Plan Change 7
Schedule of Recommended Decisions

Additional land in Rolleston requested to be rezoned via Plan Change 7

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Marilyn Mc Clure & Graeme Hubbard	**S17**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 26
		D2	We ask that our land zoning - Living 2A be returned to that of all our surrounding neighbours - Living 1B	Accept	Recommendation No 26
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 26
	F107 - Kevin Williams (Late)		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 26
Phillip Russell	**S18**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 26
		D2	We ask that our land zoning - Living 2A be returned to that of our neighbours - Living 1B which was the zoning we shared with them prior to the airport sound contour zoning being imposed on us by Plan Change 60.	Accept	Recommendation No 26
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 26
	F22 - SCCB		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 26
	F107 - Kevin Williams (Late)		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 26
		D3	Alternatively we ask that our land zoning be joined with the new Living Z area	Reject	Recommendation No 26
Annmaree & Hendrickus Hofmeester	**S19**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 26
		D2	We ask that our land zoning (Living 2A) be returned to that of other residents in the Sheralea Estate subdivision (Living 1B) which was the zoning shared with them prior to the airport sound contour zoning being imposed by Plan Change 60.	Accept	Recommendation No 26
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 26
	F22 - SCCB		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 26
	F107 - Kevin Williams (Late)		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 26
		D3	Alternatively we ask that our land zoning be joined with the new Living Z area	Reject	Recommendation No 26
Margit Muller & David Watson	**S77**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 26
		D2	We would like the SDC to rezone our land (Living 2A) to the same as our neighbours (Living 1B). We were zoned the same as our neighbours prior to the airport noise contour being imposed on us by PC60.	Accept	Recommendation No 26
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 26
	F22 - SCCB		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 26
	F107 - Kevin Williams (Late)		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 26
Clive Horn	**S21**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 27
		D2	To sub-divide in First Stage (within 10 years) - 620 East Maddisons Road	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 27
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 27
	F107 - Kevin Williams (Late)		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 27

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Angelene Holton	**S25**	**D1**	Unless the following amendments are made	Reject	Recommendation No 28
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F46 - Environment Canterbury		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 28
		D2	That the section of East Maddisons Road currently zoned as Inner plains be rezoned as Living Z deferred	Reject	Recommendation No 28
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 28
		D3	That an allocation of 200-300 houses proposed in Plan Change 7 for ODP6 be reallocated along East Maddisons Road	Reject	Recommendation No 28
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F91 - Foster Holdings Limited		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 28
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 28
		D4	That the Council includes the inner section of East Maddisons Road (both sides) in Living Z zoning for ODP6, providing landowners in that area with an opportunity to subdivide or provide land for recreational and community development purposes	Reject	Recommendation No 28
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 28
		D5	That the Council considers options for adequate development of the larger sized section running along the inside of East Maddisions and Goulds Road to prevent reverse sensitivities arising from new landowners investing in residential land in ODP6	Reject	Recommendation No 28
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F91 - Foster Holdings Limited		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 28
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 28
		D6	That the Council reconsiders Plan Change 7 in light of the principles of the District Plan, and reconsiders the development of large areas proposed for rezoning in Outline Development Plan Area 5 and Outline Development Plan Area 6 along Goulds Road	Reject	Recommendation No 28
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F91 - Foster Holdings Limited		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 28
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 28
Klaus Detlef Prusas	**S33**	**D1**	Re-evaluate the policies involving land identified as part of the SDC Structure Plan warranting residential intensification	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
		D2	Rezone Living Zone 2 (Rolleston) To average allotment sizes to not less than 2000m2 with deferral to a minimum lot area 1000m2 at a later date.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 25
	F106 - Michael Wilson		**Yes**	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
	F105 - Dene Christensen		**Yes**	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
	F104 - Shona Christensen		**Yes**	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
William McGill	**S64**	**D1**	Unless the following amendments are made	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
		D2	To rezone the land known as Helpet Park that is the area of land between Lowes Road, Lincoln Rolleston Road, Springston Rolleston Road and the Helpet Sewerage Plant Living 1.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 25
	F22 - SCCB		**No (would support rezoning to Living Z)**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 25

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	F108 - David and Donna Butts		**Yes**	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
	F105 - Dene Christensen		**Yes**	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
	F104 - Shona Christensen		**Yes**	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
		D3	As an alternative remove the Living 2A zoning for replacement to a Living 2 zone	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 25
Craig Harold Thompson	**S40**	**D2**	Amend the district planning maps to reflect the structure plans proposed for Rolleston/Lincoln including areas that are already zoned to higher densities, eg, Park Lane (Living Z) plus others	Accept	Recommendation No 30
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 30
	F22 - SCCB		**No (would support rezoning to Living Z)**	Reject	Recommendation No 30
Dianne Perry	**S42**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Trevor and Mary Ford	**S56**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Keith Ian & Karen Jean Wills	**S57**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
T B Mander	**S58**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Robin Savage	**S59**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Sarah Kirk	**S60**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Alan Blair & Kathleen Joy Haylock	**S61**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be apprорpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
John Henning Hansen	**S62**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be apprорpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Trevor Allan Smillie	**S63**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be apprорpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Elizabeth Lockhead	**S65**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be apprорpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Jacqueline and Warren Tindall	**S66**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Howard Oscar & Sharyn Judith Bailey	**S67**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Kevin & Maureen Henry	**S68**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Vincent Hsu & Daphne Chao	**S69**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be apprорpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Alison Florence Watkins	**S70**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be apprорpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Ivan Bruce & Barbara Campbell Court	**S71**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be apprорpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Marie Jeanette & John Joseph O'Donnell	**S72**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be apprорpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Lyn McIntyre	**S73**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Robert John Low	**S74**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Robert John Perry	**S75**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
John Rex & Amanda Jane Forrest	**S76**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Donald Stranack Cottle Wright	**S81**	**D1**	We have serious concerns about our position regarding Plan Change 7 and the proposed 'Living Z' zone. We would prefer that Springton-Rolleston Road be given immediate development and high density status (Stage 1). This could be done by adding the land on the southern side of the road to the proposed SR6 and SR7 zones. Or creating new sub-zones SR6A and SR7A with some different conditions, if necessary.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Rodney Jarvis	**S92**	**D1**	The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive. We ask Council to rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road / Branthwaite Drive block might be developed.	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
		D2	If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be approrpriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots	Accepted in Part	Recommendation No 24
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Rejected in Part	Recommendation No 24
Park Grove Estate Ltd	**S53**	**D1**	That the submitter's land be included as a new ODP Area known as ODP Area 7 Rolleston, as illustrated on Appendix A of their submission and rezoned to Living Z (deferred);	Accept	Recommendation No 29
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 29
	F22 - SCCB		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 29
		D2	That Policy B4.3.68 be amended to include ODP Area 7 Rolleston with appropriate criteria to enable high density residential development at approximately 20 households per hectare;	Accept	Recommendation No 29
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 29
		D3	All consequential, additional or other amendments to the provisions of the Plan Change necessary to give effect to the intent of this submission and/or support the decision sought.	Accept	Recommendation No 29
Additional land in Lincoln requested to be rezoned via Plan Change 7 - Out of Scope					
Edna Earnshaw (L)	**S13**	**D1**	Lincoln should progress towards Prebbleton rather than towards Ryelands and New World	Reject	Recommendation No 43
		D2	Include 624 Ellesmere Road within the Urban Limit for Lincoln	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F46 - Ecan		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F28 - Lincoln University		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	F29 - Plant and Food Research		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F30 - Agresearch		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
Denwood Trustees Ltd (L)	**S90**	**D3**	The Trust opposes the balance of its land (70ha) being zoned Rural Outer Plains under PC7. In terms of PC7, the Trust seeks that its balance 70ha be either (in order of preference):- * Rezoned Living Z and included as a greenfield development area able to be developed immediately; or * Rezoned partially Living Z and partially Business 2 and included as a greenfield development area able to be developed immediately; or * Rezoned Living 2 (average allotment size 3000m2) and included as a greenfield development area able to be developed immediately; or If ODPs are retained as part of PC7, the Trust seeks that its balance land be included as part of the ODP Area 5.	Reject	Recommendation No 40
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F28 - Lincoln University		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 40
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 40
		D13	ODP Area 5 - LZ Zone: The Trust further seeks that the balance of the Trust land be rezoned LZ; and the ODP Area 5 - Lincoln LZ Zone as attached as Appendix C be included as part of PC7. Two alternative ODPs are included, with the preference for Option 1 which does not shown the potential Southern Bypass. As an alternative to the above, the above Area 5 ODPs could be amended to provide for a larger B2 Zone south of the proposed B2 Zone, as shown on the plan attached as Appendix F. The Trustees seek this alternative in the event that it is preferred by the Council	Reject	Recommendation No 40
Additional land in Lincoln requested to be rezoned via Plan Change 7 - Within Scope					
McIntosh, Jung and Lee (L)	**S89**	**D1**	We oppose Plan Change 7 provisions except for those relating to medium density housing and Rolleston. (Including D2, D16 and D17 re additional land seeking to be rezoned in Lincoln)	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F103 - Hopkins		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
		D2	We consider that our land and the rural residential blocks to the north legally described as Lot1-6 DP371976 should be included within the PC7 Living Z Zone and, if staging is retained (which we oppose), staged for immediate development	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F98 - Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F103 - Hopkins		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F101 - Jacques		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
		D10	The requirements of Policy B4.3.56 for the form of ODPs for each ODP area are too restrictive and should be deleted or amended.	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
		D11	We seek that if ODP requirements in Policy B4.3.56 are to be retained, the following amendments are made to the ODP Area 1 matters:	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
		D12	Delete the notation 'potential stormwater management area' over our land and amend the area of ODP 1 to enclude our land.	Accept	Recommendation No 31
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F85 - LLD		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
		D13	Delete 'Maintenance of the buffer zone (150m) around the perimeter of the sewerage treatment plant'. This is to be decommissioned so is unnecessary and should be removed	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
		D14	Amend bullet point 5 to read "Provision of a comprehensive stormwater/wetland system, including stormwater wetland areas where required to accommodate necessary flows, in accordance with approved stormwater discharge consents, and based on mitigation of stormwater effects within the ODP 1 Area".	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F85 - LLD		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
		D15	Amend ODP 1 to show a roading link to the boundary of our land, or as a less preferred alternative, to the boundary of the existing rural lifestyle blocks to the north of our land (as per amended ODP Area 1 attached as Appendix D)	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F98 - Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F103 - Hopkins		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F101 - Jacques		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
		D16	We seek that if the provisions for ODPs in PC7 is retained, an additional ODP Area 7 is included, as attached as Appendix E of our submission. ODP Area 7 covers our land and Lots 1-6 DP371976 sited immediately to the north. We seek that all the land within ODP Area 7 be zoned Living Z.	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F98 - Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F103 - Hopkins		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F101 - Jacques		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
		D17	We seek that if the provisions for ODPs in PC7 is retained the following is added to the Policy B4.3.56: "Outline Development Plan Area 7 *ODP Area 7 align with ODP Area 1. * Provision for changing the status of the existing right of way at the end of Allendale Lane, in the adjoining Ryelands sudivision, to local road, with a minimum legal width of 10m and minimum formed width of 6m; * Provision for a possible road linkage to the adjoining ODP Area 1; * Provision for a stormwater mamangement system; *Provision for wells and water pumping facilities to provide sufficient capacity for all future growth in this area; * Provision for a reticulated wastewater system and pumping stations with capacity to accommodate necessary flows; *Provision for a 10m esplanade reserve along the western side of the Liffey (L1) waterway, consistent with the width of the existing esplanade reserve on the west side of the Liffey through the adjoining Ryelands subdivision; * Provision for pedestrian and cycle links along the western side of the Liffey (L1) waterway; * Provision of a minimum net density of 10 households per hectare averaged over the ODP area.	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F93 - Jens Christensen		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F98 - Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F103 - Hopkins		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
	F101 - Jacques		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 43
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 43
Staging of Development					
Lincoln Land Development (L)	**S85**	**D1**	Unless the following amendments are made (including D22 - 27 re ODP Area 1)	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
		D2	Planning Map 116 - removal of deferred status from the Dairy Block (ODP Area 1) and identification as Living Z zone.	Accept	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	F31 - New Zealand Transport Agency		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	F47 - Futlon Hogan		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
		D3	Removal of the split of ODP areas into different phasing periods; and	Accept	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	F31 - New Zealand Transport Agency		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	F47 - Futlon Hogan		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
		D4	If the split into two phasing is retained that ODP Area 1 be included in phase 1	Accept	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	F31 - New Zealand Transport Agency		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	F47 - Futlon Hogan		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
		D5	If the primary relief sought in D1-D4 is not accepted, deletion of the text is required, Table A4.4 - Description of Township Zones: Living Z Deferred Zone provisions, specifically that portion reading: "Where the deferral is dependent on separate phasing provisions and/or the provision of infrastructure (as is the case with Phase 2 areas in Lincoln), they will remain deferred until 2021 and sufficient infrastructure is available."	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	F90 - Denwood Trustees		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	F49 - Broadfield Developments Limited		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
		D9	Policy B4.3.7(vi). This is opposed as it relates to the deferral of ODP Area 1 to 2021. If the primary relief sought in D1-D4 is not accepted that Policy B4.3.7(vi) be deleted	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
		D10	Policy B4.3.8. This is opposed in so far as it relates to the deferral of ODP Area 1 to 2021. If the primary relief sought in D1-D4 is not accepted, that Policy B4.3.8 be deleted or amended so as remove the deferment of development of the Dairy Block (ODP Area 1).	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
		D11	That Policy B4.3.50 be deleted and that Policy B.4.3.50 in the Operative Selwyn District Plan be reinserted (ie stating that new residential development at Lincoln should be in the area South of Gerald St and East of Springs Road).	Reject	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6 & Recommendation No 32

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Lincoln Estates Limited (L)	**S15**	**D2**	Delete following sentence in Table A4.4 "Where the deferral is dependant on separate phasing provision and /or the provision of infrastructure (As is the case with Phase 2 areas in Lincoln), they will remain deferred until 2021 and sufficient infrastructure is available." or reword the sentence to read as follows "Where the deferral is dependant on separate phasing provisions and/or the provision of infrastructure (as is the case with Phase 2 areas in Lincoln), they will remain deferred until sufficient infrastructure is available, and demand for further residential development can be verified"	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
		D12	Objective B4.3.4 delete the words "…through a coordinated and phased development approach"	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D13	Policy B4.3.8 Delete the second sentence and replace with the following "The deferment of these areas shall be lifted when demand for further residential development can be verified, provided adequate infrastructure and servicing is available and an operative Outline Development Plan for the stage has been included in the District Plan	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D14	Policy B4.3.8 Explanation and Reasons - Delete the last sentence, and make any other consequential amendments.	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D28	Supports in part inclusion of Map 14a into the Selwyn District Plan. However if the staging methodology promoted by Plan Change 1 is removed from the RPS then all of the Lincoln Estates land (PartLot 1 DP 9172 and contained in Certificate of Title Reference CB37B/525) shall be rezoned to Living Z zoning	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 6
		D29	Supports in part inclusion of Map 114 (sheets 1&2) and Map 117 (sheets 1&2) into the Selwyn District Plan. However if the staging methodology promoted by Plan Change 1 is removed from the RPS, then all of the Lincoln Estates land (Part Lot 1, DP 9172 and contained in Certificate of Title Reference CB37B/525) shall be rezoned to Living Z zoning	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 6
Broadfield Developments Ltd (L)	**S49**	**D3**	To provide for future residential development to occur only once 85% of the existing zoned land has been built upon.	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Limited		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
	F89 - McIntosh		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
	F90 - Denwood Trustees		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
	F85 - LLD		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
	F47 - Futlon Hogan		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
McIntosh, Jung and Lee (L)	**S89**	**D3**	We seek deletion of all of the phasing provisions in PC7. If phasing is retained in PC7, then we seek more flexibility for amending phasing where sustainable management of physical and natural resources will still be achieved, by way of a restricted discretionary resource consent application (or similar)	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F85 - LLD		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D4	Policy B4.3.7 as follows: "Each Outline Development Plan shall include: "(vi) Set out the phasing and coordination of subdivision and development in line with the staging shown on the Planning Maps and Appendices, except where it can be demonstrated that the rate and location of development can be integrated with the provision of infrastructure and associated funding mechanisms by a different method to that which forms the basis for the applicable development staging provisions in the District Plan and Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement"	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
	F85 - LLD		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
		D5	Policy B4.3.8 as follows: "Except as provided for in Policy B4.3.9, the phasing of any living Z shown on the Planning Maps and Appendices occurs as follows:"	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
	F85 - LLD		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D6	New Policy B4.3.9 as follows: "Enable development to proceed ahead of the phasing requirements set out in Policy B4.3.8 and as shown on the Planning Maps and appendices in circumstances where it can be demonstrated that the rate and location of development can be integrated with the provision of infrastructure and associated funding mechanisms by a different method to that which forms the basis for the applicable development staging provisions in the District Plan and Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This policy is intended to provide for some flexibility in the phasing of development, in accordance with the enabling provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991. It recognises that there may be a number of ways of providing for and funding infrastructure requirements, including developer-funding upgrades (to be subsequently recovered from the COuncil where the upgrades have wider public benefits), and temporary solutions which generate capital contributions to the Council upgrades programmed for a later date. Such flexibility will help ensure a continuous supply of residential sections in accordance with market demand, and avoid the potential for a few landowners allocated to 'early stages' 'monopolising' the development process"	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
	F85 - LLD		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D7	Explanation and Reasons of Policy 4.3.9 (renumbered 4.3.10) to read as follows: "… It is nonetheless recognised that through the detailed preparation of subdivision consent applications or asset design processes there is the potential for alternative solutions or routes to be developed that still achieve the outcomes sought in the ODPs than the broad land use pattern shown on the ODP. When assessing applications for development that is not in accordance with an ODP, it is anticipated that such applications will only be granted where they are able to demonstrate that the proposed development still achieves the key principles and outcomes sought in the ODP than the layout shown in the ODP.	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F85 - LLD		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D8	Policy B4.3.50 as follows: "Except as provided for in Policy B4.3.9, ensure that new Greenfield urban growth only occurs within the Outline Development Plan areas identified on the Planning Maps and Appendices and in accordance with the phasing set out in Policy B4.3.8 once adequate infrastructure and servicing is available	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F85 - LLD		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D9	Subdivision Rule 12.1.6.5 as follows: Restricted Discretionary Activities - Subdivision - General. "The following activity shall be a restricted discretionary activity:- Any subdivision in a Living Z Zone covered by an operative Outline Development Plan within the District Plan that is not in general accordance with the Outline Development Plan and/or the Planning Maps and Appendices including in relation to phasing The exercise of discretion shall be restricted to the matters set out below:- * With regard to the matters listed in Policy B4.3.7, whether the proposed amendments (eg alternative routes, phasing, infrastructure methods) will enable development to proceed without compromising the long term outcomes sought in the ODPs; and/or where it can be shown that the proposed amendments better achieve the overall purpose of the ODPs of achieving integrated high quality urban development based on best practice urban design principles. * Appropriate mechanisms (funding, covenants, consent notices on titles etc) to assist with achieving the above outcomes"	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F99 - A Belcher		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 6
	F102 - McKeich		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F100 - Pringle		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Denwood Trustees Ltd (L)	**S90**	**D4**	The Trusts seeks removal from PC7 of the provisions for phasing of development. If phasing is retained in PC7, the Trust seeks that all of its land (80ha) be zoned for immediate development (ie not deferred). If phasing is retained in PC7, then the Trust seeks more flexibility for amending phasing where sustainable management of physical and natural resources will still be achieved, by way of a restricted discretionary resource consent application (or similar).	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D5	Policy B4.3.7 as follows: "Each Outline Development Plan shall include: "(vi) Set out the staging and coordination of subdivision and development in line with the staging shown on the Planning Maps, except where it can be demonstrated that the rate and location of development can be integrated with the provision of infrastructure and associated funding mechanisms by a different method to that which forms the basis for the applicable development staging provisions in the District Plan and Plan Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement"	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D6	Policy B4.3.8 as follows: "Except as provided for in Policy B4.3.9, ensure that the staging of any Greenfield urban growth area shown on the Planning Maps occurs as follows:"	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D7	New Policy B4.3.9 as follows: "Enable development to proceed ahead of the phasing requirements set out in Policy B4.3.8 and as shown on the Planning Maps and appendices in circumstances where it can be demonstrated that the rate and location of development can be integrated with the provision of infrastructure and associated funding mechanisms by a different method to that which forms the basis for the applicable development phasing provisions in the District Plan and Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. This policy is intended to provide for some flexibility in the staging of development, in accordance with the enabling provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991. It recognises that there may be a number of ways of providing for and funding infrastructure requirements, including developer-funding upgrades (to be subsequently recovered from the COuncil where the upgrades have wider public benefits), and temporary solutions which generate capital contributions to the Council upgrades programmed for a later date. Such flexibility will help ensure a continuous supply of residential sections in accordance with market demand, and avoid the potential for a few landowners allocated to 'early stages' 'monopolising' the development process"	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		Yes	Reject	Recommendation No 6

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D8	Explanation and Reasons of Policy 4.3.9 (renumbered 4.3.10) to read as follows: "… It is nonetheless recognised that through the detailed preparation of subdivision consent applications or asset design processes there is the potential for alternative solutions or routes to be developed that still achieve the outcomes sought in the ODPs than the broad land use pattern shown on the ODP. When assessing applications for development that is not in accordance with an ODP, it is anticipated that such applications will only be granted where they are able to demonstrate that the proposed development still achieves the key principles and outcomes sought in the ODP than the layout shown in the ODP.	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D9	Policy B4.3.50 as follows: "Except as provided for in Policy B4.3.9, ensure that new Greenfield urban growth only occurs within the Outline Development Plan areas identified on the Planning Maps and in accordance with the staging set out in Policy B4.3.8	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6
		D10	Subdivision Rule 12.1.6.5 as follows: Restricted Discretionary Activities - Subdivision - General. The following activity shall be a restricted discretionary activity:- Any subdivision in a Living Z Zone covered by an operative Outline Development Plan within the District Plan that is not in general accordance with the Outline Development Plan and/or the Planning Maps including in relation to phasing. THe exercise of discretion shall be restricted to the matters set out below: * With regard to the matters listed in Policy B4.3.7, whether the proposed amendments (eg alternative routes, staging, infrastructure methods) will enable development to proceed without compromising the long term outcomes sought in the ODPs; and/or where it can be shown that the proposed amendments better achieve the overall purpose of the ODPs of achieving integrated high quality urban development based on best practice urban design principles. * Appropriate mechanisms (funding, covenants, consent notices on titles etc) to assist with achieving the above outcomes.	Reject	Recommendation No 6
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 6

General Issues

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
New Zealand Historic Places Trust (NZHPT)	**S26**	**D1**	Should Plan Change 7 be approved, the following advice note is to be included in the decision: "It is possible that unrecorded archaeological sites may be affected by the proposed work. Evidence of archaeological sites may include burnt and fire cracked stones, charcoal, rubbish heaps including shell, bone and/or glass and crockery, ditches, banks, pits, old building foundations, artefacts of Maori and European origin or human burials. The New Zealand Historic Places Trust should be consulted if the presence of an archaeological is suspected. Work affecting archaeological sites is subject to a conent process under the Historic Places Act 1993. If any work associated with the development of these areas under Plan Change 7 around Lincoln and Rolleston, such as earthworks, fencing or landscaping, may modify, damage or destroy any archaeological site(s), an authority (consent) from the New Zealand Historic Places Trust must be obtained for the work prior to commencement. It is an offence to damage or destroy a site for any purpose without an authority. The Historic Places Act 1993 contains penalties for unauthorised site damage	Reject	Recommendation No 9
Nimbus Group Ltd	**S38**	**D1**	Reject the entire application	Withdrawn this decision point	N/a
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F91 - Foster Holdings Limited		**No**	N/a	N/a
	F45 - Murray and Lisa Alfeld		**No**	N/a	N/a
	F44 - Bruce and Michelle Coles		**No**	N/a	N/a
		D2	The contents of PC7 are inconsistent with the requirements of the Resource Management Act and also set by the Selwyn District Council in planning matters it imposed on individuals requesting similar types of application.	Reject	Final Recommendation
		D3	There is insufficient information to gauge an assessment as to the affects on the environment due to the lack of comprehensive analysis in respect of traffic, recreational, educational facilities and commercial activities to give effect to such a significant change in zoning.	Reject	Final Recommendation
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Final Recommendation
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Final Recommendation
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Final Recommendation
	F54 - NZ Guardian Trust		**Yes**	Reject	Final Recommendation
Carrick No.1 Ltd	**S39**	**D1**	To remove all the ability to provide residential living activities in a Business 1 zone.	Out of Scope	See Section Business Activities in B1 Zone
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport Agency		**No**	Out of Scope	See Section Business Activities in B1 Zone
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Out of Scope	See Section Business Activities in B1 Zone
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Out of Scope	See Section Business Activities in B1 Zone
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Out of Scope	See Section Business Activities in B1 Zone
Jens Christensen (R)	**S93**	**D3**	Restrict the use of Business 1 zones to Business activities not Living activities	Out of Scope	See Section Business Activities in B1 Zone

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport Agency		**No**	Out of Scope	See Section Business Activities in B1 Zone
Environment Canterbury	**S46**	**D1**	Support PC7, subject to the following amendments	Accept in part	Recommendation No 10
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F89 - McIntosh		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 10
	F90 - Denwood Trustees Ltd		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 10
		D2	Amend Policy B3.4.3 to ensure that all residential developments are designed in accordance with the design principles set out in the policy	Reject	Recommendation No 10
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 10
		D3	Amend Policy B3.4.3 - methods to include the subdivision design guide.	Accept	Recommendation No 10
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 10
		D4	Amend B4.1 Residential Density - Strategy to provide for the densities enabled by PC 7.	Accept	Recommendation No 10
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 10
		D5	Amend the ODP to ensure that they give effect to the requirements of Policy 8 to Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement and Proposed District Plan Policy B4.3.7.	Withdrawn this decision point	N/a
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**Yes**	N/a	N/a
	F29 - Plant and Food Research		**No**	N/a	N/a
		D6	Inclusion of appropriate Policies, Rules and/or other methods to ensure that ODP Areas are developed in accordance with the provisions of Policy 6 (including Tables 1 & 2), Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.	Reject	Recommendation No 10
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 10
		D7	Inclusion of Rules to limit the scale of retail activity that can occur at the deferred Business 2 Zone for Lincoln to safeguard the function, vitality and amenity of the existing town centre.	Withdrawn this decision point	N/a
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**Yes**	N/a	N/a
	F90 - Denwood Trustees Ltd		**No**	N/a	N/a
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**Yes**	N/a	N/a
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**Yes**	N/a	N/a
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**Yes**	N/a	N/a
Christchurch City Council	**S48**	**D1**	Approve PC7 in a form consistent with the Urban Development Strategy and Proposed Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement.	Withdrawn	N/a
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**Yes**	N/a	N/a
	F90 - Denwood Trustees Ltd		**No**	N/a	N/a
	F89 - McIntosh		**No**	N/a	N/a

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
New Zealand Fire Service	**S86**	**D1**	Given the large area involved in this plan change, the impacts on the NZFS are significant in terms of increased need for NZFS's activities, response times, staffing and operational requirements, access for fire appliances to new developments, and the provision of adequate and accessible water supply for fire fighting purposes. Therefore, the NZFS seeks assurances that development within any of the ODP areas will be serviced by a reticulated supply which meets the Code of Practice	Accept	Recommendation No 11
Lincoln Land Development (L)	**S85**	**D6**	Policy 3.4.3 should be retained	Accept	Recommendation No 12
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Reject	Recommendation No 12
Selwyn Central Community Board	**S22**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments (including D3 - ODP Area 1 (R), D4 - ODP Area 2 (R), D5 - ODP Area 3 (R), D6 - ODP Area 5 & 6 (R))	Accept in part	Recommendation No 12
		D2	Policy 3.4.3 to read "a subdivision layout that minimizes the number of rear lots	Accept	Recommendation No 12
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Limited		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 12
	F32 - CDL		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 12
Rolleston Residents Association (R)	**S79**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments (including D3 - ODP Area 1 (R), D4 - ODP Area 2 (R), D5 - ODP Area 3 (R), D6 - ODP Area 5 & 6 (R)	Accept in part	Recommendation No 12
		D2	That policy 3.4.3 be amended (in part) to read - a subdivision layout that minimizes the number of rear lots.	Accept	Recommendation No 12
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 12
		D8	The Rolleston Residents Association asks PC7, with the amendments, alterations, and additions requested as stated, be approved.	Accept in part	Recommendation No 12
Rolleston Square Limited	**S82**	**D2**	Policy 3.4.3 which seeks to provide living zones with neighbourhood centres. The term "neighbourhood centres" is not defined in the Plan. There is no guidance given on the types of activities that can take place in neighbourhood centres, nor is there any guidance on the size of neighbourhood centres. Improperly designed neighbourhood centres have the potential to adversely effect the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. This should be deleted	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
		D3	Objective B4.3.1 deals with the expansion of townships. It does not contain any reference to protecting the function, vitality and amenity of the existing town centres. It is submitted that the objective be amended to ensure that the expansion of townships does not adversely affect the function, vitality and amenity of existing town centre	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F54 - NZGT		**Yes**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
		D5	Policy B4.3.9 deals with development that is not in general accordance with an operative Outline Development Plan. The Policy does not provide any protection to the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. It is submitted that the Policy should be amended to include reference to the protection of the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D6	Policy 4.3.68 ODP Area 1 Rolleston - The part of the Policy relating to ODP Area 1 contains reference to the "provision of a local business centre". No further guidance is given as to what constitutes a "local business centre". No reference to the types of activities or the size of the local business centr is given in the Policy. Given the lack of controls on the development of the local business centre within ODP Area 1, development could occur in such a way that detracts from the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. In the circumstances, it is submitted that reference to the provision of a local business centre ODP Area 1 should be deleted. Alternatively express reference should be made in the Policy to require the provision of a local business centre only if the provision of such a centre does not affect the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
		D7	Policy 4.3.68 ODP Area 6 Rolleston - The part of the Policy relating to ODP Area 6 contains reference to the provision of a neighbourhood centre in the vicinity of the intersection of Goulds Road and East Madison Road. The term "neighbourhood centres" is not defined in the Plan. There is no guidance given on the types of activities that can take place in neighbourhood centres, nor is there any guidance on the size of neighbourhood centres. Improperly designed neighbourhood centres have the potential to adversely effect the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. In these circumstances, the reference to "neighbourhood centres" in that part of Policy B4.3.68 should be deleted.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
Rolleston Retail Limited	**S83**	**D2**	Policy 3.4.3 which seeks to provide living zones with neighbourhood centres. The term "neighbourhood centres" is not defined in the Plan. There is no guidance given on the types of activities that can take place in neighbourhood centres, nor is there any guidance on the size of neighbourhood centres. Improperly designed neighbourhood centres have the potential to adversely effect the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. This should be deleted	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
		D3	Objective B4.3.1 deals with the expansion of townships. It does not contain any reference to protecting the function, vitality and amenity of the existing town centres. It is submitted that the objective be amended to ensure that the expansion of townships does not adversely affect the function, vitality and amenity of existing town centre	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F54 - NZGT		yes	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
		D5	Policy B4.3.9 deals with development that is not in general accordance with an operative Outline Development Plan. The Policy does not provide any protection to the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. It is submitted that the Policy should be amended to include reference to the protection of the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre	Accept in part	Recommendation No 2

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D6	Policy 4.3.68 ODP Area 1 Rolleston - The part of the Policy relating to ODP Area 1 contains reference to the "provision of a local business centre". No further guidance is given as to what constitutes a "local business centre". No reference to the types of activities or the size of the local business centr is given in the Policy. Given the lack of controls on the development of the local business centre within ODP Area 1, development could occur in such a way that detracts from the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. In the circumstances, it is submitted that reference to the provision of a local business centre ODP Area 1 should be deleted. Alternatively express reference should be made in the Policy to require the provision of a local business centre only if the provision of such a centre does not affect the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 2
		D7	Policy 4.3.68 ODP Area 6 Rolleston - The part of the Policy relating to ODP Area 6 contains reference to the provision of a neighbourhood centre in the vicinity of the intersection of Goulds Road and East Madison Road. The term "neighbourhood centres" is not defined in the Plan. There is no guidance given on the types of activities that can take place in neighbourhood centres, nor is there any guidance on the size of neighbourhood centres. Improperly designed neighbourhood centres have the potential to adversely effect the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. In these circumstances, the reference to "neighbourhood centres" in that part of Policy B4.3.68 should be deleted.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
Roll Ten Investments Limited	**S84**	**D2**	Policy 3.4.3 which seeks to provide living zones with neighbourhood centres. The term "neighbourhood centres" is not defined in the Plan. There is no guidance given on the types of activities that can take place in neighbourhood centres, nor is there any guidance on the size of neighbourhood centres. Improperly designed neighbourhood centres have the potential to adversely effect the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. This should be deleted	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
		D3	Objective B4.3.1 deals with the expansion of townships. It does not contain any reference to protecting the function, vitality and amenity of the existing town centres. It is submitted that the objective be amended to ensure that the expansion of townships does not adversely affect the function, vitality and amenity of existing town centre	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F54 - NZGT		Yes	Accept in part	Recommendation No 2
		D5	Policy B4.3.9 deals with development that is not in general accordance with an operative Outline Development Plan. The Policy does not provide any protection to the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. It is submitted that the Policy should be amended to include reference to the protection of the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre	Accept in part	Recommendation No 2

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D6	Policy 4.3.68 ODP Area 1 Rolleston - The part of the Policy relating to ODP Area 1 contains reference to the "provision of a local business centre". No further guidance is given as to what constitutes a "local business centre". No reference to the types of activities or the size of the local business centre is given in the Policy. Given the lack of controls on the development of the local business centre within ODP Area 1, development could occur in such a way that detracts from the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. In the circumstances, it is submitted that reference to the provision of a local business centre ODP Area 1 should be deleted. Alternatively express reference should be made in the Policy to require the provision of a local business centre only if the provision of such a centre does not affect the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 2
		D7	Policy 4.3.68 ODP Area 6 Rolleston - The part of the Policy relating to ODP Area 6 contains reference to the provision of a neighbourhood centre in the vicinity of the intersection of Goulds Road and East Madison Road. The term "neighbourhood centres" is not defined in the Plan. There is no guidance given on the types of activities that can take place in neighbourhood centres, nor is there any guidance on the size of neighbourhood centres. Improperly designed neighbourhood centres have the potential to adversely effect the function, vitality and amenity of the existing Rolleston Town Centre. In these circumstances, the reference to "neighbourhood centres" in that part of Policy B4.3.68 should be deleted.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 2
Rolleston Square Limited	**S82**	**D1**	Plan Change 7 should be declined. Otherwise amendements should be made as follows:	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F91 - Foster Holdings Ltd		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 13
	F44 - Coles		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 13
	F45 - Alfeld		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 13
	F109 - Christchurch		**Yes (conditional on PC23 be declined)**	Reject	Recommendation No 13
		D4	The changes to Objective B4.3.3 seeks to remove the requirement for the rezoning of land to occur by way of a consistent and equitable treatment of development is undesirable. It is submitted that the changes sought to this Objective should also include reference to a consistent and equitable process.	Reject	Recommendation No 13
		D8	The plan provisions which seek to introduce medium density housing refer to the Medium Density Housing Guide. The Medium Density Housing Guide has not yet been finalised and is still in draft form. It is inappropriate to rely on a document which is still in draft form as the basis upon which the changes to medium density housing are promulgated. In order to property understand the justification for Plan Change 7, the Medium Density Housing Guide must, first be completed.	Reject	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept	Recommendation No 13

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D9	There are a number of issues with Medium Density Housing which Plan Change 7 seeks to introduce into the District Plan. In particular, the rules package which Plan Change 7 seeks to introduce provide for a decrease in the ratio of visible public open space per household. This is contrary to the Section 32 analysis which refers to the need for open space. Extra effective and functional open space is a key requirement for successful medium density housing. This appears to have been overlooked in Plan Change 7	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Reject	Recommendation No 13
		D10	There are inconsistencies between the density requirements set out in Plan Change 1 to the RPS, the Rolleston Structure Plan and the Section 32 analysis for Plan Change 7. There is no justification for housing densities exceeding 15 household units per hectare (as provided for in Plan Change 7) as this limits the ability to provide visible public open space and to retain existing character or open space together with single level housing	Reject	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept	Recommendation No 13
		D11	For these, reasons, it is submitted that Plan Change 7 does not amount to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and is contrary to the purpose and principle of the Resource Management Act 1991	Reject	Recommendation No 13
Rolleston Retail Limited	**S83**	**D1**	Plan Change 7 should be declined. Otherwise amendements should be made as follows:	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F91 - Foster Holdings Ltd		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 13
	F44 - Coles		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 13
	F45 - Alfeld		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 13
		D4	The changes to Objective B4.3.3 seeks to remove the requirement for the rezoning of land to occur by way of a consistent and equitable treatment of development is undesirable. It is submitted that the changes sought to this Objective should also include reference to a consistent and equitable process	Reject	Recommendation No 13
		D8	The plan provisions which seek to introduce medium density housing refer to the Medium Density Housing Guide. The Medium Density Housing Guide has not yet been finalised and is still in draft form. It is inappropriate to rely on a document which is still in draft form as the basis upon which the changes to medium density housing are promulgated. In order to property understand the justification for Plan Change 7, the Medium Density Housing Guide must, first be completed.	Reject	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept	Recommendation No 13
		D9	There are a number of issues with Medium Density Housing which Plan Change 7 seeks to introduce into the District Plan. In particular, the rules package which Plan Change 7 seeks to introduce provide for a decrease in the ratio of visible public open space per household. This is contrary to the Section 32 analysis which refers to the need for open space. Extra effective and functional open space is a key requirement for successful medium density housing. This appears to have been overlooked in Plan Change 7	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept	Recommendation No 13

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D10	There are inconsistencies between the density requirements set out in Plan Change 1 to the RPS, the Rolleston Structure Plan and the Section 32 analysis for Plan Change 7. There is no justification for housing densities exceeding 15 household units per hectare (as provided for in Plan Change 7) as this limits the ability to provide visible public open space and to retain existing character or open space together with single level housing	Reject	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept	Recommendation No 13
		D11	For these, reasons, it is submitted that Plan Change 7 does not amount to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and is contrary to the purpose and principle of the Resource Management Act 1991	Reject	Recommendation No 13
Roll Ten Investments Limited	**S84**	**D1**	Plan Change 7 should be declined. Otherwise amendements should be made as follows:	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F91 - Foster Holdings Ltd		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 13
	F44 - Coles		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 13
	F45 - Alfeld		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 13
		D4	The changes to Objective B4.3.3 seeks to remove the requirement for the rezoning of land to occur by way of a consistent and equitable treatment of development is undesirable. It is submitted that the changes sought to this Objective should also include reference to a consistent and equitable process	Reject	Recommendation No 13
		D8	The plan provisions which seek to introduce medium density housing refer to the Medium Density Housing Guide. The Medium Density Housing Guide has not yet been finalised and is still in draft form. It is inappropriate to rely on a document which is still in draft form as the basis upon which the changes to medium density housing are promulgated. In order to property understand the justification for Plan Change 7, the Medium Density Housing Guide must, first be completed.	Reject	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept	Recommendation No 13
		D9	There are a number of issues with Medium Density Housing which Plan Change 7 seeks to introduce into the District Plan. In particular, the rules package which Plan Change 7 seeks to introduce provide for a decrease in the ratio of visible public open space per household. This is contrary to the Section 32 analysis which refers to the need for open space. Extra effective and functional open space is a key requirement for successful medium density housing. This appears to have been overlooked in Plan Change 7	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept	Recommendation No 13
		D10	There are inconsistencies between the density requirements set out in Plan Change 1 to the RPS, the Rolleston Structure Plan and the Section 32 analysis for Plan Change 7. There is no justification for housing densities exceeding 15 household units per hectare (as provided for in Plan Change 7) as this limits the ability to provide visible public open space and to retain existing character or open space together with single level housing	Reject	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F32 - CDL		No	Accept	Recommendation No 13

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D11	For these, reasons, it is submitted that Plan Change 7 does not amount to the sustainable management of natural and physical resources and is contrary to the purpose and principle of the Resource Management Act 1991	Reject	Recommendation No 13
Lincoln Land Development (L)	**S85**	**D18**	Subject to the following amendments	Reject	Recommendation No 13
		D19	Township Volume - Part B - 4 Growth of Townships - That the objectives, policies and anticipated environmental results relating to medium density and comprehensive residential developments be amended to clarify that elderly persons housing is an anticipated outcome of a comprehensive residential development	Reject	Recommendation No 13
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F49 - Broadfield Developments		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 13
Jens Christensen (R)	**S93**	**D1**	I oppose the proposal to rezone land by way of Outline Development Plans	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 4
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 4
	F44 - Coles		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 4
	F45 - Alfeld		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 4
	F91 - Foster Holdings Ltd		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 4
		D4	Make subdivision consents publicly notifiable	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 4
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 4
	F44 - Coles		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 4
	F45 - Alfeld		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 4
	F91 - Foster Holdings Ltd		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 4
Lincoln Estates Limited (L)	**S15**	**D27**	Inclusion of ODPs into the Selwyn District Plan	Accept	Recommendation No 4
		D1	Requests the following amendments to Plan Change 7 (including D16 re ODP area 2 Lincoln)	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 5
	F49 - Broadfield Developments		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 5
		D3	Delete Policy B4.1.12 and the accompanying Explanation and Reasons in their entirety	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D4	Objective 4.2.4: Explanation and Reasons - Final Paragraph - Rewrite the first sentence to read "Objective 4.2.4 satisfies the engineering requirements of the Plan. Delete the words "…protection of views…" and Delete the last sentence of the paragraph	Reject	Recommendation No 5
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F49 - Broadfield Developments		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 5
		D5	Policy B4.2.3 "Access to sunlight" - Delete the provision in its entirety	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D6	Policy B4.2.3 Explanation and Reasons - Delete the following sentences which read: "It is important that residential buildings maximise the ability to receive sunlight in living areas which helps to achieve energy efficiency and maintain associated amenity values" and "Direct site access onto limited access roads or State Highways is not generally possible, however allotments that adjoin main roads within urban areas should be designed so as to gain access from those roads rather than 'turning their back' to main roads.	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D7	Policy B4.2.4 Explanation and Reasons - Delete the phrase "and views to the Southern Alps and Port Hills"	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D8	Policy B4.2.9 - Delete the phrase "small in scale"	Reject	Recommendation No 5

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D9	Policy B4.2.9 Explanation and Reasons - Delete the phrase "Limiting the scale of new residential blocks will" and replace with "Pedestrian, cycle and vehicular permeability within and through these living environments needs to be encouraged so that pedestrians and cyclists will experience". Under point ii delete the phrase "and views". Under point iii delete the words starting "Residential blocks with perimeters" to the end of the Explanation	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D10	Policy B4.2.11 Delete the phrase "whilst avoiding rear allotments where practical", delete the paragraph "Sufficient interaction for all allotments with road frontages…" and delete the paragraph the paragraph in its entirety "Where gated subdivisions are proposed, it will be ..."	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D11	Anticipated Environmental Results (page30) - Strong connections between allotments and the road frontage - Delete the provision in its entirety	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D17	Rule 4.13.1 - Delete the rule in its entirety or make other consequential amendments to provide flexibility, to the satisfaction of Lincoln Estates Limited	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D18	Rule 4.13.2 - Delete the rule in its entirety or make other consequential amendments to provide flexibility, to the satisfaction of Lincoln Estates Limited	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D19	Rule 4.13.3 - Amend to read as follows "4.13.3 Any activity which does not comply with Rule 4.13.1 and Rule 4.13.2 shall be a restricted discretionary activity which shall not be notified and shall not require the written approval of affected parties	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D20	Rule 4.13.4.3 - Delete the Rule in its entirety or make other consequential amendments to provide flexibility, to the satisfaction of Lincoln Estates Limited	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D21	Rule 4.13.5 - Delete the rule in its entirety or make other consequential amendments to provide flexibility, to the satisfaction of Lincoln Estates Limited	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D22	Reasons for Rules: Buildings and Streetscene (pg79) - Delete the two paragraphs in their entirety or make other consequential amendments to provide flexibility, to the satisfaction of Lincoln Estates Limited	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D23	Rule 12.1.4.16 - Delete the provision in its entirety or make other consequential amendments to provide flexibility, to the satisfaction of Lincoln Estates Limited	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D24	Rule 12.1.4.28 - Delete the provision in its entirety or make other consequential amendments to provide flexibility to the satisfaction of Lincoln Estates Limited	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D25	Rule 12.1.4.29, 12.1.4.30, 12.1.4.31 and 12.1.1.14.32 - Delete the provisions in its entirety or make other consequential amendments to provide flexibility to the satisfaction of Lincoln Estates Limited	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D26	Rule 12.1.4.33 - Delete the phrase "view shafts to mountains, or good use of the rural interface to enhance the urban area"	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D30	Make all consequential amendments to the Section 32 analysis for D1 to D28 to the satisfaction of Lincoln Estates Limited	Reject	Recommendation No 5
Craig Harold Thompson	**S40**	**D4**	Amend Rule 4.10.1 to increase the height of front fences to 1.50m maximum, thus providing owners a right of privacy whilst still achieving the council's goals.	Reject	Recommendation No 5
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 5
Broadfield Developments Ltd (L)	**S49**	**D2**	To allow for site coverage of 45% on Broadfield Estates Ltd Land.	Reject	Recommendation No 5
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 5

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Lincoln Land Development (L)	**S85**	**D7**	The following text in Policy B4.2.3 is contradictory to the Road Network and Density Plan (ODP Area 1 - Lincoln). "Direct site access onto limited access roads or State highways is not generally possible. However allotments that adjoin main roads within urban areas should be designed so as to gain access from those roads rater than 'turning their back' to main roads". LLD understood that the intention is to treat this similarly to the south-western portion of Stage 2, where there would be no direct vehicular access to Springs Road and there could be some provision for a second primary elevation along the frontage to avoid the 'turning their back' issue.	Reject	Recommendation No 5
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 5
	F49 - Broadfield Developments		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D8	Amend Policy B4.2.3 so as to provide for the type of outcome referred above.	Reject	Recommendation No 5
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 5
	F49 - Broadfield Developments		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D15	Delete all provisions within Rules 4.6 - 4.16 that pertain to design controls for buildings within the Living Z zone	Reject	Recommendation No 5
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D16	Deletion of the additional matters over which the Council has restricted the exercise of its discretion from rule 12.1.4.	Reject	Recommendation No 5
		D17	Create a new controlled activity subdivision rule for approved ODP areas	Reject	Recommendation No 5
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 5
The New Zealand Guardian Trust Company	**S54**	**D1**	NZGT conditionally supports Plan Change 7 subject to the following amendments	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 1
		D2	Commercial and business activities at Masefield Mall should no be adversely affected by residential activity. District plan issues, objectives, policies and rules should be included in Plan Change 7 that address the interface between zonings and enable sustainable management of existing business zonings and activity. Plan Change 7 land needs to internalise the effects of residential activity and impose standards on residential land to avoid conflicting land use with existing zoning and activity at Masefield Mall	Reject	Recommendation No 1
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		Yes	Reject	Recommendation No 1
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		Yes	Reject	Recommendation No 1
	F84 - Roll Ten Investments Ltd		Yes	Reject	Recommendation No 1
		D3	Business activity needs appropriate protection from residential sensitivities. These include without limitation: potential for 24 hour business activity, traffic movements including heavy traffic and commercial deliveries, need for set back for residential activity at interface and landscaping of residential activity, adequate acoustic insulation and protection from amenity, lighting and signage activities	Reject	Recommendation No 1

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Selwyn Central Community Board	**S22**	**D7**	The SCCB requests that the amount of open space and reserves provided in ODP Areas 1,2,3 & 4 be restricted so that reserve contributions from these areas shall be provided as both land and cash.	Reject	Recommendation No 8
Rolleston Residents Association (R)	**S79**	**D7**	The Rolleston Residents Association requests that the amount of open space and reserves provided in ODP Areas 1, 2, 3 & 4 be restricted to that reserve contributions from these areas shall be provided as both land and cash.	Reject	Recommendation No 8
Jens Christensen (R)	**S93**	**D5**	Ensure that the provision of green linkages in ODP's 1, 2, 3, and 4 (Rolleston) be limited in number and area and that reserve contributions from these ODP areas be in the form of 50% value in land and 50% in cash	Reject	Recommendation No 8
Jens Christensen (R)	**S93**	**D2**	On Map 102 amend Walkers Road to read Dunns Crossing Road	Accept	Recommendation No 8
Rolleston ODPs **Outline Development Plan 1**					
Sia Choo Leng	**S2**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Mei Hong Hua	**S3**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Wen Bin Lin	**S4**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Worthwhile (Ltd)	**S5**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Hoo Ting Yen	**S6**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Christine Siew Ing Yek	**S7**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Ming Shong Chen and Xin Ling Lin	**S8**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Jason Hoo	**S10**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Song Yu Rong	**S14**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Ming Xing Wang	**S35**	**D1**	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 14

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		Support?		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Jin Ping Huang	S36	D1	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		Support?		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		No	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		Support?		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
Chen Jian Wang	S37	D1	Subject to following amendments:	Accept in part	Recommendation No 14
		D2	Include the triangular area - Pt Res 1759 (indicated in the attached drawing No300/B as part of the plan change and extend the "Low Density" designated area to included this triangular area	Accept	Recommendation No 14
	Further Submission		Support?		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		No	Reject	Recommendation No 14
		D3	Introduce another neighbourhood centre at the location indicated in the attached drawing No300/B	Reject	Recommendation No 15
	Further Submission		Support?		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		No	Accept in part	Recommendation No 15
CDL Land (NZ) Ltd	S32	D1	Subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 16
	Further Submission		Support?		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		No	Reject	Recommendation No 16
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		No	Reject	Recommendation No 16
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		No	Reject	Recommendation No 16
		D2	Policy B4.3.68 - ODP Area 1 (Rolleston) - the reference to the provision of wells should be removed	Accept	Recommendation No 16
		D3	ODP Area 1 (Rolleston) - replace those areas shown as Comprehensive Residential Development with the appropriate shading on ODP Area 1 to indicate Medium Density development	Accept	Recommendation No 16
	Further Submission		Support?		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		No	Reject	Recommendation No 16

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Selwyn Central Community Board	**S22**	**D3**	Rolleston ODP Area 1 to include provision for a new primary school and early childhood facility	Accept in part	Recommendation No 17
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F27 - Ministry of Education		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 17
	F32 - CDL		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 17
Rolleston Residents Association (R)	**S79**	**D3**	That Rolleston ODP Area 1 includes provision for a new primary school and early childhood facility.	Accept in part	Recommendation No 17
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F27 - Ministry of Education		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 17
	F32 - CDL		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 17
Horncastle Homes Ltd	**S41**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 18
		D2	Horncastle Homes Ltd request that the medium density housing adjoining the Horncastle Homes Ltd block be reverted to low-density to ensure amenity values are maintained.	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 18
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in part	Recommendation No 18
	F32 - CDL		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 18
Selwyn Plantation Board Ltd	**S52**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments	Reject	Recommendation No 19
		D2	That the ODP for Area 1 be approved, subject to the inclusion of additional pedestrian and cycle connections to the submitters land to the west of ODP Area 1 generally as illustrated on the plan attached to this submission;	Reject	Recommendation No 19
		D3	Amendments to the second bullet point under the heading "Outline Development Plan for ODP Area 1" in Policy B4.3.68 to recognise the need for pedestrian and cycle connections to the submitter's proposed rural residential land to the west of ODP Area 1; and	Reject	Recommendation No 19
		D4	All consequential, additional or other amendments to the provisions of PC7 necessary to give effect to the intent of this submission and/or support the decision sought.	Reject	Recommendation No 19
Outline Development Plan 2					
Selwyn District Council	**S43**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 20
		D2	Amend PC 7 to include an Outline Development Plan for Area 2 in Rolleston within Appendix 36. As an ODP has been submitted for this area, Council seeks that the zoning for this area be changed from Living Z deferred to Living Z.	Accept	Recommendation No 20
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F22 - SCCB		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 20
Rolleston Park Residents Group	**S34**	**D5**	Provision for a maximum number of households per hectare on the ODP Area 2.	Reject	Recommendation No 20
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 20

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Selwyn Central Community Board	**S22**	**D4**	Rolleston ODP Area 2 to allow a vehicle access via a secondary road from Norman Kirk Drive and that a pedestrian and cycle link be provided to/from ODP Area 2 to Markham Way	Reject	Recommendation No 20
Greg and Maria Rolton	**S24**	**D1**	I seek that the Selwyn District Council do not go ahead with this plan due to loss of privacy, traffic flow increase causing unnecessary noise which would inturn create less room on street for parking	Reject	Recommendation No 20
Rolleston Park Residents Group	**S34**	**D2**	Vehicle access be via a secondary road connection to Norman Kirk Drive with no direct vehicle access to Markham Way or Rolleston Drive.	Reject	Recommendation No 20
		D3	A pedestrian and cycle link should be provided from ODP Area 2 to Markham Way/Rolleston Primary/Norman Kirk/Rolleston Drive	Reject	Recommendation No 20
Rolleston Residents Association	**S79**	**D4**	That vehicle access to Rolleston ODP Area 2 be via a secondary road from Norman Kirk Drive and that a pedestrian and cycle link be provided to/from ODP Area 2 to Markham Way.	Reject	Recommendation No 20
Greg and Maria Rolton	**S24**	**D2**	In regards to privacy the two story buildings would be too close to the back of our section which would make it uncomfortable for us to spend time in our backyard where we currently enjoy spending our time.	Reject	Recommendation No 20
Vicki Henderson & Ruben Groot	**S55**	**D1**	Policy B4.3.68 - ODP Area 2 (Rolleston) - Add the following point "Lots within this transition strip to have single storey dwellings only"	Reject	Recommendation No 20
		D2	That the council consider what constructive changes could be made to improve pedestrian safety on Markham Way and whether SDC should introduce 30km/hr zones in closed residential subdivisions.	Reject	Recommendation No 20
Rolleston Park Residents Group	**S34**	**D1**	Unless the following amendments are made	Reject	Recommendation No 20
		D4	Building height restrictions to be placed on any dwellings built in ODP Area 2 to a single storied building.	Reject	Recommendation No 20
Outline Development Plan 3					
L R and J A Bain	**S11**	**D1**	To rezone Rolleston Area 3 to Living Z for residential development as soon as possible	Accept	Recommendation No 21
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	S16 - Burdis		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 21
Joseph and Glennis Burdis	**S16**	**D1**	To adopt Plan Change 7 and Rolleston Outline Development Plan Area 3	Accept	Recommendation No 21
Bruce & Michelle Coles	**S44**	**D1**	That the Plan Change be approved confirming the rezoning of ODP Area 3 to Living Z and including the proposed ODP as an appendix to the District Plan and all consequential, additional or other amendments to the provisions of the Plan Change necessary to give effect to the intent of this submission and/or support the decision sought	Accept	Recommendation No 21
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 21
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 21
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 21

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Murray & Lisa Alfeld	**S45**	**D1**	That the Plan Change be approved confirming the rezoning of ODP Area 3 to Living Z and including the proposed ODP as an appendix to the District Plan and all consequential, additional or other amendments to the provisions of the Plan Change necessary to give effect to the intent of this submission and/or support the decision sought	Accept	Recommendation No 21
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 21
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 21
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 21
Selwyn Central Community Board	**S22**	**D5**	Rolleston ODP Area 3 to make sure that provision for pedestrian/cycle linkages to the east of Rolleston ODP Area 3 be large enough to provide secondary road access to/from ODP Area 3 should (future) residential to occur in the area to the east of ODP Area 3	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 21
Rolleston Residents Association	**S79**	**D5**	That the provision for pedestrian/cycle linkages to the east of Rolleston ODP Area 3 be large enough to provide secondary road access to/from ODP Area 3 should (future) residential development occur in the area to the east of ODP Area 3.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 21
New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA) (R)	**S31**	**D1**	Plan Change 7 should be approved subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 21
		D2	Delete Rule 4.9.25 or amend the rule to include the following text "Permitted Activities - ODP Area 3 in Rolleston - Dwelling Setback - No dwelling shall be located closer than 40m (measured from the nearest painted edge of the carriageway) from State Highway 1. Noise Design Standards - For any dwelling constructed between 40m and 100m (measured from the nearest painted edge of the carriageway) from State Highway 1: - appropriate noise control must be designed, contructed and maintained to ensure noise levels within the dwelling meet the internal design levels in AS/NZS2107:2000 (or its successor) - 'recommended design and sound levels and reverberation times for building interiors' and prior to the construction of any dwelling an acoustic design certificate from a suitability qualified and experienced consultant is to be provided to Council to ensure that the above internal sound levels can be achieved.	Accept	Recommendation No 21
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	S44 - Coles		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 21
		D3	A rule in either the Living Zone - Roading and /or Subdivision sections which states "That there be no access to ODP Area 3 from State Highway 1"	Reject	Recommendation No 21
Outline Development Plan 5					
Selwyn Central Community Board	**S22**	**D6**	That Rolleston ODP Area 5 & 6 be combined to allow development of the proposed Rolleston Recreation Precinct to be developed in either ODP Area 5 or 6 and residential development to occur in ODP Area 5 & 6 not subject to the Recreation Precinct development	Reject	Recommendation No 22
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 22
	F91 - Foster Holdings Limited		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 22

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Rolleston Residents Association (R)	**S79**	**D6**	That Rolleston ODP Area 5 & 6 be combined to allow development of the proposed Rolleston Recreation Precinct to be developed in either ODP Area 5 or 6 and residential development to occur in ODP Area 5 & 6 not subject to the Recreational Precinct development	Reject	Recommendation No 22
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 22
	F91 - Foster Holdings Limited		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 22
Foster Holdings Limited	**S91**	**D1**	ODP Area 5 subject to the following amendments	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 22
		D2	If a satisfactory agreement is reached between the submitter and the Council for the transfer of the submitter's land, the submitter seeks: that ODP Area 5 be extented to include all the land shown on Appendix A of the submission; and that all of the land identified in Appendix A of the submision be rezoned Living Z (deferred) with appropriate criteria in Policy B4.3.68 to enable development of this land for a recreational precinct a suitable ODP is approved	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 22
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 22
		D3	In the alternative, if a satisfactory agreement is not reached between the submitter and the Council for the transfer of the submitter's land, the submitter seeks: that ODP Area 5 be extended to include all of the land shown within the ODP at Appendix B of the submission; that the ODP and accompanying report at Appendix B of the submission be included as an appendix to the District Plan, subject to any modifications as necessary and appropriate; that all of the land shown on Appendix B is immediately rezoned Living Z to enable residential development in general accordance with the ODP; that the criteria for ODP Area 5 be amended to reflect that the land will be used for residential development; and that all references to the recreational precinct in the Plan Change and supporting documentation be deleted.	Reject	Recommendation No 22
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 22
		D4	All consequential, additional or other amendments to the provisions of the Plan Change necessary to give effect to the intent of this submission and/or support the decision sought.	Accept in part	Recommendation No 22
Outline Development Plan 6					
Foster Holdings Limited	**S91**	**D5**	ODP Area 6 subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 23
		D6	That the ODP and accompanying report at Appendix C of the submission be included within an Appendix to the District Plan, subject to any modifications as necessary and appropriate.	Accept	Recommendation No 23
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F82 - Rolleston Square Ltd		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 23
	F83 - Rolleston Retail Ltd		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 23
	F84 - RollTen Investments Ltd		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 23
		D7	That all of the land shown on Appedix C of the submission is immediately rezoned Living Z to enable residential development in accordance with the ODP.	Accept	Recommendation No 23

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F22 - SCCB		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 23
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 23
		D8	All consequential, additional or other amendments to the provisions of the Plan Change necessary to give effect to the intent of this submission and/or support the decision sought.	Accept	Recommendation No 23
Lincoln ODPs **Outline Development Plan 1**					
Lincoln Land Development (L)	**S85**	**D12**	Under Policy B4.3.56, LLD seek a clarification of the first bullet point;	Accept	Recommendation No 33
		D13	That all reference to the potential future bypass road be deleted from the proposed plan change, including but not limited to: the requirements in Policy B4.3.56 for ODP Area 1 and 5 to provide for a main roading link originating from Weedons Road linking to Springs Road and Moirs Lane; and the associated wording and indicative notations on the 'Grey Network & Density' plan of the Area 1 ODP which identify the potential bypass road.	Reject	Recommendation No 33
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F49 - Broadfield Developments		**yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 33
		D20	That Appendix 13 be amended to reflect the changes introduced by PC7 or	Reject	Recommendation No 33
		D21	That approved ODPs be exempt from the provisions of Appendix 13	Reject	Recommendation No 33
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 33
		D23	ODP Area 1: Road Network and Density Plan - That all references to the potential future bypass road be deleted from the proposed plan change, including but not limited to: the requirements in Policy B4.3.56 for ODP Areas 1 and 5 to provide for a main roading link originating from Weedons Road linking to Springs Road and Moirs Lane and all other matters incidental thereto, and the associated wording and idicative notations on the 'Grey Network and Density' plan of the Area 1 ODP which identify the potential bypass road.	Reject	Recommendation No 33
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F49 - Broadfield Developments		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 33
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F90 - Denwood Trustees		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 33
Lincoln Land Development (L)	**S85**	**D14**	Amend the final bullet point to provide flexibility and to clarify that if the sewerage treatment plant changes use the buffer will be uplifted/modified accordingly.	Reject	Recommendation No 34
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F89 - McIntosh		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 34
	F49 - Broadfield Developments		**Yes**	Reject	Recommendation No 34
Lincoln Land Development (L)	**S85**	**D25**	ODP Area 1: Green Network Plan - That an astrix or more defined "key open space location' be shown in between the medium density area to the West of the site as shown on Attachment A.	Accepted in part	Recommendation No 35

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Joint submission from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Waihora Management Board & Te Taumutu Runanga	**S87**	**D4**	ODP Area 1 (Lincoln) - Ngai Tahu seek that riparian margin and appropriately planted buffer at least 20 metres in width is provided along the L1 to buffer the river, better provide for water quality in the river and through this provide for restoration and enhancement of tangata whenua values.	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 36
		D5	ODP Area 1 (Lincoln) - Ngai Tahu recommends the creation of a 'spring reserve' to protect the existing springs that are located on the southern boundary.	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 36
Lincoln Land Development (L)	**S85**	**D22**	That ODP Area 1: Location Plan be retained	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 36
		D24	The rest of ODP Area 1: Road Network and Density Plan be retained	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 36
		D26	The rest of ODP Area 1: Green Network Plan be retained	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 36
		D27	That ODP Area 1: Blue Network and Services Plan be retained	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 36
Outline Development Plan 2					
Lincoln Estates Limited (L)	**S15**	**D15**	Preferred Growth Option (pg48) "The first preferred direction for any expansion of the residential area at Lincoln township is south of Gerald Street and east of Springs Road" Delete the sentence in its entirety and make any other consequential amendments.	Accept	Recommendation No 37
		D16	ODP Area 2 Lincoln "Provision of wells and water pumping facilities to provide sufficient capacity for all future growth in this area, including main truck connections where necessary" - Delete the provision or make any other consequential amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 37
Joint submission from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Waihora Management Board & Te Taumutu Runanga	**S87**	**D6**	ODP Area 2 (Lincoln) - Ngai Tahu strongly oppose the location of the stormwater treatment in this area. Ngai Tahu request that the Council redesign the location of the proposed wetland stormwater treatment area to a site which does not contain existing springs.	Reject	Recommendation No 37
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 37
		D7	ODP Area 2 (Lincoln) - Ngai Tahu support the creation of esplanade reserves along L1 and Ararira / L2 to protect the rivers. However, they recommend that there be an explicit requirement for the width of the esplanade reserves along these rivers to be at least 20m	Accept	Recommendation No 37
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Reject	Recommendation No 37

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D8	ODP Area 2 (Lincoln) - The lack of protection of the existing drain/race that runs from Ellesmere Road to Ararira / L2 is also opposed and is recommended as requiring riparian planting.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 37
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 37
		D9	ODP Area 2 (Lincoln) - Oppose the location of the "swale routes" and possibly the "potential alternative stormwater treatment and storage facility" along Ellesmere Rd where there is a significant remnant bush/wetland area (cabbage trees & associated vegetation). Ngai Tahu request (as stated above) that Selwyn District Council redesigns the location of the proposed stormwater system in the ODP Area 2.	Reject	Recommendation No 37
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 37
Broadfield Developments Ltd (L)	**S49**	**D1**	To retain the Broadfield Estates Ltd land as a Living 1 zone under PC7, in accordance with the operative provisions of the plan under PC4.	Accept	Recommendation No 37
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 37
Outline Development Plan 3					
Plant and Food (L)	**S29**	**D1**	Unless the following amendments are made (including D4 re ODP Area 4)	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 38
		D2	That all reference to the requirement that main pedestrian and cycle route be provided at Browns Lane (including, but not limited to, the provisions set out in Policy B4.3.56 and in ODP 3) be deleted from the plan change	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 38
		D3	That the ODP for Area 3 (Lincoln) be approved subject to the amendments proposed in Attachment 2	Reject	Recommendation No 38
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F27 - Ministry of Education		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 38
Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd	**S47**	**D2**	Amend ODP Area 3 so as to reduce the extent of medium density development as identified in the attached plan; and	Reject	Recommendation No 38
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 38
	F29 - Plant and Food Research		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 38
Fulton Hogan Land Development Ltd	**S47**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments (include D2 re ODP 3 Lincoln))	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 38
		D3	Amend "Table C12.1 - Allotment Sizes" so as to reduce the minimum average and minimum individual allotment sizes in the Living Z Zone at Lincoln to 600m and 500m respectively; and	Accept	Recommendation No 38
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 38

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 38
	F89 - McIntosh		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 38
		D4	Any other consequential amendments required to give effect to the relief sought as identified above.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 38
Ministry of Education	**S27**	**D1**	The Ministry acknowledge the opportunity to comment and wish to continue to be involved in determining future school sites and supports the concept of Outline Development Plans that form part of Plan Change 7.	Accept	Recommendation No 38
		D2	Further discussion with Selwyn District Council regard effective methods for ensuring the security of proposed school sites	Accept	Recommendation No 38
		D3	The school site identified in the Outline Development Lincoln Area 3 be removed from the Outline Development Plan and a more appropriate site identified with the Ministry	Accept	Recommendation No 38
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F47 - Futlon Hogan		**Yes**	Accept	Recommendation No 38
Jillian and John Meredith (L)	**S12**	**D1**	That all paths (cycle or pedestrian) should be situated on the perimeter of the Liffeyfields stormwater reserve and not traverse the reserve in any way	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 38
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 38
Joint submission from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Waihora Management Board & Te Taumutu Runanga	**S87**	**D10**	ODP Area 3 (Lincoln) - Ngai Tahu wish to see the establishment of a 'springs reserve' as discussed in ODP Area 2, and seek that the area be given specific plantings to support customary use by the local whanau and hapu. Ngai Tahu also considers there is a lack of protection given to the existing drain/race that runs off Birches Rd, and Ngai Tahu seek that the Council includes riparian planting as a buffer along this drain/race	Reject	Recommendation No 38
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F29 - Plant and Food Research		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 38
		D11	ODP Area 3 (Lincoln) - The planting of streets and reserves with special trees and landscaping in ODP Area 3 is supported but Ngai Tahu request that specific reference is made to planting locally sourced indigenous species in particular especially where streets are adjacent to springs and waterways.	Reject	Recommendation No 38
Outline Development Plan 4					
Plant and Food (L)	**S29**	**D4**	That ODP Area 4 as proposed by notified Plan Change 7 be deleted; or	Reject	Recommendation No 39
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 39
		D5	Without derogating the relief sought in point 3 above, that ODP Area 4 be amended to include an appropriate landscaped buffer and setback from Smiths Block so as to avoid or mitigate the risk of reverse sensitivity effects arising between existing research activities and future residential activities	Accept	Recommendation No 39

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Agresearch (L)	**S30**	**D1**	Unless the following amendments are made	Reject	Recommendation No 39
		D2	That ODP Area 4 as proposed by notified Plan Change 7 be deleted; or	Reject	Recommendation No 39
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept	Recommendation No 39
		D3	Without derogating the relief sought in point 3 above, that ODP Area 4 be amended to include an appropriate landscaped buffer and setback from Smiths Block so as to avoid or mitigate the risk of reverse sensitivity effects arising between existing research activities and future residential activities	Accept	Recommendation No 39
Plant and Food (L)	**S29**	**D6**	That all reference (including, but not limited to, text in proposed Policies, Rules, and ODPs) to a requirement for a main road connection linking Boundary Road to Birchs Road via Smiths Block be deleted from the plan change	Accept	Recommendation No 39
Agresearch (L)	**S30**	**D4**	That all reference (including, but not limited to, text in proposed Policies, Rules, and ODPs) to a requirement for a main road connection linking Boundary Road to Birchs Road via Smiths Block be deleted from the plan change	Accept	Recommendation No 39
Craig Harold Thompson	**S40**	**D1**	Subject to the following amendments (include D2 - Additional Land Rezoned in Rolleston & D4 re ODP Area 4 Lincoln))	Reject	Recommendation No 39
		D3	Amend ODP area 4 Lincoln plans such that the primary road is not unduly located solely within land owned by the 'Claridges'	Reject	Recommendation No 39
Joint submission from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Waihora Management Board & Te Taumutu Runanga	**S87**	**D12**	ODP Area 4 (Lincoln) - Ngai Tahu support the protection of races through the incorporation of the races within the reserves, however Ngai Tahu seek that all races are explicitly identified as requiring protection with riparian planting within the reserves and that the planting criteria refer to locally sourced indigenous species	Reject	Recommendation No 39
		D13	ODP Area 4 (Lincoln) - Ngai Tahu request that Council specifically include provision for establishment of a 'spring reserve' as an acknowledge of the significance of waipuna (springs) to tangata whenua and to this area.	Reject	Recommendation No 39
Phillip Long (L)	**S1**	**D1**	Support the inclusion of land down Tancreds Road as Living Z or Living Z Deferred	Accept	Recommendation No 39
Paul Francis Claridge (L)	**S9**	**D1**	That Plan Change 7 is approved as publically notified on 27 February 2010	Accept	Recommendation No 39
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**No**	Reject	Recommendation No 39
Marion & Peter Burnett	**S20**	**D1**	Fully support Plan Change 7 and ask that the Plan Change be adopted	Accept	Recommendation No 39
Early Property Holdings	**S50**	**D1**	Approve Plan Change 7 as notified, subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 39
		D2	Delete the words "that form part of a larger regional or sub-regional reserve network" from the definition of 'Net Density".	Reject	Recommendation No 39
		D3	Retain Objectives B4.3.3, B4.3.4, B4.3.5 and B4.3.6 as notified	Accept	Recommendation No 39
		D4	Retain Planning Map 014C as notified as it pertains to Outline Development Area 4	Accept	Recommendation No 39

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D5	Retain Policy B4.3.50 as notified	Accept	Recommendation No 39
BHL Trust	**S51**	**D1**	Approve Plan Change 7 as notified, subject to the following amendments	Accept	Recommendation No 39
		D2	Delete the words "that form part of a larger regional or sub-regional reserve network" from the definition of 'Net Density".	Reject	Recommendation No 39
		D3	Retain Objectives B4.3.3, B4.3.4, B4.3.5 and B4.3.6 as notified	Accept	Recommendation No 39
		D4	Retain Planning Map 014C as notified as it pertains to Outline Development Area 4	Accept	Recommendation No 39
		D5	Retain Policy B4.3.50 as notified	Accept	Recommendation No 39
Outline Development Plan 5					
Denwood Trustees Ltd (L)	**S90**	**D1**	Oppose all of Plan Change 7 except for the provisions relating to Rolleston and for medium density housing (including D12 amd 13 re ODP Area 5 Lincoln, D3 re additional land sought to be rezoned in Lincoln)	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 40
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		no	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 40
		D11	The requirements of Policy B4.3.56 for the form of ODPs for each ODP area are too restrictive and should be deleted or amended.	Reject	Recommendation No 40
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		No	Accept	Recommendation No 40
		D12	ODP Area 5 - B2 Zone: The Trust seeks that the Deferred status be removed from the Lincoln proposed B2 Zone at Springs Road; and that the ODP Area 5 - Lincoln B2 Zone as attached as Appendix C be included as part of PC7; and the amended B2 rules as they apply to the B2 Zone at Lincoln as attached as Appendix B be included as part of PC7. Two alternative ODPs are included in Appendix C, with the preference for Option 1 which does not show the potential Southern Bypass. The amended B2 Zone rules for Lincoln are considered appropriate in terms of the requirements of Part 2 of the Act, in particular to avoid or mitigate any potential environmental effects on adjoining zones. Also attached as Appendix D is a s32 assessment in support of the removal of deferred status, the Area 5 ODP and the amended B2 rules for the Lincoln B2 Zone. This includes a noise report from Marshall Day Acoustics explaining the reasoning for the proposed noise rules	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 40
		D2	The Trust supports the provision in PC7 for the Lincoln B2 Zone being zoned Business 2, but opposes the Deferred status of the zoning. It seeks that this be removed, and the land be zoned Business 2. It seeks amendments to the B2 Zone rules as they affect the Lincoln B2 Zone as set out in Appendix B and, if ODPs are to retained as part of PC7, inclusion of the Area 5 ODPs for the proposed B2 and LZ Zones as setout in Appendix C of our submission.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 40
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F28 - Lincoln University		**no**	Withdrawn at the hearing	Recommendation No 40
Lincoln University (L)	**S28**	**D3**	The Plan Change be amended by excluding the Old Railway Line from ODP Area 5 and the Business 2 Deferred Zone as shown on Attachment 1	Accept	Recommendation No 40

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D4	That all reference to the potential future bypass road be deleted from the proposed plan change, including (but not limited to): the requirement in Policy B4.3.56 for ODP Area 1 and 5 to provide for a main roading link originating from Weedons Road linking to Springs Road and Moirs Lane and the associated wording and indicative notations on the 'Grey Network & Density' plan of the Area 1 ODP which identify the potential bypass road.	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 40
GJ & SP Worner (L)	**S88**	**D1**	The rezoning of ODP Area 5 land to Business 2 for future industrial purposes	Reject	Recommendation No 40
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F90 - Denwood Trustees		**no**	Reject in Part	Recommendation No 40
	F28 - Lincoln University		**Yes**	Withdrawn at the hearing	Recommendation No 40
Lincoln University (L)	**S28**	**D1**	That Proposed Plan Change 7 be amended by deleting all reference to the proposed Business 2 Deferred zoning and associated ODP requirements for ODP Area 5; or	Withdrawn at the hearing	Recommendation No 40
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	N/a	Recommendation No 40
	F90 - Denwood Trustees		**No**	N/a	Recommendation No 40
		D2	Without derogating the primary relief set out in point (1) above, that: either i. the ODP Area 5 site be given an alternative business zoning to the Business 2 zone, which will not carry a risk of compromising the amenity, character, or efficient operation of the University; or ii. The ODP Area 5 site be given a 'split' zoning whereby an alternate business zone to the Business 2 zone is established at the northern portion of the site which will not carry a risk of compromising the amenity, character or efficient operation of the University; or iii. If the Council decides that the Business 2 Deferred zoning is the most appropriate zoning of the land, that the requirement in Policy B4.3.56 to include a landscaped buffer area between the ODP Area 5 site and the University be strengthened to require a minimum setback of no less than 20m between industrial activities and University land with additional requirements for the mitigation of potential adverse noise and visual impacts created by industrial activities (i.e via planting, fencing, bunding, etc); or iv. That specific restrictions on land uses be applied to ODP Area 5 (and as needed in the relevant Business 2 provisions) to ensure that the amenity, character, and efficient operation of the University are not compromised by future activities which establish on the ODP Area 5 site. This could include, but not be limited to, a provision controlling maximum site size	Withdrawn at the hearing	Recommendation No 40
Outline Development Plan 6					
Diana McDrury & Others (L)	**S23**	**D1**	Plan Change 7 as it stands	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D2	As it relates to "Vege Block" that only single story, normal roof space (no attics) will be allowed and under all circumstances the 4 metre at 45 degrees recession plane be disallowed	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D3	That usual distance of building from rear boundary be extended	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D4	That you do not allow a development that will become a slum	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D5	That shrubs be no higher than 0.3m above boundary fence, so there is no blocking of sun	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
Kevin Zygmant (L)	**S78**	**D1**	I am not happy the council has through the notice of requirement now got the stadium under way and now wishes to "get rid" of the balance of land to a developer and presumably make what money it can out of the balance of land at all costs through this plan	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D2	Develop this strip of land on the veggie block, so we can hold the council accountable for the development, as there will be little chance of holding the developer accountable.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D3	I would like to see council provide a strip of land 2-3 metres wide down the boundary of Roblyn Place, planted with trees that will in time give us shelter, noise reduction and the aesthetic views we once had.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D4	The council have allowed for an acoustic barrier (fencing) on the north side protecting the noise from who knows. That acoustic barrier needs to be put down Roblyn Place residents boundary.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D5	I don't want to look at the rear of a town house, and by cramming in more homes on that site, I believe they will have to be close to my boundary.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D6	No two storey homes	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D7	Easements to existing residences boundaries	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D8	Covenants on style of some of these homes.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
Patrick & Helen Aldwell (L)	**S80**	**D1**	That the site is not changed to medium density housing	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D2	That the site is designated as L1 and allows a maximum of 12 dwellings	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D3	That no back sections and back section dwellings are permitted	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D4	That the site is not sold to a developer or other private body and is retained in SDC ownership in perpetuity	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D5	That a 3 metre buffer zone is created along the back boundary of the Robyn Place residents to help maintain privacy from the vege block developments	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D6	That the 3 metre buffer zone is planted in trees and that planting density and species are designed to maximise the privacy of the existing dwellings in Roblyn Place.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D7	Should any one of these items (D1 to D6) not occur, then Roblyn Place residents have the right to veto and modify any developments that result in intrusion on their existing residential properties.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
Margaret & David Hannan (L)	**S94**	**D1**	That the site is not changed to medium density housing	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D2	That the site is designated as L1 and allows a maximum of 12 dwellings	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D3	That no back sections and back section dwellings are permitted	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D4	That the site is not sold to a developer or other private body and is retained in SDC ownership in perpetuity	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D5	That a 3 metre buffer zone is created along the back boundary of the Robyn Place residents to help maintain privacy from the vege block developments	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D6	That the 3 meter buffer zone is planted in trees and that planting density and species are designed to maximise the privacy of the existing dwellings in Roblyn Place.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D7	Should any one of these items (D1 to D6) not occur, then Roblyn Place residents have the right to veto and modify any developments that result in intrusion on their existing residential properties.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
Margery Baker (L)	**S95**	**D1**	That the site is not changed to medium density housing	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D2	That the site is designated as L1 and allows a maximum of 12 dwellings	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D3	That no back sections and back section dwellings are permitted	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D4	That the site is not sold to a developer or other private body and is retained in SDC ownership in perpetuity	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D5	That a 3 metre buffer zone is created along the back boundary of the Robyn Place residents to help maintain privacy from the vege block developments	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D6	That the 3 meter buffer zone is planted in trees and that planting density and species are designed to maximise the privacy of the existing dwellings in Roblyn Place.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D7	Should any one of these items (D1 to D6) not occur, then Roblyn Place residents have the right to veto and modify any developments that result in intrusion on their existing residential properties.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
Margaret McDrury (L)	**S96**	**D1**	That the site is not changed to medium density housing	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D2	That the site is designated as L1 and allows a maximum of 12 dwellings	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D3	That no back sections and back section dwellings are permitted	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D4	That the site is not sold to a developer or other private body and is retained in SDC ownership in perpetuity	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D5	That a 3 metre buffer zone is created along the back boundary of the Robyn Place residents to help maintain privacy from the vege block developments	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D6	That the 3 meter buffer zone is planted in trees and that planting density and species are designed to maximise the privacy of the existing dwellings in Roblyn Place.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D7	Should any one of these items (D1 to D6) not occur, then Roblyn Place residents have the right to veto and modify any developments that result in intrusion on their existing residential properties.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
Kevan & Penny Zygmait (L)	**S97**	**D1**	That the site is not changed to medium density housing	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
		D2	That the site is designated as L1 and allows a maximum of 12 dwellings	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F31 - New Zealand Transport		**No**	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D3	That no back sections and back section dwellings are permitted	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D4	That the site is not sold to a developer or other private body and is retained in SDC ownership in perpetuity	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D5	That a 3 metre buffer zone is created along the back boundary of the Robyn Place residents to help maintain privacy from the vege block developments	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D6	That the 3 meter buffer zone is planted in trees and that planting density and species are designed to maximise the privacy of the existing dwellings in Roblyn Place.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
		D7	Should any one of these items (D1 to D6) not occur, then Roblyn Place residents have the right to veto and modify any developments that result in intrusion on their existing residential properties.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 54 (Page 142)
Joint submission from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Waihora Management Board & Te Taumutu Runanga	**S87**	**D14**	ODP Area 6 (Lincoln) - The lack of protection of Liffey Stream with riparian planting is a concern to Ngai Tahu. To address this a 20 metre planted buffer and riparian margin is requested to be incorporated for the L1. This buffer should include appropriate indigenous plantings	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 55 (Page 143)
Tangata Whenua Values					
Joint submission from Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd, Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu, Te Waihora Management Board & Te Taumutu Runanga	**S87**	**D1**	Supports in principle the strategic, community approach of Plan Change 7 to better manage urban development, rather than leaving it to the market. (includes D4 & 5 re ODP Area 1, D6-9 re ODP Area 2, D10-11 re ODP Area 3, D12-13 re ODP Area 4 and D14 re ODP Area 6\))	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D2	Supports in principle the concept of ODPs as a planning method as they are an effective tool for identifying tangata whenua values and areas for protection.	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D3	Opposes the lack of explicit reference to tangata whenua values, including in the Lincoln ODPs. Ngai Tahu considers the Plan Change in its present state fails to recognise and provide for the relationship between Ngai Tahu and Selwyn District.	Accept in Part	Recommendation No 7

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
			Inclusion of the following additional provisions for Objective B4.3.3 relevant to Ngai Tahu and supporting policies for the objective for ODPs both of which are modelled on that of Christchurch City Council's Plan Change 61 for greenfield development. Add the following text:		
			"General Tangata Whenua Objective Outline Development Plans to recognise, provide and protect land, water (including waipuna), sites, wahi tapu and other taonga of cultural significance to tangata whenua) Policies: Tangata Whenua Protect Ngai Tahu cultural values and features and places of cultural significance, including natural habitats and mahinga kai, from the adverse effects of development and create opportunities to enhance or restore these values, features and places where possible. Incorporate Ngai Tahu values in the design of green and blue networks through the restoration and creation of natural habitat and mahinga kai and use of best practice stormwate conveyance and treatment mechanisms that avoid adverse effects on natural waters. That the design reflects and incorporates tangata whenua values such as mahinga kai, wahi tapu and wahi taonga, and kaitiakitanga. That relevant iwi management plans, in particular the Taumutu Runanga Resources Management Plan and the Te Waihora Joing Management Plan, be taken into account".	Reject	Recommendation No 7
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D16	Inclusion of the following urban design principles for Policy B4.1.13 - "That where appropriate the design reflects and incorporates tangata whenua values such as kaitiakitanga, mahinga kai, wahi tapu and wahi taonga" and "That relevant iwi management plans in particular the Taumutu Runanga Natural Resources Management Plan and the Te Waihora Joint Management Plan be taken into account"	Reject	Recommendation No 7
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D17	Inclusion of the following provision in B4.3.7 - "(x) Provide for tangata whenua values such as kaitiakitanga, mahinga kai, wahi tapu and wahi taonga and show how they are to be enhanced, maintained and restored"	Reject	Recommendation No 7
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D18	Inclusion of the following provision in Quality of the Environment - Objectives p4 - "Urban development protects, enhances and restores tangata whenua values, through riparian plantings, native species plantings, protection of water quality and quantity and waterways including waipuna (springs), habitat restoration of mahinga kai species, adequate provision for open space" and "In managing urban development particular regard will be given to kaitiakitanga"	Reject	Recommendation No 7
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D19	Inclusion of the following provisions in Policy B3.4.3 - "Ensure that tangata whenua values such as kaitiakitanga, mahinga kai, wahi tapu and wahi taonga are recognised and provided for" and "Ensure that in addressing the effects of development, the Ngai Tahu integrated approach of 'Ki Uta Ki Tai' (from the mountains to the sea) is taken into account"	Reject	Recommendation No 7
	Further Submission		**Support?**		

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D20	Reword Objective B4.2.3 to read as follows "The maintenance, enhancement and restoration of the amenities of the existing natural and built environment and tangata whenua values through subdivision design and layout". And reword part of the explanation and reasons "... Subdivision design should also pay close regard to important natural features tangata whenua values such as mahinga kai and wahi tapu or wahi taonga sites, cultural heritage resources, waterways and public linkages"	Reject	Recommendation No 7
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D21	Reword Policy B4.2.4 to read as follows "Encourage the retention, enhancement and restoration of natural, tangata whenua, historic and other values and features within the subdivision and for allotment boundaries to follow natural or physical features where it maintains the amenity of the area" and reword part of the Explanation and Reasons to "It is desirable to maintain, enhance and restore natural, tangata whenua, or other values and features historical within the subdivision area, including the retention of mature trees or other characteristic features"	Reject	Recommendation No 7
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D22	Inclusion of the following bullet point within Subdivision of Land - Anticipated Environmental Results (pg 30) - "Retention, enhancement and restoration of tangata whenua values such as kaitiakitanga, mahinga kai, wahi tapu and wahi taonga"	Reject	Recommendation No 7
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D23	Include the following principles within the Subdivision And Medium Density Design Guide - * Provide for effective participation particularly in the early stages, of Ngai Tahu as kaitiaki, in urban planning and design including Outline Development Plans; * Protect, enhance, and restore kaitiakitanga value, including but not limited to: riparian plantings; habitat restoration for mahinga kai species; native species plantings; protection of water quality and quantity in all water ways including springs and wetlands; adoption of LIUD techniques and principles and protection and adequate provision for open space; * Provide for whanaungatanga (social relationships) and tangata whenua cultural identity in urban design such that tangata whenua identity and social relationship values can be reflected in places (work, street/place names, public spaces, artworks, leisure facilities, neighbourhoods and residences) in the community; * Protect and restore wahi tapu and wahi taonga management areas / values including known spring sites from development including but not limited to: protection and restoration of sites and access from disturbance, earthworks and contamination; archaeological surveys and Accident Discovery Protocols * Implement the Te Aranga Maori Cultural Landscapes Strategy * Utilise cultural sustainability indicators for monitoring such as those identified in "The Cultural Sustainability review for the House of Tahu" (2006), and "The Cultural Health Assessment of the Avon Heathcote Estuary and its Catchment (2007) * Develop wastewater and stormwater treatment systems that protect and improve water quality	Reject	Recommendation No 7

Submitter	Submission No	Decision No	Decisions Sought	Recommendations	Decision Reference
			* Take into account the Ngai Tahu holistic, integrated management approach of 'Ki Uta Ki Tai' (from the mountains to the sea) so that the downstream effects of development on the environment are addressed * Ensure that street lights have upper shields or suppression rings to reduce the impact of new residential development on natural night time darkness * Take into account relevant iwi management plans in particular the Taumutu Runanga Natural Resources Management Plan and the Te Waihora Joint Management Plan		
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7
		D24	Ngai Tahu seek that the Council ensure that rules for subdivision, landuse and earthworks reflect the protection and restoration matters described in the ODP and policy sections of this submission.	Reject	Recommendation No 7
	Further Submission		**Support?**		
	F15 - Lincoln Estates Ltd		**no**	Accept	Recommendation No 7