of the site size and therefore the ability of sites with a large amount of road frontage to accommodate such signs. Considers the new restrictions would be inconsistent with policies B3.4.20 and B3.4.21 and Objective B3.4.2; notes that policy B3.4.21 states that signage is an integral part of the business zone. Considers that the discussion in the section 32 report, relating to pedestrian experience, is not supported by the objectives and policies.	Remove amendments to rule 19.1.1.6
		5	Policies B3.4.22 and B3.4.23a	Oppose	Considers that proposed policies are more appropriate than existing ones for achieving Objectives B3.4.1 and B3.4.2; But that provisions are not consistent with these policies.	Reject amendments to first and third paragraphs of explanation under Policy B3.4.22
		7	Miscellaneous	Not Stated	It is clearly intended that PC29 refer to the business 1 zone, but some provisions would apply to other zones. These include: Policy 3.4.23(a); Policy B4.3.6; rule 19.1.1.6	Amend provisions to apply to the Business 1 zone only
8	Lieuwe Doubleday	1	Whole of plan change	Oppose	Considers PC29 makes no allowance for the particular circumstances of small townships [Southbridge in particular]. Considers that activity in Southbridge is too small for PC29 to be relevant and that PC29 would be a disincentive to investment. Considers that changes to rule 16 for small developments are too restrictive.	Reject PC29; OR exempt Southbridge and other small towns; OR insert a minimum \$500,000 threshold for additions and alterations; OR limit the application of PC29 to large development only in small towns.
9	Lincoln Land Development	1	Whole of plan change	Oppose in Part	LLD understands the intent of PC29 and supports the desire of Council to improve design in its business zones in general. Concerned that PC29 is inflexible and overly restrictive. Considers that PC29 does not give effect to Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement because it will not achieve a built environment that has a sense of character and identity and will restrict the ability of business to be functionally efficient and economically vibrant (objective 2). Also considers that provisions do not provide for a high standard of visual interest and amenity (Policy 7).	Make requested amendments (see below) or reject PC29
		2	Large Developments (rule 16.10)	Oppose	Considers assessment matters are overly restrictive and are in effect prescriptive rules which require compliance. Considers 16.10.3.1(b) is inconsistent because it seeks a varied streetscene but also compliance with scale modules, building lines and detailing. Considers rule 16.10.3.5 is especially prescriptive and is covered by more general matters. Considers rule 16.10.3.6 [site layout and car parking] is written as a rule not an assessment matter. Seeks an alternative approach based on a design guide incorporated into the District Plan.	Delete Rule 16.10 OR reject the plan change to be renotified with a revised approach. Delete the word "through" and the following bullet points from proposed rule 16.10.3.1(b). Delete rule 16.10.5. Amend rule 16.10.3.6 to read: "The design and layout of the site in relation to the location of car-parking areas"

Submission Number	Name	Submission Point	Subject area	Submission Type	Detail	Relief sought
		3	Buildings and external finish (rule 16.12)	Oppose	Considers the rules overly restrictive. Considers that restrictions on materials and roof colours have not been adequately assessed in the section 32 analysis; and that they will not achieve the policies and objectives of the plan (Objective B3.4.2 and Policy B3.4.4). Considers that a blanket approach to design in all business 1 zones is inappropriate and inconsistent with the existing character of the zone.	Delete rules 16.12.1, 16.12.2 and 16.12.3 and associated text in Reasons for Rules.
		4	Signage	Oppose	Considers that change to rule 19.1.1.6 would limit the amount of signage per site with little consideration of the site size and therefore the ability of sites with a large amount of road frontage to accommodate such signs. Considers the new restrictions would be inconsistent with policies B3.4.20 and B3.4.21 and Objective B3.4.2; notes that policy B3.4.21 states that signage is an integral part of the business zone.	Remove amendments to rule 19.1.1.6
		5	Policies B3.4.22 and B3.4.23a	Support in part	Supports new policies but considers that they do not sufficiently address large format retail. Also considers that new provisions are not consistent with these policies.	Amend Policy 3.4.23a as follows: Add an additional bullet point: "Ensuring that large developments are complimentary to the business 1 zone and do not undermine the town centre character" Amend the seventh paragraph of the explanation to read "Large developments have a greater scale of effects but can be designed comprehensively and include on-site public space. <u>However, not all large developments will be able to be accommodated in the business 1 zone and larger developments will therefore not always be appropriate.</u> These proposals <u>therefore</u> need a greater degree of scrutiny..." Reject amendments to first and third paragraphs of explanation under Policy B3.4.22
		6	Miscellaneous	Not Stated	It is clearly intended that PC29 refer to the business 1 zone, but some provisions would apply to other zones. These include: Policy 3.4.23(a); Policy B4.3.6; rule 19.1.1.6	Amend provisions to apply to the Business 1 zone only
		1	Policies B3.4.22 and B3.4.23a	Support in part	Generally supports proposed policies and rules where they are consistent to centres based approach to accommodating growth. But considers Policy B3.4.23a unnecessarily prioritises pedestrian requirements and fails to acknowledge other requirements.	Amend or delete policy B3.4.23a
		2	Policy B4.3.6	Oppose	Considers policy B4.3.6 fails to acknowledge the operational requirements of many businesses, and imposes inappropriate restrictions on layout and design.	Amend or delete policy B4.3.6
10	Progressive Enterprises Ltd	3	Small scale developments (rule 16.9)	Support in part	Supports high amenity values in town centres but considers rules are unnecessary and onerous. Considers that discretionary status of non-compliances is unnecessary and that a "middle ground" approach should be taken.	Amend rules 16.1.1.1, 16.1.1.2 and 16.9.1.4. Amend rule 16.9.2 as follows: "16.9.2 Any building or structure which does not comply with rule 16.9.1 shall be a discretionary activity <u>controlled activity as per the matters listed in 19.9.1</u> "
		4	Large Developments (rule 16.10) and Retail fronting on-site spaces (rule 16.11)	Support in part	Considers that requirement for specific design features such as verandahs, footpaths, continuous building lines and active frontages are inappropriate and impractical for large format retail. Concerned with rule 16.10.3.9 which includes degree of compliance with permitted activity standards for small scale development; submits that effects of small and large scale development are different in scale and scope and that effects should be specifically addressed in rule 16.10	Retain the proposed assessment criteria to the extent that they are consistent with Progressives concerns. Either delete assessment criteria 16.10.3.1(a) and (b) or amend them to make them less onerous and to give the Council a more general discretion to consider adjacent buildings. . Delete or amend criteria 16.10.3.2-4 and 16.10.3.6 to meet Progressive's concerns. Delete 16.10.3.5 and 9 Amend the assessment criteria generally so as not to unnecessarily prioritise pedestrian amenity over other considerations and adequately provide for mitigation measures rather than adopting such a stringent approach.
		5	Buildings and external finish (rule 16.12)	Support in part	Considers controls regulating design and colour scheme are sufficient in achieving the desired amenity effect.	Either delete rules 16.12.1-32 [sic] or amend them so as not to specifically prescribe materials that must be used.

Submission Number	Name	Submission Point	Subject area	Submission Type	Detail	Relief sought
		6	Dwellings	Support	Submits that provisions do not provide for adequate acoustic privacy	Include as part of rule 16.13.1 a noise insulation requirement in accordance with rule 16.14.1.4
		7	Car Parking (rules 17.6 and 17.7)	Support	Supports rule 17.6 and considers controlled status for development and redevelopment of parking is appropriate. Supports the principle of landscaping of car-parks (rule 17.7) but considers that rules impose obligations in respect of design and layout that are unnecessary and that the section should be amended to reflect what is practicable.	Amend section 17.7 to provide for more realistic landscaping requirements.
		8	Commercial Design Guide	Oppose	Considers the guide is too prescriptive and that it should not be included as part of the Selwyn District Plan	Delete references to the Commercial Design Guide.
11	Rolleston Square Ltd	1	Policy 3.4.23a	Oppose	Considers that the policy fails to take into account the constraints that exist in the Rolleston Town Centre; in particular the part which seeks to bring activity to street frontages by means of the position of buildings and active frontage is overly prescriptive. Impractical to expect car users to walk to the street front to enter buildings and not possible to put active frontage on front as well as rear of buildings. Fails to recognise that majority of people who visit the town centre do so by car.	Delete third bullet point of policy: "bringing activity to street frontages by means of the positioning of buildings and active frontage along the street boundary and by internalising car parking with a site or development block" Amend final bullet point: "ensuring that design and layout prioritises the needs of pedestrians over the parking of cars accommodates a mixed use traffic environment including pedestrians, cycles, motor vehicles and public transport"
		2	Policy B3.4.27	Oppose	Considers that Business 1 land should be preserved for business type activities	Delete Policy B3.4.27
		3	Policy B4.3.6	Not Stated	Considers that policy should be amended to prevent rezoning of land if it would adversely affect existing town centres.	Amend the policy as follows: "Only rezone land for business if: <u>It does not adversely affect the function, amenity and vitality of existing Town Centres</u> It has an appropriate shape to allow for the creation of a high quality town or smaller centre environment"
		4	Small scale developments (rule 16.9)	Oppose	Considers that rule 16.9.1.1 is too prescriptive and cites examples of where car-parking between shop fronts and the road may be required. Considers that non-compliance with rule 16.9.1 should trigger restricted discretionary status.	Delete rule 16.9.1.1 and make non-compliance with rule 16.9.1 a restricted discretionary activity subject to a list of urban design matters.
		5	Rule 16.10.3.1(Large Developments)	Oppose	Considers that matters of discretion under 16.10.3.1 are too wide, too subjective and too uncertain. Considers that it would be artificial to constrain development on a site where neighbours have not developed to District Plan maximums. Considers it artificial to subdivide buildings into modules with a width of 5-10m; opposes need to provide upper floor detailing consistent with neighbours. Notes that not all roof mounted equipment is visible from the ground and suggests amendments to rule 16.10.3.1(c)	Delete Rule 16.10.3.1(a). Delete first and third bullet points under 16.10.3.1(b). Amend rule 16.10.3.1(c) as follows: "Avoids or disguises roof mounted equipment such as airconditioning units Integrates roof mounted equipment in a manner that does not detract from the visual amenity of the building"
		6	Rule 16.10.3.2 (Large developments)	Oppose	Considers that rule fails to recognise that most people arrive by motor vehicle and it is impractical that building entrances should face the street but car parking be located at the rear.	Amend rule so that it refers to provision of active frontage facing the road
		7	Rule 16.10.3.5 (Large developments)	Oppose	Notes that large developments will be designed to integrate with car park and so may be inappropriate to provide active frontage to street	Delete that part of rule 16.10.3.5 that refers to active frontage along street boundaries
		8	Rule 16.10.3.6 (Large developments)	Oppose	Submits that the rule is too prescriptive and does not take into account the orientation of sites.	Delete rule 16.10.3.6
		9	Rule 16.10.3.9 (Large developments)	Oppose		Reference to matters listed under 16.9.1.1 should be excluded
		10	Notes under rule 16.10	Oppose	Considers note is vague and refers to terms not used in part 16.10 such as people oriented space.	Delete note
		11	Buildings and external finish (rule 16.12)	Oppose	Considers non-complying status is too onerous for non-compliance.	Amend rule 16.12.3 to change status to restricted discretionary
		12	Dwellings (rules 16.13, 16.14 and 16.15)	Oppose	Use of business 1 zone for residential use is inappropriate	Delete rules 16.13, 16.14 and 16.15

Submission Number	Name	Submission Point	Subject area	Submission Type	Detail	Relief sought
		13	Definitions	Oppose	Definition of People Oriented Space is vague	Amend definition to provide greater certainty
12	Rolleston Retail Ltd	1	Policy 3.4.23a	Oppose	Considers that the policy fails to take into account the constraints that exist in the Rolleston Town Centre; in particular the part which seeks to bring activity to street frontages by means of the position of buildings and active frontage is overly prescriptive. Impractical to expect car users to walk to the street front to enter buildings and not possible to put active frontage on front as well as rear of buildings. Fails to recognise that majority of people who visit the town centre do so by car.	Delete third bullet point of policy: "bringing activity to street frontages by means of the positioning of buildings and active frontage along the street boundary and by internalising car parking with a site or development block" Amend final bullet point: "ensuring that design and layout prioritises the needs of pedestrians over the parking of cars accommodates a mixed use traffic environment including pedestrians, cycles, motor vehicles and public transport"
		2	Policy B3.4.27	Oppose	Considers that Business 1 land should be preserved for business type activities	Delete Policy B3.4.27
		3	Policy B4.3.6	Not Stated	Considers that policy should be amended to prevent rezoning of land if it would adversely affect existing town centres.	Amend the policy as follows: "Only rezone land for business if: <u>It does not adversely affect the function, amenity and vitality of existing Town Centres</u> It has an appropriate shape to allow for the creation of a high quality town or smaller centre environment"
		4	Small scale developments (rule 16.9)	Oppose	Considers that rule 16.9.1.1 is too prescriptive and cites examples of where car-parking between shop fronts and the road may be required. Considers that non-compliance with rule 16.9.1 should trigger restricted discretionary status.	Delete rule 16.9.1.1 and make non-compliance with rule 16.9.1 a restricted discretionary activity subject to a list of urban design matters.
		5	Rule 16.10.3.1 (Large Developments)	Oppose	Considers that matters of discretion under 16.10.3.1 are too wide, too subjective and too uncertain. Considers that it would be artificial to constrain development on a site where neighbours have not developed to District Plan maximums. Considers it artificial to subdivide buildings into modules with a width of 5-10m; opposes need to provide upper floor detailing consistent with neighbours. Notes that not all roof mounted equipment is visible from the ground and suggests amendments to rule 16.10.3.1(c)	Delete Rule 16.10.3.1(a). Delete first and third bullet points under 16.10.3.1(b). Amend rule 16.10.3.1(c) as follows: " Avoids or disguises roof mounted equipment such as airconditioning units <u>Integrates roof mounted equipment in a manner that does not detract from the visual amenity of the building</u> "
		6	Rule 16.10.3.2 (Large developments)	Oppose	Considers that rule fails to recognise that most people arrive by motor vehicle and it is impractical that building entrances should face the street but car parking be located at the rear.	Amend rule so that it refers to provision of active frontage facing the road
		7	Rule 16.10.3.5 (Large developments)	Oppose	Notes that large developments will be designed to integrate with car park and so may be inappropriate to provide active frontage to street	Delete that part of rule 16.10.3.5 that refers to active frontage along street boundaries
		8	Rule 16.10.3.6 (Large developments)	Oppose	Submits that the rule is too prescriptive and does not take into account the orientation of sites.	Delete rule 16.10.3.6
		9	Rule 16.10.3.9 (Large developments)	Oppose		Reference to matters listed under 16.9.1.1 should be excluded
		10	Notes under rule 16.10	Oppose	Considers note is vague and refers to terms not used in part 16.10 such as people oriented space.	Delete note
		11	Buildings and external finish (rule 16.12)	Oppose	Considers non-complying status is too onerous for non-compliance.	Amend rule 16.12.3 to change staues to restricted discretionary
		12	Dwellings (rules 16.13, 16.14 and 16.15)	Oppose	Use of business 1 zone for residential use is inappropriate	Delete rules 16.13, 16.14 and 16.15
		13	Definitions	Oppose	Definition of People Oriented Space is vague	Amend definition to provide greater certainty
13	Roll Ten Investments Ltd	1	Policy 3.4.23a	Oppose	Considers that the policy fails to take into account the constraints that exist in the Rolleston Town Centre; in particular the part which seeks to bring activity to street frontages by means of the position of buildings and active frontage is overly prescriptive. Impractical to expect car users to walk to the street front to enter buildings and not possible to put active frontage on front as well as rear of buildings. Fails to recognise that majority of people who visit the town centre do so by car.	Delete third bullet point of policy: "bringing activity to street frontages by means of the positioning of buildings and active frontage along the street boundary and by internalising car parking with a site or development block" Amend final bullet point: "ensuring that design and layout prioritises the needs of pedestrians over the parking of cars accommodates a mixed use traffic environment including pedestrians, cycles, motor vehicles and public transport"

Submission Number	Name	Submission Point	Subject area	Submission Type	Detail	Relief sought
		2	Policy B3.4.27	Oppose	Considers that Business 1 land should be preserved for business type activities	Delete Policy B3.4.27
		3	Policy B4.3.6	Not Stated	Considers that policy should be amended to prevent rezoning of land if it would adversely affect existing town centres.	Amend the policy as follows: "Only rezone land for business if: <u>It does not adversely affect the function, amenity and vitality of existing Town Centres</u> It has an appropriate shape to allow for the creation of a high quality town or smaller centre environment"
		4	Small scale developments (rule 16.9)	Oppose	Considers that rule 16.9.1.1 is too prescriptive and cites examples of where car-parking between shop fronts and the road may be required. Considers that non-compliance with rule 16.9.1 should trigger restricted discretionary status.	Delete rule 16.9.1.1 and make non-compliance with rule 16.9.1 a restricted discretionary activity subject to a list of urban design matters.
		5	Rule 16.10.3.1(Large Developments)	Oppose	Considers that matters of discretion under 16.10.3.1 are too wide, too subjective and too uncertain. Considers that it would be artificial to constrain development on a site where neighbours have not developed to District Plan maximums. Considers it artificial to subdivide buildings into modules with a width of 5-10m; opposes need to provide upper floor detailing consistent with neighbours. Notes that not all roof mounted equipment is visible from the ground and suggests amendments to rule 16.10.3.1(c)	Delete Rule 16.10.3.1(a). Delete first and third bullet points under 16.10.3.1(b). Amend rule 16.10.3.1(c) as follows: " Avoids or disguises roof mounted equipment such as airconditioning units <u>Integrates roof mounted equipment in a manner that does not detract from the visual amenity of the building</u> "
		6	Rule 16.10.3.2 (Large developments)	Oppose	Considers that rule fails to recognise that most people arrive by motor vehicle and it is impractical that building entrances should face the street but car parking be located at the rear.	Amend rule so that it refers to provision of active frontage facing the road
		7	Rule 16.10.3.5 (Large developments)	Oppose	Notes that large developments will be designed to integrate with car park and so may be inappropriate to provide active frontage to street	Delete that part of rule 16.10.3.5 that refers to active frontage along street boundaries
		8	Rule 16.10.3.6 (Large developments)	Oppose	Submits that the rule is too prescriptive and does not take into account the orientation of sites.	Delete rule 16.10.3.6
		9	Rule 16.10.3.9 (Large developments)	Oppose		Reference to matters listed under 16.9.1.1 should be excluded
		10	Notes under rule 16.10	Oppose	Considers note is vague and refers to terms not used in part 16.10 such as people oriented space.	Delete note
		11	Buildings and external finish (rule 16.12)	Oppose	Considers non-complying status is too onerous for non-compliance.	Amend rule 16.12.3 to change status to restricted discretionary
		12	Dwellings (rules 16.13, 16.14 and 16.15)	Oppose	Use of business 1 zone for residential use is inappropriate	Delete rules 16.13, 16.14 and 16.15
		13	Definitions	Oppose	Definition of People Oriented Space is vague	Amend definition to provide greater certainty
15	RD and JC Butt	1	Policies B3.4.23a and B4.3.6	Oppose	The policy does not take into account situations where it is more suitable to have parking in front of the building	Delete new policies 3.4.23a and B4.3.6
		2	Rules 16.9-16.12	Oppose	The policy does not take into account situations where it is more suitable to have parking in front of the building	Delete rules 16.9-16.12
		3	Dwellings (Rule 16.13)	Oppose	Considers that rules are micromanagement and that they would not allow for medium density housing on business 1 zoned land	Delete rule 16.13.1.1
		4	Dwellings (Rule 16.14)	Oppose	Considers rules are micromanagement	Delete rule 16.14
		5	Dwellings (Rule 16.15)	Oppose	Considers 50m2 is too large a living area in the business 1 zone and that rules are micromanagement	Delete rules 16.15.1(a) and (d), or reduce the required outdoor living area to 30m2 with a 3m dimension. Delete rule 16.15.2
		6	Landscaping (Rule 17.6)	Oppose	Considers that rules are micromanagement and they do not allow for good site design. Considers rule 17.7 will prevent exposure of business to passing traffic	Delete rule 17.6.1 and rule 17.7
		7	Reasons for rules and definitions	Oppose		Make consequential changes in accordance with relief sought

Submission Number	Name	Submission Point	Subject area	Submission Type	Detail	Relief sought
16	Rolleston Residents Association	1	Policies	Support		Update and insert proposed policies
		2	Rules 16.9-16.12	Support		Update rules as per proposed plan change
		3	Dwellings (Rules 16.13-16.15)	Support		Update rules as per proposed plan change
		4	Landscaping (rules 17.6 and 17.7)	Support		Update rules as per proposed plan change
		5	Signage	Support		Update rules as per proposed plan change
		6	Reasons for rules and definitions	Support		Update rules as per proposed plan change
17	Selwyn Central Community Board	1	Whole of plan change	Support		