

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0001	Amanda Kay	001	Oppose	Opposes the zone changes for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pressure on roading infrastructure - the present level of service will not support the increase in traffic.</li> <li>The reduction in rural community feel by way of lack of proposed greenspace.</li> <li>Lincoln having few business and childcare amenities to help support the increasing community.</li> <li>Effect the native wildlife in the area. Currently Lincoln gets Herron, eels, fresh water crayfish, geckos, frogs and other native birds. Removing a large majority of greenspace, which has underground waterways, is concerning to the long-time effect to these waterways and the wildlife.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. The issues have all been considered. The greenspace provided is appropriate. The provisions of the ODP as amended now provide for protection and enhancement of waterways and ecological values.
PC69-0002	Nicholas Martin	001	Support	Supports plan change 69 as it is important to provide land for development due to current housing shortage. Lincoln is well suited for expansion.	Requests Council approve plan change 69 in its entirety	Accept. The evidence supports the need for development in the context of a housing shortage.
PC69-0003	Jeff Denley	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes zone change as the small residential sections proposed are not the best for family, children need a place to play outside. Submitter would support this development if sections are a size and similar to that of the existing Lincoln township.	Amend ODP design/layout to increase the section size.	Reject. Living Z Zone allows for a range of section sizes and the density proposed is appropriate.
PC69-0004	Dave Clark	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as the proposed rezoning will lead to my disruptions through increased traffic and potential pollutants affecting my ability to enjoy our current location.	Reject any subdivision of high value productive farmland.	Reject. Increased traffic, that issue has been appropriately addressed.
PC69-0004	Dave Clark	002	Oppose	Opposes the use of land that provides a value base for growing of food given its highly productive soils. Current subdivision is creating huge stockpiles of soil which are needing to be disposed of and subject to wind blow.	Further investigate with an environment report the cost of loss of topsoil and potential pollution.	Reject. Versatile soils have been considered. In relation to the stockpiling, that is a matter addressed at construction phase.
PC69-0004	Dave Clark	005	Oppose	Opposed to impacts as the LII is currently showing increased signs of silting and plastic contamination. The local reserves and buffer zones near water ways being impacted.	Require a substantial riparian zone around the key waterways to reduce run off and maintain or ideally enhance biodiversity.	Reject. Riparian setbacks and other issues have been appropriately addressed and considered.
PC69-0004	Dave Clark	006	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to results of building and new lighting potential effect on local residents and local biodiversity.	Development occur on less high value areas.	Reject. Plan change is appropriate at this site. Building and lighting issues will be addressed at subdivision stage.
PC69-0004	Dave Clark	007	Oppose	Opposed to rapid growth; higher population leads to increased stress on all infrastructure.	Greater consultation and more lead in time for major projects such as this.	Reject. Growth issues addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0004	Dave Clark	008	Oppose	Opposed to the rezoning of the Springs Road, Collins Road, leave as an essential high value food source and strategic buffer zone.	Direct development to a lower value lower strategic environmental zone.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0005	Purvish Panchal	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as the current infrastructure in and around Lincoln is not equipped to support large-scale population increase. Lincoln is known for its semi-rural lifestyle and agricultural university. The increase in population by 5000 -7000 will result in a change to the identity and character of Lincoln. Such an increase in population in a short period increases issues of road safety. Current town infrastructure does not have full-scale hospital/s, recreational centre/s, and limited primary and high schools. Large scale development should not be approved until at least 2030 in order to develop infrastructure to support sustainable development.	Reject plan change 69 and leave it as a rural area to protect Lincoln's character, heritage, and wetland.	Reject. Issues raised by submitter addressed and considered in Recommendation and note the increase in dwellings and population will occur over a number of years.
PC69-0006	Vicky Brown	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as the infrastructure of Lincoln is not suitable for this large a scale subdivision. Proposed growth of the area is too fast, and the density proposed is too great. Less sections of larger size would be better. Proposal results in a waste of good farmland. Increased traffic is too substantial.	Not specified, but submitter notes that a smaller area of development would be preferable if something had to happen, but not for another 5 or 10 years.	Reject. Matters addressed in evidence and Recommendation.
PC69-0007	Mark Gleave	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as the layout of the Lincoln Township and in particular the businesses and residential properties on Gerald Street, along with the nature of the road intersections, do not allow the town to be substantially increased in size whilst maintaining the safety of the road users. There are plans to upgrade the town centre and it is essential that this is done as a matter of priority. If Lincoln is to grow significantly bigger then a road(s) bypassing the town centre will be required to divert traffic away from Gerald, Edward and James Street.	Reject plan change 69 unless there is a major review of the road network in Lincoln and work is completed to upgrade the road layouts before any new subdivisions are commenced.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation and note that the plan change now proposes specific upgrades in relation to transportation issues.
PC69-0008	Daryl Streat	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as it is at odds with the Greater Christchurch Urban/Future Development Strategy (2019), which concluded (Table 3) that Selwyn likely already has enough land zoned residential to cater for population growth out to 2028.	Reject plan change 69	Reject. Issues have been addressed in Recommendation. Capacity and land supply issues have been addressed in Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Any uncertainty is managed by zoning additional land as 'Future Development Areas' in Rolleston. Lincoln is intended to develop within existing agreed urban/infrastructure boundaries, thereby 'retaining its village and university character' (pp.25).		
PC69-0008	Daryl Streat	002	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as Lincoln has grown too fast. The town currently has a small town/village feel that will not survive the continued residential development. In little over a decade, the population of the 'village' will have doubled and the size of it will have more than doubled adversely impacting the community-feel of Lincoln. A community reflects the community culture of its residents. The recent subdivisions have increased traffic loads, road safety, education etc. Lincoln no longer feels like 'Lincoln'.	Reject plan change 69 until such time that existing developments (i.e., Flemington, Te Whariki, etc) have had sufficient time to become 'Lincoln'.	Reject. Rezoning appropriate. Evidence provided at hearing in relation to existing capacity and demand. Provides significant development capacity in an appropriate manner.
PC69-0009	Shane Halligan	001	Oppose	Opposes the plan change as the indicative Movement and Connectivity plan has a Primary Road plan showing future possible links to Liffey Springs. This link will cut through a reserve opposite the submitters property, resulting in additional noise/traffic and devaluing the submitters property.	To ensure that adequate roading is provided should the plan change proceed, which in particular does not require the need for cutting into the Liffey Springs Reserve for very little benefit and at great disadvantage to the residents of Liffey Springs.	Reject but note possible links to Liffey Springs no longer pursued.
PC69-0009	Shane Halligan	002	Neither Support Nor Oppose	The submitter notes the roading around Lincoln is in a poor state of repair and adding an additional 2000+ homes with the associated traffic will not improve the situation.	To improve roading, Ellesmere road and connecting roads to the motorway will be a must if SDC approve the subdivision. This should commence prior to the subdivision beginning and be fully functional to avoid additional commute time to the current residents of Lincoln.	Reject. Roading upgrades and timing addressed in evidence and ODP.
PC69-0009	Shane Halligan	003	Oppose	Opposes the small lot sizes proposed, which are not in keeping with the small-town character of Lincoln.	Amend plan change 69 to lot sizes to a minimum of ~500-600m <sup>2</sup> .	Reject. Living Z zoning enables a range of allotment sizes.
PC69-0010	Graeme Greenslade	001	Support In Part	Supports plan change 69 as there is a great need for more housing as Selwyn is a great to live and growth will be great for district and local business. Submitter does oppose any provision of a bypass road through a residential subdivision.	Amend plan change 69 ODP to remove bypass road.	Accept. ODP no longer references bypass road.
PC69-0011	Sam Wang	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as the infrastructure, such as roads and supermarkets could not cope with the additional 5000 residents. Lincoln should focus on indoor pools, recreation centres to supply basic needs before considering more residents.	Reconsider the plan change and reduce the additional living areas and focus on supermarkets, indoor pools, gyms and other needs rather than houses.	Reject. Infrastructure, roading and community facilities addressed in evidence and Recommendation.
PC69-0011	Sam Wang	002	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 due to current state of road infrastructure.	Council to focus on infrastructure before approving additional residential development.	Reject. Infrastructure upgrades appropriately addressed.
PC69-0012	Letitia Rowson	001	Oppose	Opposes high density housing proposed by the plan change. The submitter did not live in Lincoln so it could turn into a place with high density housing, otherwise would have bought in Rolleston. People are attracted to Lincoln because it still feels like a small quiet town, and given people don't even want a second supermarket, residents are not happy with a significant increase in population. The roads are not equipped for the increase in traffic, Ellesmere Road is already a hazard to cars, trucks, bikes, walkers etc and that hazard will only get worse. Crime has also increased steadily in Lincoln over the past 12 months.	Reject plan change 69 and the proposal for the Lincoln South development.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Density and LZ zoning appropriate. Evidence that existing subdivisions are largely complete.
PC69-0013	Aimee Patchett	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposal of a link road via Liffey Springs through the reserve. The submitter purchased and built in Liffey Springs, along with most of the other residents because of the reserve. Submitter also does not want the roads getting busier, especially with Ararira Primary School, this is a road used by a lot of school children going to and from school. Using Liffey Springs as an access to the new subdivision and cutting through the beautiful reserve is not good for Lincoln residents. Many families and dog walkers use the walking track that goes along the reserve on Jimmy Adams Tce.	Reject plan change 69.	Accept in part. Link to Liffey Springs no longer incorporated into ODP.
PC69-0014	Helen Hulme	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as submitter does not consider that traffic impacts of the development will be minor. Submitter notes that the Integrated Traffic Report was prepared in Oct 2020, Lincoln and its surrounding districts are experiencing rapid growth. The vehicle movement figures will therefore be inaccurate. Secondly the report recorded the vehicle movements at only two intersections. No consideration was given to the impact of traffic on Gerald Street, or on other intersections further outside the Lincoln township boundary. In particular, Boundary Road.	Requests the Council require a more appropriate Integrated Transport Plan with respect to the subdivision effect on the Lincoln transport network before considering or dis/agreeing to the proposed plan change.	Reject. Effects on transportation network addressed and upgrades appropriately recorded.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS001	Support In Part	<i>A third party needs to be engaged on behalf of council to determine the true and wider implications of the increased traffic flows and movements from this proposed development. Minimal research has so far been conducted and therefore will be entirely inaccurate. Particular focus needs to be on Collins Road and Springs Road.</i>	<i>Engage a third party to conduct more accurate traffic movements.</i>	<i>Reject. Traffic movements have been further addressed in the evidence.</i>
PC69-0015	M Jones	001	Oppose	Opposes the rezoning of good rural agricultural land to Living X, Z and Business 1 zones and the removal of greenspace and topsoil that cannot be replaced for agricultural purposes.	Reject plan change 69	Reject for reasons recorded in the body of the Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				The submitter is opposed to the addition of so many houses to a town that does not have the facilities to cope. Christchurch City should be building higher density housing and the satellite towns should stay as small local communities. There is no transport system for the residents of these proposed houses which means a huge increase in traffic on the roads which is environmentally damaging. Submitter is opposed to the density of housing being built, there is a surplus of large properties and no higher density housing.		
PC69-0016	Michael Rowson	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The people of Lincoln not wanting high density housing. Residents prefer the generous section sizes, the open space and higher standard of living. Do not want to turn into the next Rolleston.</li> <li>Lincoln does not need a housing project of this scale. There is plenty of other subdivisions in the area.</li> <li>The roading infrastructure could not handle the additional traffic, it struggles currently. Already have had speed reductions to cope with the increase in traffic, as the roads are not up to standard.</li> <li>The land to be rezoned is some of the best farming land in the country. In a time where disasters can strike at any time (for example COVID-19), we need to be able to self-support more than ever.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Density appropriate, evidence as to lack of development capacity not meeting demand. Infrastructure upgrades proposed. Loss of farming land addressed.
PC69-0017	Paul Tougas	001	Oppose	Opposes rezoning as the vast scale of the new housing will irrevocably change the character of Lincoln for the worse. The increased pressure on schools, roads, services and infrastructure will remake Lincoln into just another Christchurch suburb. People like Lincoln and want to live here because of the way it is now.	Not specified.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0018	Anthony John Amos	001	Oppose	Opposes any connection to Liffey Springs Drive. A bridge to connect to the very large proposed development would see large traffic and high-speed traffic volume with associated detriments to its peaceful and quite living environment. Additionally, it would see the breakup of the prized green streamside development from a treasured recreational area to a split and dangerous road crossing. Traffic danger at the Russ Drive intersection would substantially increase and this would further endanger the children on their walk from home to the nearby Ararira Springs School.	Not specified	Accept in part. Connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer pursued.
PC69-0019	Megan Greenslade	001	Support	Supports plan change 69, which will be great for Lincoln and its business.	Approve plan change 69	Accept for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0020	Ronald de Vries	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes the potential vehicle access link to Liffey Springs Drive for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The plan does not show enough connectivity between the proposed subdivision and Te Whariki, which already has all the established roads connecting to the village and amenities.</li> <li>Liffey Springs Drive already has connectivity via Southfield Drive.</li> <li>Submitter supports a walking and cycling link to Liffey Springs Drive to assist with access to the new primary school and the rail trail for health and wellbeing benefits.</li> </ul>	Amend plan change 69 to establish links connecting to roadways in the Te Whariki subdivision.	Reject. Note connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer pursued.
PC69-0021	William Talbot	001	Oppose	Opposes the use of highly productive soil essential for growing the food we need to have a thriving economy and to feed the world. Submitter understands there is a need to build more houses, however, this highly productive farmland is not where it should be built; this is highlighted in the government's 'Proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land'.	Reject plan change 69	Reject for reasons recorded in the body of the Recommendation.
PC69-0022	Jack Dixon	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes the use of productive soils around Lincoln for housing and asks - do we really want to be the next Pukekohe?	Council pay more attention to the soil classes and build on soil that is not as productive.	Reject for reasons recorded in the body of the Recommendation.
PC69-0023	Alison Grayston	001	Oppose	Opposes the rezoning as the area is outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and the Greenfield Priority Areas shown on Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. It is also a large area to rezone prior to the Proposed National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land being finalised and may be contrary to the direction of that NPS which seeks to sustainably manage productive land. As identified in the Traffic Assessment by Novo Group, transport network improvements also need to be made to ensure that transport infrastructure is not adversely affected. For these reasons, the submitter considers that it is inappropriate to approve the plan change at this point in time.	Reject plan change 69 and retain the current Rural Outer Plains zoning.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0024	Tony McKenzie	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposal to not include a sport and recreational park (2.3ha or more) "given the sites close proximity to Lincoln University fields, Lincoln Domain and Lincoln Events Centre". The submitter considers this statement is false as these facilities are located outside the normal walking distance for children and are otherwise oversubscribed. This proposal will exacerbate the existing shortage of sports grounds.	Amend so that a suitable sport and recreational park is included to cater for the proposed population increase.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. SDC adopts a catchment approach in terms of recreational facilities and Mr Rykers evidence notes further land has been purchased within Lincoln for extension of playing fields.
PC69-0025	Roshean Woods	001	Oppose	Opposes the use of versatile soils for housing development and states the need to protect our highly productive land around Lincoln for food production. Food security is very important now and will continue to be into the future. Food production is most efficient on highly productive land because soil on this land needs the least fertiliser and cultivation (tilling or ploughing) to grow crops and livestock (Lynn et al., 2009). Highly	Reject plan change 69	Reject for reasons recorded in the body of Recommendation.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				productive land is also less prone to leaching fertiliser and contaminants into the environment than land with shallower or stony soil (Carrick et al., 2013; McLeod et al., 2014).		
PC69-0026	Aaron M Kenny	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to increase in traffic without substantial roading investment. Proposal would also make the roads into the city (Selwyn/Shands/Springs/Birch's) more dangerous as compared to diverting traffic to the new motorway if development continued at Rolleston. Submitter considers development should continue at Rolleston by expanding to the designed town limits and Council complete the new district park so there is the infrastructure for the growing town.	Not specified	Reject. Acknowledge concerns in relation to roads but addressed in evidence and Recommendation.
PC69-0027	Sandy de Vries	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes the potential vehicle access link to Liffey Springs Drive at the Eastern Border of the township, which would become a thoroughfare to get to Christchurch. Liffey Springs Drive has Aririra School on Russ Drive frequented by hundreds of school children - a thoroughfare would make walking and biking to school for children unsafe. Liffey Springs Drive already has considerable traffic from Southfield Drive. There would be traffic jams at the end of the road for traffic attempting to get out of Liffey Springs Drive in the mornings - it is already very busy.	Amend the zone change so that vehicle access is closer to the Lincoln township including the Library, restaurants/cafes, events centre, shops and service station.	Reject. Note linking road to Liffey Springs Drive no longer pursued.
PC69-0028						
PC69-0029						
PC69-0030	Suzy Alsop	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as unlike the recent growth, this is unplanned and outside the agreed Urban Infrastructure Boundary and at odds with the Greater Christchurch Urban/Future Development Strategy (2019), which concluded (Table 3) that Selwyn likely already has enough land zoned residential (i.e.. available for housing) to cater for population growth out to 2028. Any uncertainty in this is managed by zoning additional land as 'Future Development Areas' in Rolleston.	Have an evening community meeting to discuss further before any consents are granted.	Reject. Acknowledge growth is outside of the structure boundary. Evidence in terms of capacity identified and addressed in Recommendation.
PC69-0031	John Yin	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as it would undermine the District Plan's intention to limit residential development in Lincoln to the existing Development Areas. The proposal would impose significant strain on the roading, water, education and other community infrastructure in Lincoln. Unconstrained greenfield development carries a large carbon footprint by increasing reliance on cars, energy consumption and urban sprawl. The proposal contradicts Selwyn 2031 - the proposed development would significantly extend the size of Lincoln and dilute the 'village feel' of the township. The proposal would disrupt the staged development approach set out in the Lincoln Structure Plan and undermine the associated retail and infrastructure development plan for Lincoln.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues raised addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0032	Matt Crozier	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as it does not allow for planning of Lincoln township facilities. No provision for how additional small sections will be serviced by the Selwyn Council. Lincoln is renowned as a spacious town, small sections and therefore roads create social problems. Opposes the development of farmland with first class topsoil, which should be retained for food growing and residential development located in areas with poor quality topsoil.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues raised addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0033	Alastair Smithies	001	Oppose	Opposes the potential traffic access link from the new subdivision onto the southern end of Liffey Springs Drive. The presence of this road would adversely affect the existing reserve alongside Jimmy Adams Drive by cutting across it and interrupting the existing continuous public access along the L1 stream from Southfield Drive to the Lincoln Wetland and Liffey Springs reserve. The proposed linking road would have a detrimental effect on the reserve and would increase traffic volume on Liffey Springs Drive to levels well above what was expected when residents made the decision to live here.	Not specified	Reject and note linking road to Liffey Springs Drive no longer pursued.
PC69-0034	Samuel Edward Bridgman-Smith	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposed idea to subdivide 190 hectares to the south of Lincoln primarily due to the loss of high-quality soil. The soil that I use to grow crops is superb. With minimal applications of inputs to maintain structure, it yields outstanding results. The proposed subdivision will permanently deprive future generations the opportunity to grow food in some of the best soils in the country. A superior solution is vibrant inner city living (desperately needed in Christchurch) defined by attractive buildings with commercial businesses on the ground floor, followed by three to four stories of residential apartments all laid out around communal parks and squares.	That the Plan Change 69 be rejected in its entirety; and that a permanent, unchanging boundary be marked on the map of Lincoln around developed areas to prevent further urban encroachment onto quality soils to ensure future generation's prosperity.	Reject for reasons addressed in Recommendation. Issues raised re urban boundary not in scope.
PC69-0035	Robert Brian Wynn-Williams	001	Oppose	Opposes the rezoning of elite (Class 1 or 2) agricultural land (Templeton, Wakanui or Temuka soils) to residential. The lack of national policy on the use of elite land. If the change is approved the subdivision design be conditional on meeting best environmental and energy practices. SDC must put caveats on subdivision orientation such that the long access of sections must run east west (+/- say 5 degrees).	Decline the plan change request.	Reject. Issues of versatile soils addressed in Recommendation. Issues of design and caveats are matters which may be addressed at subdivision.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Consideration should also be given to building covenants to modify temperatures through the use of reflective surfaces and lighter roof colours; and water use and wastewater disposal through rainwater storage and gutter configuration.		
PC69-0036	Shaun & Natasha Roper	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 on the basis that there is not the infrastructure to support 2000 more residential sites in Lincoln. There is one primary school and one high school and one Medical Centre. Existing residents bought in Lincoln for the small-town vibe.	Request Council reject plan change 69.	Reject. Evidence on infrastructure provision provided. ODP and proposed rules identify potential for schooling subject to needs assessment.
PC69-0037	Professor Keith C. Cameron	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69, the main reason being that it would result in the loss of more 'highly productive land' in the Selwyn District. Approval of Private Plan Change Request 69 would be in direct conflict with the New Zealand Government's proposed National Policy Statement (NPS-HPL) designed to protect Highly Productive Land.	Reject private plan change 69 request.	Reject for reasons addressed in Recommendation. NPS-HPL not operative.
PC69-0038	Polly (Pauline) Warren	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as the nature reserve should not be tampered with in any way. Need to protect the natural environment and habitat for future generations.	Not specified.	Reject. ODP provides for protection and potential enhancement of habitat.
PC69-0039	Elizabeth Ruth Mitchell	001	Oppose	Opposed to the link between development and Liffey Springs Drive. This is green space with native birds (some protected) would be turned into an arterial road which is not acceptable. Property was built with an understanding of no more subdivisions in such wet areas.	Not specified.	Accept in part. Link to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0040	Denis Dumaine	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 to protect the remaining Highly Productive Land resource within Selwyn District for future generations. As more houses are needed, suggests: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stopping a model of urban development based on spread out villages later on becoming towns and destroying the wilderness around by multiplying houses and small sections.</li> <li>Stop reproducing a horizontal urbanisation based on an old model of low population and slow growing population. Should rather think in terms of verticalization of our model with 5-6 storey buildings with multiple apartments around and a small communal garden.</li> <li>Encourage the urbanisation on poorer soils between Rolleston and West Melton where the infrastructure is already present in terms of shops and roads.</li> </ul>	Not to approve private plan change request 69.	Reject. Versatile soils addressed in Recommendation. Other matters better considered through wider processes and not on site specific plan change.
PC69-0041	Jill Smithies	001	Oppose	Opposes the potential road between the proposed subdivision and Liffey Springs Drive acknowledging that the developer does not currently own the land necessary to make this connection, but this could change. The potential road would cut through a beautiful tree lined reserve that is an asset to not just the residents of the Liffey Springs subdivision but to all of Lincoln. As a connector road for the proposed subdivision it is likely that Liffey Springs Drive would become the preferred route to the centre of Lincoln for the residents in the eastern part of the subdivision. The increase in traffic would make it less safe for children crossing the road when going to and from the Ararira Springs Primary School or accessing the reserve. The potential road from the proposed subdivision would degrade the nature of both the Liffey Springs Drive and the reserve surrounding the Liffey Springs subdivision.	Remove the potential road going through the reserve to Liffey Springs Drive.	Accept in part but note road linkage to Liffey Spring removed from ODP.
PC69-0042	Eleonore Dumaine	001	Oppose	Opposes the development on a versatile soil, class 1 and 2, which are the best soils. Only 5% of all soils in NZ are this quality. Once you've covered a land with concrete and houses, there is no going back. Submitter considers it is time to think of vertical urbanisation instead of horizontal, answering both the need for more housing and more land to grow food, and decrease our human footprint on the environment.	Not specified	Reject. Versatile soils addressed in Recommendation and the NPS-UD anticipates a variety of dwellings including standalone and attached dwellings and in different locations.
PC69-0043	Clare Mateara	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes the potential effects to Liffey Springs Drive either directly creating the road as a "main road" like Edward Street or indirectly, where roads along the area would inadvertently encourage the road to be used as a shortcut, thoroughfare. The increase in traffic means increase noise will destroy the sanctuary created for the nature created around Liffey Springs and also the people living in the area. Submitter presumes fears may be unwarranted based on proposal now before Council, but considers it prudent to make my submission base on that fear, and trust that you would consider our concerns should it ever come up as a proposal in the future.	Not specified	Reject in part. Link to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0044	Susan Lysaght	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes the traffic access link through Liffey Springs Drive. The access link would cut through a reserve which is used by the community. Submitter has no objection to a pedestrian crossing so school children can access the school, however putting a road through would change the nature of the community feel. Submitter bought in Lincoln for the reserves and does not want more to be lost. The loss of the reserve would be damaging to the environment and the nature that currently live there.	Not specified.	Reject in part. Link to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0045	Cass McGimpsey	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposed access link through Liffey Springs Drive to the proposed subdivision for the following reasons: would require a bridge over the Liffey Stream which would not be in harmony with the surrounding wildlife area. Pollution from transport and potential for rubbish to be littered around the bridge area would be tragic for the fragile eco system. Increase in traffic movement would create many hazards for the local children and adults who enjoy access freely and safely. The area alongside the stream is popular for picnicking and games, having a bridge and road access in this area would make the area unsafe to use for recreational uses. Liffey Springs Drive as an access road would devalue the properties in the Liffey Springs Subdivision.	Reject the plan change or alternatively amend the access to Moirs Lane and out to Ellesmere Road with no access link to Liffey Springs Drive.	Reject. Note link to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0046	June and Ian Burney	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to insufficient infrastructure in the Town Centre to support the level of proposed growth. The creation of additional business zone outside of the town centre fragments the township further. Focus should be on retaining the country community character and general town centre of Lincoln.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Infrastructure addressed. Additional Business Zones provide for daily needs of residents only and does not fragment the township.
PC69-0047	Lincoln Envirotown Trust	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Plan change does not exhibit the housing density and housing model that we feel is essential to Selwyn's balanced growth.</li> <li>Low density housing proposed by this plan carries results in effects. Continuing to sequester large land areas for high area houses will not be sustainable and will not enhance the Selwyn District.</li> <li>The developers cite the need for housing in New Zealand as an important reason to allow the proposed plan change. However the large housing units proposed will be expensive not provide the quantity of affordable housing that could occupy our land areas.</li> <li>Large housing units are invariably less energy efficient than smaller housing units.</li> <li>Loss of large areas of agricultural land involved in the current low-density models.</li> <li>Reliance on private transport carries long term implications not only for the residents themselves, but the wider Selwyn area to say nothing of the continuation of an unsustainable carbon foot print.</li> <li>Perpetuates the lack of communal green space as an essential part of family and community living in Selwyn. The green space shown on the plan looks negligible and is stated as being subject to change.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69 as presented.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Living Z zoning allows for variety of housing. Green space appropriate.
PC69-0265	Don Babe	FS001	Support	<i>The proposed housing density is low. This is likely to be caused by the requirement of each dwelling to have 2 or more motor vehicles. There is no planning for any alternative transport options. Most car journeys are less than 5 kms so this subdivision needs to reduce those car journeys by offering realistic options. There is no evidence of this planning. One example could be the addition of cycle parking at bus stops in Lincoln Village so people travelling to town could cycle to the bus stop and leave their bike securely whilst enjoying the bus trip. Children need to be able to access schools and recreation facilities independently from an early age.</i>	<i>Require the plans to be re-submitted with better transport options and a variety of housing options.</i>	<i>Reject. Transportation issues and variety of housing addressed. Living Z zone enables a variety of housing. Park and Ride facility included. Cycling and pedestrian linkages provided.</i>
PC69-0265	Don Babe	FS002	Support	<i>The housing crisis will not be solved by a business as usual model.</i>	<i>Let Rolleston have the cookie cut new sections, Lincoln needs to build on its University and Research centre heritage and provide housing that is appropriate. There could also be a requirement that a certain percentage of the units built be passive houses.</i>	<i>Reject. Living Z Zone appropriate.</i>
PC69-0264	Christchurch - Little River Railtrail Trust	FS001	Support	<i>The subdivision is designed for car use so there will be as many cars in the area as there are dwellings, probably more. A number of these will use Moirs Lane for access and egress. Moirs Lane has been recognised as part of the Christchurch - Little River Railtrail. It is important that any upgrade to Moirs Lane includes the provision of an off-road cycle path.  Furthermore, we would like to provide the residents of the two adjoining subdivisions with easy access to the bike trail by the provision of cycle ways suitable for people aged from 8 to 80 years old from Springs Road to Moirs Lane. Shared paths on the edge of main roads do not meet this description.</i>	<i>Ask the planners to re-submit their application with due consideration of other means of transport especially for those journeys of 5km or less. That will include access for children to get to school and to Lincoln township for those supplies not available in the proposed retail areas.</i>	<i>Reject. Evidence that upgraded Moirs Lane will include recognition of the rail trail. Cycling and walking access addressed.</i>
PC69-0048	Mark Mateara	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes the potential effects to Liffey Springs Drive either directly creating the road as a "main road" like Edward Street or indirectly, where roads along the area would inadvertently encourage the road to be used as a shortcut, thoroughfare. The increase in traffic means increase noise will destroy the sanctuary created for the nature created around Liffey Springs and also the people living in the area.  Submitter presumes fears may be unwarranted based on proposal now before Council, but considers it prudent to make my submission base on that fear, and trust that you would consider our concerns should it ever come up as a proposal in the future.	Not specified.	Accept in part. Link to Liffey Springs Drive removed.
PC69-0049	Andrew Barclay	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes plan change in part due to the resultant limited competition in residential sections for some time and that this development would limit the approval other subdivisions until these are developed,	Approve plan change 69 and simultaneously rezone land around the perimeter of Lincoln, of equal	Reject in part. Rezoning of additional land around the perimeter of Lincoln not within jurisdiction.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>which given the scale will take many years.</p> <p>The location of this development skews Lincoln heavily to the south. Already the town is rather disparate with little "town centre" feel. The hub of the town is the current town centre, high school, sports fields, churches etc. Shops and houses exist side by side in this area, making it difficult to become a centre. More effort is needed to create a thriving town centre full of commercial and community-based activities, that the residents want to be part of and travel to.</p>	distance to the centre. This will provide opportunity for other landowners providing more competition. and respect the current town centre as the hub of the town.	
PC69-0050	Gordon Hope	001	Support	<p>Supports the proposed subdivision going ahead in that:</p> <p>It helps the Government's requirement for more land to be made available for housing; and</p> <p>When completed, will be enclosed by natural boundaries, which makes sense.</p> <p>The argument that too much "good" land is going into housing is true, but when towns were first established in New Zealand they were built on "good" land, because people had gardens to grow vegetables in order to survive, no handy supermarkets then, so of course "good" land was going to be built on.</p> <p>Would like more information on the proposed Business Zone. Other than that, can't think of any reason why the subdivision should not proceed.</p>	Not specified.	Accept for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Additional Business areas included.
PC69-0051	Murray and Judy Reid	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes any motor vehicle access to Liffey Springs Drive, but supports a footbridge allowing pedestrian.	Remove any provision for vehicle access down Liffey Springs Drive from plan change 69.	Accept in part. Liffey Springs link removed.
PC69-0052	Bruce Dobbs	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the continued use of productive farmland for the construction of housing, of either low- or high-density although the latter is obviously a more efficient use of any residential land.</p> <p>Submitter considers that residential and/or business development should be confined to land of poor agricultural/horticultural value which, in general, means the lighter, stonier soils in our region. Also, I believe, as a nation we need to move from the single (low density) residential property to a higher density, possibly vertical (3 - 5 floors) construction with surrounding communal green space and recreational areas.</p>	Not specified.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Living Z zone appropriate.
PC69-0053	Bill and Debbie Ogg	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as such a significant development of this scale will negatively impact on the quality of life of the existing rate payers and residents in Lincoln. These impacts are summarised as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic congestion as a result of significant low and medium density living introduced.</li> <li>Potential loss of existing recreational areas for Verdeco Park by allowing construction of a by-pass.</li> <li>Loss of existing features marketed by Verdeco Park.</li> <li>Significant traffic congestion created in Springs Road South and the wider area.</li> <li>Increased demand on existing infrastructure and services.</li> <li>Introduction of increased dust and environmental pollution as a result of the development.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0054	Frederick Bustin	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change based on potential vehicles travelling on Liffey Springs Drive. Young children use this road on their way to Russ Drive school. The reserve is widely used by locals and people outside the area because of the pleasant stream boundary and bird life it attracts; a road going through would detract from this.	Not specified.	Reject but note Liffey Springs link removed.
PC69-0055	Bruce and Joanne Dobbs	001	Oppose	<p>The submitter acknowledges the need for more housing in the Selwyn District, but opposes plan change 69 in order to protect fertile land and the environment.</p> <p>Society can no longer afford to adhere to the current model of one dwelling to each section, in order to house the burgeoning population.</p> <p>To avoid the risk of destroying more of our valuable farmland and wildlife areas, we now need to consider other options such as more high-density housing. A model of several apartments with an area of common ground (play area, etc) could be an acceptable alternative.</p> <p>Poorer soils which are less suitable for agriculture and horticulture could be used for housing, leaving the better-quality Plains soils like Templeton Silt loams for the purpose for which they are best utilised.</p>	Not specified.	Reject but note Living Z rules enable potentially more intensive development.
PC69-0056	Chris Chisholm	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 due to the use of Class 1 soils and that existing infrastructure cannot support this development.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0057	Michael and Joanne Moore	001	Oppose	Opposes any connection to Liffey Springs Drive and any other through road, which would ruin the subdivisions and ruin the environment, water ways and park like areas that residents enjoy walking and cycling around.	Remove any road connection to Liffey Springs Drive.	Reject. Note road connection to Liffey Springs Drive removed.
PC69-0058	Not allocated					
PC69-0059	Not allocated					



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0060	Scott Loeffler	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient infrastructure capacity to adequately deal with the development in terms of roading, sewage systems, sports field and other parks and community centres. Fees paid by the developer per section sold to council is only enough for maintenance of current roading, sewage and facilities, not enough to purchase and produce new ones.</li> <li>Does not address adequately any of the issues in the Climate Change Response Amendment Act 2019.</li> <li>Use of good soils for housing means longer travel times and more greenhouse gases due to not being able to use good arable land to grow food near to the greater Christchurch area. Lincoln soils are classed in the top 2% of arable land in Canterbury. It is creating problems for future generations by utilising these good soils for housing.</li> <li>Does not contribute to the amenity of Lincoln township.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject. Issues raised appropriately addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0061	Deborah & Kevin Powell	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed bypass cuts directly through a Council reserve. Verdeco Park maintains a connection between nature, happiness and healthy living. A bypass road, traffic and noise pollution are in direct conflict with the very nature of the Verdeco Park environment.</li> <li>Pressure on existing education facilities. There is already displacement of young children who were educated off site as their local school could not accommodate them.</li> <li>Upgrading roading and improving transport links takes many years to come to fruition. Lincoln roads will not be able to cope with the increase in traffic, which in turn causes time delays.</li> <li>186 hectares of high-quality land, with soils proven to be unique in quality composition and structure, should be maintained for further horticultural purpose and not transformed for intense housing.</li> <li>Plan Change 69 does not include amenities to support the recreational, social and cultural needs of a growing community. Lincoln's infrastructure would be insufficient, and this would have a direct effect on all residents and their community needs.</li> <li>Lincoln is a rural township with agricultural businesses and a University that supports research and development of cropping and dairy farming. The township has grown over a 12-year period with new housing spread across large areas. However, a further 2,000 section high intensity subdivision would change the special nature of this special township.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues raised addressed and considered in Recommendation. Bypass not included in ODP.
PC69-0062	Charlotte Crittenden	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There is a need to protect against the permanent loss of the high-quality soil in this area.</li> <li>The beauty about NZ/towns like Lincoln is the amount of land with no infrastructure ruining the country look and feel. Cramming in a large number of properties in an area of that size is ugly and overcrowding.</li> <li>When will a new High School., Primary School and supermarket be built to cater for this increase in people?</li> <li>Land and house packages add no character to the area.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues raised addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0063	Richard Morris	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposal due to potential contradiction between guidance provided by the NPS-UD and NPS-HPL.	Reject the request for plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0064	Yurie Tiltman	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change rezoning, which should be considered as part of SDC's long-term plan. This would require a considerable amount of infrastructure work.	Reject plan change 69 at this time.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0065	Sarah Pollard	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change resulting in the construction of 2500 new houses in areas that do not have the roading infrastructure. Springs Road and Shands Road are at capacity now. What are the Council's plans to deal with this?	Request that Council put on hold any development until the infrastructure can deal with extra traffic.	Reject. Improvements to address transportation issues now incorporated into plan change.
PC69-0066	Brenton Crittenden	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as the main street/area of Lincoln was not designed appropriately for all this extra infrastructure. With 2000 extra proposed properties there will be demand for another primary school, high school, supermarket and other residential facilities.</p> <p>Building over high-quality soil would be a huge loss - we must protect it.</p> <p>Lincoln used to have such a community feel to it and that is slowly decreasing with the increased infrastructure. Lincoln is becoming less attractive and too crowded.</p>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0067	Roger McLenaghan	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as approval would be in direct conflict with the New Zealand Government's proposed National Policy Statement designed to protect Highly Productive Land, with an overall purpose of maintaining its availability for primary production for future generations and protect it from inappropriate subdivision, use and development.</p> <p>The soil types represented in the proposed development are mostly Wakanui and some Templeton soils (Landcare s-map). Both of these soils have a good depth of topsoil that is stone free and have a relatively</p>	Requests the Selwyn District Council be proactive and protect the remaining Highly Productive Land resource within Selwyn District for Future Generations.	Reject. Issues addressed in Recommendation.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				high available water capacity (Landcare s-map). They are therefore classified as class 1 soils (Cox J.E. 1978). Only 5 percent of the land in New Zealand are class 1 soils (Curran-Cournane, 2021), making these soils the most productive soils for food production due to their versatility. According to Selwyn District Council's baseline Assessment of Versatile Soils only 1 percent of Selwyn is class 1 soils.		
PC69-0037	Professor Keith C. Cameron	FS001	Oppose	<i>I oppose Plan Change 69 because of the loss of Highly Productive Land that would occur. I therefore ask Selwyn District Council to reject Private Plan Change 69 Request at what would be the "11th hour" before the New Zealand Government's National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land comes into effect later this year. Approval of Private Plan Change Request 69 would be in direct conflict with the New Zealand Government's proposed National Policy Statement (NPS-HPL) designed to protect Highly Productive Land.</i>	<i>Oppose in Full</i>	<i>Reject. Issues addressed in Recommendation.</i>
PC69-0068	Tony Bywater and Judy Derby	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed subdivision is on the most productive class of agricultural land (Land Use Capability class 1) which is in short supply both regionally and nationally. This land should be retained for food production and not used for housing.</li> <li>Road transport provisions both within and surrounding Lincoln are already under stress and the addition of such a large subdivision will add significantly to congestion within the township and between Lincoln and other centres (Rolleston and Christchurch in particular). Provision for increased traffic flows, particularly within the township, must be addressed before any major expansion.</li> <li>Further retail development must occur in the vicinity of Gerald St in the centre of the township and not be dispersed throughout the various subdivisions.</li> <li>The destruction of an existing reserve area to allow road access.</li> </ul> Any further development must preserve and enhance the character of the Lincoln township in terms of the vitality of its centre and the provision of reserve areas.	Not specified.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0069	Anthony Campbell	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size of properties and houses to be constructed - small cheap housing will create a "ghetto" type" area which will also bring more crime into Lincoln.</li> <li>Lincoln does not have the infrastructure to support the proposed development in terms of schools, sports field and roading/transport links.</li> <li>In the event that this subversion is granted, the Selwyn District Council will be obliged and need to upgrade many facilities in and around Lincoln, the cost of course always is burdened back to the ratepayer.</li> <li>All new housing in New Zealand should be developed on poorer type soils. NZ is a food producing country and if we continue to let our top fertile soils go into unnecessary housing mainly because a developer wants to, we will be reliant on imported food.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0070	Kim and Steve McDrury	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to concerns around more traffic/people on current roads and infrastructure. The use of good soil and that Lincoln needs another supermarket, garage, buses and sports grounds. The placement of a road through a reserve.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0071	Kerry Blake and Gary Eggers	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to two main concerns: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the visual/sensory impact of a road and bridge instead of green space that is pleasing to the eye and utilised for recreation.</li> <li>the negative effects on the waterway, fauna and wildlife.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0072	Olivia and Ben Thompson	001	Oppose	Opposes the impact on educational facilities based on insufficient planning regarding land required for the development of schools and kindergartens/early childhood centres.	Amend the ODP to make land available for schools and kindergartens/early childhood education centres; or alternatively require an undertaking from the developer that land will be made available for educational facilities in accordance with consultation with the Department of Education and the Selwyn District Council.	Reject. Note ODP now enables consideration of need for land for educational facilities.
PC69-0072	Olivia and Ben Thompson	002	Oppose	Opposes the impact on community facilities based on insufficient planning regarding land required for the development of community facilities. A larger Lincoln will require additional facilities, such as a swimming pool, another supermarket, another petrol station, increased medical facilities. Not having amenities close to the proposed subdivision will require people to travel further which will increase traffic.	Amend the ODP to make land available for community facilities including, but not limited to, a supermarket, petrol station, swimming pool and medical facilities; or alternatively require an undertaking from the developer that land will be made available for community facilities in accordance with consultation with the Selwyn District Council.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS002	Support In Part	A development proposal of this size should include major community amenities to ensure community engagement remains within the immediate neighbourhood and provides activities for existing and future residents. Current amenities involve further car movements to the Northern area of Lincoln, increasing traffic in all parts of the township and demoting the need for walkable communities.	Have developer disclose more detailed plans of the proposed subdivision including addressing current and future amenities	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0072	Olivia and Ben Thompson	003	Oppose	Oppose the proposed Western Bypass road and request that it be declined outright and removed from the proposed Lincoln South ODP. The proposed bypass road will run through an area currently designated as a reserve and storm water management area. It would remove the only playground in Verdeco which is a key community space, exponentially increase the traffic through Verdeco Park and split the subdivision in two.  The introduction of a collector road and significant increase to traffic through the development would adversely impact on pedestrian and traffic safety, aesthetic, and the acoustic values for the community.	Delete the bypass road from the ODP.	Reject. Western Bypass road no longer proposed as part of PC69.
PC69-0072	Olivia and Ben Thompson	004	Oppose	Opposes the roading element of the plan change based on the disproportionate impact the development will have on Springs Road traffic volumes and road safety.  The Springs Road / Edward Street roundabout / interchange is expected to operate at full capacity once Te Whariki is completed.  The proposed plan change would add an approximate 14,000 car trips per day to Springs Road, passing through the interchange without any improvements being planned. Submitter is concerned about the significant increase of traffic movements on Springs Road and the safety relating to vehicles turning in/out of the Verdeco Park and Te Whariki subdivisions and cars turning into driveway properties which are accessed directly from Springs Road. Increased vehicle movement will impact on pedestrians crossing Springs Road to access Lincoln amenities located in the Lincoln Township and Te Whariki including the zoned primary school for Verdeco Park, Ararira School located east of Verdeco Park in Russ Drive.	Amend the plan change to require the developer to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>contribute to the upgrade of the roundabout to an interchange with traffic lights;</li> <li>to plan and construct, alternatively contribute to, safe road crossings for Springs Road;</li> <li>to plan and construct, alternatively contribute to, a turning lane into Verdeco Park</li> </ul>	Reject. Amendments proposed now include appropriate transport related upgrades and indicative funding.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS003	004	Support In Part	Further to this, the Springs Road and Collins Road intersection would need an intense upgrade in order to provide for increased traffic movements.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Note indicative gateway treatment in ODP.
PC69-0072	Olivia and Ben Thompson	005	Oppose	Opposes the stormwater proposals in the proposed plan change based on the lack of information as to the impact of the proposal on wetlands and downstream catchments and properties.  The proposed plan does not make adequate provision for ponds and wetlands to manage stormwater and is likely to increase flooding risk and does not explain how the filling that will be required will impact on downstream catchments and properties, including on Verdeco Park.  The Plan Change area includes several natural springs which will be intercepted with the new development. Further clarification would be required to understand how the realignment of drainage channels, interception of springs and ground water would meet the requirements outlines in the National Policy Statement for Fresh Water management (2020).	Require the Applicant to provide further clarity on how the realignment of drainage channels, interception of springs and ground water would meet National Policy Statement for Fresh Water Management (2020) and explain plans to mitigate flooding risk and associated impacts on community resilience as a result of the filling required to give effect to the proposed plan change.	Reject. National Policy Statement for Fresh Water Management (2020) addressed in evidence. Further information provided in relation to groundwater, drainage channels and springs.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS004	Support In Part	Agree. Existing drains on Collins Road properties have not been factored into calculations and how natural springs not within the Greenslade property would be determinately affected.	Ensure full Geotechnical reports are provided and robust storm water management plan is implemented.	Reject. Geotechnical evidence provided.
PC69-0072	Olivia and Ben Thompson	006	Oppose	Opposes the wastewater solution proposed by the developer based on the risk to Lincoln residents, wetland wildlife and potential impact on Selwyn rates payers to ensure suitable upgrades are done.  Proposing that peak time wastewater overflow ponds be utilised to compensate for lack of treatment capacity at local wastewater treatment plants is not an acceptable engineering solution.  Approval of the plan as presented by the Developer will transfer an unacceptable cost to Selwyn ratepayers to upgrade the wastewater treatment facility. These ponds have been designated as emergency storage for the Lincoln Township. Any regular discharge to this pond would remove a portion of this emergency storage capacity.	Reject the request to amend Rule 4.9.32 and maintain the requirement of a setback of at least 150m from the boundary of the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant and Allandale Pump Station and require the developer to upgrade the wastewater treatment plant or make an appropriate contribution to the upgrade; or alternatively the number of proposed sections in the ODP must be reduced to fit within the capacity of the existing infrastructure.	Reject. Setback of 100m incorporated. Upgrades, if necessary, funded through appropriate mechanisms.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS005	Support In Part	Agree. No residential development should be able to proceed without basic wastewater capacity. This reiterates the scale of the proposal and how the township would not be able to cope. Overflow ponds are not a modern-day solution.	Upgrade wastewater facilities prior to development	Reject. Upgrade to Pines WWTP facility planned and funded.
PC69-0072	Olivia and Ben Thompson	007	Oppose	Opposes the location, scale and density elements of proposed plan change 69 based on the development's lack of compliance with the Selwyn District Plan and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy as well as the potential impact of development in areas that pose risk to high water tables and poor soil conditions.  The proposed layout of the development is not in keeping with the semi-rural character of Lincoln and, more specifically, Verdeco Park and will place smaller, high density sections next to semi-rural sections.  The densification of land away from the existing town centre will adversely affect the urban design of Lincoln and connection of amenities for residents.	Amend the ODP to be in keeping with Lincoln's character and better match proposed development to existing neighbourhoods; the number of proposed sections in the ODP must be reduced to be more proportionate to Lincoln's existing size and Local Government's planning intention to focus development in Selwyn on Rolleston.	Reject. Living Z Zone rules appropriate. Acknowledge focus of development in Rolleston but Lincoln also identified as a Key Activity Centre with some growth anticipated.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				High water tables increase flooding risk not only to roads but also to properties and allowing development in areas that are prone to natural disasters (flooding) is not appropriate land planning and does not support community resilience.  There is little or no precedence of medium comprehensive density in Lincoln (350m <sup>2</sup> ) which is proposed for the Plan Change Area and this scale is unsuited to the semi-rural nature of Lincoln Township.		
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS006	Support In Part	<i>Increase in impervious areas will result in higher risk of flooding for existing properties in the area, particularly 36 Collins Road, as well as future homes to be built. There has also been no provisions to transition the housing density of this proposal to the rural properties along Collins Road. These lots would need to be large lifestyle blocks to fit with the rural nature of Lincoln and surrounding properties and ensure no vehicle access comes off Collins Road.</i>	<i>Provide more detailed plans for storm water and lot sizes.</i>	<i>Reject. Flooding issues addressed in evidence and will be further addressed at subdivision stage. Density anticipates lower density towards Collins Road.</i>
PC69-0072	Olivia and Ben Thompson	008	Oppose In Part	Oppose the ecological elements of plan change 69 on the basis that the developer has not put adequate plans in place to ensure that springs and wetlands in the proposed development area will be protected. Gaps in the ODP's ecological assessment was identified as part of the Council's RFI. One aspect requiring further work relates to location, state and protection of springs.  While Aquatic Ecology identifies some aspects that will contribute to preserving springs (such as through understanding of the local geohydrology, stormwater conveyance and treatment) as well as measures required to protect and enhance wetlands and springs (preserving discharge, combined with a wider, more biodiverse riparian buffer), no statements from either Aquatic Ecology or the developer suggests that plans are in place to implement these measures as part of the ODP.	Amend the ODP to include plans to protect springs and wetlands in accordance with the measures identified in the ecological response.	Accept in part and record considerable amendments to ODP to address the protection and enhancement of springs and wetlands and riparian areas.
PC69-0073	H Ward	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 due to temperature rises, constant dust produced when further land is developed, noise pollution, light pollution, pollution from heavy machinery and the resulting increased traffic volumes will see the carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, nitrous oxides, hydro carbons, volatile organic compounds and particulate matter levels increasing and will alter the ecosystems and patterns of behaviour of the wildlife.  In addition the water run-off will increase, putting pressure on water systems, both natural and man-made. Liffey Springs has a unique and natural beauty and is an important habitat of water ways and the associated wildlife - this is under threat by the sudden large-scale alterations proposed and the human activity will impact this area irreversibly.  The 'Templeton Soils' in the areas directly to the south of Lincoln that would be affected by Plan 69 include some of the most outstandingly rare and highly productive 1st class soils of the Canterbury Plains which have taken up to 6,000 years to form.  It is my belief that our quiet rural town and its links to the famous Lincoln College, of which generations of families have attended, should remain small and surrounded by fields of animals and crops, conserved for our future generations to enjoy.  There is no provision for additional traffic on roading to and from Lincoln - Christchurch routes, sports fields or schools. The domain is too small currently to support our community's activities.	Reject plan change 69 outright. Failing that, delete the possibility of any future road connecting into the end of Liffey Springs Drive.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Note future road connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer included.
PC69-0074	Not allocated					
PC69-0075	David Page	001	Oppose	Submitter is concerned that additional traffic from the proposed development will impact Springs Road and environs and potentially resident safety. Recommends that Council investigates and makes provision for roading improvements at intersections including Verdeco/Springs Road intersection, that speed limits south of Verdeco Boulevard on Springs Road is decreased.  Submitter is aware that Verdeco Park traffic design has volume limitations (narrow roads, on-street parking) and a connection from the proposed development to Verdeco Park appears to be a safety and noise risk, and will impact lifestyles. Request to analyse traffic volumes and if the proposed volumes of traffic from the proposed development impact the roading design parameters and hence noise, and safety then not proceed with this connection.  In Verdeco Park, sewerage macerators were required by Council in Building Consent process of larger sections. This caused additional unplanned costs.  Flooding risk.	Not specified.	Reject. Matters raised in submission have been addressed but note setting of speed limits are not a matter for determination at plan change stage.
PC69-0076	Rebecca	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 due to concern that continued development of this magnitude is contradicting environmental goals and Lincoln's Envirotown image.  Good fertile farming land being lost to urban spread, will push farming activities to land of lesser quality requiring heavy land preparations, meaning more nitrates will be released into the water table.  Inevitable increase to traffic volumes of those mostly commuting to the city for work, school, and recreation. Decisions around public transport options and frequencies did not take into consideration a population growth such as this.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Issues identified in submission have all been addressed and considered.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>The available infrastructure in Selwyn such as water treatment is already needing to have upgrades in order to meet the required standards never mind to support the increased population.</p> <p>Lincoln's roading will not be able to support the population resulting in an increase in congestion, delays and repairs making the Lincoln roads more hazardous.</p> <p>Jobs and services in recent years have been relocated from Lincoln to Rolleston, most recently the maternity hospital. Should PC69 go ahead there will be more people but a smaller pool of available local resources and jobs.</p> <p>Selwyn has grown rapidly in the last 10 years, this has not been supported with an increase in local schools.</p>		
PC69-0077	Nigel J Heslop	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The roading infrastructure can't support the additional vehicle traffic that will be created by the new subdivision.</li> <li>From a climate change point of view this proposal goes against everything the world, New Zealanders, the government and the Selwyn District council is advocating for.</li> <li>The government is drafting up legislation that will (hopefully) protect productive land that is required to grow food from being taken and used as subdivision for housing. This land the proposed new subdivision is going on is such prime productive land that should be protected so that it can continue to produce food.</li> <li>Lincoln has a unique character in that it is small, and build around the LII stream, the springs and the University. It has many walkways along such features. The new subdivision plans to increase the population in Lincoln by 67% so that will automatically take away that small village character thus adversely effecting everyone who currently lives here.</li> <li>The proposed subdivision proposes to put a road bridge through the reserve at the top end of Liffey Springs drive connecting the new subdivision with Liffey springs Drive. This will leave a large scar in the reserve which is currently enjoyed by cyclists, dog walkers, and the general public.</li> </ul>	Council reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Issues raised have been addressed and considered through the hearing process. Note Liffey Springs Road linkage no longer proposed.
PC69-0078	B J G & M S Prendergast	001	Support In Part	Supports the proposed ultra fast broadband available in the proposed subdivision. However, submitter lives on the other side of Collins Road and would like this to be made available.	Amend plan change 69 to include ultra fast broadband on both sides of Collins Road.	Reject. Provision of ultra fast broadband to sites outside site not within jurisdiction of the plan change.
PC69-0078	B J G & M S Prendergast	002	Support In Part	<p>Supports road widths within the subdivision being of a size that cars parked on both sides of the road will allow easy movement of emergency vehicles and traffic in both directions.</p> <p>Retain the existing width of Collins Road with the inclusion of the proposed walkway/cycle way. Also, road to be retained in current or better condition and all areas to be free of contaminants.</p> <p>Truck movements to be limited on Collins Road during construction.</p> <p>Upgrading of Collins/Springs Road corner.</p> <p>Roads within subdivision to be connected to existing roads in existing subdivisions creating through roads and taking traffic off Springs Road.</p>	Amend plan change to achieve the outcomes set out above.	Accept in part. Matters raised have been addressed and considered but matters of detail are for subdivision stage.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS007	Support In Part	<i>Upgrade of Collins Rd and Springs Rd intersection would be a must due to its current dangerous layout. It is also suggested that new properties on the Northern side of Collins Road are not granted vehicle access from Collins Road but are serviced from the rear within the new subdivision.</i>	<i>Enforce roading upgrades and limit vehicle access to properties off new roads, not existing</i>	<i>Reject. Upgrading proposed but not appropriate to limit vehicle access to properties off new roads.</i>
PC69-0078	B J G & M S Prendergast	003	Oppose In Part	<p>Submitter would like all dust to be contained within the work site during construction and would like contact details of contractor if this was not complied with.</p> <p>We would also like to be informed on a timely manner of any disruptions to power or road works that may affect us. Also all necessary road works to be completed together as we have faced the same piece of road being worked on and resealed during Verdeco Park being developed. Do it Once. Do it right.</p>	Not specified.	Reject. Matters to be addressed at subdivision stage.
PC69-0078	B J G & M S Prendergast	004	Oppose	Opposed if the uptake of water from the proposed subdivision would effect the quality of quantity and volume of submitters existing well.	Amend plan change to ensure sufficient water supply.	Reject. No evidence of well interference. Requirement included in ODP to transfer take and use consents.
PC69-0078	B J G & M S Prendergast	005	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Submitters are using an Oasis wastewater system and would like the option to be able to connect into the proposed reticulated system.	Amend to include both sides of Collins Road.	Connections to reticulated system are matter for subdivision stage and are limited to the plan change site.
PC69-0078	B J G & M S Prendergast	006	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Submitter would like to be able to consult with the developers to have a meeting for the affected neighbours.	Not specified.	Reject. While noting request for a meeting between developers and affected parties, that is a matter that is appropriate but not one that can be mandated.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS008	Support In Part	Some meetings have taken place however there has been an absolute lack of response and cooperation from the Rolleston Industrial Developments Ltd.	Developer to hold a community meeting and provide more detail.	Reject. While noting request for a meeting between developers and affected parties, that is a matter that may be appropriate but not one that can be mandated.
PC69-0079	David Richards and Kerry Driscoll	001	Oppose In Part	Submitter has concerns regarding the proposed increase in traffic and being able to enter and exit Verdeco Park safely.	Reduce size of development under plan change 69 so traffic is manageable.	Reject. Issues in relation to traffic management appropriately addressed.
PC69-0079	David Richards and Kerry Driscoll	002	Oppose In Part	Opposes the small commercial development proposed for what is a very large development. This is inadequate and the siting on Springs Rd will add to congestion. No school or kindergarten/preschool is shown. The need to transport children will increase traffic movements down Springs Road.	Increase facilities within the plan change 69 development area to service needs of residents.	Reject. Note increased commercial areas included in plan change and policy and rule addressing schooling issue.
PC69-0079	David Richards and Kerry Driscoll	003	Oppose	Opposes plan change as it would destroy the entire character of Verdeco Park and would impair the drainage and obliterate the children's playground.	Not specified.	Reject.
PC69-0080	Deborah Bratton	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change and considers every household in Lincoln, should be given a vote on whether they support or oppose. The land is fertile soil, with not much of that left in Canterbury, also there would have to be another school, more money spent on infrastructure. There are no construction jobs in CHCH anymore. Insurance has changed for homes in Lincoln, this now classes Lincoln as a flooding zone in the next 50 years, so it would be ridiculous to build on flood lands. Big subdivisions cause many social problems and this is my biggest issue.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Residents have had opportunity to submit and be heard. Other issues raised addressed. No evidence that subdivision will cause social problems.
PC69-0081	Carl Bratton	001	Oppose	Oppose plan change as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rare soil is not to be retained</li> <li>The infrastructure is not capable of another 2000 homes;</li> <li>Our rates would have to go up, to pay for this;</li> <li>Not enough jobs in the area;</li> <li>Schools would have to be built; and</li> <li>New sewerage works required.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. All issues identified and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0082	Angela Bustin	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposed bridge over the reserve at the end Liffey Springs Drive. The reasons for this is the council have spent a huge amount of time and money making the area a place for people to enjoy and feel safe. If the road is made busier with more traffic, it will endanger the school children in this area.	Not specified.	Reject but note Liffey Springs Drive has been removed.
PC69-0083	Nicola McDowell	001	Oppose	Opposes the plan change for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Services within Lincoln have not been designed or planned to cope with an additional, substantial increase to the Lincoln population.</li> <li>Lincoln High School is already at capacity. Plan Change 69 would require a whole new High School, which takes many years to plan and build.</li> <li>Increasing the population of Lincoln will greatly increase traffic, esp commuters, which is bad for air quality and for climate change.</li> <li>Selwyn can only practically sustain one large population base of centralised services (Rolleston) and housing should be created close to those services.</li> <li>The rural roads with controlled intersections around Lincoln are treacherous. An increase in traffic movements, and the risk of serious and fatal crashes, will be unacceptably high.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues all addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0084	Clare E Scott	001	Oppose	Opposes the plan change for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the road through the current Liffey Springs Reserve and the building of an access bridge.</li> <li>Liffey Springs Drive becoming a busy thoroughfare endangering children walking, biking and scootering to school.</li> <li>Extra heavy vehicles, trades vans, and cars on Liffey Springs Drive because of their increased emissions and the impact on climate change.</li> <li>Subdivision being developed on arable farmland because of the seriously diminishing Versatile Soil, of which there is less than 2% left in Canterbury.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject. Versatile soils addressed in Recommendation. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection has been removed.
PC69-0085	Matthias and Jane Kerkmann	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as it does not accord with NPS-UD Objective 3, 6, 7, 8 and Policy 10c. The development of such large urban housing complex contributes to climate change effects. The proposed development results in a significant loss of productive agricultural land. Other environmental issues with negative impact: - Noise from increased traffic and housing - Light pollution from housing and street lighting - Air quality (traffic, urbanisation).	Reject Plan Change 69.	Reject. NPS-UD considered including climate change effects. Loss of agricultural land considered. Changes to ODP in relation to potential provision for schooling following needs assessment. Traffic assessment updated in evidence and changes to ODP. Issues of policing and emergency response outside of plan change.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>Schools in Lincoln are already at the capacity and cater barely for the current residents. With no further upgrade on the horizon parents forced to find schooling in the surrounding communities.</p> <p>Lincoln will change to an urban environment and has sadly nothing left of its village character.</p> <p>The surrounding environment comprising the agricultural land making Liffey-Springs a high-quality living environment. All those aspects I am seeing compromised by further residential subdivision at our doorstep.</p> <p>The transport assessment of the PC69 Appendix D is flawed.</p> <p>Observed an increase in crime rate in community and wonders how the council is addressing the increasing demand in policing and emergency response.</p>		
PC69-0086	Fiona Lynch	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as the Selwyn District Council proposed plan over the last 20 years has never included rezoning this land to the south of Lincoln.</p> <p>Lincoln is already at capacity with the current infrastructure and population number we have. A new Primary School was recently added to cope with the new growth, but not for another 6000 new residents, our sporting facilities are also at capacity.</p> <p>If a road extension is made from Liffey Springs Drive to the proposed subdivision through a current Reserve area this will have a hugely negative effect on the eco system and what was so carefully planned and executed successfully around this area. The extra traffic would also have a negative impact on children walking, cycling and scootering to the new primary school.</p> <p>The change application promotes intensification of rural land, reduction of versatile, highly productive soils (less than 2% of NZ can claim to have the high quality of soil found in Lincoln and surrounds), would bring over 12,000 additional cars to the area putting stress on already compromised roading networks and increasing carbon emissions. There is no provision for alternative power sources such as wind turbines or solar power.</p>	To reject plan change 69 and retain the planning zoning of land for urban use as in the Proposed District Plan notified in 2020.	Reject. Issues relating to infrastructure addressed in Recommendation. Road extension through Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed. Potential traffic effects addressed.
PC69-0087	Katrina Hunter	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change unless there is some reconsideration to ensure that it considers the impacts the rural community it will be encroaching on, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed subdivision will mean that the views of the Port Hills and Southern Alps will be impeded/lost.</li> <li>The high-density housing on the opposite side of Collins Road which will substantially increase the light pollution (from houses and street lighting) and will change the rural feel of the street.</li> <li>The plan change will result in 2 accessways into Lincoln and traffic will increase substantially as people use it as a means to bypass Lincoln central.</li> <li>The noise and dust pollution from a subdivision being built will impact our day to day living for a number of years.</li> </ul>	Reject the plan change in its present form; alternatively amend the ODP to include 4,000m <sup>2</sup> lifestyle properties on the north side of Collins Road.	Reject for reasons addressed in Recommendation. Noise and dust from construction can be assessed and addressed at construction phase.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS009	Support In Part	Light pollution from the proposed subdivision will encroach on existing rural properties to the South of the plan change area.	Developer to provide a large green belt as a buffer zone	Reject. Lighting can be addressed at subdivision stage.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS010	Support In Part	001	Enforce properties along Collins Road to be larger lifestyle blocks.	Reject. Subdivision design addressed at subdivision stage.
PC69-0088	Bernadette Amos	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes any connection to Liffey Springs Drive as part of the plan change. The submitter purchased land and built in the Liffey Springs subdivision in the full knowledge that it was a well-planned and no exit. Liffey Springs Drive is a peaceful residential area and provides a safe environment for children as they walk or ride to Ararira Primary School without the fear of heavy traffic volumes.</p> <p>Infrastructure particularly roading into and out of Lincoln and through Prebbleton is currently only adequate. Ellesmere Road as exists is dangerous with deep open ditches both sides.</p> <p>The scale of the development is immense for the township and the proposal needs to include significant contributions to infrastructure projects.</p> <p>The development on any new subdivision in Lincoln should be within the existing plan parameters and not be a further intrusion into the surrounding rural area containing top class soils.</p>	Not specified.	Reject. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection has been removed. Infrastructure addressed in Recommendation and soils considered.
PC69-0089	Marion Dumaine	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as am doing a bachelor's in environmental science and have learned much about preserving good soils for the right land use. This means not using soils that are of great quality and highly fertile suited to multiple land use for urban development.</p> <p>Plan change 69 would further reduce the beauty of Lincoln, increase traffic and noise in the area, and disturb nature and wildlife.</p> <p>Should look into building vertically, with housing units on top of each other with a small balcony and shared garden. This may not suit families, but would be a good option for elder people, students, or couples.</p>	Not specified.	Reject. Soils addressed in Recommendation. Amenity effects addressed and considered in Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0090	Andrew Savin	001	Oppose	Oppose the change owing to the adverse impact to the Lincoln township infrastructure to support the additional population. Lincoln is a rural, rustic township with roots to farming as reflected by the University ethos and the SDC's own website and advertising as a great place to live. It is does not have the amenities and infrastructure to support this direction.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Infrastructure and amenities addressed in Recommendation.
PC69-0091	Christopher (Chris) Ward	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as does little to meet the purpose of sustainable management found in the RMA. The protection of the versatile soils is vital and the zoning of the land covered by Plan Change 69 should remain as it is. The on-going development of the areas that have been approved have seen an increase in the dust in the air, aggravating respiratory conditions amongst the inhabitants. There is already pressure on the existing facilities in Lincoln and an increase in housing lots as proposed would add significantly to this pressure. Any capacity increase in the three waters' facilities required should be solely at the cost of the developer in these situations and not be a further burden to the general ratepayer base in Selwyn. Springs and Ellesmere Road are already inadequate for the volumes of traffic using these roads. The Plan Change does not fully acknowledge the effect it would have on these roads and the upgrades that would be needed. Open space will be lost in the development as proposed and is not adequately provided for. Lincoln Schools have been under pressure brought on by the very large increase in student numbers as a result of new housing areas. It is unsatisfactory to have planning for such facilities happening "after the fact" with the resulting delays in getting new facilities up and running, detrimentally affecting student learning in crowded classrooms.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues considered and purpose of the Act met by the rezoning. Dust management issue for construction phase. Infrastructure and open space and potential schooling addressed in Recommendation.
PC69-0092	Valma Jean Soper	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to the loss of productive soils, village appeal and lack of adequate infrastructure/services. The land in question is highly suitable for production of food and it would be irresponsible to put houses on some of the best soil types in Canterbury or even in NZ. Many people choose to live in Lincoln for the village appeal. One can walk most places and the community is supportive and caring. It is a rural township. The services in Lincoln are already struggling to support the current population. You cannot easily get a Doctor. Any further population growth of the magnitude planned would put extra stresses on services.	Reject the plan change and keep this land zoned rural.	Reject for reasons addressed in Recommendation. Services such as access to doctors is not a matter which can be addressed at the plan change.
PC69-0093	Joanna Condon and Stephen Higham	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change based on: Impact on transport infrastructure due to unplanned significant population increase is likely to increase the number of injuries and deaths caused by road accidents. The unplanned population increase that this change would bring has not been factored into the development of community facilities such as libraries, sporting and recreational facilities, parks and nature reserves. The current school and early childcare facilities have not been planned to accommodate the population increase that would be created by this plan change. Impact on the special character of the Lincoln township. Loss of highly productive soils.	Reject proposed plan change 69.	Reject. Number of changes to transport infrastructure included. Recreational facilities respond and sporting and reserve modelling incorporates growth from the plan change. Highly productive soils addressed in Recommendation.
PC69-0094	D Ward	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as it will alter the identity and image of Lincoln detrimentally forever. The proposed plan change will increase the population of Lincoln by 67% and require additional infrastructure to provide services, schooling, parks, etc. Schools typically can take up to 6 years to be ready for students and so the existing schools will be under pressure to cope with an influx of new students resulting in larger classes and a poorer education experience. This proposed plan change will turn quiet, beautiful, and safe neighbourhoods into busy, traffic filled and potentially dangerous ones. For example, provision for a bridge to built across reserve land to connect to Liffey Springs Drive. The land that is the subject of the proposed plan change is "some of the most fertile land in Canterbury". In fact it is part of the top 2.5% most fertile land in Canterbury and once it is lost to development. Increased dust in the air, or the increased noise from further, previously unplanned, building activity, the stresses for local residents will increase to unprecedented, and unacceptable levels.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Effects on character of town and versatile soils addressed in Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0095	John and Loraine Somerville	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as the proposal changes the character of the town. Class 1,2,3 versatile land should be preserved as is. The roading cannot cope. Proposal indicates a minimum road width of 13 metres. The current supermarket and medical facilities are undersized for the current population. Would like to see a quota on smaller sections and a higher min size than 400sq m. Smaller sections do not lend themselves to healthy living.	Reject proposal for plan change 69.	Reject. Effects on character of town, versatile soils, transportation and facilities addressed in Recommendation. Quota of small sections inappropriate.
PC69-0096	Anne Caldwell	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as patients already have difficulty accessing the GP following major surgery. The traffic is already busy. Elderly people are struggling already going to the supermarket and parking. Concerned regarding the traffic and safety.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Also note traffic related upgrades required.
PC69-0097	Peter and Catherine Smith	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to loss of quality agricultural and horticultural soils has reached a crisis. Believe time has come to focus on a long-term view and not be drawn into the argument -must save our best soils for current and future food production. Established as New Zealand's first Envirotown, Lincoln has a strong community ethic relating to sustainability and the quality of the living environment. Ring-fencing quality grade soils, such that they can never be encroached upon by urban development, will also create a secure future for farmers.	Reject Plan Change 69 to the Operative Selwyn District Plan.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0098	Bruce & Valmai Gemmell	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This land would better left as farm land.</li> <li>Shopping Centre in Lincoln would need to be improved.</li> <li>Road are not up to standard anymore volume of traffic.</li> <li>There has been two developments going on along Springs Road Te</li> <li>Whariki and Verdeco. No one from those two developments has approach us about sewerage line going in along Springs Road.</li> <li>Dust from development works.</li> <li>Can ground take water in wet winter and the amount springs that in that development 69.</li> <li>Footpaths need looking at.</li> <li>Will there be cycleway going along Springs Road?</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject. Issues identified in submission addressed in Recommendation. Shopping centre in Lincoln not a matter within the plan change but 3 business zones incorporated. Groundwater issues addressed in Recommendation and indicative cycle route along Springs Road.
PC69-0099	Distinguished Professor Philip Hulme	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as it completely ignores the Selwyn District Council Climate Change Policy and has not considered the risks to the proposed site arising from future climate change, particularly flooding risk from rising sea levels. By 2100 most of the area proposed for subdivision will be below sea level.	Reject housing developments planned in areas that are likely to be below sea-level by the end of this century.	Reject. Submission addressed and considered in Recommendation and evidence. Removal of Living X zone assists and modelling for subdivision will include sea level rise inputs.
PC69-0099	Distinguished Professor Philip Hulme	002	Oppose	Opposes further development of impervious land surfaces as a result of new housing and roading infrastructure will exacerbate the existing risks of flooding due to weather bombs similar to that experienced at the end of May 2021. Current stormwater management is insufficient to deal with the current run-off let alone run-off that will arise from new subdivisions in the area.	Reject further subdivision in areas prone to flooding in the future and in particular in the low-lying areas south of Lincoln, especially where current stormwater management is insufficient to deal with extreme rainfall events.	Reject. Living X removed. Stormwater management addressed in Recommendation and will be further addressed at consenting stage.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS011	Support In Part	<i>Will there be adequate stormwater management systems in place to ensure exiting properties are not affected by the extra stormwater runoff that will be a result of the increased impervious areas? Has research been conducted to determine an approximate FGL of the sections and FFL of the homes to ensure residences stay dry in large rain events?</i>	<i>Guarantee from Council and Developer there will be no effects on 36 Collins Rd in regards to stormwater.</i>	<i>Reject. Stormwater management systems will be addressed at consenting stage. Issue addressed in Recommendation.</i>
PC69-0100	Hamish Biggs	001	Oppose	Opposes proposed change for the following reasons. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The impact of existing subdivisions on the schooling, roading, community facilities and other infrastructure is yet to be realised. It would be irresponsible to rezone an area for an additional 2000 households before the impact of the existing developments have been analysed and quantified.</li> <li>Other concerns are: increased traffic on children's safety; noise pollution; light pollution; water quality and quantity (i.e. non-chlorinated drinking water and non-polluted river water); and the overall environmental impact of the development.</li> <li>The economic assessment of the proposal does not adequately quantify the cost of the proposed development.</li> </ul>	Reject the proposed district plan change.	Reject. Impact on the environment considered in Recommendation and will be addressed further at consenting stage. Economic assessment of the proposal expanded upon by evidence at the hearing.
PC69-0101	Martin and Nelia Outram	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as it is outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and the Greenfield Priority Areas shown in Map A of the CRPS. Concerned that it is a large area of rural land that is being zoned to urban use ahead of the NPS on Highly Productive Land. Transport network improvements should be addressed prior to the land being rezoned. Concern over impact on rates for existing residents in Lincoln/Selwyn. Hazard risk of Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere.	Reject the proposal and retain the current Rural Outer Plains zoning.	Reject for reasons addressed in Recommendation including capacity demand assessments, relationship between CRPS and NPS-UD, transport improvements and funding for infrastructure upgrades addressed. Hazards adequately



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
						addressed and will be further addressed at subdivision stage.
PC69-0102	Jeanette Tucker	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposed bypass road that will run through an area currently designated as a reserve and storm water management area. The proposed bypass road will directly negatively impact on submitters property and its value, their enjoyment of the property and negate the reason they chose to purchase in Verdeco Park. Note: supporting information provided.	Remove the bypass from all development plans.	Accept in part. Bypass no longer included on ODP.
PC69-0102	Jeanette Tucker	002	Oppose	Opposes the ODP not indicating any plans for safe road crossings to be installed at Springs Road to allow children from Verdeco Park to safely cross the road to go to schools in Lincoln. Springs Road does not currently have safe turning lanes/slipways to and from Verdeco Park. With increased traffic, these will be required. The proposed roads connecting the new Lincoln South development with Verdeco Park are proposed in areas where there is no clear connection point as it is adjacent to large semi-rural sections that are already in development. Note: Supporting information provided.	Requests Council require the developer to contribute to the upgrade of the roundabout to an interchange with traffic lights; Require the developer to provide safe road crossings for Springs Road and a turning lane into Verdeco Park.	Reject. Traffic upgrade now specified in ODP address issues identified.
PC69-0102	Jeanette Tucker	003	Oppose In Part	Opposes the plan change as it does not state how it intends to comply with National Policy Statement for Fresh Water Management (2020) with regards to interception of ground water and work adjacent and within existing wetlands and streams. Does not explain how the filling that will be required will impact on downstream catchments and properties, including in Verdeco Park and the L2 River catchments. Note: Supporting information provided.	Request the developer give further clarity on how the realignment of drainage channels, interception of springs and ground water would meet NPS and document plans to mitigate flooding risk as a result of the filling required.	Reject. NPS-FM addressed and considered in Recommendation and interception of groundwater and work adjacent to existing wetlands and streams assessed in Recommendation.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS012	Support In Part	No reference to ensure existing wetlands, streams and drains will not be adversely affected.	Guarantee from Council and Developer there will be no effects on 36 Collins Rd in regards to stormwater and existing drains.	Reject. Wetlands, streams and drains adequately addressed in evidence, Recommendation and ODP.
PC69-0102	Jeanette Tucker	004	Oppose In Part	Opposes plan change using wastewater overflow ponds to compensate for lack of treatment capacity. Note: Supporting information provided.	Reject the request to amend Rule 4.9.32 and maintain the requirement of a setback of at least 150m from the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant and Allandale Pump Station. Amend plan change to require the developer to upgrade the wastewater treatment plant; or make an appropriate contribution to the upgrade; reduce the number of sections to fit within the capacity of the existing infrastructure.	Reject.. 100m setback and associated provisions included are appropriate. Funding of any upgrades addressed under the Local Government Act.
PC69-0102	Jeanette Tucker	005	Oppose In Part	Opposes the lack of education facilities, dog park, swimming pool, medical facilities and commercial facilities, to accommodate the increased population allowed for in the current ODP. Note: Supporting information provided.	Amend the ODP to make land available for schools and council facilities; or alternatively require an undertaking from the developer that land will be made available.	Reject for reasons addressed in Recommendation. Note additional business zones and reference to educational facilities in ODP and rules.
PC69-0102	Jeanette Tucker	006	Oppose In Part	Opposes the lack of plans in place to protect springs and wetlands. Lincoln is an EcoTown and the same principles should be applied to the proposed Lincoln South development. Note: Supporting information provided.	Amend the ODP to protect springs and wetlands in accordance with the measures identified in its ecological response.	Accept in part. Issues relating to protection of springs and wetlands addressed and provisions strengthened.
PC69-0102	Jeanette Tucker	007	Oppose In Part	Opposes the scale of the plan change being disproportionate to the existing size of Lincoln. Layout is not in keeping with the semi-rural character of Lincoln. The proposed Lincoln South development does not contribute to a well-functioning urban environment and does not comply with Objectives 1, 3, 6 and 8 of NPS-UD. Note: Supporting information provided.	Reject the plan change in its current form, or alternatively reduce the number of sections.	Reject. Reduction in number of sections may impact on meeting a number of the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD and Council's function to provide at least sufficient development capacity.
PC69-0103	Donna Rurehe	001	Oppose	Opposes the plan change in full.	Reject the plan change.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Rezoning most appropriate.
PC69-0104	Maureen Mulcahy	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as has concerns about the impact of the planned traffic lights and increase of traffic, traffic noise due to the stop/starting of cars directly outside house and the increased vehicle pollution affecting health and devaluing property. Opposes use of productive land for housing. Lincoln does not have the capacity in the current Community Centre, sports fields, library etc to cater for the increase of the population.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues identified addressed in Recommendation in terms of productive land, capacity for community facilities and benefits of traffic lights to address existing and future traffic capacity issues.
PC69-0105	Ngaere Carolan	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposed plan change; main objections being the increased traffic flow using Springs Road to the north of Lincoln. This would impact on Prebbleton residents as they go about their daily business.	Reject plan change 69 until the necessary infrastructure is in place.	Reject. Matter considered in Recommendation. Works being undertaken to address impact on Prebbleton residents.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				The addition of several hundred senior residents living in the two planned Retirement Villages further adds to our vulnerable and at-risk residents.		
PC69-0106	Janine Sidery	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 due to climate change, environmental issues (including recognition of soil quality and uniqueness), flooding schooling and recreation demands, unique character (and history) of Lincoln, transport and traffic issues (which are now at their limits with regards to safety), and post-Earthquake demand for new housing.</p> <p>The applicant has not indicated how it will ensure that each piece of land it sells will have an 'affordable' home built on it.</p> <p>Any use of the reserve lands to make Liffey Springs Drive a thoroughfare to the new subdivision will negatively impact on the reserve values and the eco system.</p> <p>Proposal is inconsistent with the NPS-UD, Objectives 1, 2, 6, 7 &amp; 8.</p>	Reject Change 69 to Operative Plan.	Reject. Issues identified addressed in evidence and Recommendation. Economic evidence in terms of benefits of additional supply on land values. Proposal consistent with the NPS-UD. Connection through to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0107	Jo Wager	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as it would have significant adverse effects across the community.</p> <p>Housing should be built closer to Christchurch City to reduce the environmental effects of travel by car.</p> <p>Disruption caused by noise, pollution, traffic accidents, overloaded roading network.</p> <p>Good, productive farmland should not be built on.</p> <p>Disruption to the enjoyment of users of the Rail Trail cycleway with the addition of roads, housing, etc.</p> <p>Lincoln is a rural community with a village feel this can be sustained with the addition of a huge subdivision. Lincoln would become another "Rolleston".</p>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Potential adverse effects addressed in Recommendation. Productive farm land addressed and considered. Character effects assessed and roading network not considered to have any effect on rail trail cycleway.
PC69-0108	Richard Wager	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposed plan for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The road network does not cater for such development and its creation would divert SDC funds from projects of greater benefit to the community.</li> <li>The nature of Lincoln as a community and country town would be permanently changed.</li> <li>It is not a sustainable direction for Christchurch or Selwyn to progress with more and more housing further from Christchurch city, requiring a large increase in car travel, pollution and traffic noise and risk of accidents.</li> <li>The loss of yet more prime agricultural land to housing.</li> <li>The loss of the amenity of reserve area and open countryside.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Matters addressed and considered.
PC69-0109	Chris Feltham	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This will change the small village feel of Lincoln. There is limited infrastructure in Lincoln as it is and to more than double the population needs huge investment into the area to cope with the population increase</li> <li>The water and sewage infrastructure would also need upgrading as even now in the summer there are water restrictions. Liffey Springs Drive does not have much traffic; the proposal at a later stage to carve a road through the river and into Liffey Spring Drive would mean possibly up to 2000 extra cars on the road which is unacceptable.</li> <li>We have seen no details but the plan if it was to proceed would need at least one extra school, sports grounds, children's playground, parks and shops to be able to cope with the increase. Also a new supermarket. The land is good for farming ground and there is limited amount of this type of land in the Canterbury Plains.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Note connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0110	Sue and Ken Beechey	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change having the following concerns and objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land is on valuable pasture and crop soils and is part of only 2.5% of the remaining fertile soils left in Canterbury and should not be used for housing.</li> <li>The roads are already extremely busy without more demand from having such a huge population growth in the district.</li> <li>The proposal does not allow for additional schools and sports fields which would be required.</li> <li>The current infrastructure would not cope with such a large development.</li> <li>The main attraction of moving to Lincoln for us was the village feel which would be lost with the almost doubling up of households.</li> <li>The density of housing on the plan does not fit with countryside living and would seem more suitable for the city.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Matters addressed and considered.
PC69-0111	Tiffany McCrean-Lennon and Dave Lennon	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change having the following concerns and objections:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land is on valuable pasture and crop soils and is part of only 2.5% of the remaining fertile soils left in Canterbury and should not be used for housing.</li> <li>The roads are already extremely busy without more demand from having such a huge population growth in the district.</li> </ul>	Oppose	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Living Z zone appropriate. No evidence to suggest GV of current housing in the area will be lowered. Assessment of likely effects appropriate rather than consideration of GV.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposal does not allow for additional schools and sports fields which would be required with the population growth.</li> <li>The current infrastructure would not cope with such a large development. There would have been no long-term Lincoln Future Planning for such a huge increase of population.</li> <li>The main attraction of moving to Lincoln for us was the village feel which would be lost with the almost doubling up of households.</li> <li>The density of housing on the plan does not fit with countryside living and would seem more suitable for the city.</li> <li>There is also a concern that sections and houses will be a small, allowing cheaper builds and lowering the GV of current housing in the area.</li> </ul>		
PC69-0112	Alison Goodfellow	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69, the main concern being the negative effect new housing development would have on roads, traffic and public safety throughout the wider area. Selwyn roads, particularly Springs and Shands Roads are already overburdened and inadequate for current usage. A further 2500 households in Lincoln would seriously exacerbate pressure on our roading system generally. Our roads and traffic control measures are simply inadequate for such an increase. The safety and wellbeing of our communities should be our priority.	Reject plan change 69 until ratepayers can be assured that our roads, and communities, will not be subjected to unsustainable traffic pressure.	Reject for reasons addressed in Recommendation and discussions on transportation related issues.
PC69-0113	Not allocated					
PC69-0114	Jennifer and John Anderson	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Wasting valuable farmland which has some of the best soil in the world. Lincoln was never designed for high density housing.</li> <li>Lincoln does not have the infrastructure to cope with all the extra traffic this would bring.</li> <li>Building a road through a council reserve to go down Liffey Springs Drive would make this a main thoroughfare.</li> <li>There are not the medical facilities to cope with approximately an extra 6000 people.</li> <li>Concerned at fire services ability to cope with this development.</li> <li>Built in Lincoln with a semi-rural lifestyle in mind.</li> <li>Further expansion should be in Rolleston.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. While Rolleston is the focus of growth, Lincoln is a KAC and growth anticipated.
PC69-0115	Rebecca	001	Support	Supports the rezoning approximately 190ha of farmland to residential and business areas as it will help increase housing supply and hence help improve housing affordability. It will help to improve the business sector in Lincoln and provide a more self-reliant district. This will also help to reduce traffic flow to Christchurch City. Furthermore, it will help to take the pressure off housing demand in Christchurch City. Rezoning this section of farmland will help to achieve Objective 2 of the NPS on Urban Development 2020, which states that local authorities must provide at least sufficient development capacity.	Not specified.	Accept. In terms of Objective 2 of the NPS-UD and growth, will assist business sector in Lincoln.
PC69-0116	Hamish & Mary Hamilton	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as considers SDC current and proposed plans regarding zoning of land should be followed based on their historic record of accommodating climate change, environmental issues(including recognition of soil quality and uniqueness), schooling and recreation demands, unique character of Lincoln, transport and traffic issues, post-Earthquake demand for new housing. Connectivity to Christchurch city is a huge issue, Ellesmere, Springs Road Edward &amp; Gerald St are becoming traffic intense.</p> <p>Current sports facilities and schools are not capable of providing for the additional 6000 new residents.</p> <p>Opposes any proposal that links with Liffey Springs Drive.</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to the retention of first class productive soil for future sustainability and economic reasons.</p>	Reject Plan Change 69.	Reject for the reasons addressed in Recommendation. Issues raised all addressed and considered. Note proposed linkage to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0117	Diane Sparks	001	Oppose	Opposes the subdivision as would not want the vehicular road to come through Liffey Springs Drive (don't mind a cycle way or walkway). Believe it would be necessary with access through other roads. Insufficient infrastructure for this many properties.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Note proposed linkage to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed. Infrastructure issues addressed and considered.
PC69-0118	Ian McIntosh	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as land has high agricultural value &amp; should therefore be protected from residential development, especially with some sections being 3,000-4000m<sup>2</sup>; this is squandering productive land.</p> <p>The infrastructure of Lincoln is not sufficient to handle such a large development.</p> <p>The traffic intensity on Springs Road will become too intensive.</p>	Reject the plan change; or alternatively amend to ensure that all sections are no bigger than 1,000m <sup>2</sup> .	Reject. Agricultural values/soil addressed. Living Z zone provides for range of section sizes. Traffic and infrastructure issues addressed.
PC69-0119	Gifford Alexander Scott	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change 69 on the basis that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Puts a road through the current Liffey Springs Reserve and the construction of an access bridge. We bought our property simply to enjoy our park- like outlook as well as the reserve.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject but note proposed linkage to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed. Versatile soil issues addressed and considered and traffic related matters also addressed in Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Liffey Springs Drive becoming a busy thoroughfare and the detrimental impact on the value of our home.</li> <li>Extra heavy vehicles, trades vehicles, and commuting cars because their increased emissions will have a detrimental effect on our health.</li> <li>Subdivision being developed on an area of arable farm land of Versatile Soil, and there is less than 2% of these soils left here in Canterbury.</li> </ul>		
PC69-0120	Jacoba Hurst	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the rezoning, reasons being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Transport Infrastructure - the new motorway has done nothing to improve our driving time into Christchurch. The problem is that the new motorway was really to connect Rolleston. It is very hard to even get onto Shands road from Weedons Road. Going to school and having to cross Gerard Street from either Vernon drive or West belt street is a nightmare in the mornings with the amount of cars on the road.</li> <li>Schooling - concerned that proposal will result in immense pressure and overpopulation of students due to the rapid growth in Lincoln. Lincoln Primary had to split the school for the juniors to go off campus to a new site for close to 2 years. The stress and unsettledness it caused the students, teachers and family was huge. Adding another 2,000 homes will put even more pressure on the system</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Transportation matters addressed and considered. Issues relating to crossing Gerald Street addressed in evidence of Mr Mazey and subject to a separate process. Changes made to the ODP and plan provisions in relation to potential schooling needs.
PC69-0121	Tania & Charles Hefer	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposed bypass road that will run through an area currently designated as a reserve and storm water management area. The proposed bypass road will directly negatively impact on submitters property and its value, their enjoyment of the property and negate the reason they chose to purchase in Verdec Park.</p> <p>Note: supporting information provided.</p>	Remove the bypass from all development plans.	Reject. Note Bypass removed.
PC69-0121	Tania & Charles Hefer	002	Oppose	<p>Opposes the ODP not indicating any plans for safe road crossings to be installed at Springs Road to allow children from Verdec Park to safely cross the road to go to schools in Lincoln. Springs Road does not currently have safe turning lanes/slipways to and from Verdec Park. With increased traffic, these will be required. The proposed roads connecting the new Lincoln South development with Verdec Park are proposed in areas where there is no clear connection point as it is adjacent to large semi-rural sections that are already in development.</p> <p>Note: Supporting information provided.</p>	<p>Requests Council require the developer to contribute to the upgrade of the roundabout to an interchange with traffic lights;</p> <p>Require the developer to provide safe road crossings for Springs Road and a turning lane into Verdec Park.</p>	Reject. Decisions requested addressed in the ODP other than turning lane into Verdec Park.
PC69-0121	Tania & Charles Hefer	003	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change as it does not state how it intends to comply with National Policy Statement for Fresh Water Management (2020) with regards to interception of ground water and work adjacent and within existing wetlands and streams. Does not explain how the filling that will be required will impact on downstream catchments and properties.</p> <p>Note: Supporting information provided.</p>	Request the developer give further clarity on how the realignment of drainage channels, interception of springs and ground water would meet NPS and document plans to mitigate flooding risk as a result of the filling required.	Reject. Further information provided through the hearings process in relation to issues identified. Appropriate methods to mitigate flooding risk and will require full assessment at subdivision and stormwater discharge consent stage.
PC69-0121	Tania & Charles Hefer	004	Oppose In Part	<p>Opposes plan change using wastewater overflow ponds to compensate for lack of treatment capacity.</p> <p>Note: Supporting information provided.</p>	<p>Reject the request to amend Rule 4.9.32 and maintain the requirement of a setback of at least 150m from the Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant and Allandale Pump Station.</p> <p>Amend plan change to require the developer to upgrade the wastewater treatment plant; or make an appropriate contribution to the upgrade; reduce the number of sections to fit within the capacity of the existing infrastructure.</p>	Reject. 100m setback and associated provisions included and appropriate. Funding of any upgrades addressed under the Local Government Act.
PC69-0121	Tania & Charles Hefer	005	Oppose In Part	<p>Opposes the lack of education facilities, dog park, swimming pool, medical facilities and commercial facilities, to accommodate the increased population allowed for in the current ODP.</p> <p>Note: Supporting information provided.</p>	Amend the ODP to make land available for schools and council facilities; or alternatively require an undertaking from the developer that land will be made available.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Potential for education facilities addressed in ODP and rules.
PC69-0121	Tania & Charles Hefer	006	Oppose In Part	<p>Opposes the lack of plans in place to protect springs and wetlands. Lincoln is an EcoTown and the same principles should be applied to the proposed Lincoln South development.</p> <p>Note: Supporting information provided.</p>	Amend the ODP to protect springs and wetlands in accordance with the measures identified in its ecological response.	Accept in part. Amendments to ODP made to protect springs and wetlands including increased setback, management plans and evidence on construction techniques available.
PC69-0121	Tania & Charles Hefer	007	Oppose In Part	<p>Opposes the scale of the plan change being disproportionate to the existing size of Lincoln. Layout is not in keeping with the semi-rural character of Lincoln. The proposed Lincoln South development does not contribute to a well-functioning urban environment and does not comply with Objectives 1, 3, 6 and 8 of NPS-UD.</p> <p>Note: Supporting information provided.</p>	Reject the plan change in its current form, or alternatively reduce the number of sections.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation including findings that PC69 does contribute to well-functioning urban environments.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0122	Robyn and David Painter	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as it would result in unacceptable use of highly productive agricultural land, have adverse effects on Lincoln Liveability, have adverse effects on horizontal infrastructure capacity, have adverse effects on transport vehicle emissions and disrupt Selwyn District present and future transport and traffic systems. Plan change is not supported by the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 and National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (due to take effect late this year, 2021). Note: supporting information provided.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues identified in submission have been addressed in Recommendation and evidence. Findings made in relation to NPS-UD with particular regard had to capacity provided.
PC69-0123	Tracey MacLeod and Nicki Turner	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 due to climate change, environmental issues (including recognition of soil quality and uniqueness), flooding schooling and recreation demands, unique character (and history) of Lincoln, transport and traffic issues (which are now at their limits with regards to safety), and post-Earthquake demand for new housing. The applicant has not indicated how it will ensure that each piece of land it sells will have an 'affordable' home built on it. Any use of the reserve lands to make Liffey Springs Drive a thoroughfare to the new subdivision will negatively impact on the reserve values and the ecosystem. Proposal is inconsistent with the NPS-UD, Objectives 1, 2, 6, 7, 8 & 10.	Reject Change 69 to Operative Plan.	Reject. Issues identified addressed in evidence and Recommendation. Economic evidence in terms of benefits of additional supply on land values. Proposal consistent with the NPS-UD. Connection through to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0124	John and Rosemary Hewson	001	Oppose	Opposes the plan change proposal in full as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The land is on valuable pasture and crop soils and is part of only 2.5% of the remaining fertile soils left in Canterbury</li> <li>Roads are already extremely busy without more demand from having such a huge population growth in the district. The main access roads are already under stress and will not cope with the additional heavy traffic load.</li> <li>The proposal does not allow for additional schools and sports fields which would be required with the population growth.</li> <li>Current infrastructure would not cope with such a large development. Village feel being eroded due to current developments and would be totally lost with almost doubling up of households.</li> <li>Number and size of the proposed sections would completely change the demographic of Lincoln.</li> <li>Density of housing does not fit with countryside living</li> <li>Appears to be sufficient sections available for Lincoln's projected population growth.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69 in full.	Reject. Issues identified in submission have been addressed in the evidence and Recommendation. Expert evidence is that there is a considerable lack of section capacity.
PC69-0125	Barbara Forbes	001	Oppose In Part	Roads must be wide enough and there must be adequate provision made for parking to allow emergency vehicles to access houses and ability for bus routes. If sufficient allowance is not made for bus access more residents will drive their cars adding to NZ's carbon emissions.	Request that the density of housing and roading allows for access for emergency vehicles & buses.	Reject but note emergency access and bus routes provided for. Park and ride facility now incorporated.
PC69-0125	Barbara Forbes	002	Oppose In Part	The amount of space reserved does not appear to be sufficient to be consistent with the District's policies.	Amend plan change to increase the amount of green space to be consistent with the Selwyn District policies.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Evidence of Mr Rykers and others illustrates green space is consistent with relevant policies.
PC69-0125	Barbara Forbes	003	Oppose In Part	The proposed rezoning does not allow for sufficient diversity of housing and provision of living zones which are less busy and more spacious than in residential areas in metropolitan centres.	Amend to increase the amount of land zoned for low density.	Reject. Living Z zone provides for appropriate range of allotment sizes.
PC69-0125	Barbara Forbes	004	Oppose In Part	Opposes the development having a significant impact on facilities and infrastructure in Lincoln. Zoning should allow for adequate facilities such as schools and businesses.	Amend to increase the amount of land zoned for schools, daycares, medical clinics, businesses and other facilities as appropriate.	Reject. Land zoned Business 1 is increased with the addition of two further areas. Amendments to rules and policies to ensure, subject to a needs assessment, that additional land for schooling would be considered.
PC69-0126	Maree Lysaght	001	Oppose In Part	Oppose the proposed connection to Liffey Springs Drive. Connection is proposed to go over a reserve that follows the Liffey River and is used by the community as a green space. A pedestrian crossing could be used here instead to allow children to walk to the school, but remain a green safe place for all of the community to use. Secondly there is a proposed development to go ahead in the 23-hectare block bounded by Edward Street, Ellesmere Lane and the Liffey River. This will put considerable pressure on the Russ – Liffey Springs Drive intersection, which would in turn be exacerbated were a direct connection to the new subdivision facilitated by Plan Change 69 be provided. This intersection is next to a school and no consideration has been given to this.	Not specified.	Reject but not connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0127	David Whale	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 being concerned regarding: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enhanced risk of flooding on lower lying land and increase in L2 levels. Raised land levels for building platforms and hard surfaces will increase runoff rate.</li> </ul>	Reject Plan Change 69.	Reject. Flooding and traffic issues addressed in evidence and Recommendation, and changes to

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic on Ellesmere Road from development of Moirs Lane and the likelihood that Collins Road is formed to join Hudsons Road.</li> <li>Increased likelihood that there will be pressure to develop the land East of this proposal adjacent to Ellesmere &amp; Hudsons Roads.</li> <li>Will convert Lincoln into nothing more than a dormitory town for those working in Rolleston and Christchurch, totally destroying its current character.</li> <li>Should be striving for improvement rather than status quo.</li> </ul> <p>There is no analysis of the impacts on the environment around the proposal and instead draws on the fact that other developments have been allowed and should be seen as a precedent for this proposal.</p>		the ODP. Impacts on the environment have been undertaken and changes to the ODP made.
PC69-0128	Bob Heinz	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to impact on Liffey Springs Drive. The proposal to connect a road from a huge new subdivision through the reserve into Liffey Springs Drive spells disaster for the area, which will inevitably become a busy main road with speeding vehicles a major concern. Arariua school is only a few metres away, children on bikes and scooters as well as pedestrians will be in constant danger and many residents can expect to find their properties devalued.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject but note connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0129	Jane Heinz	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as Lincoln does not have the roading and infrastructure to cope with all the people that this subdivision will produce. Opposes the use such high quality arable soil for housing. If a road extension is made from Liffey Springs to the proposed subdivision truck and trade vehicles will use this road as a thoroughfare, shortcut, endangering children and have a negative impact on the ecosystem and beautiful green space that SDC has so carefully planned and executed in this area.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Roding, infrastructure and soil issues addressed in Recommendation and appropriately addressed by plan change. In terms of connection to Liffey Springs Drive, this is no longer proposed.
PC69-0130	Tim Presland	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to increased traffic to Liffey Springs Drive, to effectively become a thoroughfare for vehicles, increasing unnecessary traffic and road noise creating 'bottleneck' with safety implications. Creates no direct benefit and encroaches on existing public reserve space and outlook.	Delete secondary road (possible future connection) to Liffey Springs Drive. Restrict any such access to be Cycle or Walkway only. Promote Road Access via Ellesmere Road.	Accept in part noting connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0130	Tim Presland	002	Support In Part	Supports roundabout solution to assist traffic flow from all directions. Will act as a natural speed deterrent from those travelling from Tai Tapu direction towards Lincoln, improve Safety and reduce excessive road noise in this area.	Approve installation of a Roundabout at Edward Street/Ellesmere Road/Lincoln Tai Tapu Road Intersection.	Accept in part. Issue addressed.
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	001	Oppose In Part	Considers that the proposed area is outside the growth area identified in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the Urban Growth Overlay (Proposed Plan). The Canterbury DHB are not satisfied that the section 32 evaluation adequately assessed the impact on social wellbeing or demonstrated the social benefits of the proposed plan change. The Canterbury DHB questions whether a development of this scale would require changes to current amenities that would be inconsistent with the character of Lincoln as small semi-rural town. The community has continually indicated a desire for a consolidated urban form. While the proposal is located adjacent to an existing township it detracts from the existing strategic planning that has carefully considered areas for future growth and rapid transport planning. Continued building in the current form of medium-low density residential subdivisions in Lincoln, although economically feasible, may be flawed in a number of ways, both socially and environmentally, including impractical in the long-term unless uncoupled from fossil fuel dependency.	Requests that the proposal be granted subject to a detailed social or integrated impact assessment concluding that this level of growth is desirable to the Lincoln community and the wider region.	Reject. Overall I am satisfied that there are benefits from the plan change in terms of social well-being which are achieved from a number of aspects of the proposal. These include provision of housing capacity in an area where, on the evidence, there is high demand, and poor supply. Providing that supply in an area of high demand improves social well-being. There are economic benefits which have been addressed in Recommendation. Increased employment opportunities and increased spending tend to create a more self-sufficient town and again can contribute to social well-being. I acknowledge that there may be some diminution in the appreciation of the status quo but I do not consider that of itself raises any real concern in relation to social well-being. In any event, such is recognised by Policy 6(b) of the NPS-UD. I also consider the benefits of urban development, given my findings in relation to Policy 1 of the NPS-UD, and overall, I am satisfied that this plan change in this location is desirable. It is in a consolidated form and well designed urban growth can provide real social benefits.
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	002	Oppose In Part	Opposes development of highly productive land. The Land Use classification is 1, 2 and 3 (highly productive land). If this land is built over, that productive soil for food production is lost forever. As is the local connection for residents to the land and where and how food is grown. To move food growing to less productive land requires increased usage of fertilisers and water.	Requests that the proposal be granted subject to the applicant demonstrating that the ODP proposal is the most appropriate option based on a consideration of the feasibility of alternative locations and options to provide for the demand, and an assessment of the full	Reject. Addressed the highly productive land issues in Recommendation and in the circumstances of the demonstrated shortage of development capacity, I am satisfied that the

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>The draft National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL), currently under Ministerial review, proposes that councils will be required to consider the availability of highly productive land within their region or district for primary production now and for future generations. The urban expansion policy in the proposed NPS-HPL would only allow urban expansion to occur on HPL when there is a shortage of development capacity (as defined in the proposed NPS-UD) to meet demand and it can be demonstrated that it is the most appropriate option.</p> <p>The Canterbury DHB are not satisfied that the Section 32 evaluation adequately assessed the impact on the full range of benefits and costs, especially social wellbeing, of the proposed development.</p>	range of benefits and costs (social, economic, environmental and cultural) from allowing urban expansion onto HPL compared to continued use of that land for land-based primary production; and the ODP including more green space that could be used for community gardens to enable local food production and increase food resilience.	rezoning is the most appropriate option for this land.
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	003	Oppose In Part	<p>The Canterbury DHB supports the aim of the plan change ‘to create diversity and variety of housing typology without compromising lifestyle.</p> <p>The provision of smaller residential lot sizes are recognised as an important method to reduce sale prices and meet the demands of a greater proportion of the community, particularly first home buyers seeking a warm, energy efficient home that meets modern lifestyle needs. The density provides for a mix of dwelling types and lot sizes to cater to a wide range of the residential market. It allows for people of different ages and incomes to mix and create a diverse community, as well as for people to move within the development as their needs change’.</p> <p>The Canterbury DHB notes the proposed plan only enables medium-high density housing in a small area, it does not prescribe it. The majority of the proposed Living Zones are medium to low density. To satisfy the objectives of the NPS-UD enabling greenfield development outside of strategically agreed areas more medium to high-density housing would be required.</p> <p>The Canterbury DHB is not satisfied the proposed ODP would deliver enough diverse or affordable housing.</p>	The Canterbury DHB seeks that the proposal be granted subject to increased provision for medium-high density housing and ensures it is prescribed; and enables homes to be built that can cope with the effects of climate change.	Reject in part. The Living Z zoning provides for a mix of dwelling types and lot sizes.
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	004	Oppose In Part	<p>Canterbury DHB disagree with the findings of the Section 32 assessment that the ODP has “suitable provision for business, through a small local centre that will service local needs and supplement the services otherwise found in the Lincoln commercial centre.” The size of the development is not considered suitable to service the many needs of residents of 2000 homes.</p> <p>The Canterbury DHB is not satisfied that it would be viable for local services to service such a large increase in population or that they would be accessible enough. The ODP is outside a recommended walkable catchment of 500m to existing services and amenities in Lincoln.</p> <p>The Canterbury DHB would like details on how the proposal reflects the values and tikanga of local iwi Te Taumutu Rūnanga outside of the impact on natural resources.</p>	The Canterbury DHB seeks that the proposal be granted subject to increasing the size of commercial/business zones; undertaking a community planning study or social plan; ensure drinking fountains and accessible amenities are incorporated into the designs of green corridor, the reserves and other public spaces; and incorporate the principles and policies identified in the Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines into the development designs.	Accept in part. The additional two business zones provide for local services that are readily accessible.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS015	Support	<i>Agree the proposed amenities and small local centre need to be much larger in order to support a development of this size.</i>	<i>Increase commercial and retail space so residents have better access to amenities that are within walking distance.</i>	<i>Accept in part. Additional business zones now incorporated.</i>
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	005	Support In Part	<p>The 2021-2031 Selwyn Long Term Plan indicates that no improvements to the Springs Road/Gerald Street/Ellesmere Road area is planned until after 2031. Although a park and ride facility is planned it is unlikely to be within a walkable catchment of the ODP. The proposal notes a development contribution to the Ellesmere Junction Road/Springs Road/Gerald Street traffic signals and to Edward Street. Traffic volumes generated by the proposal would mean the intersection would be over capacity. A further bypass road would not necessarily help as this would not provide direct access to Lincoln or Shands Road – the main arterial into Christchurch.</p> <p>The Canterbury DHB supports the provision of walking and cycling trails to enable active transport. It recommends the ‘orange’ Green Link and cycle way indicated on the Movement and Connectivity map be confirmed to enable better connection to the Lincoln town centre and current education facilities which are currently outside of the 800m walkable catchment.</p>	The Canterbury DHB seeks that the proposal be granted subject to confirmation of the orange potential cycle way; ensuring road links through Verdeco Park, Te Whāriki and Liffey Springs Road are possible to ensure permeability, accessibility, and create alternate driving routes to Lincoln Town Centre; and adequate provision for public transport infrastructure (including road size) is built early, and work closely with Environment Canterbury to ensure public transport options are available.	Accept in part. The cycle links through the cycleways and walkway links are appropriate. Infrastructure has adequate provision for public transport, including the park and ride facility for up to 75 vehicles now proposed. While road links through Te Whāriki are limited, there are benefits in not proceeding with the proposed Liffey Springs Drive link and in my view that has real benefits including in terms of social well-being.
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	006	Oppose In Part	Opposes the reliance on private vehicles for residents to access services and employment. Current amenities (education, commercial, retail, medical and community facilities) are outside of the 800m walkable catchment. The net greenhouse gas emissions from the location and size of the development would far exceed any small reductions for short local trips.	Requests that the proposal be granted subject to confirmation the orange potential cycle way on Map as a confirmed option; EV charging infrastructure be integrated in the plans; proactive planning be undertaken to ensure public transport routes will service development as early as possible.	Accept in part. EV charging infrastructure can be addressed at subdivision stage. The inclusion of the park and ride facility will increase opportunities for public transport servicing.
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	007	Support In Part	The Canterbury DHB support the connection to the reticulated network. As there are several proposals for drinking water supply, any granting of the plan change should be conditional to ensuring that the current system has capacity and/or facilitates the necessary upgrades.	The Canterbury DHB requests the proposal be granted subject to the ODP being connected to the reticulated water network and any required network upgrades are undertaken as a development contribution; the	Accept in part. ODP able to be connected to reticulated water network and any required network upgrades would be contributed to. PC69 now includes greater certainty in relation to protection of groundwater flow and the



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				Maintaining groundwater flow to the springs is paramount to their future viability. Freshwater is also vulnerable to climate change, as water in our rivers, lakes, estuaries and wetlands will become warmer as air temperature increases.	development incorporating all key design features recommended in the Ecological Assessment.	maintenance and potential enhancement of waterways and wetlands.
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	008	Support In Part	The Canterbury DHB support the connection to the reticulated wastewater network. Any granting of the plan change should be conditional to ensuring that the current system has capacity and/or the applicant partners with Council to facilitate necessary upgrades.	The Canterbury DHB seeks that the proposal be granted subject to any required wastewater network upgrades deemed necessary to meet system capacity requirements are undertaken as a development contribution.	Accept in part. Satisfied that any wastewater network upgrades deemed necessary will be contributed to either through development contributions, or met.
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	009	Support In Part	The Canterbury DHB supports the proposal for a wetland, detention basin and first flush basin to facilitate treatment of stormwater. Tārekeautuku Yarrs Lagoon is nearby to the proposed site and is only mentioned in a limited manner in the infrastructure assessment. Given the importance of this wetland/lagoon for freshwater quality, a more detailed assessment of the impacts from the proposed plan is recommended. Domestic stormwater holding tanks provide significant additional capacity during heavy rainfall events and reduce pressure on the stormwater network. Rules requiring the installation of these should be given consideration.	The Canterbury DHB seeks that the proposal be granted subject to a more detailed assessment of the impacts on the Tārekeautuku Yarrs Lagoon is undertaken. That rules requiring the installation of domestic stormwater holding tanks be given consideration.	Accept in part. Detailed assessments can be undertaken at subdivision stage but I am satisfied that is appropriate.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS016	Support	<i>Each new residential lot should be in some way responsible for stormwater management either through a crate or soak ring system. This will reduce water run off during the large rain events.</i>	<i>Investigate viability of crate systems per lot and enforce as a condition of any RC.</i>	<i>Reject. A matter for subdivision/stormwater discharge consent.</i>
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	010	Support In Part	The Canterbury DHB supports the proposal to raise the minimum floor level. This is particularly pertinent given the location of the proposal in the lower catchment of the Selwyn-Waihora Zone.	Not specified.	Accept in part. Minimum floor levels can be addressed at subdivision stage. Removal of Living X zone renders that appropriate.
PC69-0131	Canterbury District Health Board	011	Support In Part	Reverse sensitivity in and around the Canterbury region has led to a reduction in amenity value and consequent odour complaints. The Canterbury DHB note that this proposal has the potential to facilitate further odour complaints.	Not specified.	Accept in part. Odour effects and reverse sensitivity have been addressed in the evidence and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0132	John and Jillian Lindsay	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is not consistent with SDP Objective B3.3.3 and Policy B4.3.1.</li> <li>The remaining rural areas of productive farmland should be protected and remain as is.</li> <li>Will have a major detrimental impact on the existing Lincoln Infrastructure, including but not limited to: Climate change, environmental issues including the soil quality of the proposed area, transport, and traffic issues.</li> <li>Does not adhere to recommended Township objectives and policies for Living Z zone.</li> <li>Does not adequately meet the requirement of Objective 2.</li> <li>It is unclear whether the proposed bridge and road through an existing reserve onto Liffey Springs Drive is still in the Development Plan or not.</li> </ul>	Refuse plan change 69.	Reject for the reasons recorded in Recommendation. Objective B3.3.3 is met with the provision for a larger site around the Chudleigh Homestead and its immediate surround that accounts for heritage values and settings associated with the building which are to be provided at the time of subdivision. Inconsistency with Policy B4.3.1 relating to existing zoned land and greenfield priority areas is acknowledged but NPS-UD provides for unanticipated and out-of-sequence proposals to be considered. Proposed bridge and road connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0133	Robin Spreag	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change to protect what is left of the highly productive land resource within the district for the benefit of present and future generations. The present rate of growth around Lincoln is un-sustainable and will ultimately ruin its character and appeal. Finally, the need for housing should be satisfied by the urbanization of less productive areas like Rolleston and West Melton where the land is productively poor yet has better amenities and roading.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0134	Gareth Oldman	001	Oppose	Opposes rezoning and loss of extremely fertile soil if this development went ahead. There are better locations. Lincoln does not have the infrastructure to support a significant growth in population. Concerned about Liffey Springs Drive becoming a main thoroughfare to this proposed development. With Ararira Springs primary school nearby, the vast increase in traffic raises the potential for collisions with schoolchildren. Wishes for Lincoln to retain it 'country life' aesthetic.	Plan change 69 be denied.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation in relation to soils and infrastructure. Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0135	Leah Oldman	001	Oppose	Opposes rezoning and loss of extremely fertile soil if this development went ahead. There are better locations. Lincoln does not have the infrastructure to support a significant growth in population. Concerned about Liffey Springs Drive becoming a main thoroughfare to this proposed development. With Ararira Springs primary school nearby, the vast increase in traffic raises the potential for collisions with schoolchildren. Wishes for Lincoln to retain it 'country life' aesthetic.	Plan change 69 be denied.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation in relation to soils and infrastructure. Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0136	Michael James	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not want to see new access roads &amp; bridges through an existing green space reserve area, specifically the south end of Liffey Springs Drive.</li> <li>Does not want to see 'high-density' housing on small sections. This type of living accommodation is not yet warranted in New Zealand.</li> <li>Lincoln currently has the infrastructure to accommodate the residents associated with 2000 new sections, examples high school capacity, sewerage, traffic flows, amenities.</li> <li>Do not support the use of prime farming land being converted to housing. Land for producing food is a basic human requirement.</li> <li>Questions the real need for such a large development given the amount of land around Lincoln currently being developed for housing. Further the housing developments around the greater Canterbury area (Halswell, Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Marshlands, Pegasus, etc) should be quite sufficient to accommodate projected population growth for the foreseeable future.</li> </ul>	Reject the plan change and the proposed subdivision not proceed.	Reject. The proposed connection to Liffey Springs Drive is no longer sought. Infrastructural issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Conversion of the land from farming use to residential has been carefully considered and to be the most appropriate option. In terms of the need for such a large development, NPS-UD seeks a variety of housing options including by way of location. Lincoln is an area of high demand. Expert evidence for the Applicant has identified insufficient capacity in Lincoln, and indeed in Selwyn.
PC69-0137	Andrew Dollimore	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The location is unfair to the owners of Verdeco Park semi-rural sections and it is understood that some existing reserve land is proposed for a new road traffic will increase exponentially.</li> <li>The number of proposed residences is completely disproportionate to the existing Lincoln.</li> <li>The proposal is inconsistent with the GCUDS. The SDP focuses on Rolleston. Approving this proposal would undermine SDC's planning credibility.</li> <li>Concerns about various springs and wetlands in the relevant area and the lack of a plan for protection.</li> <li>Existing schools will become insufficient. Parks and other community facilities will also all become insufficient and poorly located (if this proposal goes ahead).</li> <li>Such an extreme increase in Lincoln's size and population will obviously place the existing three waters under huge strain.</li> <li>Springs Road cannot carry an extra 14,000 trips per day. If this proposal proceeds Springs Road will turn into a very difficult issue for the people of Lincoln and Prebbleton.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. While growth is focused on Rolleston, growth in Lincoln is also anticipated. It is a KAC.
PC69-0138	Broadfield Estates Limited	001	Support In Part	<p>Submitter is supportive of the intent of Plan Change 69, as it will assist in addressing the recognised shortfall of suitable land zoned for residential purposes in Lincoln. However, the submitter is opposed to the identification of an 'Indicative Road', characterised as a 'Secondary Road', on the Proposed Planning Maps, proposing a connection to Liffey Springs Drive.</p> <p>Although the submitter acknowledges that most movements will be to Springs and Collins Roads and Moirs Lane, it must be expected that a reasonable proportion of movements would occur to the Liffey Springs Drive area. It is also noted that Russ Drive will become a great deal busier as an east – west throughfare as a result of the development of the 23-hectare block bounded by Edward Street, Ellesmere Lane and the L II River.</p> <p>This will put considerable pressure on the Russ – Liffey Springs Drive intersection, which would in turn be exacerbated were a direct connection to the new subdivision facilitated by Plan Change 69 be provided. The ITA does not appear to address this prospect.</p> <p>The imposition of a road over the Liffey Springs Reserve would compromise the attractive, low-key amenity and character of that reserve and would be inconsistent with the Operative Outline Development Plans that apply with respect to the Liffey Springs area (E35 and E36 respectively).</p>	<p>Approve Plan Change 69, subject to the deletion of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 'Indicative Road' shown on the 'Outline Development Plan (ODP) Lincoln South' Proposed Planning Map, extending in a north – south direction from a connection with the proposed east – west route between Springs Road and Moirs Lane;</li> <li>and The 'Secondary Road' shown on the 'Movement and Connectivity' Proposed Planning Map in the same position as the 'Indicative Road' referred to above.</li> </ul>	Accept in part. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0139	Nicola Russell	001	Support In Part	Partially supports the plan change as Lincoln is an area of extreme growth and houses need to go somewhere, however, the number of houses in one development is too large. The pressure on the current roading, which is already under stress, would be too great.	Amend plan change 69 to ensure the correct roading is in place or is put in place (without damaging reserve land). Stipulate that the developer must provide space for a supermarket within the subdivision. Require the developers to stage the development to allow infrastructure to catch up.	Accept in part. Roading upgrades specified and incorporated into ODP. Two additional business areas now incorporated. Development will occur through a natural staging of around 250 dwellings per year.
PC69-0139	Nicola Russell	002	Oppose In Part	Opposes the road through reserves. The environmental impact would be huge and is not necessary. Use and improvement of existing roads is what's needed.	Remove roads through reserve land.	Reject. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0140	Michelle McLachlan	001	Oppose	Opposed to the "possible future" road connecting the subdivision to Liffey Springs Drive. Submitter purchased on the understanding that this would always be a closed off subdivision, other than the road leading out onto Southfield Drive. A road in would create extra traffic which is not needed or wanted along Liffey Springs Drive, especially with there being school children from the new Ararira Springs Primary School.	Not specified.	Reject. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0140	Michelle McLachlan	002	Support In Part	Supports proposed roundabout on Edward St/Ellesmere Street. This would help the flow of traffic.	Not specified.	Accept in part.
PC69-0141	Judy Collins	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impact on bird life.</li> <li>Impact on elite soils. This area contains a percentage of elite soils in NZ.</li> <li>Traffic problems, Lincoln is already overflowing with traffic and many times it is impossible to get near the main shops for minimal parking. The roads intended to come out on to Collins Road are situated at dangerous points with impaired views.</li> <li>Schooling - the two local schools are almost at capacity.</li> <li>Emergency Services - A manned police station is overdue and there has been a major increase in break ins, thefts around especially the new areas of Lincoln.</li> <li>High density housing will lower the value of surrounding property.</li> <li>Historic Places - There is a Pearson Bros water trough on Springs Road.</li> <li>Flooding - This is swampy land proposed for living.</li> <li>Thought has to be given to the future, not just 10 years, but longer. Lincoln is no longer a community, but a disjointed sea of housing.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues raised have largely been addressed in evidence and in Recommendation. No evidence in relation to lowering of property values and in any event are not particularly relevant. Historic places around Homestead recognised. The environmental management and enhancement now proposed likely to benefit in terms of bird life.
PC69-0142	Mike and Corinne Bailey	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as it is not supported by the SDC current and proposed plans regarding zoning of land.</p> <p>NPS-UD well-functioning urban environments that enable all people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing, and for their health and safety, now and into the future.</p> <p>Lincolns playing fields are already at capacity.</p> <p>The new primary school has been provided with the Proposed Plan in mind not for an additional 6000 new residents</p> <p>If a road extension is made from Liffey Springs drive to the proposed subdivision, trucks and trades vehicles will use this road as a thoroughfare and short cut, and endangering children, as well as negatively impacting the eco system.</p> <p>NPS-UD: Local authorities have robust and frequently updated information about their urban environments and use it to inform planning decisions. Less than 2% of NZ can claim to have the quality of versatile soil as Lincoln and immediate surrounds.</p>	Reject Change 69.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0143	Jessica Nelson	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as Proposed Plan which did not include rezoning this area of land to the South of Lincoln.</p> <p>Lincolns playing fields are already at capacity.</p> <p>The new primary school has been provided with the Proposed Plan in mind not for an additional 6000 new residents</p> <p>Traffic is already a serious issue in Lincoln. Adding 6000 more residents than planned for will add to this burden. Increased density of traffic will have a negative impact on the non-car travel of children to schools, and years of trucks and trades vehicles travelling to and from the development area will endanger children.</p>	Not specified.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0144	Melanie Burns	001	Oppose	Opposes Chudleigh Homestead being right beside medium density zone.	Amend so the Chudleigh Homestead is surrounded by low density sections.	Reject. Chudleigh Homestead is set in a larger lot which is sufficient.
PC69-0144	Melanie Burns	002	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as there has been no consideration to the increased traffic along Southfield Drive because of children attending Ararira Primary School. The school is already at capacity for parking with the current student numbers.</p> <p>Public transport – there is no mention of proposed bus routes.</p> <p>The proposal would result in an overall change in character from open and rural to one that is more dense and suburban in nature. The proposed subdivision with its smaller medium density lots, is not in keeping with the character of Lincoln.</p> <p>There are a number of development sites in Lincoln at present (at least four). The cumulative effects of multiple subdivisions currently in development is having more than minor adverse effects as a result of dust, emissions, noise, vibration, and traffic congestion.</p> <p>The proposed subdivision will have a proposed density that ranges between 12 to 15 hh/ha.</p> <p>There is currently no ambulance service in Lincoln and limited police numbers.</p> <p>This proposal will result in loss of versatile soil.</p>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation including the pedestrian and cycle linkages provide appropriate accessibility. Public transport addressed to the degree possible and particularly noting inclusion of the park and ride. Development effects addressed at subdivision stage and appropriate density.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0144	Melanie Burns	003	Neither Support Nor Oppose	There is no mention of proposed bus routes this does not support accessibility of transport and reduction in energy use and greenhouse gas emissions.	Request the Council consider an extension of the existing public transport routes.	Reject. CRC may wish to consider requesting an extension of existing public transport routes. It is not a matter in the Applicant's direct control. Layout will enable public transport and park and ride facility.
PC69-0145	Mike Nash	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposed bypass directly behind my property. This will seriously affect my standard of living and diminish the local environment and have an adverse effect on property values. It will also become a "rat run" as people try to avoid overcrowded junctions due to increased traffic. The increase traffic is highly likely to increase incidents of accidents in the local surrounding area.	This bypass must be removed from all current and future plans.	Accept in part. Bypass has been removed from the ODP.
PC69-0145	Mike Nash	002	Oppose	Opposes the reference in the ITA to crashes within 100m. The change to traffic lights and increased dimensions will increase accident risk. The lack of pedestrian crossings will increase the risk to university students and staff crossing the main roads. The current infrastructure is notorious for accidents within 1200m. Increased traffic at 100kmh will only add to potential accidents. Most traffic will use Springs Road as opposed to the suggestion that Shands Road would be more popular. Traffic will significantly increase on Springs road, already a road in poor condition, will become worse. All the traffics will do is create a short-term fix to a major problem.	Requests all roading be improved from Lincoln to Christchurch to increase safety.	Reject. Number of issues raised by the submitter have been addressed including crossings of Springs Road to the University, changes to the frontages and impact on vehicle speed.
PC69-0145	Mike Nash	003	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to Ellesmere Road and Tai Tapu Road junction in poor condition and considerable traffic uses this road now to short cut to Halswell or Wigram. The additional traffic will disproportionately affect the traffic loads on roads really aimed at farm traffic.  This plan will change the whole village feel of Lincoln. The current infrastructure of Lincoln will not cope with 2000 more houses, let alone the 8000 people. Current medical facilities are over stretched. Let Lincoln settle and grow into itself before creating more housing and people inundate it.	Reject the proposed plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation and in response to the numerous submissions that have raised the same or similar issues.
PC69-0146	Ross Lee	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:  Traffic flow on the surrounding arterial roads of Lincoln (mainly Shands, Springs and Ellesmere) not only will not cope and cause substantial increases in commuting times into Christchurch City at peak times. The desire to direct traffic away from Prebbleton and onto Shands Rd to get onto the CSM is counter intuitive. Developments such as this should take advantage of the new CSM Stage 2 by being closer to the new infrastructure and limit commuting times.  Development extends beyond the town limits and proposed commercial zones take people away from the centre of the village, being disjointed unplanned mess just like Rolleston.  This is productive land which once built on is lost forever.  There better land for building on closer to the CSM and the infrastructure associated with it and Rolleston.  There is no provision for additional sports fields.  Lincoln High is already redrawing its Zone to limit intakes to a site that is at capacity. The additional 2500 houses will contribute a large number of students for LHS. Children currently at Lincoln Primary will be directly impacted by overcrowding at LHS during their High School education.	Reject this plan change application.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation and in response to other similar submissions. Proposed commercial zone will meet the local day-to-day needs of the residents.
PC69-0147	John Jenner	001	Oppose	Opposes any proposed roading link to subdivision via Liffey Springs Drive (as depicted on the video plan of the proposed new subdivision). Liffey Springs would become a throughfare which will bring an enormous amount of traffic.  Liffey Springs Road legended as a primary or secondary road was not drawn on the Movement and Connectivity Plan, so there is confusion as to what proposal or plans are valid. It seems on the latest plan Moirs Lane is the only entrance from the Eastern side.	Remove any plan that involves ground works in the completed subdivision of Liffey Springs and destroys any part of the completed Reserves and rivers which are now natural habitats to wildlife that all who live here enjoy.	Reject. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0147	John Jenner	002	Oppose	Opposes the development of a new subdivision in Lincoln by way of plan change 69.  While Urban planning is necessary it's primary concerns should involve the protection of the environment and the wellbeing of the public. Lincoln is a delightful rural town that has been surrounded by continual development on former hugely productive farm land. Verdeco Park, Rosemerryn, Flemington, Te Whariki ,Barton Fields are all multistage developments that have acquired 100's of hectares and are many years from completion.  Questions whether Lincoln needs another subdivision. Council should focus on the social and environmental bottom lines, get what has started finished and then reassess future planning.	Reject any new Rural development projects in Lincoln until all other ongoing subdivision projects have been completed. Complete an environmental and CO2 emissions analysis when the 5 multistage subdivisions being developed in Lincoln have been completed to determine the sustainability of any planned new developments in the future.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation and evidence is clear in terms of need for additional capacity.
PC69-0148	Katherine Powell	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>The proposed bypass road will run through an area currently designated as a reserve and storm water management area negatively impacting the surrounding properties and devaluing them.</li></ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject but note the bypass road is not proposed. Safety issues and ability to cross the road for Verdeco residents addressed. Provision of amenities on site in relation to supermarket and similar are matters for subdivision stage but note

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed bypass road will exponentially increase the traffic through Verdeco Park and the streets within the subdivision are not designed for increased numbers. Streets are too narrow and do not offer appropriate parking to allow for two way traffic in many cases.</li> <li>If the traffic increased by more than the planned Verdeco subdivision this would cause safety issues for people walking out of their homes and trying to cross the road. The connection and subsequent traffic would diminish the lifestyle feel of the low-density sections in Verdeco Park subdivision.</li> <li>Require the developers to plan for and build key amenities that provide necessities. Examples include a supermarket and doctors surgery etc. Plus require the developer to contribute to upgrading current amenities within Lincoln so that they are suitable for the larger number of people (library, post office, public parks and playgrounds).</li> <li>The primary schools are both set to hit capacity and the high school is already struggling with the current load.</li> <li>Concerned that the proposed layout and size of lots are not consistent with the surrounding subdivisions and the Plan Change would adversely change the character of Lincoln.</li> <li>Opposes medium comprehensive density (400m<sup>2</sup>), this scale is unsuited to the semi-rural nature of Lincoln Township.</li> </ul>		additional business zones now included. Development contributions will be assessed. Living Z zone and density provisions appropriate.
PC69-0149	Reza Zarnekabi	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change on the basis lots that agriculture land changing to residential is not sustainable. Providing and maintenance of infrastructures and facilities for low density residential areas is very high compared to high residential buildings/towers and high density areas. Developers should build multi-story buildings or towers. It saves land as well as cost of infrastructures and facilities in long term.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. The NPS-UD seeks a variety of dwellings including standalone.
PC69-0150	Veronica Robinson, Paul Robinson, Liam Robinson	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased cars on roads, the increased population in the Lincoln South subdivision will cause increased traffic on the Springs, Shands and Ellesmere Roads into Christchurch.</li> <li>Public transport is better used in areas where there is a higher population.</li> <li>Once houses are built, the ground is lost to farming. The ground near the river is thought to have organic soil, which is possibly good for growing vegetables. The land has a high water table meaning less need for irrigation.</li> <li>Stormwater is going to be diverted into the Ararira River, how will the river and Te Waihora cope with this extra water.</li> <li>Employment/Schooling/Health Hub/Recreation/Retail - should be considering reducing carbon emissions, and living close to work, school, recreation and health facilities. Rather than double up on these amenities to need to more fully utilise the ones that are already exist.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Traffic, public transport, loss of farm land addressed in Recommendation. Increase in population around the Lincoln KAC may encourage development of amenities.
PC69-0151	S & B Powell	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 on the basis of: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic through Verdeco Park into the new development. The current road construction in Verdeco Park is not designed to handle the proposed traffic volume.</li> <li>Lack of consideration and allowances for additional public facilities that will be required with proposed population growth.</li> <li>The neighbouring Verdeco rural sections are 3000m<sup>2</sup> to 6000m<sup>2</sup> (Living 3); having living zone Z sections neighbouring rural sections is not in keeping.</li> <li>Current SDC infrastructure cannot handle proposed waste water infrastructure.</li> <li>Additional development next to my property will put additional strain on the creek at the western side of Verdeco Park and have detrimental consequences on my property.</li> <li>Current flood mapping provided by SDC does not take into account this new development and FFL of proposed houses and any adverse effects to neighbouring properties need to be considered.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69 and all traffic links into Verdeco Park.	Reject. Traffic links into Verdeco Park limited. Bypass road no longer forms part of the ODP roading network. Infrastructure addressed and flooding issues addressed in Recommendation and subject to further assessment at subdivision and stormwater discharge consent stage.
PC69-0152	Stephen Topliss	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 on the basis that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed bypass road will run through the current stormwater management area within Verdeco Park negatively impact the surrounding properties.</li> <li>The proposed bypass will increase traffic through the Verdeco Park subdivision, which the roading network has not been designed for.</li> <li>The development has not planned appropriately for the amenities required for the number of households. The current supermarket in Lincoln is already under stress to meet the current demand. Similarly, facilities such as doctors offices would have limited capacity to accept new patients.</li> <li>Concerned the development has not fully considered the effects of flood displacement in detail.</li> <li>Concerned that the development does not support usage or introduction of a public transportation system for commuters, but instead is reliant on individual vehicle usage.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69 and delete all reference of proposed bypass from development plans.	Accept in part. Proposed bypass reference deleted from ODP. Amenities from a flood displacement, public transportation and character all addressed and considered in Recommendation.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change in the character of Lincoln by increasing residence numbers as well as changing the rural plains outlook. The layout of the subdivision does not appear to be consistent with the current developments within Lincoln and the identified future growth model for the village.</li> </ul>		
PC69-0153	Anita Wreford	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Climate change action - This proposed development will undermine the ability of its residents to reduce their transport emissions, due to dependency on private car and creating further urban sprawl; undermining the ability of the Selwyn District and New Zealand as a whole to reach the country's goal of net zero Carbon by 2050 or its National Determined Commitment under the Paris Agreement.</li> <li>The loss of highly productive land - This proposed development would be on land classified as Class 1, 2 and 3 land, according to the Selwyn District Council's Baseline Assessment Versatile Soils. There is only a limited area of this high quality Class 1 and 2 land in the Selwyn District (~2.5%), and it is vital to protect this limited land resource for food production of future generations. By pushing food production onto less versatile soil, it becomes necessary to use more inputs (e.g. fertiliser) to achieve the same amount of output (food), increasing greenhouse gas emissions from soil (nitrous oxide) and nitrates into waterways.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0154	Melanie Brooks	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 on the basis that the AEE for the Plan Change does not sufficiently address the wider network effects on traffic from the 14,000 vehicle movements per day that the proposed subdivision will generate. There is little consideration of the effects on the roads that connect to the motorway or impact on Prebbleton. Distributing the traffic to Shands and Ellesmere Roads will further congest these roads which are already over capacity.</p> <p>The Operative Plan states that residents have access to adequate community facilities. With a sizable extension to the living zones in Lincoln as a result of the proposed plan change and increase in households it is likely that the existing Primary and High Schools will not be sufficiently sized to meet the increase in demand.</p> <p>The objective B1.1.3 focuses on encouraging activities and management practices that will help to sustain the life supporting capacity of the soils in our District. With climate change we need to be continuing to focus on food and fibre supply close to urban centres.</p>	Reject private Plan Change 69 and retain the land as Rural Outer Plains and only approve further residential developments in Selwyn with direct access off the motorway; where it is within the urban boundary or Living Zones; and to limit development on productive soils outside that already accounted for as part of the District Plan.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Transportation network effects have been addressed. Changes noted in relation to consideration of land for additional educational facilities. Objective B1.1.3 considered.
PC69-0155	Malcolm Powell	001	Oppose	Opposes the density of sections proposed as is not in character with adjacent Verdeco Park. Verdeco Park transition zoning from LZ closer to township through to L3 adjacent to rural settings. It would be poor planning that any proposed adjacent subdivision further away from the township wouldn't keep the character or intent of semi-rural outlook intact.	Delete LZ area to west of Springs Road; Amend zoning in keeping with precedence set on adjacent Verdeco Park and transition guidelines to rural areas.	Reject. The indicative road linkage to Verdeco Park is shown to be through the Business 2B zoning. Deletion of the LZ area to the west of Springs Road would result in a significant reduction in development capacity and would be inappropriate.
PC69-0155	Malcolm Powell	002	Oppose	Opposes the reference to an existing green link to North of proposed subdivision (adjacent to Verdeco Park south boundary). This does not exist and would be totally unacceptable to propose one now after people have purchased sections in Verdeco park expecting a low density semi-rural neighbourhood setting without pedestrian links, for the 50 or so L3 sections at rear of Verdeco Park. Submitter would not have purchased section if knew there was a walkway next door, due to privacy and diminishes enjoyment. Bought section because of rural outlook.	Delete greenlink walkways.	Reject. Indicative pedestrian and cycle route location appropriate.
PC69-0155	Malcolm Powell	003	Oppose	Opposes internal road links to North of proposed subdivision bordering south boundary of Verdeco Park. Purchasers of Verdeco park sections in L3 have done so under the pretence of a semi rural feel. It would be unfair to propose roading links that should have been planned for.	Delete any proposed roading connections to Verdeco Park.	Reject. Roading connections to Verdeco Park limited and appropriate.
PC69-0155	Malcolm Powell	004	Oppose	Opposes proposed by-pass road, there should not be high traffic roads proposed through semi rural low density Verdeco Park. The negative effects far outweigh any benefit.	Delete by-pass road from the outline development plan.	Accept in part. Bypass road no longer incorporated into ODP.
PC69-0156	Nicole Cave	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 due to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale of the proposed development is disproportionate to the size of the current Lincoln township.</li> <li>The proposed layout of the development is inconsistent with the semi-rural character of Lincoln.</li> <li>The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy focuses future development on Rolleston.</li> <li>The Selwyn Development Plan focuses on development in Rolleston.</li> </ul> <p>Land will need to be made available for further schooling and other community facilities.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Significant increase to traffic on Springs Road, current roundabout almost at capacity.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69. Undertake independent assessment to understand what educational and community facilities will be required to support such a significant population increase; as well as wider traffic safety impact of the proposed development.	Reject. Urban design and associated matters address issues arising from scale of the proposed development in terms of Lincoln character. While growth is to focus on Rolleston in the documents referred to, growth in Lincoln is also anticipated. Significant changes to the roading network on Springs Road current roundabout are now included.
PC69-0157	Alan Barbour	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as NZ Government declared a climate emergency and set emissions reduction targets to meet our Paris Accord obligations. Higher density affordable housing on sites closer to the city of Christchurch is required, where families and residents can live, work and play within walking and cycling commuting distance – and reduce transport congestion and emissions.	Not specified.	Reject. NPS-UD anticipates a range of housing type in various locations. Evidence in relation to climate change from Mr Farrelly indicates that reduction in methane production is positive. Highly productive

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>The 23km distance is too far for commuting by bicycle, and the bus service from Lincoln is not convenient or attractive and is scarcely used by commuters.</p> <p>The priority for climate change should be to protect carbon stocks, by maintaining pasture or plant cover. Developing this pastureland will release the carbon stored in the soil into the atmosphere. The land proposed to be developed under this plan change is classified as Highly Productive Land, and that approximately 70% of the land proposed to be developed is classed Highly Versatile Land suitable for a range of crops.</p> <p>The proposed Lincoln South development is totally residential in nature with no employment opportunities. Travel times by bus to Christchurch are regularly in excess of 60 minutes, which will increase congestion. Residents will have a reliance on car-based transport contrary to the NPS-UD.</p> <p>Lincoln High School and the primary schools will struggle to accommodate additional pupils from the new housing currently being developed around Lincoln.</p>		land issues addressed in Recommendation and in response to other submitters.
PC69-0158	Emma Sprott and Jamie Pearce	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as the proposed small commercial area is not going to meet the convenience needs of future residents.</p> <p>The integrated transport proposals outlined at Appendix D, do not create a "fix" for a predicted increase in the numbers of cars on already busy main roads out of Lincoln (being Springs Road, Shands Road and Birches Road).</p>	Reject plan change 69 or amend to include a shopping centre with an additional supermarket and gas station.	Reject. The provision of additional business zones may assist in meeting day-to-day needs.
PC69-0159	Richard Clark	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change ODP and Appendix D (integrated transport assessment) including reference to an 'indicative road' connecting the proposed subdivision to Liffey Springs Drive. The proposed road would impact the existing subdivision greatly and severely impact on the recreational value of the existing reserve land and spring that the proposed road would cut through. The reserve should be maintained as it is and a proposed road connection not allowed.	Remove all reference and indicative road connections on the outline development plan for a future road connecting to Liffey Springs Drive and redirect all traffic through Springs, Collins and Ellesmere Roads, with upgrades to Ellesmere Road (widening) and the intersection of Ellesmere Road and Edward Street, to accommodate additional traffic movements.	Reject. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0160	Rachel Sugrue	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as the Indicative Road connection to Liffey Springs Drive is classified as Reserve land and should be maintained as such. It offers a high level of recreational value and enjoyment and to put in a connecting road to the proposed subdivision would create adverse effects on the residents of Liffey Springs and the wider Lincoln Town.	Remove all reference to the indicative road connection on the ODP for a future road connecting to Liffey Springs Drive. Redirect all traffic through Springs, Collins and Ellesmere Roads, with upgrades to Ellesmere Road (widening) and the intersection of Ellesmere Road and Edward Street.	Reject. Note Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0160	Rachel Sugrue	002	Oppose	Opposes plan change as could not see any reference as to how the additional growth of this proposed subdivision would be accommodated with the current school (Ararira Springs Primary). The new school was designed to take the additional growth that is already in the township with the likes of the Verdeco Park, Te Whariki and Liffey Springs Subdivisions on the South side of Edward/Gerald Streets. It is was not projected to take the growth of another 2000 households. While not opposed in full to the addition of this subdivision, have serious concerns about how long it takes to get a school operational from design to build.	Require early conversations with the Ministry of Education to ensure that there is not another situation of the local primary school bulging at capacity. Amend to include land for a new school to accommodate the growth.	Reject. Potential of need for land for educational facilities appropriately addressed following discussions between Applicant and Ministry of Education.
PC69-0161	Alastair Ross	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change as does not take any account of additional public infrastructure that would be required. This is not an incremental increase, this will nearly double the size of the existing township, not including the population growth from development of the substantial parcels of land that have already been zoned for residential development. Lincoln will already need infrastructure to cope with a high rate of growth, this development, with no clear intention of mitigating the effects of this, is a tipping point, and will adversely affect the quality of life of present and future residents.</p> <p>Road safety: the main roads in Lincoln are already very busy, with no provision for assisted crossing for cars across Gerald or Edward Streets as it is.</p> <p>No provision for new sports or school facilities.</p>	To decline Plan Change 69.	Reject. Infrastructure addressed and considered in Recommendation. While the scale of PC69 is significant, it will not be all delivered in one year so to that degree will be incremental. Evidence establishes capacity shortages in Lincoln. Assisted crossings of Springs Road included. Provision of sports facilities addressed in Recommendation and potential for school facilities addressed in amendments to the ODP and rules.
PC69-0162	Glenda Burt	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change as the Urban Development Policy is to provide residential areas to support well-functioning cities. This increase in population will significantly increase traffic movements on country roads not designed to cope with such high volumes of traffic, significantly increase the loading on water and wastewater services and undermine planning for the township that took place in 2013.</p> <p>The increase in residential footprint will remove valuable agricultural land from food production.</p> <p>The usual access to Christchurch at this end of Lincoln is Ellesmere, Longstaffs and Whinchops Road. There is little provision for cyclists on these roads. The proposed linking to Liffey Springs Drive will endanger the wildlife in this area during the construction and cause a significant loss of amenity.</p> <p>The introduction of higher density housing will reduce the ambience of the village atmosphere in Lincoln making it more like a busy city suburb rather than a village community.</p>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues addressed in Recommendation. Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0163	John and Leslie Greenslade	001	Support	<p>Supports plan change as Te Whariki and Verdeco subdivisions are nearing completion it will be increasingly difficult for our dairy farming operation to continue.</p> <p>There is nearly 4 km of housing along our northern and north eastern boundaries. We have already had a few complaints about the noise from general farm machinery such as irrigators, tractors and motorbikes which will only increase as the houses get closer.</p> <p>Over many years, we have been fencing and protecting the large natural springs that we have on our farm. We believe that the proposed plans will continue the enhancement and they will be something that the whole community can enjoy. The retention ponds will collect run off in settling ponds which will have the effect of improving the waterways and slowing down any potential run off into the LII river.</p> <p>We feel that a better alternative to the primary route indicated in the ODP would be along Collins Road. There would need to be a bridge upgrade to cross over the LII, however this would be a better route for people coming from Springston / Leeston and Tai Tapu / Banks Peninsula.</p> <p>Extra features that could be incorporated into the green areas are a dog park and an area for model boat enthusiasts.</p>	Not specified.	Accept in part. Do not accept that Collins Road should be the primary route as proposed primary route appropriate.
PC69-0164	Laura Burgess	001	Oppose In Part	<p>Opposes the plan change as the roading network in Lincoln is currently under pressure from the existing population. There has been no roading upgrades to the existing road network, except to link new subdivisions. Congestion is common throughout the township. Parking availability in the main shopping areas isn't sufficient during peak times. Impacts of a 67% increase in population are potentially significant and must be understood to consider the plan change.</p> <p>The recent over-crowding of the current schools negatively impacted the quality of schooling for the tamariki affected and it is critical that any further development does not increase the school population ahead of increased school capacity.</p>	<p>Request an assessment of the impact of increased traffic from the development. Required upgrades should be completed before any further population growth. Amend the development to be staged to upgrading of the road network to ensure the population does not increase before the roads are able to safely handle it.</p> <p>The Lincoln Town Centre Plan adopted in 2016 should be implemented to ensure the commercial and amenity values of the town are sufficiently developed to accommodate the population growth.</p> <p>Request the applicant and council consult with the local schools and the Ministry of Education on the subsequent impacts on current school capacity and timing for additional capacity.</p>	Reject. Assessment of impact of increased traffic has been undertaken. Number of upgrades, timing and funding now incorporated into the ODP. Lincoln Town Centre Plan and its implementation is beyond the jurisdiction as a separate process but as noted by the submitter it is adopted. Consultation has occurred between the Applicant and the Ministry of Education.
PC69-0165	Brian Dunn	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Would change Lincoln from township to a mini city like Rolleston.</li> <li>• Would require more commercial properties e.g. supermarket.</li> <li>• Roads not suited to further high traffic volume around the township. Christchurch City Council requires less cars travelling into the CBD for work.</li> <li>• Main arterial roads are not suited to the higher volume of traffic travelling into the city.</li> <li>• Expansion of fast-food outlets in the area.</li> <li>• Clean air environment is lost if it goes ahead.</li> <li>• Insufficient public transport in the area to cope with higher density. Effects of dust on the health of the population.</li> <li>• Insufficient schooling.</li> <li>• Don't want a large bypass road in Lincoln.</li> <li>• Small sections cramped housing not Lincoln country style next there will be apartments with high density living.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. The scale of the activity is not such to render Lincoln a "mini city". Traffic issues appropriately addressed and public transport access to the area appropriately facilitated to the degree possible. Bypass road no longer proposed.
PC69-0166	Caroline Gieseg	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The land is on valuable pasture and crop soils and is part of only 2.5% of the remaining fertile soils left in Canterbury and should not be used for housing.</li> <li>• Roads are suitable for the increased volume of traffic that will result form change of land to housing. Ellesmere Road already has subsidence on it and no plans for this to be fixed.</li> <li>• Proposal does not allow for additional schools which will put pressure upon the existing schools. There needs to be a cohesive plan with the Ministry of Education around the increase in population.</li> <li>• Lincoln is already low on accessible green space and I don't believe that Plan provides enough green space for the community</li> <li>• Infrastructure in Lincoln Town Centre would struggle with such a large increase in population e.g. for parking, the library, through traffic.</li> </ul>	That the Council reject the change in plan.	Reject. Issues identified have all been addressed in Recommendation. Issues in relation to Ministry of Education and infrastructure appropriately addressed.
PC69-0167	Elaine Bayne	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public Transport can't provide a service that is quicker and cheaper than a car.</li> </ul>	Reject plan change.	Reject. Issues addressed appropriately and findings recorded in Recommendation.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Major roads into city couldn't cope with extra cars.</li> <li>Local roads wouldn't handle extra cars.</li> <li>Commercial business would have to be expanded removing the village.</li> <li>Health service would need to be increased.</li> <li>Clean fresh air areas would be replaced with carbon dioxide from cars.</li> <li>Too much pollution with current subdivisions without more.</li> </ul>		
PC69-0168	Amber and Brendon Rawcliffe	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed plan change is inconsistent with policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the strategic sub-regional land use and infrastructure planning framework for Greater Christchurch.</li> <li>Inconsistency with the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement Settlement Pattern. Chapter 6 requires that the PC69 development is located and designed in a way that achieves consolidated and coordinated urban growth that is integrated with the provision of infrastructure.</li> <li>The plan change site is not identified as a Greenfield Priority Area (GPA) for residential development. The plan change request is therefore considered to be inconsistent with Objective 6.2.1</li> <li>The proposed plan change estimates an additional approximately 1,968 vehicle movements per day along Ellesmere Road with no allowance for pedestrian or bicycle users.</li> <li>No allowance has been made to increase the accessibility of cycling as a mode of transport into the city (where most of resident will likely travel to work).</li> <li>A proposed access point at the end of Liffey Springs Drive would greatly increase the traffic reducing safety and the quiet nature of the Street.</li> <li>Without offering an alternative to cars as a transport option for residents who work in Christchurch City, this plan appears to go against the governments net carbon zero goals with an increase in residents living outside of Christchurch City</li> <li>With an increase of nearly 1/3 of the current town size, it is expected that more allowance would be made into the commercial/retail space within the proposed plan change.</li> <li>The proposed subdivision will provide little to no benefit to the community by way of services and will burden the already at capacity town centre area.</li> <li>This subdivision will provide no long-term employment opportunities once complete and residents will need to commute out of the town to find work.</li> <li>People come to Lincoln for the space, quiet and relaxed feel.</li> </ul>	<p>Reject this plan change, although if it were to go ahead suggest the following is considered in more detail:</p> <p>Additional commercial space; Colins Rd to be extended through to Ellesmere Rd; A through Rd onto Allendale Lane with its improvement and a pedestrian bridge only as access to the school; Additional green space with fields and a dog park; Minimum section size of 600m<sup>2</sup> to be more in keeping with the current township; Better promote public transport; Create some space available for recreation facilities to prevent commuting out of the town for these activities.</p>	<p>Reject. Acknowledge inconsistent with the policy direction in the CRPS in relation to directive settlement patterns and locational provisions in Objective 6.2.1. An appropriate cycling network is proposed in terms of connections between PC69 site and Lincoln. Cycle networks into the city are a wider matter. Public transport provided for but provision of public transport is a matter for CRC. Economic evidence in terms of employment opportunities with construction are compelling. Increased population may contribute to more opportunities for employment within Lincoln.</p>
PC69-0169	Janet James	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as it does not accord with 'Our space 2018-2048, Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update'. The target for Selwyn is to provide 7200 sections between 2018-2028. With all the sections that have been developed since 2018 and those still in the process of being developed, plus those in the pipeline, Selwyn will be well in excess of this target and well on the way to meeting the 2048 target of 13,500 sections. Rolleston was identified the main township for growth in the Selwyn District owing to public transport, roading, schooling and all other infrastructure. The targets would have been set taking immigration into account, but those figures were pre pandemic which has rendered immigration practically non-existent and not likely to pick up for several years.</p>	<p>Reject the Proposed Plan Change 69 in its entirety.</p>	<p>Reject. Acknowledge that growth in Selwyn has been rapid. Evidence that demand is still significant and sufficient development capacity is not being provided in Lincoln in particular. Acknowledge Rolleston is identified as the main township for growth. Lincoln is a KAC and is identified for some growth.</p>
PC69-0170	Matt Hopping	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as the current roading in and out of Lincoln is not adequate for this extra development.</p> <p>Sport parks, facilities will be too small with the extra development.</p> <p>Lincoln Town Infrastructure will need a major upgrade if such a development was to go ahead (water, wastewater, power, Fire service, ambulance service etc).</p> <p>Lincoln has a nice, small town vibe and this is what it is known for and why families, like mine moved here. Adding such a huge amount of extra housing is not what Lincoln wants.</p> <p>The land proposed to be used is some of the best land around for agriculture, to use this for housing development would be a huge waste.</p>	<p>Reject the proposal.</p>	<p>Reject. Issues have been addressed and considered in Recommendation.</p>
PC69-0171	Patricia Mary Coffin	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as there is plenty of residential housing around Lincoln and more housing means Lincoln would lose its character and the reason people originally shifted there.</p> <p>Residential areas are encroaching on fertile land.</p> <p>Change would mean more vehicles on road and more disruptions.</p> <p>At the present, there does not appear to be provision for cyclists.</p> <p>Questions if local schools will be able to provide enough space for the incoming pupils.</p> <p>With the increased numbers proposed for this subdivision and the existing new areas, would the current medical centre be able to handle the numbers?</p>	<p>Reject plan change 69.</p>	<p>Reject. Issues have been identified and addressed in Recommendation.</p>



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0172	Keith Elliott	001	Support	Supports the need for additional housing in the Lincoln area.	Accept the plan change with the provision for section sizes and a mix of section sizes compatible with the recent Te Whariki development. No sections below 500 square meters. With the provision for a sports field for cricket/football complete with toilets/change rooms.	Accept in part. Provision of sports field for cricket/football not required. Recreation matters addressed in full in Recommendation.
PC69-0173	Lois Sidery	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 due to climate change, environmental issues (including recognition of soil quality and uniqueness), flooding schooling and recreation demands, unique character (and history) of Lincoln, transport and traffic issues (which are now at their limits with regards to safety), and post-Earthquake demand for new housing. The applicant has not indicated how it will ensure that each piece of land it sells will have an 'affordable' home built on it. Any use of the reserve lands to make Liffey Springs Drive a thoroughfare to the new subdivision will negatively impact on the reserve values and the eco system. Proposal is inconsistent with the NPS-UD, Objectives 1, 2, 6, 7 & 8.	Reject the plan change application for failing to adequately meet the requirements of the NPS-UD.	Reject. Matters addressed in Recommendation. Proposal consistent with the NPS-UD.
PC69-0174	Nicole and Ben Schon	001	Oppose	Opposes the plan change for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incompatibility with strategic plans;</li> <li>• Inconsistency with the intent and substance of the NPS-UD;</li> <li>• Resulting reverse sensitivity;</li> <li>• Loss of amenity;</li> <li>• Irreversible loss of versatile and productive soils;</li> <li>• Lack of suitable transport and infrastructure and its impact on greenhouse gas emissions.</li> <li>• Lack of schools and community facilities.</li> </ul> Note: supporting information provided.	Reject the plan change in its entirety. Without prejudice to the relief sought, if the plan change is not declined we seek changes to address issues raised.	Reject for reasons addressed in Recommendation. Issues all addressed and considered. Consistent with NPS-UD.
PC69-0175	James Teonea	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes the following aspects of plan change 69, whilst understanding there is a need to provide new housing and an affordable housing market. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Density: should be in line with existing Township.</li> <li>• Development size: the development is too large a change for the community.</li> <li>• Highly Productive Land: should be reserved for agricultural purposes.</li> <li>• Flooding: prospective landowners should not be exposed to risks of flooding.</li> <li>• The cost of repurposing the land.</li> <li>• Services: some services (public and private) including: road networks (in particular, Springs Rd) and grocery shopping are already at or over capacity.</li> <li>• Development design: native plantings, waterways and walkways incorporated into the Te Whariki subdivision make for a very pleasant environment to live in and are a benefit to the community.</li> </ul>	Amend the proposal to ensure: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The housing density is kept in line with the existing; The size of the development is reduced so that the number of new households is ~10% of existing households</li> <li>• Development does not proceed on land which has been categorised as Class 1.</li> <li>• Development does not proceed on land which has been identified as susceptible to flooding or “pooling” of water. The developer should fund any costs involved with repurposing the land.</li> <li>• The development should include the development of Public Services, Infrastructure and Private Services, i.e.: public transport, schools, roading repairs, new roading developments (to cater to future road usage), hospitals, emergency services, recreational areas, grocery shopping.</li> <li>• The Principles and Policies in the Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines are incorporated into the development design to the same degree as the Te Whariki subdivision.</li> </ul>	Reject. Housing density appropriate and capacity provided significant. Other issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Development design, plantings, waterways and walkways appropriate.
PC69-0176	Sam Carrick	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as it does not meet the key principles of the NPS-UD. The location of PC69 does not enable a productive and well-functioning urban environment. PC69 also undermines the NPS-UD requirement that councils plan well for growth and ensure a well-functioning urban environment. PC69 is not consistent with the policies and objectives of the CRPS. PC69 is not consistent with the outcomes of Our Space 2018-2048 Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update. Our Space 2018-2048 identifies there is sufficient existing development capacity to meet anticipated housing. PC69 claims are not consistent with the March 2021 Selwyn District Council report on housing growth and demand projections to the year 2050.	Decline PC69.	Reject. All issues addressed in Recommendation. Proposal is consistent with and meets the relevant objectives and policies of the NPS-UD, and the relevant objectives and policies of the CRPS. It provides significant capacity in an area of significant demand. It is well integrated with the remainder of the Lincoln community through pedestrian and cycle network.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>The application site was also not included within the 'Urban Growth Overlay' notified as part of the proposed Selwyn District Plan in October 2020.</p> <p>The Selwyn Long-term plan has only limited commitments to improving the Lincoln community infrastructure, despite the current recognised pressures, let alone the inevitable pressure from the already planned urban growth.</p> <p>PC69 will have potential serious consequences on provision of primary and secondary education in Lincoln.</p> <p>PC69 is planned for an area of recognised versatile soils (Land Use Capability classes 1 -2).</p> <p>Due to the location of PC69 it will effectively operate as a very large residential area isolated from the rest of the Lincoln community.</p>		
PC69-0177	Shona and David Bycroft	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposed bridging of the river and extending Liffey Springs Drive into the subdivision, which would break faith with the residents and seriously disturb the natural environment of the area affecting flora and fauna and the character of the area including a pedestrian friendly recreational precinct.</p> <p>The potentially heavy traffic would create added danger for the children who attend the nearby Ararira Springs Primary School.</p>	Delete any proposal to extend Liffey Springs Drive.	Reject but note Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0177	Shona and David Bycroft	002	Support In Part	Supports the steady healthy growth of Lincoln but considers it would be wiser for it to be carried out in a more controlled manner. Lincoln has strength in being a smaller town and stretching its size too rapidly will cause it to lose its essential character.	Amend the development so that it takes place more conservatively where the infrastructure can be designed with due consideration to the existing town with the establishment of facilities.	Reject. ODP provides sufficient control.
PC69-0178	Alan Gilmour	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as there is a requirement for a cross section of section sizes and a balance of sizes to retain the strong sense of local identity. A subdivision with an equal balance smaller and larger section sizes would be more acceptable. A section of 400 sq. metres is too small.</p> <p>Parks and open spaces have been ignored in this proposal. Amenity areas are a vital part of any healthy community</p> <p>This proposed subdivision will dramatically increase stormwater collection areas and the subsequent discharge to ground, with poor infiltration rates and waterways, will place significant loads on infrastructure.</p> <p>Two thousand additional houses will place huge overloads on the roading infrastructure, creating bottlenecks.</p> <p>There is no allowance for schools in this proposal. The local high school is near full capacity and the primary schools are in a similar position. An area must be set aside within this area to cater for educational needs.</p>	Reject plan change 69 in its current form.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. All issues considered in reaching recommendation. Living Z zoning appropriate.
PC69-0179	Lincoln University	001	Neither Support Nor Oppose	The submitter takes a neutral position regarding plan change 69, but Lincoln University has strongly opposed the concept of the potential bypass from its inception, in particular any potential route either through or adjacent to the University's main campus. The University's position in this regard remains unchanged. Any bypass bisecting the University Campus would split the site, resulting in isolating key components of the University's assets and negatively impacting upon its function. The Plan Change proponent has undertaken further traffic modelling (by Abley Consultants Ltd). While several references in the RFI response are made by the Plan Change proponent that the Plan Change is not reliant on the Lincoln Bypass to mitigate transport effects, it also acknowledges the traffic network would operate better with the bypass than without. It is these comments, and the continued representation of the bypass on the ODP plans, in particular the Movement and Connectivity ODP, which raises concerns for the University and is the key reason for this submission.	Requests that all references to the Lincoln Bypass in any context within PC69 are deleted, including any reference on the ODP's. If any reliance upon the proposed bypass is required to mitigate transport network effects, the University seeks PC69 is rejected.	N/A. Note Lincoln bypass has been deleted and not relied upon.
PC69-0180	Rosemary & Scott Anderson	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as Lincoln is already at capacity for the current residents (and surrounding rural residents) to cope with facilities, schooling, recreation grounds and traffic.</p> <p>The position of the proposed zone/main road will destroy the preservation of the carefully considered planning for the current reserve, wetlands, rail trail and birdlife.</p> <p>Social impact to the increased housing/zoning in Lincoln is a escalation of social issues and crime. Lincoln has already seen a surge in crime with no resource to police it.</p> <p>Increasing the population in Lincoln does not make sense, when again there are not the mandatory services to support it. This is also goes hand in hand with healthcare (Maternity ward closing) and the St Johns availability which is not sufficient for the area/population.</p>	Reject plan change 69 and do not increase Lincoln population beyond the subdivisions already in progress.	Reject. All issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Connection to Liffey Springs no longer proposed. No evidence to suggest social impact in terms of social issues and crime arising from the proposal.
PC69-0181	Audrey Ross	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <p>Currently the roads around Lincoln and the main links to Christchurch are not suitable for purpose at peak times</p> <p>No provision in plan 69 for sustainable forms of transport.</p>	Not specified.	Reject. All issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Note provision of park and ride facility. Living Z zone appropriately addresses density and section sizes.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>Rolleston has the room to grow and the transport links in place with the new motorway, shouldn't be aiming to turn Lincoln into another Rolleston.</p> <p>Lincoln Primary School and Lincoln High school are already at capacity and Ararira Springs Primary School has allowed only for the subdivisions underway.</p> <p>This subdivision in on some of the best soil we have in Canterbury.</p> <p>Plan change 69 is located outside the infrastructure boundary.</p> <p>The main entrance to the subdivision is cutting across the rail trail.</p> <p>Adding that many additional houses to Lincoln without adding recreation facilities would be a huge loss.</p> <p>Plan 69 is proposing to make the majority of their sections very small.</p> <p>Stick to the boundaries created in the Greater Christchurch plan.</p>		
PC69-0182	Kevin and Jennifer Thompson	001	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <p>The land in question is productive land, and we are against housing being built on productive land, which is an important asset and must be preserved.</p> <p>Lincoln is a village with limited jobs, infrastructure, and transport connections to the city. It is many kilometres to the next urban areas. It is not suitable as a sprawling dormitory suburb for workers who primarily work in other parts of Canterbury. The roads from Lincoln to Christchurch City and to Rolleston are not built to carry the thousands of extra cars each day at peak hours that this rezoning application would lead to.</p> <p>Large amounts of extra housing should be put into Rolleston. There are a number of jobs there in the iZone, and there is also a motorway to the city and a chance of a commuter rail connection to the city in the future.</p> <p>Putting thousands of extra households in Lincoln would spoil the quiet village atmosphere and amenity of this pleasant rural place.</p>	Reject Plan Change 69.	Reject. All issues identified and addressed in Recommendation. Note Lincoln is a KAC. Amenity issues addressed.
PC69-0183	Claire Bunt	001	Oppose	Oppose due to loss of community feel of township due to population increase, strain on infrastructure including services and roads, dig up quality land/soil for farming for residential purposes.	Reject rezoning proposed by plan change 69.	Reject. All issues addressed in Recommendation.
PC69-0184	Next Level Developments Limited	001	Support	Supports proposed plan change as it is both appropriate and necessary for the continued sustainable growth of Lincoln Township and to meet anticipated residential development demand. The site is a logical extension of the Verdeco development and will continue to achieve an efficient urban form with good connectivity.	Accept the plan change Council.	Accept for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0185	cjy Trust	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as the proposed bypass road will run through an area currently designated as a reserve and storm water management area; mean taking away the proposed playground and shared community orchard; and exponentially increase the traffic through Verdeco Park.</p> <p>The proposed plan change would add an approximate 14,000 car trips per day to Springs Road, passing through the interchange without any improvements being planned.</p> <p>The development has not planned appropriately for the amenities required for the number of households they are adding to the community.</p> <p>Emergency services, including fire, ambulance and policing, are currently stretched with existing new developments.</p> <p>Parents already in Lincoln are struggling to find preschools that meet their needs. The primary schools are both set to hit capacity and the high school is already struggling with the current load.</p> <p>Proposing peak time wastewater overflow ponds be utilised to compensate for lack of treatment capacity at local wastewater treatment plants is not an acceptable engineering solution.</p> <p>Concerned that the layout and size of lots is not consistent with the surrounding subdivisions and the Plan Change would adversely change the character of Lincoln.</p> <p>There is a distinct lack of consideration to Verdeco park and the character, feel , intent of bordering a semi-rural very low density subdivision.</p> <p>Very little assessment to the effects of flooding on Verdeco park form the waterway to the western end of proposed sub division.</p> <p>The proposed subdivision does not provide house size and diversity.</p>	Amend the plan change to address the submitters concerns.	Reject but note Bypass road no longer proposed. Other issues addressed in Recommendation.
PC69-0186	Warren Ladbrook	001	Oppose In Part	Opposes plan change as it does not consider the negative impact on Springs Road and Prebbleton.	Require additional consultation and consideration of the downstream effects of additional traffic on Prebbleton.	Reject. Effects of additional traffic on Prebbleton considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0187	Nancy Borrie	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as the SDC Proposed District Plan, ECAN Defined Flood Zones and Plan Change 69 documentation indicate that land has been identified as subject to flood hazard risks. The use of flood prone land for residential housing is undesirable.	Reject the rezoning of the land to Living X for residential purposes;	Reject. Rezoning of land to Living X no longer proposed. Rule 4.9.32 addressed. 100m setback and related provisions appropriate.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>The Lincoln Sewerage Treatment facility is still used, 150m buffer zone should be retained so it can meet the ongoing wastewater treatment needs of the Lincoln community.</p> <p>Plan Change 69 relies primarily on an east west road network that channels traffic onto Springs and Ellesmere Roads but provides only 1 indicative road access into the existing Lincoln Township.</p> <p>The Esplanade Reserve should not be incorporated into the storm water treatment area.</p>	<p>Retain Rule 4.9.32 (Township Volume) Selwyn District Operative District Plan;</p> <p>Require the Applicant to create additional road access into the adjoining Te Whariki subdivision;</p> <p>Require the Applicant to form the paper road into Moirs Lane and create an access from that road into Allendale Lane, and Liffey Springs;</p> <p>That a 20m Esplanade Reserve be created along both banks of Springs Creek when the Applicant applies for Subdivision Consent.</p>	
PC69-0188	Caroline Yardley	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as believes Lincoln does not have the infrastructure to support the additional population. Springs Road cannot handle the additional traffic as it currently is and would need upgrading to be able to handle 2000+ additional households in the community.</p> <p>Lincoln is a small town with a strong community spirit. Increasing the town size by nearly double will affect the town feel and culture. It will no longer be a village feel and decrease community spirit.</p>	Reject the plan change.	Reject. All issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. No evidence that increase in population over the period of development will decrease community spirit.
PC69-0189	Mark Morrison	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes proposed development as it will remove the desirable "village" community feel of Lincoln.</p> <p>Negative effect of traffic on Ellesmere Road and Springs Road.</p> <p>Negative effect on Lincoln Infrastructure.</p> <p>Negative effect on Lincoln village town planning boundary.</p> <p>Negative effect of building on swampy wetland, waterway, low lying area.</p> <p>Negative effect of losing fertile pastures forever.</p>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. All issues addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0190	Not allocated					
PC69-0191	Manmeet Singh	001	Support	Supports the rezoning of the land and listed Allendale Lane properties that will facilitate the integrated management of land use and infrastructure, and overall contribute to a more efficient use of natural and physical resources in the general vicinity of Allendale Lane.	Approve Plan Change 69 either in its entirety, or to the extent that it is needed to provide for integrated access and other infrastructure to enable urban residential development to service the listed properties in Allendale Lane. Any consequential or other changes to PC69 as are necessary or appropriate to give effect to the intent of this submission.	Accept in part for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0191	Manmeet Singh	002	Support In Part	Supports the proposed ODP as it will provide a comprehensive integrated development in South Lincoln, including enabling the infilling of current rural lifestyle lots situated between Areas 1 (Te Whariki subdivision) and 2 (Liffey Springs subdivision) of the Lincoln ODPs and adjoining the northeast boundary of PPC 69 to provide a more consolidated urban form.	Amend the ODP narrative under 'Access and Transport' to consider the traffic effects of providing this linkage by adding the following text "The roading link to Liffey Drive shown on the ODP in the vicinity of Allendale Lane shall be provided for (as either a local or collector road). This is essential to achieve connectivity and enable 'infill' urban residential development of the Allendale Lane properties".	Reject in part for reasons addressed in Recommendation. Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0192	DJ Broughton	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as the proposal is outside the current and proposed Selwyn District Plan and unplanned as part of the Urban infrastructure boundary. The large addition to the village population and its geographic spread will not allow Lincoln to retain this village culture. Will put undue, unbudgeted and unplanned pressure on Lincolns traffic, roading, parking, shopping, medical and other facilities. A substantial part of the proposed development will be built on good quality soil making the land agriculturally and horticultural unproductive. Climate change mitigation has no provision and transport emissions in the area would grow substantially.	Decline the entire plan change.	Reject. All issues addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0193	David Cunningham	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as Lincoln is a growing town but is entirely agri based and this has the affect on the populace having to travel to the Christchurch for employment. This will put undue loading on the Roading infrastructure.</p> <p>The density of this subdivision is making Lincoln a "slum" of the future. This will encourage crime.</p> <p>Lincoln is a community that is growing but its infrastructure needs time to catch up so we do not lose this feel.</p>	Not specified.	Reject. Density appropriate. No evidence that subdivision will encourage crime. Significant development capacity provided and infrastructure addressed.
PC69-0194	Margaret Broughton	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as it does not comply with Selwyn District Plan and Greater CHCH Urban Development Strategy. Most people who live in Lincoln chose it for its small town "village" semi-rural atmosphere. Traffic routes to Christchurch cannot handle the extra traffic load. Too much good agricultural land would be lost. Local infrastructure would be overloaded. There is not provision for climate change mitigation and transport emissions would grow substantially.	Decline Plan Change 69 in its entirety	Reject. All issues addressed and considered in Recommendation.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0195	Kate Milne	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as it is necessary to maintain certain areas for crops/soil. Not to destroy any current reserves. Consider a new police station, schools, swimming amenities, dog parks, grocery stores. Ensure the roads are wide enough - Flemington (in Lincoln) is awful, you cannot drive cars safely.	Amend the plan change to address above concerns.	Reject. Road linkage to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed. Matters in relation to schools and amenities addressed and considered in Recommendation. Additional commercial areas will enable grocery stores. Road design at subdivision stage but roading hierarchy is to provide safe and efficient access catering for extensions to existing public transport routes.
PC69-0196	Brian Lester	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as the rezoning is not consistent with the Lincoln Structure Plan.	Reject the application.	Reject. Lincoln Structure Plan considered as part of overall assessment.
PC69-0197	Christchurch City Council	001	Oppose In Part	<p>Christchurch City Council is supportive of growth in the towns in Selwyn District to support the local needs. The area sought by Plan Change 69 for rezoning is outside of the areas identified for development in the CRPS and Our Space 2018-2038: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update - Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga (Our Space).</p> <p>The Council seeks an urban form with a minimum level of density for the development of 15 households per hectare, and that relevant recommendations of the review of minimum densities undertaken under Action 3 of Our Space be incorporated in the Plan Change.</p> <p>The proposal is not anticipated by RMA planning documents as the site is located outside the greenfield priority areas identified on Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) and has not been included as a future development area in Change 1 to the CRPS.</p> <p>The Council considers that the assumption that 2,000 houses within the Greater Christchurch Partnership sub-region constitutes significant development capacity needs to be further supported by evidence, which has not been included with the plan change material as the plan change focuses on Lincoln and the Selwyn District only.</p> <p>Development beyond the greenfield priority areas and the future development areas is not meeting a capacity shortfall, but rather could delay other growth and urban regeneration areas identified in Our Space (and where infrastructure, and the public transport system, has been already built to served) from being developed and regenerated.</p> <p>Council is unclear how this addition traffic volume will support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions without a funded and implemented public transport network.</p>	That unless the concerns outlined above are addressed, the plan change is refused.	Reject. All issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Proposed minimum density of 12hh/ha appropriate. Development is assisting in meeting capacity shortfall. No evidence that it would impact on other growth in urban regeneration. Greenhouse gas emissions considered. Public transport network provisions outside of Applicant's control but note inclusion of park and ride facility for at least 75 vehicles.
PC69-0198	Vicky Graham	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as Lincoln has begun to lose its village feel that made it so attractive to us as a family to live here. Fear that spreading out Lincoln further by adding even more houses and potential shops would be detrimental to the township's village feel and community.</p> <p>Traffic already is a problem as there is often congestion at the many intersections with Gerald Street. The new roading laid recently on Birches road is already torn up by the heavy load of trucks involved in the current busy building projects underway today.</p> <p>Submitters two primary aged children have been separated onto different temporary and permanent school sites whilst new classrooms have been built to accommodate the increased number of children moving to Lincoln.</p> <p>There appears to be no extra sports facilities worked into the new proposal. Prime soils will be built on and once gone can never be regained. Lincoln is lucky to have such an asset.</p>	<p>Amend plan change to incorporate more cycleways to give a safe travel options rather than encouraging us to use cars to access the spread-out facilities.</p> <p>Construct the roading before building commences rather than trying to correct the roading issue once it has become a problem, which is very disruptive.</p> <p>School facilities should be expanded considerably.</p> <p>Not to use prime agricultural land to build housing on.</p>	Reject. All matters identified considered and addressed in Recommendation. Comprehensive cycleways and walkways included. Roading upgrades and timing addressed in amended ODP.
PC69-0199	Beth McEachen	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes building of houses on prime food-producing land when we have so many people in the world and in New Zealand of need of the food that it could produce.</p> <p>Another negative impact of having more houses and more people is the impact that it has on our village in Lincoln and the well-being of our people within this community.</p> <p>People need houses, and these should be provided where there is already infrastructure and transport avenues in place. Central Christchurch and Rolleston should be first considerations.</p> <p>Springs and Shands Road were never designed to carry the volumes of traffic they already are today let alone to increase those volumes of future traffic if this sub division goes ahead. There's no mention in the plan about how the road noise impacts other people living around these roads.</p>	Reject this proposal entirely.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Lincoln is a KAC and some growth anticipated. NPS-UD anticipates planning decisions enable a variety of homes including meeting locational needs.
PC69-0200	Andrew Wallace	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change as it increases the number of dwellings in Lincoln by about 70% without any provision for the infrastructure.</p> <p>Any bypass through the new subdivision would put a major road right through the middle of the residential area, which would create major safety problems for residents. With or without the bypass most of the residents will have to travel to Rolleston or Christchurch for employment and cultural activities and create unacceptable congestion at peak travel times through Lincoln.</p>	Reject the proposed plan change in its entirety.	Reject. All issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Bypass not proposed.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>The ongoing loss of good agricultural land should not be allowed to continue just because each proposed area is a small fraction of the region's agricultural area.</p> <p>This area is acknowledged to have a high risk of bypass flow, and the risk of inundation was not investigated in the geotechnical report. If development proceeds the increased flows of storm water could adversely affect land further downstream from this very low-lying swampy area.</p>		
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS013	Support In Part	Developer has confirmed that limited geotechnical assessment has taken place. Need more evidence prior to plan change regarding stormwater management	Demand further information	Reject. Adequate geotechnical assessment has occurred and evidence provided.
PC69-0201	Jenny Broomhall	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as the area has Elite versatile soils and should not be used for residential housing. Opposes the provision of a small commercial area when the local supermarket is so close.</p> <p>Questions the benefits to building so many houses in Lincoln – better to go further west in Selwyn District and build on solid dry non agriculturally beneficial land.</p> <p>Springs/Collins Road intersection is not suited for such an increase in traffic. The proposed plan change would add an approximate 14,000 car trips per day to Springs Road. How does this support Climate Change and reducing the greenhouse gas emissions?</p> <p>Has Pearson Bros water trough on Springs Road been marked as historical and will this be preserved.</p> <p>The surrounding areas are known for swampy land and springs. The wild life needs to be protected – some examples are bell birds / pukeko / white + grey heron / pheasants / quail / paradise ducks / plovers.</p> <p>Impact on emergency services.</p> <p>Many Preschools are currently operating at capacity and have long waitlists. The Primary Schools are both set to hit capacity and the Secondary is already struggling with the current load.</p> <p>Suggest low lights are used in proposed subdivision so current and existing rural properties are not further affecting by the city and township light pollution.</p>	Reject or otherwise amend plan change to address the above concerns.	Reject. Issues all addressed and considered in Recommendation. It is within road reserve and can be addressed at subdivision stage.
PC69-0202	Thomas Johnson	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as Lincoln will suffer greatly with the increased traffic and emission levels and does not have the infrastructure to support this.</p> <p>Loss of quality agricultural soil.</p> <p>Pressure on the town's infrastructure and public services.</p> <p>Plan is irresponsible in respect to climate change where flood model predictions put Lincoln under significant threat to sea level rises.</p>	Reject the plan change in full.	Reject. All matters addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0203	Paul Rutherford	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The size of the proposed development will have significant impacts on the township.</li> <li>Housing needs to be provided in the right places. The planning for Greater Christchurch has anticipated the growth to be in Rolleston rather than Lincoln.</li> <li>Housing density is higher than the recommended density. This is still a rural township and development should be in line with that.</li> <li>Traffic effects. Connectivity to Christchurch seems already challenged, Springs Road is frequently experienced to be struggling with traffic to/from Christchurch City, this will be further impacted by the large scale of this proposed development.</li> <li>This proposed development covers a large area of highly productive land that is of limited quantity in this region considering its high suitability for arable, pastoral and agricultural production.</li> <li>Climate Change. There is the need to move away from car dependency and towards public transport.</li> <li>Flooding - land is known to be susceptible to flooding and to expect future residents to bear through such events when there is safer land available.</li> </ul> <p>Items I do appreciate in the proposal include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prioritisation of walking and cycling;</li> <li>Inclusion and accessibility of Recreation Reserves and Green Links;</li> <li>Provision of space near waterways and wetland areas to enable habitat protection and access;</li> <li>Protection and natural enhancement of Springs Creek, L II River and existing springs and wetland areas;</li> <li>Use of low-impact design techniques.</li> </ul>	<p>Reject plan change, alternatively if any such development is to go ahead requests that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any development be staged for the long term</li> <li>The size of the development be reduced considerably, retaining highly productive lands.</li> <li>Housing density be reduced</li> <li>Housing not be permitted in the lower parts of the site that are susceptible to flooding</li> <li>Public Transport be well-integrated into any development.</li> <li>Sections be designed primarily with a northerly aspect</li> <li>Encourage and actively support development of environmentally sustainable housing incorporating the principles of healthy home standards, energy efficiency and universal design</li> <li>The Principles of the Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines be strongly incorporated into the development design and all other recommendations in the Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd Statement.</li> </ul>	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Note the Living X zone has been removed, section design and aspect addressed at subdivision, housing density appropriate.
PC69-0204	Duane Perrott	001	Oppose	<p>Submitter is concerned over the use of versatile land within the proposal and understands there is a National Policy Statement on Versatile soil in draft form and is due to be confirmed soon this year.</p> <p>Requests that any decision on the PC69 development is delayed until such time that this NPS is confirmed. This may have a big impact on the proposal.</p>	Reject the plan change on versatile land.	Reject. Issues in relation to versatile soils have been addressed and considered in Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0204	Duane Perrott	002	Oppose In Part	<p>Submitter is concerned over lack of infrastructure within the Lincoln area to support such a development. Infrastructure being but not exclusive to schooling to support new volume of families, roading, recreation facilities, shopping, public facilities, etc.</p> <p>High density housing will only contribute to many of the issues highlighted above. Would like consideration being given to reject the high density nature of the proposal and support lower density, larger section sites.</p>	<p>Request an assurance of appropriate infrastructure ahead of any development approval.</p> <p>Amend to lower density proposal.</p>	Reject. Infrastructure issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Density appropriate.
PC69-0204	Duane Perrott	003	Support In Part	The neighbouring sites of Allendale Lane are currently zoned rural. By approving PC69 this will effectively create an 'island' of rural properties with urban sites surrounding. Not ideal having these zoned as rural, thus allowing bonfires, cattle etc in a largely urban area.	Accept the plan change but give consideration to neighbouring zoning.	Accept in part. Neighbouring zoning considered but scope issues and incomplete evidence render rezoning through this process inappropriate.
PC69-0205	Environment Canterbury	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change due to being inconsistent with policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the strategic sub-regional land use and infrastructure planning framework for Greater Christchurch.</p> <p>Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga (Our Space 2018-2048) was endorsed by the Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) in June 2019 and subsequently adopted by each partner council, including Environment Canterbury and Selwyn District Council.</p> <p>Our Space sets out a proposed approach to meet the projected shortfall, which includes intensification in existing urban areas and the identification of new greenfield areas for urban housing (termed Future Development Areas (FDAs)) in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi.</p> <p>Further development capacity in Lincoln is not required to meet medium- and long-term housing targets, identified in Our Space 2018–2048 and expressed in the CRPS.</p> <p>Environment Canterbury acknowledges that Policy 8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) requires local authorities to be responsive to unanticipated or out-of-sequence plan change proposals and give particular regard to proposals that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments; this matter is not sufficiently addressed by the plan change.</p>	Decline the plan change in its entirety.	Reject. Issues of consistency with policy direction addressed and considered in Recommendation. NPS-UD provides for a range of locations. The proposal provides significant development capacity. It contributes to well-functioning urban environments. There was considerable evidence provided that Lincoln does not have sufficient development capacity and overall a responsive approach is considered appropriate. The policy direction in the CRPS and other Greater Christchurch documents has been carefully considered. I am satisfied, on the basis of the evidence, that further development capacity in Lincoln is not required.
PC69-0206	Sue Mingard	001	Oppose	<p>Submitter is not against additional growth in Lincoln but feels that this development is too large and that the proposed location is unsuitable.</p> <p>The plan change is inconsistent with policy direction in the Lincoln Structure Plan, the Land Use Recovery Plan, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and infrastructure planning framework for Greater Christchurch.</p> <p>The proposed development is likely to cause significant traffic congestion, particularly at the Springs Road/Ellesmere Junction Road roundabout.</p> <p>The location of the proposed development is outside the infrastructure boundary for Lincoln defined in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).</p> <p>The proposed development includes around 2000 sections and would put significant pressure on the current infrastructure of the town and wider area</p> <p>This plan change proposal would not result in a “well-functioning urban environment” as required by the NPS-UD.</p> <p>The majority of soils in the proposed plan change area are type 1 and 2 soils which should be protected for agricultural activity.</p> <p>The eastern part of the site has a high water table and is at risk from flooding. It is therefore unsuitable for residential development.</p>	Plan Change 69 is rejected in its entirety. In the event that the Plan Change is approved, request that the size of the development is significantly reduced and that it does not extend to the LII river in the east.	Reject. All issues raised identified and considered in Recommendation including by removal of the Living X zone.
PC69-0207	Neale Elder	001	Oppose	Opposes as the land proposed for housing is flood prone and will become more so as sea level rises.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Living X zone has been removed. Flood issues, including sea level rise, can be appropriately addressed at subdivision and resource consent stage.
PC69-0208	Paul Comrie	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It fails to meet Lincoln's vision outlined in the 2001 document.</li> <li>• PC69 is outside the scope of the district plan.</li> <li>• The scale of the proposed development is too large and sections too small.</li> <li>• Does not take account of natural surroundings.</li> <li>• The ODP shows a by-pass road through the University campus.</li> <li>• Does not meet the objective set out in the draft Long Term Plan.</li> <li>• Proposal places unacceptable stress on community services.</li> <li>• The plan change area includes Class 1 and 2 Versatile soils.</li> </ul>	Reject Plan Change 69 in its entirety.	Reject. The issues raised in terms of scale, natural surroundings, community services and Class 1 and 2 versatile soils have been addressed and considered in reaching the overall Recommendation. The Living Z zoning is appropriate and the proposal provides significant development capacity in an area where there is significant demand.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0209	Christopher and Mary Baugh	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as submitter has already witnessed the Lincoln community expand rapidly and observed the congestion in the main street, parking problems, noise, pollution and litter. The main reasons for objection is the loss of productive land required to feed our growing population. There is enough housing in the area and services are already stretched with the character of Lincoln being adversely effected.	Reject plan change 69 to the District Plan.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. 'Main street' (Gerald Street) are being addressed through separate process and Lincoln Town Centre Plan.
PC69-0210	Lance Roper	001	Oppose In Part	Submitter is concerned that the land to the south of PC69 will remain rural, and will continue to be a working farm and the reverse sensitivity effects which are likely arise as a result: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Spray drift from agrichemical applications</li> <li>Fertiliser application</li> <li>Irregular working hours during peak seasons causing disturbance to residential properties</li> <li>Cultivation in preparation for fine seed bed</li> <li>Increased safety risks with heavy traffic movements on public roads.</li> </ul>	Amend the plan change so that: Developer contribute to 10m vegetation buffer <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.8m paling fence on top of 1.5m x 1m bunding along Collins Road to mitigate against reverse sensitive issues.</li> <li>No direct access from or to individual sections from Collins or Springs Road for the proposed PC 69</li> <li>Contribute to a roundabout at intersection of Collins Road and Springs Road.</li> <li>Upgrading roading infrastructure on Springs Road and Collins Road to deal with increased heavy traffic movements.</li> </ul>	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0266	Theresa Kortegast	FS014	Support In Part	<i>Will a covenant or caveat be in place of new homes to ensure there is no objection to agricultural works taking place in neighbouring properties, including but not limited to farm machinery, spraying of fertilizers and pesticides, all times of day?</i>	<i>Ensure covenants are in place to protect existing rural properties and activities that take place on these lots.</i>	<i>Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.</i>
PC69-0211	Lincoln Roper	001	Support In Part	Not stated.	Not specified.	N/A
PC69-0212	Brendan Herries	001	Support	Supports the proposal for the plan change and growth of the Lincoln township in line with the proposed plan change.	Requests that the future infrastructure plan is fast tracked to ensure the township can continue to provide infrastructure for the growing town.	Accept in part. Fast-tracking of infrastructure plan not appropriate plan change matter.
PC69-0213	Samantha Elder	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inconsistent with the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and Greater Christchurch Future Development Strategy (Our Space 2018-48).</li> <li>Undermines and puts at risk the Greater Christchurch Partnership and ongoing collaborative urban planning processes.</li> <li>No 'housing crisis' in Greater Christchurch &amp; importance of repopulating the Christchurch CBD.</li> <li>Planning and funding for infrastructure and services.</li> <li>Natural hazards and climate risk.</li> <li>Poor transport connections.</li> <li>Access to education.</li> <li>Increase in carbon emissions.</li> <li>Doesn't implement the Lincoln Town Centre Plan.</li> <li>Use of highly productive soils.</li> </ul>	Reject the Plan Change 69 in its entirety. Alternatively, if plan change 69 is not rejected seek that the specific matters and recommendations raised in submission are addressed in the decision.	Reject. All matters raised have been addressed and considered in Recommendation. No evidence that the plan change puts at risk the Greater Christchurch Partnership and collaborative urban planning processes on a wider basis. This plan change assessed on its merits. Lincoln and Christchurch CBD are different markets. No evidence of any impact on repopulating the Christchurch CBD. Do not consider it in any way impacts on the implementation of the Lincoln Town Centre Plan.
PC69-0214	Yuwei Li	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to use of Versatile soils as defined by ECAN. Inner Plains zone has plenty of land available for residential development through subdivision. Intensification in the Inner Plains zone won't affect the bottom line on versatile land. By focusing residential development in the Inner Plains zone, the Selwyn District council can operate under the RMA and give effect to the NPS-UD. The scope of the ITA with regard to traffic impact is hugely inadequate. There will be great amount of traffic generated between the proposed development and Christchurch. Key corridors are already operating at or near capacity during the peak time. Bottlenecks beyond the scope studied in the ITA but would be significantly affected by the proposed rezoning. The proposed development is not infrastructure-ready and cannot add to development capacity in Selwyn. Abley's modelling report did not address any of the significant flaws of the ITA produced by the Novo Group, most notably the scope of ITA, neglecting the peaking pattern, and the lack of sensitivity analysis. The modelling by Abley is also too limited in scope and without sensitivity analysis.	Reject the rezoning request and keep the land in the Outer Plains zone. Reconduct the peer review of the ITA by opening up the process to competing consults and ensuring peer reviewer's independence from the applicant.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Additional evidence provided in relation to the ITA and methods included in the ODP to address any modelling issues.
PC69-0215	Withdrawn					
PC69-0216	Victoria Hoban	001	Oppose	Opposes the plan change as it is well known by the community that current venues are already at capacity, the view regarding the proximity to existing facilities negating the need for more, does not demonstrate understanding of the communities needs or requirements.	Decline plan change 69 proposal.	Reject. All issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Note the 'new connecting road' referred to no longer proposed.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>This proposal significantly increases the population and size of Lincoln township it will see the disappearance of the wonderful character and sense of community that the township has had and continues to make it a superb place to live.</p> <p>The current routes in and out of the city and also to the south are simply not adequate for traffic volumes, and already result in prolonged transit times. There is no mass transport option for the area and limited public transport which is also impacted by traffic congestion.</p> <p>Loss of 190 hectares of valuable and much needed versatile soils (LUC Classes 1-3) which are so important for our local areas food production, emission's reduction, and to help with mitigating climate change.</p> <p>The maps appear to show a new connecting road through a wetland/nature reserve. This is unacceptable and in conflict with environmental policy and ideals.</p> <p>The proposal conflicts with the Operative and Proposed District Plan.</p>		
PC69-0217	Verdeco Park Community	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the proposed bypass road will run through an area currently designated as a reserve and storm water management area negatively impacting the surrounding properties and devalue them as well as adding another busy road that will prevent children from walking/biking to school and also put off people from walking and biking around their immediate neighbourhood.</p> <p>The proposed bypass road will exponentially increase the traffic through Verdeco Park and the streets within the subdivision are not designed for increased numbers. Streets in the rural zoned area are too narrow and do not offer appropriate parking to allow for two way traffic in many cases.</p>	Delete the bypass road and require the developer to remove it from all development plans	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Note that a number of the key issues in terms of Springs Road transportation have been addressed in the amended ODP.
PC69-0217	Verdeco Park Community	002	Oppose	The developers have suggested roads running into Verdeco Park from the south. This is not in line with the design of the roads within the rural sections of Verdeco Park. The roads are narrow, and effectively operate as one way if there is someone parked on the curb. If the traffic increased by more than the planned Verdeco subdivision this would cause safety issues for people walking out of their homes and trying to cross the road.	<p>Delete all through roads into Verdeco Park; alternatively</p> <p>Amend the design to ensure safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers; widen roads; add foot paths to both sides; create parking spaces and safe crossing areas.</p>	
PC69-0217	Verdeco Park Community	003	Oppose	<p>The Springs Road/Edward Street roundabout/interchange is expected to operate at full capacity once Te Whariki is completed.</p> <p>The proposed plan change would add an approximate 14,000 car trips per day to Springs Road, passing through the interchange without any improvements being planned.</p> <p>The ODP does not indicate any plans for safe road crossings to be installed at Springs Road to allow children from Verdeco Park to safely cross the road to go to schools in Lincoln.</p> <p>Springs Road does not currently have safe turning lanes/slipways to and from Verdeco Park.</p>	<p>Require the developer to contribute to the upgrade of the roundabout to an interchange with traffic lights;</p> <p>Require the developer to plan and construct safe road crossings for Springs Road at the Verdeco Park junction and in other key points;</p> <p>Require the developer to plan and construct, alternatively contribute to, a turning lane into Verdeco Park.</p>	
PC69-0217	Verdeco Park Community	004	Oppose In Part	<p>The development has not planned appropriately for the amenities required for the number of households they are adding to the community. Providing appropriate amenities within the proposed Lincoln South area would create a stronger sense of community and provide opportunities for people to connect with each other.</p> <p>Emergency services, including fire, ambulance and policing, are currently stretched with existing new developments, including Verdeco Park.</p> <p>The primary schools are both set to hit capacity and the high school is already struggling with the current load.</p> <p>Proposing that peak time wastewater overflow ponds be utilised to compensate for lack of treatment capacity at local wastewater treatment plants is not an acceptable engineering solution.</p> <p>Concerned that the layout and size of lots is not consistent with the surrounding subdivisions and the Plan Change would adversely change the character of Lincoln.</p>	<p>Require key amenities that so that they are suitable for the larger number of people (library, post-office, public parks and playgrounds).</p> <p>Require the developer to contribute to the expansion of emergency services.</p> <p>Require the developer to work alongside the Ministry of Education and the Selwyn District Council to isolate areas of land that must be set aside for educational facilities.</p> <p>Require the developers to come up with a suitable solution for wastewater management and pay to upgrade or build new facilities as required.</p> <p>Require sections that complement and enhance the surrounding areas, with provisions for open, shared areas and reserves and a focus on stormwater management.</p>	Reject. Consider that reserves are appropriate. Has been consultation with the Ministry of Education and amendments to the ODP to address potential school needs. Wastewater management issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. The reserves and stormwater management issues appropriately addressed.
PC69-0218	Janine Waites	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as Lincoln has the most fertile land in the country and do not agree with using this land for housing. Lincoln is a wonderful small town with a country feel that is being lost. There are not enough schools to cope with another large subdivision. There are not enough amenities, supermarkets, adequate roading for all of these extra people and roading. The traffic in Lincoln is already getting worse and worse every day and it will be so much worse. The beauty of Lincoln is being lost with subdivisions and overcrowding. The main street is already struggling with parking and traffic.	That plan change 69 not go ahead.	Reject for the reasons recorded in Recommendation. Issues all addressed and considered in Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0219	Britta Liberty	001	Oppose	Opposes the proposed bypass road will run through an area currently designated as a reserve and storm water management area negatively impacting the surrounding properties and devalue them as well as adding another busy road that will prevent children from walking/biking to school and also put off people from walking and biking around their immediate neighbourhood.  The proposed bypass road will exponentially increase the traffic through Verdecos Park and the streets within the subdivision are not designed for increased numbers. Streets in the rural zoned area are too narrow and do not offer appropriate parking to allow for two-way traffic in many cases.	Delete the bypass road and require the developer to remove it from all development plans.	Accept in part. Bypass road deleted from ODP.
PC69-0219	Britta Liberty	002	Oppose In Part	The developers have suggested roads running into Verdecos Park from the south. This is not in line with the design of the roads within the rural sections of Verdecos Park. The roads are narrow, and effectively operate as one way if there is someone parked on the curb. If the traffic increased by more than the planned Verdecos subdivision this would cause safety issues for people walking out of their homes and trying to cross the road.	Delete all through roads into Verdecos Park; alternatively Amend the design to ensure safety for pedestrians, cyclists and drivers; widen roads; add foot paths to both sides; create parking spaces and safe crossing areas.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation and in summary of Verdecos Park submission.
PC69-0219	Britta Liberty	003	Oppose In Part	The Springs Road/Edward Street roundabout/interchange is expected to operate at full capacity once Te Whariki is completed.  The proposed plan change would add an approximate 14,000 car trips per day to Springs Road, passing through the interchange without any improvements being planned.  The ODP does not indicate any plans for safe road crossings to be installed at Springs Road to allow children from Verdecos Park to safely cross the road to go to schools in Lincoln.  Springs Road does not currently have safe turning lanes/slipways to and from Verdecos Park.	Require the developer to contribute to the upgrade of the roundabout to an interchange with traffic lights; Require the developer to plan and construct safe road crossings for Springs Road at the Verdecos Park junction and in other key points; Require the developer to plan and construct, alternatively contribute to, a turning lane into Verdecos Park.	Accept in part. Note contributions in relation to roundabout, road crossings addressed.
PC69-0219	Britta Liberty	004	Oppose In Part	The development has not planned appropriately for the amenities required for the number of households they are adding to the community. Providing appropriate amenities within the proposed Lincoln South area would create a stronger sense of community and provide opportunities for people to connect with each other.  Emergency services, including fire, ambulance and policing, are currently stretched with existing new developments, including Verdecos Park.  The primary schools are both set to hit capacity and the high school is already struggling with the current load.  Proposing that peak time wastewater overflow ponds be utilised to compensate for lack of treatment capacity at local wastewater treatment plants is not an acceptable engineering solution.  Concerned that the layout and size of lots is not consistent with the surrounding subdivisions and the Plan Change would adversely change the character of Lincoln.	Require key amenities that so that they are suitable for the larger number of people (library, post-office, public parks and playgrounds). Require the developer to contribute to the expansion of emergency services. Require the developer to work alongside the Ministry of Education and the Selwyn District Council to isolate areas of land that must be set aside for educational facilities. Require the developers to come up with a suitable solution for wastewater management and pay to upgrade or build new facilities as required. Require sections that complement and enhance the surrounding areas, with provisions for open, shared areas and reserves and a focus on stormwater management.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Consider that reserves are appropriate. Has been consultation with the Ministry of Education and amendments to the ODP to address potential school needs. Wastewater management issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. The reserves and stormwater management issues appropriately addressed.
PC69-0220	Kathleen Liberty	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Under-estimates the effects of climate change and flooding in the proposed area.</li> <li>Date used may be outdated.</li> <li>Sea level rise and flooding risk is greater than estimates.</li> <li>The proposal under-estimates the impact of increased traffic and does not address greenhouse gas emissions.</li> <li>The Developer identifies increased traffic flow but does not calculate greenhouse emissions for this.</li> <li>Current land use is already low greenhouse gas emitting.</li> <li>Area is outside of the boundaries for development identified in Our Space.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0221	Hugh Mingard	001	Oppose	Opposes Plan Change 69 for the reasons outlined below: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed plan change is not consistent with the National Policy Statement (NPS-UD). Approving this proposal would result in greater urban sprawl, less efficient transport with higher maintenance costs (borne by the council and ratepayers, not by the developer), and a higher reliance on cars at the expense of public transport (and so greater impact on climate change).</li> <li>The massive scale of the development (relative to the current size of Lincoln) will result in a huge increase in commuting traffic along the already busy Springs Road route into Christchurch (for employment and access to retail services).</li> </ul> This increased distance and poor connectivity between the area of proposed development and the	Reject Plan Change 69 in its entirety.	Reject. All issues have been addressed and considered in Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>centre of Lincoln will result in larger numbers of people driving to the local centre and pressure on the already close-to-capacity parking in the town.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The area is sited on difficult soils for development due to their tendency to water-logging, high water table and presence of peaty-organic) sub-soils.</li> <li>A significant part of the eastern area lies in the 200y ARI rainfall flood zone mapped for Selwyn District Council. In addition to the potential flooding of the proposed development area itself, the scale of development proposed has the potential to cause problems “up-stream” of the development by choking the southwards exit of flood waters from a large part of the township.</li> </ul>		
PC69-0222	Suvi Viljanen	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as it is inconsistent with Selwyn District Council Long Term Plan for residential housing in Lincoln.</p> <p>Infrastructure (roading, waste service, water supply upgrades) to cater for this application is not in the long-term plan. Roading would need to be substantially improved to cater for 1400 extra vehicle movements per day.</p> <p>Schools (both high school and primary schools) will be required to be built to adequately cater for the suggested increase in population. No recreational areas (sports fields) are included in the application.</p> <p>There are not enough medical centres to cater for the increase in population.</p> <p>The majority of the land in the application is considered fertile soils 1 and 2.</p> <p>Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahangai O Te Horapa Nohoanga (Our Space 2018-2048) identifies sufficient development capacity to meet anticipated housing needs in Lincoln over a thirty year planning horizon out to 2048.</p>	Reject the plan change application.	Reject. Issues raised addressed and considered in Recommendation. Considerable evidence provided in relation to potential shortfalls in development capacity. Reserves issues addressed in Recommendation and note development of new recreational areas/sports field as discussed by Mr Rykers and addressed in the LTP.
PC69-0223	Tyler Watson	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the plan change due to the size of this subdivision not being in the general best interests of the community, especially since it is unplanned.</p> <p>The size of the Medium Density Small-lot and Medium Density Comprehensive sections is too small to allow this type of lifestyle and this subdivision will feel cramped and claustrophobic as a result.</p> <p>This massive influx of people will not all be able to work in the surrounding Lincoln area and the Economic report mentions that people will need to factor in the cost of travel when considering buying in this subdivision. This implies that a large number of the future population will be working in Christchurch and travelling to and from Christchurch in a regular manner. This type of car-based, high-frequency travel will negatively impact traffic conditions in and around Lincoln – as mentioned in the traffic report – and will significantly contribute to further degradation of our environment.</p> <p>The ecological assessment mentions that in the vast majority of cases, urban development has negative effects on local aquatic flora and fauna.</p> <p>The land which is the subject of this application is all ranked as Land Use Capability Class 1-3.</p> <p>Current infrastructure will not be sufficient to service it.</p> <p>Like to see more ambition and vision in terms of encouraging people to live in ways that foster community and reduce our impact on the environment.</p>	<p>Reject the plan change on the basis that it is not planned for and is so large.</p> <p>Alternatively, reduce the size of the area being rezoned by at least half, there should be more of this higher density living planned than is currently in the ODP, include provision of a supermarket, all households on sections 500m<sup>2</sup> or larger to have rainwater collection tanks, include space for a new primary school, early childhood centres, sports fields, and skate park and greater emphasis on including ‘green technologies’ and enabling self-sufficiency of residents.</p>	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Consider density is appropriate. Issues in relation to infrastructure addressed. Acknowledge no express recognition of green technologies but can be addressed at subdivision/construction stage.
PC69-0224	Matthew Keen	001	Support	<p>Supports the ongoing development to allow others to be able to enjoy our great Lincoln community.</p> <p>Selwyn District and Lincoln offer a rural community that has plenty to offer and the location is within close proximity to Lincoln township and easily biked or walked.</p>	Approve plan change 69.	Accept for reasons recorded in Recommendation.
PC69-0225	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	001	Neither Support Nor Oppose	<p>Submitter notes that consideration should be given to prioritising development of areas within the projected infrastructure boundary to promote a sustainable, consolidated centres-based urban growth pattern.</p> <p>Proposal provides minimal improvement to providing transport nodes that benefit the Greater Christchurch Region, i.e., park and ride infrastructure.</p> <p>Potential for downstream traffic effects have not been adequately addressed.</p> <p>The proposed development will further contribute to the transport associated carbon emissions as there appears to be a reliance on private vehicle usage and no provision for improved public transport to support future residents.</p>	That the issues raised above are suitably addressed.	Reject for reasons recorded in Recommendation. Downstream traffic effects have been addressed and considered. Note inclusion of park and ride infrastructure which will enable provision of improved public transport but that decision rests with CRC.
PC69-0226	Anna Sapsford	001	Support In Part	<p>Submitter appreciates the effort gone into providing for the surrounding environment, however, not enough has been done to ensure that the effects are not only minimised but allow for the environment to flourish. Seeks to encourage amendments around native planting to allow for riparian efforts, while increasing biodiversity.</p> <p>The Greenspace overall seems very small, more opportunities for effective green space to incorporated to keep a more rural feel to the area, as many citizens are wanting to see this.</p>	Amended to address the above.	Accept in part. Changes to ODP address issues in relation to greenspace and ecological management plan now required.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0227	Robert Parsons	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change and considers that the SDC current and proposed plans regarding zoning of land should be backed, in total, based on their historic record of accommodating climate change, environmental issues (including recognition of soil quality and uniqueness), schooling and recreation demands, unique character (and history) of Lincoln, transport and traffic issues (already struggling). Urban zoning should not be allowed outside the Urban Limit in the Regional Council RPS. Plan change should also be subject to the Climate Commission report dated 31 May 2021.	Reject Change 69 to Operative Plan.	Reject. Issues raised have been addressed and considered in Recommendation. NPS-UD enables appropriate plan changes outside the identified urban areas to be considered.
PC69-0228	Dean and Linda Waller	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Roading along Springs Rd inadequate to support projected volume of traffic from a large new subdivision.</li> <li>• Infrastructure i.e. water supply etc not adequate.</li> <li>• Support Services, schooling, medical services etc presently inadequate for projected rate.</li> <li>• Rolleston has the new motorway - more logical for housing expansion there.</li> <li>• Lincoln village culture will be destroyed.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject. Note issues have all been addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0229	John Irvine	001	Oppose	Opposes Plan Change 69 for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Protection of Soils: the area has strong presence of Recent Fluvial (RF), Gley Recent (GR) and Pallic Immature (PI) soils. The importance of maintaining and protecting such soils (mainly GR and RF) for farming and food production is of utmost importance for future generations.</li> <li>• Protection of Reserve in Liffey Springs: oppose any proposal for a road connecting the subdivision to Liffey Springs Drive.</li> <li>• Altering the fundamental Character of Lincoln - the proposed development would increase population of Lincoln by approximately 67% and alter significantly the fundamental character of Lincoln and the various reasons why so many truly love living here.</li> <li>• Infrastructure - there is no Infrastructure capacity for such a sizable development, and we don't see Schools, Sports areas, Reserves and Parks, proposed and built in the subdivision proposed by the developer.</li> </ul>	Reject the plan change.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Note removal of Liffey Springs Drive connection.
PC69-0230	Waihora Ellesmere Trust	001	Oppose	Opposes the application for the Plan Change recognising that the LI (Liffey) Creek and Ararira/LII River are tributaries to Lake Ellesmere/Te Waihora as are the springs, streams and drains flowing into them. Changes in the nature of the land use in their catchment affects the ecological health of these tributaries and the water bodies into which they flow. The potential for adverse effects (e.g., sedimentation, contaminants, light, noise) on the environment within and beyond the area covered by Plan Change 69 are of a scale that we are concerned may will adversely affect the fauna and flora and other species that are important to the ecological health of the tributaries and the Lake itself. The Trusts opposition to the proposed plan change is based on:- The lack of sufficient information in the application identifying and assessing the adverse environmental effects. The adverse environmental effects (including cumulative effects) on fauna and flora and waterbodies that are likely to occur during construction of developments that will be facilitated by the Plan Change; as well as those in-going. The lack of sufficient proposed mitigation to address the concerns set out above. The Trust is concerned that approving the application would not promote sustainable management of the natural and physical resources of the country, region or district and thus would be contrary to the purpose of the Act. It also does not meet the requirements of the Freshwater Management National Policy Statement 2020, particularly in relation to Te Mana o Te Wai.	Plan Change 69 be declined.	Reject for the reasons recorded in Recommendation. The issues in relation to the springs, streams and drains have been addressed and considered. Overall I consider the plan change provides for maintenance and potentially enhancement of those values including through the use of the now required Ecological Management Plan. Further information has been provided through evidence and the need for assessment by suitably qualified and experienced practitioners in relation to a detailed groundwater level investigation and specific construction measures now included, including the pumping of water into downstream water courses to mitigate flow loss in springs.
PC69-0231	Jen Laraman	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 as more houses means more traffic and Prebbleton township itself is bursting at the seams with the increased traffic from Lincoln. Intersection is busy and dangerous especially at peak times and the wait times to safely cross are getting longer and longer, this will only increase the amount of traffic with the development coming from the south. More cars more chances of accidents. The local Lincoln high school is at capacity with recent boundary changes to relieves some of this pressure. It doesn't appear that the new subdivision is planning any major infrastructure the current supermarket would not cope with that increase. Lincoln is running the risk of losing its country, community feel, by opening up yet another lot of land to developers. The town is selling up their fertile and arable land, once it's in houses it's gone.	Plan change 69 be declined.	Reject. Traffic issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Note ODP provisions relating to specific upgrades, timing and anticipated funding mechanisms now included. Educational facilities addressed and considered including provisions in the ODP that new educational facilities can be provided within the block or in the wider area albeit subject to a needs assessment.
PC69-0232	Tim Curran	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change request on the grounds that rezoning 190 ha of highly productive land is not a sustainable use. The Draft National Policy Statement for Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) produced in	Not specified.	Reject for reasons addressed in Recommendation.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<p>August 2019 explicitly aims to ‘protect highly productive land from inappropriate subdivision, use and development’.</p> <p>The reverse sensitivity impacts of this proposed Plan change request are also likely to extend beyond the 190 ha directly affected by the proposal.</p> <p>If highly productive land is used for housing, it means that less of such land is available for either agriculture, conservation or ecological restoration. A sustainable vision of land use on the Canterbury Plains does not involve rezoning large parts of highly productive land to permit urban development.</p>		
PC69-0233	Penny Curran	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change will lead to the permanent loss of 190 hectares of highly productive soils and this is not sustainable use of the land.</p> <p>Development is at odds with the Greater Christchurch Urban/Future Development Strategy (2019) which concluded that Selwyn likely already has enough land zoned residential to cater for population growth out to 2028.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure and services are not suitable for such an increase in population i.e. sewerage, services such as doctors, health services, public transport services, emergency services, community facilities and schools.</p> <p>The roading network will not cope with such the population increase. There is already safety issues with cars from the community, commuters to the University and CRI’s with a high accident numbers at the crossroads /intersections in Selwyn.</p>	Reject the plan change.	Reject. Issues considered in Recommendation, including infrastructure and roading. The proposal provides significant capacity.
PC69-0234	Ian Collins	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change on the basis that Lincoln does not have and does want the magnitude of infrastructure that would be required for the proposed development, including schools, medical facilities, policing, roading, and other essential infrastructure. To put it in place would change the character and pleasantness of Lincoln and its surrounding area irretrievably.</p>	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation including infrastructure and amenity related issues.
PC69-0235	Percival Apolinario	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Traffic and roading infrastructure. At present, the roading infrastructure connecting Lincoln to Christchurch already seems inadequate. The two main roads connecting Lincoln to Christchurch are experiencing traffic congestion.</li> <li>• Public Transportation in Lincoln is very limited.</li> <li>• Lincoln has limited commercial infrastructure.</li> <li>• Schools and recreational centres have lagged behind recent population growth.</li> <li>• Development of high-density housing is in contradiction to Lincoln’s small township and rural character.</li> </ul>	Plan change 69 be declined.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Proposed density is appropriate.
PC69-0236	Seth Atkinson	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as 2000 is too many additional households. Requests an EV sharing station, so people can borrow cars and not have to own them.</p> <p>Keep the soil for growing food to share and flowers and plants that make bees and birds feel safe and happy.</p> <p>Create places for walking and bikes only, no cars.</p> <p>Plant on the tops of the bus stops and other roofs for bees and bugs too.</p>	Oppose plan change 69.	Reject. The issues largely addressed and considered in Recommendation. The walking and cycleway provisions are appropriate and a focus of the ODP. Not appropriate to address the planting issue at plan change stage.
PC69-0237	Victoria Wadhams	001	Oppose	<p>Submitters concerns with the proposal are that Lincoln is not a location that has the said ‘existing services, public transport networks and infrastructure’ to cope with proposed growth.</p> <p>Road infrastructure: - to date we are experiencing high levels of traffic, many crossroad intersections that are simply not fit for the volume of traffic.</p> <p>As the town has grown, so has the use of cars, we are not serviced with enough flexible public transport to enable people to make better travel choices.</p> <p>Lincoln residents present with dust and dry air related conditions due in part to constant dust created by the subdivisions over a number of years now.</p> <p>Children coming into the community should not have to face overcrowded schools, with ad hoc teaching provisions because someone wants to increase housing with ill thought out plans.</p> <p>Soil needs to be protected, we have destroyed so much versatile and healthy soil with careless use of highly productive land.</p> <p>Climate change.</p> <p>Affordable housing.</p> <p>The sheer number is plan changes in Selwyn is a huge concern.</p>	Oppose in Full.	Reject. Issues all addressed and considered in Recommendation including infrastructure, public transportation and soils. A park and ride facility is now included. Issues of dust can be addressed through construction management.
PC69-0238	Ralph Scott	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed rezoning will permanently remove 190ha of agricultural versatile soils from any productive use.</li> </ul>	Decline the Rezoning of the Land	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Proposal provides significant

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The change in Lincoln's character.</li> <li>The magnitude of effect of the plan change increase Lincoln by a third.</li> <li>Increased road congestion.</li> <li>Compromising the quality of local waterways.</li> </ul>		development capacity and waterways protection and enhancement methodologies proposed.
PC69-0239	M & A Wright	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes Plan Change 69 as it includes submitters land (Lot 1 DP 55313). The ODP shows a road going through property which cannot go ahead as submitter has no plans to sell their property.</p> <p>Submitter operates business from home which involves use of plant and equipment that may make noise during the day that residential residents may not like. Rezoning the area allowing for future development will result in us having neighbours that may not be sympathetic towards our rural lifestyle.</p> <p>Flooding potential as we are surrounded on three sides by this Plan Change and the earthworks will involve substantial changes in the contouring and levels around our land.</p> <p>Dust and noise from earthworks near us (or carried on the wind) could have potential adverse health effects.</p> <p>Other concerns re PC69 include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Loss of highly productive land;</li> <li>Road connectivity to Verdeco Park;</li> <li>Impact on village and community feel of Lincoln;</li> <li>Building a large residential development near an area of springs could lead to unexpected water issues for residents;</li> <li>The current schools are not located on the south-west side of Lincoln so there will be a lot more traffic movements with parents dropping off/picking up children, particularly young children that they will not want biking or walking such a long (and potentially unsafe) distance;</li> <li>Emergency Services and Community Facilities;</li> <li>There is a heritage feature on the grass verge on the east side of Springs Road near the current Mainscape landscaping business. This is a concrete trough built by the Pearson Brothers who were locally based engineers in the early 1900s;</li> <li>Birdlife in the area includes bellbirds, white and grey heron, pheasants, quail and plovers. More earthworks to create residential sites is going to impact substantially on the habitat of these birds; and</li> <li>More residential housing is going to impact on the night sky which has already changed significantly looking north from Collins Road.</li> </ul>	<p>Reject Plan Change 69.</p> <p>Alternatively if the Plan Change does go ahead then it is requested that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a substantial setback be imposed around the three sides of our property to keep the housing development and residents further away from our rural and business activities to reduce complaints;</li> <li>Council to ensure that there are no adverse effects on our property from changes in land contouring; and</li> <li>dust to be managed appropriately and earthworks to not be allowed outside of the hours of 7am-6pm.</li> <li>Plan change is amended to address other concerns raised.</li> </ul>	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Dust and noise addressed through construction management. Flooding potential addressed in Recommendation. The heritage feature is within road reserve.
PC69-0240	Hamish Rennie	001	Oppose	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 69 on the grounds set out in the Waihora Ellesmere Trust and because of ancestral connections to Lake Ellesmere and my concerns for the environment generally. Support the submission made by the Waihora Ellesmere Trust in its entirety, in addition has the following concerns regarding the adverse effects (including cumulative):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Enables and encourages activities that would have adverse effects contrary to the nation's commitment to the Paris Agreement's targets for reduction in greenhouse gas emissions and the Climate Change Commission's report and recommendations to the Government.</li> <li>Would rezone food production land, a finite and increasingly rare resource when such land is increasingly needed.</li> <li>Would lead to a substantial new draw on water aquifers in a region where water resources are already over-allocated or and under significant pressure – especially in drought years.</li> <li>The waste discharges enabled add to the cumulative waste in our freshwater (including ground water) systems and soils.</li> <li>The developments and uses facilitated by the proposal will add to the light and sound pollution of the area.</li> <li>Insufficient infrastructure to address the increased mobility demands of the developments and uses.</li> <li>Undermines the integrity of the operative district plan and the processes of the current Selwyn District's Proposed District Plan process.</li> </ul>	Plan change 69 application be declined.	Reject. Principal issues addressed and considered in Recommendation in relation to the Waihora Ellesmere Trust. Issues of light spill and noise can potentially be addressed through district plan rules but noting residential activity not generally identified as a significant source of 'noise pollution'.
PC69-0241	Orion	001	Neither Support Nor Oppose	<p>Orion comments on the Plan Change Request:</p> <p>It is important the ODP and Plan Change Request mitigates adverse effects on strategic infrastructure and sufficient protection is provided to ensure the on-going operation, development and maintenance of these lines and their associated support structures.</p> <p>It is also critical that the Applicant and Council are aware of the need for early engagement with Orion where the electricity distribution network is within an application site.</p> <p>On this basis, we provide the following comments:</p>	<p>Orion seeks the following to facilitate the safe on-going operation, maintenance and access to Orion's assets and infrastructure within the ODP and Plan Change:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any buildings, structures and cycleways in the vicinity of the 33kV distribution line in Springs and Collins Roads must demonstrate compliance with NZECP34:2001.</li> </ul>	N/A. Importance of infrastructure acknowledged. Issues will need to be addressed at subdivision/ development stage.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The 33kV line passes through an area identified by the ODP and Plan Change Request as a future business zone. The electrical requirements and clearances stipulated by NZECP34 are mandatory and must be maintained.</li> <li>The sub-transmission nature of this line means any relocation of this infrastructure associated with or required by the ODP will be very costly.</li> <li>The ODP suggests the existing 33kV line runs very close to (if not directly above) a proposed pedestrian and cycleway route. As advised above, this line is subject to a range of minimum clearances including in relation to earthworks around poles.</li> <li>The ODP identifies a number of new roads and pathways which interface with waterways, drains and / or stormwater management areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Vegetation to be planted around existing electricity distribution lines shall be selected and/or managed to ensure that it will not result in that vegetation breaching the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</li> <li>Any construction works including the operation of mobile machinery in the vicinity of electricity distribution infrastructure must comply with the NZECP34:2001.</li> </ul>	
PC69-0242	Lincoln University Soil Society (77 members)	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change due to being in highly productive land.</p> <p>The land under the proposed Lincoln subdivision is classified as Highly Productive Land. With the forecast population growth, the amount of food produced needs to more than double what is produced now, and this Highly Productive Land is the most suitable for this production. Only 15% of New Zealand's land area is classified as highly productive. However, within Selwyn district, only 1% of soils are class 1, and 7% are class 2 (Selwyn District Council, 2018) so it is greatly important to protect this local resource.</p> <p>By using land that is not highly productive to produce food, more pesticide, fertiliser, and irrigation inputs are required, which influence the health of nearby rivers and the groundwater. It also degrades the health of the soil, impacting the soil ecosystems and health of the overall environment. Degrading the soil causes damage to the soil structure, which prevents the soil from retaining water, requiring more irrigation as well as contributing to greater overland flow (resulting in erosion and nutrient losses to surface water – degrading stream health).</p>	Decline plan change.	Reject. Issues in relation to highly productive soils addressed and considered in Recommendation and their importance is one matter to be considered as noted and recorded.
PC69-0243	Ministry of Education	001	Neither Support Nor Oppose	<p>The Ministry estimates that the addition of 2000 households is likely to put significant pressure on the rolls of Ararira Springs Primary – Te Puna o Ararira, Lincoln High School and Lincoln Primary School.</p> <p>The Ministry's school network planning and investment in Lincoln in recent years has been guided by Council advice on future development. This Council advice has been shaped by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and ODPs and the current school network has generally not been designed to accommodate any development outside of these areas.</p> <p>The Ministry has reviewed its education networks in Lincoln, particularly the Year 1-8 state education network and if PPC69 is approved, the acquisition of land for the construction of additional education facilities will be required as well as a likely review of the local primary school enrolment scheme home zone boundaries to manage demand across schools. As such, PPC69 will have a significantly greater impact on school capacity than other recent private plan changes which have occurred within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary. Consultation with the Ministry has not occurred and accordingly, the Ministry requests that PPC69 is only approved if the applicant consults with the Ministry and sufficient provisions are made to accommodate additional school age children which could include amending the ODP to provide for a new school site. Additional education facilities will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment and provide an important community service. While the Ministry is aware of the national direction of the NPS-UD in relation to unanticipated growth, it is noted that if PPC69 is approved, it may set a precedent of development outside of existing planned areas in the Selwyn District and Canterbury, which makes planning for school capacity and networks increasingly difficult.</p> <p>The Ministry requests that the envisaged vehicle and active travel access between PPC69 and Ararira Springs Primary School is clarified.</p> <p>The presence of contaminated land may be an issue for Ararira Springs School during excavation of the site, and the Ministry support a DSI and remediation prior to development and building consents being granted.</p> <p>While this is the case the Ministry has some concerns about potential odour effects on Ararira Springs Primary School and seeks confirmation from the applicant that potential effects will be mitigated.</p> <p>The Ministry also supports in principle proposed cycling and pedestrian infrastructure across, as well as to and from the PPC69 site to schools in Lincoln, as they assist in facilitating active travel modes.</p>	Requests that potential inconsistencies between Policy 8 of the NPS-UD and the CRPS are satisfactorily resolved as it relates to development capacity and well-functioning urban environments. The applicant consults with the Ministry to ensure adequate provision is made to accommodate additional school age children. This could include amending the ODP to provide for a new school site; that vehicle and active travel access between PPC69 and Ararira Springs Primary School is clarified; that vehicle and active travel from the PPC69 site to Allendale Lane and Southfield Drive is clarified; that a DSI and remediation is undertaken prior to development and building consents being granted; and that potential odour effects from the use of the existing Allendale Pump Station, tanks and emergency storage pond area on Ararira Springs Primary School be mitigated.	N/A. Potential inconsistencies between Policy 8 of the NPS-UD and CRPS have been addressed and considered in Recommendation. Significant development capacity provided and contributes to well-functioning urban environments. Note consultation has occurred with the Ministry and changes integrated into the ODP.
PC69-0244	Leandro Koteck and Soodesh Jooron	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 on the basis of protecting fertile soils valuable for food production; the proposed connection to Liffey Springs Drive adversely affecting the roading and natural environment of the area; and the scale of the proposed development altering the fundamental character of Lincoln.	Reject plan change 69.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in Recommendation. Proposed connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0245	Sonya Strahan	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 based on Objective 8a of the NPS-UD - the government and Selwyn district council are committed to reducing carbon emissions, 1500 extra car movements a day minimum will significantly increase in the environment. The government signed the Paris agreement on climate change	Decline proposed plan change 69 to the operative district plan.	Reject. Issues in relation to the NPS-UD addressed and considered. Park and ride facility now incorporated to support public transport.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
				and the government is committed to reduce to 30% below 2005 levels by 2030. This proposed development runs contrary to the governments pledge. The development should be sited on the edge of Christchurch where public transport networks are more extensive and have shorter travel distances. Regional Policy Statement Policy 5.3.7 - the traffic survey undertaken is now out of date. Parking on Gerald Street is already an issue.		
PC69-0246	Fay Miller	001	Oppose	Oppose plan change 69 due to all the good fertile soil being used for housing development. There is not anymore land/soil being made.	Not specified.	Reject. Issues of versatile soils have been addressed and considered in Recommendation. Proposal provides significant development capacity.
PC69-0247	Richard Barratt	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change as this land is good agricultural land and presently a productive dairy farm. Submitter likes the feel of where they live and don't want high density housing so close to lifestyle block. Should include houses with bigger sections bordering up to the lifestyle blocks would be a better blend.	Not specified.	Reject. Agricultural land values addressed in Recommendation. Density and distribution appropriate with higher density being internalised.
PC69-0248	Barry and Elizabeth McIvor	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change on the basis that existing infrastructure would not cope with the proposed increase in housing, in particular schools and state of Ellesmere Road. Submitter opposes any potential link to Liffey Springs Drive due to detrimental effects on amenity of residents, congestion, road safety, and impacts on wildlife. Opposes the loss of highly fertile agricultural land.	Not specified.	Reject. Infrastructure issues are addressed and considered in Recommendation. Connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed. Issues of agricultural land addressed.
PC69-0249	Grant and Dianne McPherson	001	Oppose In Part	Objects to the proposed access roading being allowed to cut through the reserve land joining Liffey Springs Drive. This would lead to significant increases in traffic impacting the current peaceful environment. Traffic danger at the Russ Drive intersection would substantially increase further endangering children from nearby Ararira Springs School.	Not specified.	Reject. Connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed.
PC69-0250	Denise Carrick	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change in full for the following reasons: Education: already insufficient schooling with no plans/solutions to address increased demand. Liffey Springs Reserve: negative impact on Liffey Springs community, the use of public reserve land, and environmental impacts on protected reserve. Roads: Ellesmere/Springs Road roundabout is already at capacity and roads are not up to standard and this development would add to congestion. Policing and Lincoln Community Patrol: concerned that low crime rates will increase with unplanned, ineffective urban development and lack of funding. Housing Development Capacity: Lincoln already has sufficient capacity until 2045. Valuable Soils: opposes use of highly productive land for housing. Medical, Health and Wellbeing: large number of building sites is already having health impacts in the community. Climate Change and Lincoln Town Centre: Plan Change 69 does not meet NPS-UD and will not maintain a village like feel.	Decline plan change 69.	Reject. Issues all addressed and considered in Recommendation. Liffey Springs Drive connection removed. Potential for educational facilities included in ODP. In terms of housing capacity, received considerable evidence that there was insufficient capacity to meet demand and that evidence has been accepted. Climate change and amenity issues addressed and considered.
PC69-0251	Susan and John Prendergast	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change 69 due to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Loss of highly productive land;</li> <li>• Lack of account taken to long term planning;</li> <li>• Effects on the environment (waterways, flora &amp; fauna);</li> <li>• Increased traffic movements;</li> <li>• Density of housing and visual impact.</li> </ul> Note: Supporting information provided.	Not Specified.	Reject. All of the issues identified have been addressed and considered in Recommendation.
PC69-0252	Lynette & Ronald Beazer	001	Oppose	Opposes plan change due to the high quality of the land and that it should be used to produce food crops. The Operative and Proposed District Plans do not include this land for re-zoning. Playing/sports fields are at capacity. The new primary school is not sufficient to cater for the increased housing. There are more appropriate locations for such development. Traffic is already a serious issue in Lincoln. Proposal to link with Liffey Springs Drive will endanger children and the ecosystem. Wishes to retain the village feel of Lincoln.	Not Specified.	Reject. Issues raised have been addressed and considered in Recommendation. Plan change request provides mechanism for consideration of the rezoning. Playing/sports field discussed at some length with Mr Ryker from SDC. Has been engagement with Ministry of Education in relation to potential need for facilities. The location is appropriate.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0253	Peter Francis and Kathleen Clarke	001	Oppose	<p>Submitters consider that the operative and proposed District Plans should be retained based on their historic record.</p> <p>The Applicant has not provided detail of how sections will be reasonably deemed affordable.</p> <p>Opposes the development of versatile soils for housing.</p> <p>Concerned that existing community facilities and infrastructure will not cope with the level of proposed growth.</p> <p>Wishes to retain the rural village feel of Lincoln, being the reason, the submitters chose to purchase their property.</p>	Not specified.	Reject. Issues in relation to versatile soils, community facilities and infrastructure addressed and considered in Recommendation. Evidence on the rural village feel of Lincoln again addressed and considered in evidence and Recommendation. Proposal provides significant development capacity.
PC69-0254	Dorothy Jordan	001	Oppose	<p>Submitter is against plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The distinct sense of identity and community will be diluted/changed. Urban sprawl - Lincoln should not be a dormitory suburb of Christchurch.</li> <li>Volume of additional traffic.</li> <li>Taking good productive soil to build houses on.</li> <li>High water table of subject land.</li> <li>Negatives of this development outweigh the positives.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject. Issues raised by the submitter all addressed and considered in Recommendation. Overall consider the benefits of the development outweigh the costs.
PC69-0255	Roy and Margaret Cole	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change as the connection with housing and farming will disappear if this development goes ahead.</p> <p>Will create some 4000 additional cars on the roads around Lincoln causing congestion and pollution. No provision for public transport.</p> <p>Education, medical and recreational/community facilities are already under pressure and more would have to be built.</p> <p>Proposal is all about money.</p>	Refuse plan change 69.	Reject. Matters were addressed and considered in Recommendation. Proposal will have economic benefits.
PC69-0256	Lynne Prattley	001	Oppose	<p>Considers that some of the reasons why plan change 69 should not proceed are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Soils in the area are the most productive types and should be used more effectively for the production of food.</li> <li>The area is outside the area identified for housing and there are no provisions in the District Plan for additional sewage capacity, water supply and roading required to service the development.</li> <li>Lincoln has become a desirable place to live, but to allow the population to increase by some 60% will result in it becoming less desirable.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject. Issues raised in submission have all been addressed and considered in Recommendation. These include soils, infrastructure and impact on Lincoln. Proposal provides significant development capacity in an area of high demand.
PC69-0257	Gillian Jaques	001	Oppose	<p>Submitters object to the proposed link road through the reserve and joining with Liffey Springs Drive. This will increase through traffic to Edwards Street. Would prefer this to be cycle/pedestrian only.</p>	Not specified.	Reject. Liffey Springs Drive connection no longer proposed.
PC69-0258	John and Annett Priest	001	Oppose	<p>Submitter opposes plan change 69 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Productive land going to housing;</li> <li>Roading concerns and traffic congestion;</li> <li>Village atmosphere will be gone;</li> <li>Small sections and low cost housing;</li> <li>Rolleston more suitable for such housing development.</li> </ul>		Reject. Issues identified and discussed in evidence and Recommendation. Location of development is appropriate.
PC69-0259	Craigie and Ray Withers	001	Oppose	<p>Submitters oppose the proposed Springs Road/Weedons Road bypass through Verdecos Park. The bypass road will run through a reserve and stormwater management area. The increase in traffic and pollution will adversely impact on submitters quality of life and devalue their property.</p>	Delete proposed bypass road from current and future development plans.	Reject but note Bypass road deleted.
PC69-0260	Shelly Owens	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes plan change 69 as the land is taonga and an area of significance being the last remaining open area and homesite of the Springs Run, from which the founding land for Lincoln was subdivided in 1862. The land incorporates a known flooding area made up of and including areas of Springs Creek, LII River and drains. The proposed houses and stormwater from roads will adversely effect the LII River.</p>	Reject Plan Change 69.	Reject. Heritage recognised in relation to the homestead area. Flooding and effects on LII River appropriately addressed and considered in evidence and Recommendation. Impacts on LII River considered and require further assessment and consideration at subdivision and consenting stage.
PC69-0261	Malcolm and Lynette	001	Oppose	<p>Opposes the development of good quality soil for housing.</p> <p>Increase of traffic on Springs and Ellesmere Roads.</p> <p>Lincoln does not have the infrastructure to cope with the extra people and cars.</p> <p>Existing streets are too narrow and include accommodation for overseas students who all have cars parked on the street.</p> <p>The proposed development will impact on the Village atmosphere, which was the reason the submitters moved to Lincoln. High density housing does not fit with the existing Lincoln Township.</p>	Not specified.	Reject. The issues identified have been addressed and considered in Recommendation including traffic and infrastructure. Housing density appropriate.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation
PC69-0262	Alan Currie	001	Oppose	<p>Submitter is concerned that the addition of approximately 2000 homes will have a negative impact on the existing fabric of Lincoln society. Lincoln needs to retain its small town character that attracted many of the existing residents. Negative impacts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ability of existing roading infrastructure to cope with additional traffic (also including during construction).</li> <li>• Additional costs on existing roading works and undermining of Government's aim to reduce carbon emissions.</li> <li>• The use of reserve land for proposed access road.</li> <li>• Ability of existing water supply to cope.</li> <li>• Population increase leading to increased costs on existing ratepayers due to need to expand existing services such as library/police/fire.</li> </ul>	Not specified.	Reject. Impacts of concern all addressed and considered in Recommendation. Costs primarily met either directly by the developer or through development contributions.
PC69-0263	Ann Judson Farr	001	Oppose In Part	<p>Submitter moved to Liffey Springs Drive as able to still feel part of the land and as a gardener able to enjoy David Hobbs wonderful plantings. Seeks precise details of how Liffey Springs Drive and Jimmy Adams Tce will be impacted by Plan 69. Concerned about future development of Moirs Lane as this is used to access the rail trail to Little River.</p>	Not specified.	Reject in part. Connection to Liffey Springs Drive no longer proposed. Development of Moirs Lane able to be undertaken without impacting on access to rail trial.