

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

To Selwyn District Council

Name of person making further submission: **Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL) (Submitter 0004)**

- 1 This is a further submission on submissions on Plan Change 71 to the Selwyn District Plan (*Plan Change*).
- 2 CIAL is a person who has an interest in the Plan Change that is greater than the interest of the public generally, as its operations in the Selwyn District are directly affected by the Plan Change.
- 3 If others make a similar submission, CIAL will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing.
- 4 CIAL's further submissions are set out in **Annexure 1**.

Signed for and on behalf of Christchurch International Airport Limited by its solicitors and authorised agents Chapman Tripp



Jo Appleyard
Partner
30 August 2021

Address for service of submitter:

Christchurch International Airport Limited
c/- Amy Hill
Chapman Tripp
Level 5, PwC Centre
60 Cashel Street
PO Box 2510
Christchurch 8140
Email address: Jo.Appleyard@chapmantripp.com / Amy.Hill@chapmantripp.com

ANNEXURE 1: FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

Submitter name and submission point	Decision requested by submitter	CIAL support/ oppose	Reason for CIAL's support/oppose	Decision sought by CIAL
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) 001 - 004	<p>The plan change is inconsistent with the policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the strategic sub-regional land use and infrastructure planning framework for Greater Christchurch; including in relation to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the anticipated settlement pattern; the protection of the airport, as strategic infrastructure. Considers that a deferred zoning for urban development under the air noise contour is presumptuous and would be more appropriately considered as part of the full review of the CRPS; wastewater disposal; and public transport. 	Support	CIAL considers that the plan change should be rejected because it is inconsistent with the CRPS and Greater Christchurch planning framework. It would result in adverse reverse sensitivity effects on the operations of the Airport. CIAL does not consider that a deferred zoning would be appropriate as it creates expectations that may not be realised and which pre-empt a variety of technical processes which are yet to occur.	Accept the submission
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) 005	The submitter wishes to draw attention to the emerging national direction strengthening measures to protect highly productive land from development.	Support	CIAL agrees that versatile soils and highly productive land are important considerations when looking at urban growth.	Accept the submission

Submitter name and submission point	Decision requested by submitter	CIAL support/oppose	Reason for CIAL's support/oppose	Decision sought by CIAL
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) 006	Considers that the desirability of growth at Rolleston is best considered as part of a future spatial planning exercise rather than ad-hoc and individual assessments prompted by private plan change requests.	Support	CIAL opposes any further residential density increase under the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contours. This will result in adverse reverse sensitivity effects on strategic infrastructure. Considering growth at Rolleston as part of a future spatial planning exercise rather than on an ad hoc and individual basis (with the exception of those activities which meet the criteria in Policy 8 of the NPS-UD) would be more efficient and achieve better outcomes, including the protection of the Airport.	Accept the submission
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) 007	Does not consider it has been demonstrated that the proposed plan change will add significantly to development capacity or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, nor has it been demonstrated that the proposal is, or will be, well connected, and therefore does not give effect to various provisions in the NPS-UD.	Support	CIAL supports this for the reasons set out in its submission. Enabling activities which generate adverse reverse sensitivity effects on strategic infrastructure does not amount to a well-functioning urban environment.	Accept the submission
Christchurch City Council 001	Considers that the significance of the development capacity and the appropriateness of the proposal needs to be considered in a broader context of the Greater	Support	CIAL supports this for the reasons set out in its submission.	Accept the submission

Submitter name and submission point	Decision requested by submitter	CIAL support/oppose	Reason for CIAL's support/oppose	Decision sought by CIAL
	Christchurch sub-region, the direction in the NPS UD as a whole, and the CRPS framework.			
Christchurch City Council 002	The plan change does not give effect to the CRPS as the site is outside of the areas identified for development in the CRPS, and in the submitter's view must be declined.	Support	The CRPS requires that the location and design of rural residential development shall avoid noise sensitive activities within the 50dBA Ldn Air Noise Contour. Development should not occur in areas under the Air Noise Contour.	Accept the submission
Christchurch City Council 004	Considers that a higher minimum density of 15 households per hectare would better achieve efficiencies in coordination of land use and infrastructure, support mixed land use activities, support multi-modal transport systems and protect the productive rural land resource.	Oppose	CIAL opposes any residential density increase under the 50dB Ldn Air Noise Contours. If the plan change is granted and the higher density of households per hectare granted, this relief will result in adverse reverse sensitivity effects on strategic infrastructure.	Reject the submission