Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary		Decision Requested
1299	McIntosh K & D, Jung W, Jung MK, Sung M, and Lee SK	1299.01	Oppose	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes plan Change in its entirety for the following reasons: In 2007 the submitter applied for resource consent to subdivide their land into 4 x 2ha lots, each with a dwelling. The application was declined on the grounds that two additional dwellings would have a significant adverse effect on the rural amenity of adjoining rural lifestyle block owners to the north and on local rural character. The submitter states that the proposed plan change, if adopted, would create 294 residential lots, which would create a very major adverse effect on rural landscape character. The submitter also states that their land is part of the wetland system in the Lincoln Structure Plan. The submitter states that the 'Dairy' block is lowlying and stormwater drainage is difficult. The submitter considers that the 'Dairy' block should mitigate these effects rather than using their land; or that the submitter should be compensated at residential market land value for the use of their land. the submitter also states that their land is higher than that subject to Plan Change 4 so therefore is unlikely to be suitable as a wetland area. The submitter believes that if plan Change 4 is adopted, it will increase the severity of adverse reverse sensitivity effects that already exist. The submitter considers that the Section 32 analysis in respect of reverse sensitivity for Plan Change 4 is inaccurate and	That Plan Change 4 is declined in its entirety unless provision is made as part of the Plan Change for rezoning the submitters land (and potentially the rural lifestyle blocks to the north, located between the current Living 1 Zone and the submitters land) to living 1 Deferred, subject to the same standards and terms as the Plan Change 4 area (where applicable)

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary	Decision Requested
Number	Submitter	roint	Position	understated. The submitters state that given the existi access arrangements the only suitable farming option is for grazing and hay and sileage. The creation of residential sites along their eastern boundaries will further limit the effective productive potential of our land by increasing the existing reverse sensitivity effects and create additional problems. The submitter has concerns regarding their security if the Railtrail and esplanade are constructed alongside the L1 Creek, such as dogs straying onto their proper and scaring or damaging stock. The submitter believes that the visual assessment by Robert Watson included with Plan Change 4 is inaccurate and incorrect in terms of its assessment of visual impacts of the proposed rezoning. The	ng s
				submitters consider that the assessment that their properties as possessing 'low naturalness' reflecting a great deal of modification to the landscape is incorred and that their blocks are more accurately described as at the very least possessing 'moderate naturalness'. The submitters also consider that the visual assessme	t
				only considered the Lincoln Dale residential subdivision to the north west of the applicants proper and that no assessment of impacts on the rural land to the west was considered. The submitters consider that the riparian planting proposed will not mitigate visual effects on that part of the western boundary of the	

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary	Decision Requested
Number	Submitter	Point	Position	applicants land which does not bound the LI Creek. The submitters consider that Plan Change 4 renders their land incapable of reasonable use and that Section 85 of the Resource Management Act 1991 applies. The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 is contrar to a number of the Selwyn District Plan objectives as policies, in particular, but not limited to: Town Form Policy B4.3.3 and B4.3.5, Lincoln Preferred Growth Option Policies B4.3.51, B4.3.52, B4.3.53 B4.3.54 as B4.3.55. The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 does not meet the purpose and requirements of particular sections of the Resource Management Act 1991, including but not limited to: • Does not promote the sustainable management of physical resources, including the submitters land endowed by Does not protect physical resources in a way or a rate which enables people and communities to provide for their economic wellbeing; • Section 31(a); • Section 32 – Incorrect, inadequate and incompleted the submitter considers that if Plan Change 4 is adopted, then their land should be rezoned to Deferrent Living 1 for conventional residential subdivision (10 dwellings per hectare), with the option for road acce from the proposed 'southern boundary road' when	on y nd f ; t a ee

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary		Decision Requested
- 1,022230 02					formed.	
		1299.02	Oppose	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes plan Change in its entirety for the following reasons: In 2007 the submitter applied for resource consent to subdivide their land into 4 x 2ha lots, each with a dwelling. The application was declined on the grounds that two additional dwellings would have a significant adverse effect on the rural amenity of adjoining rural lifestyle block owners to the north and on local rural character. The submitter states that the proposed plan change, if adopted, would create 294 residential lots, which would create a very major adverse effect on rural landscape character. The submitter also states that their land is part of the wetland system in the Lincoln Structure Plan. The submitter states that the 'Dairy' block is lowlying and stormwater drainage is difficult. The submitter considers that the 'Dairy' block should mitigate these effects rather than using their land; or that the submitter should be compensated at residential market land value for the use of their land. the submitter also states that their land is higher than that subject to Plan Change 4 so therefore is unlikely to be suitable as a wetland area. The submitter believes that if plan Change 4 is adopted, it will increase the severity of adverse reverse sensitivity effects that already exist. The submitter	

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary	Decision Requested
				considers that the Section 32 analysis in respect of reverse sensitivity for Plan Change 4 is inaccurate understated. The submitters state that given the exi access arrangements the only suitable farming opti is for grazing and hay and sileage. The creation of residential sites along their eastern boundaries will further limit the effective productive potential of o land by increasing the existing reverse sensitivity effects and create additional problems. The submitter has concerns regarding their security the Railtrail and esplanade are constructed alongsist the L1 Creek, such as dogs straying onto their propand scaring or damaging stock.	and isting toons ur y if de
				The submitter believes that the visual assessment by Robert Watson included with Plan Change 4 is inaccurate and incorrect in terms of its assessment visual impacts of the proposed rezoning. The submitters consider that the assessment that their properties as possessing 'low naturalness' reflecting great deal of modification to the landscape is incorrect and that their blocks are more accurately described at the very least possessing 'moderate naturalness'	of ng a rect I as
				The submitters also consider that the visual assess only considered the Lincoln Dale residential subdivision to the north west of the applicants propand that no assessment of impacts on the rural land the west was considered. The submitters consider	perty I to

Submission	Cubacitton	Doint	Dogition	Summer our	Desirion Descuested
Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary the riparian planting proposed will not mitigate	Decision Requested
				effects on that part of the western boundary of	
				applicants land which does not bound the LI Co	
				approximation which does not could the 21 c.	
				The submitters consider that Plan Change 4 rer	nders
				their land incapable of reasonable use and that	
				85 of the Resource Management Act 1991 appl	lies.
				The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 is co	
				to a number of the Selwyn District Plan objecti	
				policies, in particular, but not limited to: Town	
				Policy B4.3.3 and B4.3.5, Lincoln Preferred G	
				Option Policies B4.3.51, B4.3.52, B4.3.53 B4.	3.54 and
				B4.3.55.	
				The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 does	s not
				meet the purpose and requirements of particula	
				sections of the Resource Management Act 199	
				including but not limited to:	
				 Does not promote the sustainable managem 	
				physical resources, including the submitters	
				 Does not protect physical resources in a wa 	
				rate which enables people and communities	s to
				provide for their economic wellbeing;	
				• Section 31(a);	
				Section 32 – Incorrect, inadequate and inco	omplete
				The submitter considers that if Plan Change 4 i	
				adopted, then their land should be rezoned to D	
				Living 1 for conventional residential subdivision	on (10

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary		Decision Requested
	Junior II	7 3 3 3 3	2 333301	Jummy	dwellings per hectare), with the option for road access from the proposed 'southern boundary road' when formed.	2003300 Tequestou
		1299.03	Oppose	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes plan Change in its entirety for the following reasons: In 2007 the submitter applied for resource consent to subdivide their land into 4 x 2ha lots, each with a dwelling. The application was declined on the grounds that two additional dwellings would have a significant adverse effect on the rural amenity of adjoining rural lifestyle block owners to the north and on local rural character. The submitter states that the proposed plan change, if adopted, would create 294 residential lots, which would create a very major adverse effect on rural landscape character. The submitter also states that their land is part of the wetland system in the Lincoln Structure Plan. The submitter states that the 'Dairy' block is lowlying and stormwater drainage is difficult. The submitter considers that the 'Dairy' block should mitigate these effects rather than using their land; or that the submitter should be compensated at residential market land value for the use of their land, the submitter also states that their land is higher than that subject to Plan Change 4 so therefore is unlikely to be suitable as a wetland area. The submitter believes that if plan Change 4 is adopted,	That consideration of Plan Change 4 is deferred until such time as consent is granted, at no cost to the submitters (either by way of plan change or resource consent) for development of the submitters land for rural lifestyle purposes, with an average density per net site of 3,000m2 And/or Such other relief as the Council considers will give effect to the intent of this submission.

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary	Decision Requested
Aumber	Submitter	1 omt	TOSICION	it will increase the severity of adverse reverse sensitivity effects that already exist. The submitt considers that the Section 32 analysis in respect reverse sensitivity for Plan Change 4 is inaccura understated. The submitters state that given the access arrangements the only suitable farming or is for grazing and hay and sileage. The creation residential sites along their eastern boundaries of further limit the effective productive potential or land by increasing the existing reverse sensitivity effects and create additional problems. The submitter has concerns regarding their secut the Railtrail and esplanade are constructed along the L1 Creek, such as dogs straying onto their pland scaring or damaging stock. The submitter believes that the visual assessment Robert Watson included with Plan Change 4 is inaccurate and incorrect in terms of its assessment visual impacts of the proposed rezoning. The submitters consider that the assessment that their properties as possessing 'low naturalness' reflect great deal of modification to the landscape is in and that their blocks are more accurately describate the very least possessing 'moderate naturalness' moderate naturaln	tter t of ate and existing options n of will of our ty rity if gside oroperty nt by ent of ir cting a icorrect bed as
				The submitters also consider that the visual asset only considered the Lincoln Dale residential subdivision to the north west of the applicants p	

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary	Decision Requested
Number	Submitter	Point	Position	and that no assessment of impacts on the rural land the west was considered. The submitters consider the riparian planting proposed will not mitigate vis effects on that part of the western boundary of the applicants land which does not bound the LI Creel The submitters consider that Plan Change 4 render their land incapable of reasonable use and that Sec 85 of the Resource Management Act 1991 applies The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 is contr to a number of the Selwyn District Plan objectives policies, in particular, but not limited to: Town Fo Policy B4.3.3 and B4.3.5, Lincoln Preferred Grow Option Policies B4.3.51, B4.3.52, B4.3.53 B4.3.54 B4.3.55. The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 does not meet the purpose and requirements of particular sections of the Resource Management Act 1991, including but not limited to: Does not promote the sustainable management physical resources, including the submitters lated to the provide for their economic wellbeing; Does not protect physical resources in a way of rate which enables people and communities to provide for their economic wellbeing; Section 31(a); Section 32 – Incorrect, inadequate and incomp	that sual k. rs etion rary s and rm eth 4 and ot rard rard rard rard rard rard rard ra
				The submitter considers that if Plan Change 4 is	

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary		Decision Requested
Number	Submitter Foliit	Tosition	Summary	adopted, then their land should be rezoned to Deferred Living 1 for conventional residential subdivision (10 dwellings per hectare), with the option for road access from the proposed 'southern boundary road' when formed.	Decision requested	
		1299.04	Oppose	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes plan Change in its entirety for the following reasons: In 2007 the submitter applied for resource consent to subdivide their land into 4 x 2ha lots, each with a dwelling. The application was declined on the grounds that two additional dwellings would have a significant adverse effect on the rural amenity of adjoining rural lifestyle block owners to the north and on local rural character. The submitter states that the proposed plan change, if adopted, would create 294 residential lots, which would create a very major adverse effect on rural landscape character. The submitter also states that their land is part of the wetland system in the Lincoln Structure Plan. The submitter states that the 'Dairy' block is lowlying and stormwater drainage is difficult. The submitter considers that the 'Dairy' block should mitigate these effects rather than using their land; or that the submitter should be compensated at residential market land value for the use of their land, the submitter also states that their land is higher than that subject to Plan Change 4 so therefore is unlikely to be suitable as a wetland area.	The submitters consider that the 'Dairy' block should mitigate the effects of its development 'on site' rather than use the submitters land for this purpose, or compensate the submitters for this at residential market value for the use of their land.

Submission	Cubmitton	Doint	Dogition	Summany	Desicion Degregated
Number	Submitter	Point	Position	The submitter believes that if plan Change 4 is ado it will increase the severity of adverse reverse sensitivity effects that already exist. The submitter considers that the Section 32 analysis in respect of reverse sensitivity for Plan Change 4 is inaccurate understated. The submitters state that given the exiaccess arrangements the only suitable farming optic is for grazing and hay and sileage. The creation of residential sites along their eastern boundaries will further limit the effective productive potential of or land by increasing the existing reverse sensitivity effects and create additional problems. The submitter has concerns regarding their security the Railtrail and esplanade are constructed alongsic the L1 Creek, such as dogs straying onto their prop and scaring or damaging stock. The submitter believes that the visual assessment be Robert Watson included with Plan Change 4 is inaccurate and incorrect in terms of its assessment visual impacts of the proposed rezoning. The submitters consider that the assessment that their properties as possessing 'low naturalness' reflecting great deal of modification to the landscape is incorrand that their blocks are more accurately described at the very least possessing 'moderate naturalness'.	and sting ons ar if de erty y of g a rect as
				The submitters also consider that the visual assessm	nent

Submission					
Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary	Decision Requested
				only considered the Lincoln Dale residential subdivision to the north west of the applicants property and that no assessment of impacts on the rural land to the west was considered. The submitters consider that the riparian planting proposed will not mitigate visual effects on that part of the western boundary of the applicants land which does not bound the LI Creek. The submitters consider that Plan Change 4 renders their land incapable of reasonable use and that Section 85 of the Resource Management Act 1991 applies. The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 is contrary to a number of the Selwyn District Plan objectives and policies, in particular, but not limited to: Town Form Policy B4.3.3 and B4.3.5, Lincoln Preferred Growth Option Policies B4.3.51, B4.3.52, B4.3.53 B4.3.54 and	
				B4.3.55. The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 does not meet the purpose and requirements of particular sections of the Resource Management Act 1991, including but not limited to: • Does not promote the sustainable management of physical resources, including the submitters land; • Does not protect physical resources in a way or at a rate which enables people and communities to provide for their economic wellbeing; • Section 31(a); • Section 32 – Incorrect, inadequate and incomplete	

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary		Decision Requested
					The submitter considers that if Plan Change 4 is adopted, then their land should be rezoned to Deferred Living 1 for conventional residential subdivision (10 dwellings per hectare), with the option for road access from the proposed 'southern boundary road' when formed.	
		1299.05	Oppose	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes plan Change in its entirety for the following reasons: In 2007 the submitter applied for resource consent to subdivide their land into 4 x 2ha lots, each with a dwelling. The application was declined on the grounds that two additional dwellings would have a significant adverse effect on the rural amenity of adjoining rural lifestyle block owners to the north and on local rural character. The submitter states that the proposed plan change, if adopted, would create 294 residential lots, which would create a very major adverse effect on rural landscape character. The submitter also states that their land is part of the wetland system in the Lincoln Structure Plan. The submitter states that the 'Dairy' block is lowlying and stormwater drainage is difficult. The submitter considers that the 'Dairy' block should mitigate these effects rather than using their land; or that the submitter should be compensated at residential market land value for the use of their land, the submitter also states that	The submitter considers that if Plan Change 4 is adopted, then their land should be rezoned to Deferred Living 1 for conventional residential subdivision (10 dwellings per hectare), with the option for road access from the proposed 'southern boundary road' when formed.

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary	Decision Requested
Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	their land is higher than that subject to Plan of so therefore is unlikely to be suitable as a week the submitter believes that if plan Change 4 it will increase the severity of adverse reverse sensitivity effects that already exist. The submitter state that given the submitters state that given the access arrangements the only suitable farming is for grazing and hay and sileage. The creat residential sites along their eastern boundaries further limit the effective productive potential land by increasing the existing reverse sensitive effects and create additional problems. The submitter has concerns regarding their set the Railtrail and esplanade are constructed all the L1 Creek, such as dogs straying onto their and scaring or damaging stock. The submitter believes that the visual assessing Robert Watson included with Plan Change 4 inaccurate and incorrect in terms of its assessing the suitable and scaring or its assessing the submitter believes that the visual assessing the submitter believes that	is adopted, see mitter sect of curate and the existing ag options tion of es will all of our tivity ecurity if longside ir property ment by is sment of
				Robert Watson included with Plan Change 4	sment of
				properties as possessing 'low naturalness' regreat deal of modification to the landscape is and that their blocks are more accurately design at the very least possessing 'moderate natura'	flecting a s incorrect scribed as

Submission					
Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary	Decision Requested
				only considered the Linc subdivision to the north wand that no assessment of the west was considered. The riparian planting properfects on that part of the applicants land which do applicants land which do The submitters consider their land incapable of rest of the Resource Mana. The submitter believes the total number of the Selwy policies, in particular, bu Policy B4.3.3 and B4.3.5	sider that the visual assessment coln Dale residential west of the applicants property of impacts on the rural land to and the submitters consider that posed will not mitigate visual exwestern boundary of the best not bound the LI Creek. That Plan Change 4 renders easonable use and that Section agement Act 1991 applies. That Plan Change 4 is contrary on District Plan objectives and at not limited to: Town Form 5, Lincoln Preferred Growth B4.3.52, B4.3.53 B4.3.54 and
				meet the purpose and req sections of the Resource including but not limited • Does not promote the physical resources, in • Does not protect physical	Management Act 1991, I to: e sustainable management of including the submitters land; sical resources in a way or at a eople and communities to

Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary		Decision Requested
Tumber	Sustances	Tome	Toskion	Summary	 Section 31(a); Section 32 – Incorrect, inadequate and incomplete The submitter considers that if Plan Change 4 is adopted, then their land should be rezoned to Deferred Living 1 for conventional residential subdivision (10 dwellings per hectare), with the option for road access from the proposed 'southern boundary road' when formed. 	Decision requested
1300	Lincoln Estates Ltd	1300.01	Oppose	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes Plan Change 4 in its entirety for the following reasons: The submitter states that the rezoning of the land fails to give enough certainty that adequate provision will be made for the proper position to adjoining properties of connecting roads, cycleways, walkways, reserves, and all services including but not limited to water supply, stormwater, sanitary sewer. The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 fails to take account of an integrated planning approach for all land on the eastern extent of Lincoln and instead considers the Liffey Springs land in isolation. The submitter believes that aspects of Plan Change 4 are contrary to sound resource management planning principles and practice.	That Plan Change 4 be declined.

Submission						
Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary		Decision Requested
Number	Submitter	1300.02	Oppose Oppose	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes Plan Change 4 in its entirety for the following reasons: The submitter states that the rezoning of the land fails to give enough certainty that adequate provision will be made for the proper position to adjoining properties of connecting roads, cycleways, walkways, reserves, and all services including but not limited to water supply, stormwater, sanitary sewer. The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 fails to take account of an integrated planning approach for all land on the eastern extent of Lincoln and instead considers the Liffey Springs land in isolation. The submitter believes that aspects of Plan Change 4 are contrary to sound resource management planning principles and practice.	That the rezoning confer sufficient definition, to the submitters satisfaction, to take account of: 1) General urban design principles and practice; 2) The Draft Lincoln Structure Plan; 3) The development of the land lying to the east of the LII River which is also proposed to be developed for residential development; 4) The Draft integrated Catchment Management Plan for Lincoln; and 5) Any and all other such matters relevant to the submitter. This would include sufficient definition, within the plan Change, so that the proper position to the adjoining property to the
1201	Moir BR & AS	1301.01	Oppose	Entire Plan	The submitter opposes Plan Change 4 in its entirety for	east for connecting roads, cycleways, walkways, reserves, and all services including but not limited to water supply, stormwater and sanitary sewer. That Plan Change 4 be declined.
1301				Change	the following reasons: The submitter states that the rezoning of the land fails to give enough certainty that adequate provision will be made for the proper position to adjoining properties of connecting roads, cycleways, walkways, reserves, and all services including but not limited to water supply,	

Submission						
Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary		Decision Requested
					stormwater, sanitary sewer. The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 fails to take account of an integrated planning approach for all land on the eastern extent of Lincoln and instead considers the Liffey Springs land in isolation. The submitter believes that aspects of Plan Change 4 are contrary to sound resource management planning principles and practice.	
		1301.02	Oppose	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes Plan Change 4 in its entirety for the following reasons: The submitter states that the rezoning of the land fails to give enough certainty that adequate provision will be made for the proper position to adjoining properties of connecting roads, cycleways, walkways, reserves, and all services including but not limited to water supply, stormwater, sanitary sewer. The submitter believes that Plan Change 4 fails to take account of an integrated planning approach for all land on the eastern extent of Lincoln and instead considers the Liffey Springs land in isolation. The submitter believes that aspects of Plan Change 4 are contrary to sound resource management planning principles and practice.	That the rezoning confer sufficient definition, to the submitters satisfaction, to take account of: 1) General urban design principles and practice; 2) The Draft Lincoln Structure Plan; 3) The development of the land lying to the east of the LII River which is also proposed to be developed for residential development; 4) The Draft integrated Catchment Management Plan for Lincoln; and 5) Any and all other such matters relevant to the submitter. This would include sufficient definition, within the plan Change, so that the proper position to the adjoining property to the east for connecting roads, cycleways, walkways, reserves, and all services

PLAN CHANGE 4 (PC4)– SUMMARIES OF SUBMISSIONS Rezone Outer Plains to Living 1 (Deferred) – Liffey Springs Lincoln								
Submission Number	Submitter	Point	Position	Summary	Decision Requested			
					including but not limited to water supply, stormwater and sanitary sewer.			