

Summary of Submissions and further submissions

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner's Recommendation
PC71-0001	Paula	001	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Concerned that Nobeline Drive is narrow and could not safely accommodate two way traffic and a footpath. Considers there is a need for a wide road to accommodate truck parked on submitter's property.	Not stated	Reject. However it is noted that the ODP provides: <i>Nobeline Drive including at the intersection with Lincoln Rolleston Road is to be upgraded, including vesting of frontage where needed, to a Local Major Road standard in accordance with the Engineering Code of Practice.</i>
PC71-0001	Paula	002	Residential and Business Development	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Previously advised that the area would not be subdivided in 20 years. Queries why has this been brought forward.	Not stated	Reject. Not a matter relevant to the Recommendation on PC71.
PC71-0001	Paula	003	Quality of the Environment	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Concerned that new residents will be affected by noise from motorbike riding on the submitter's property.	Not stated	Reject for the reasons addressed in the Interim Recommendation at paragraph [96].
PC71-0001	Paula	004	Water	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Queries effect of housing on submitter's water well.	Not stated	Reject – no evidence of direct negative impacts on submitter's well.
PC71-0001	Paula	005	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Queries ability to safely continue to ride horses on the road and whether they can be ridden on the footpath.	Not stated	N/A
PC71-0001	Paula	006	Community Facilities	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Requests consideration of more houses on car parking in township.	Not stated	Reject. I accept the evidence that parking external to PC71 can be managed by landowners and existing Council processes (8.2 Transportation Hearing Report, December 2021).
PC71-0001	Paula	007	Utilities	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Queries if increased housing will impact submitter's internet.	Not stated	Reject. No evidence that plan change will impact on the submitter's internet. Matter for subdivision and not relevant at plan change.
PC71-0001	Paula	008	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Concerned about ability for traffic to exit Nobeline Drive during peak hours.	Not stated	Reject. Traffic evidence from Ms Williams for the Applicant and Mr Collins that the intersection will perform adequately as an urbanised priority intersection.
PC71-0002	Alistair Grant	001	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concerned about the impact the plan change will have on traffic safety and safe access to the submitter's property on Levi Road as a motorist, pedestrian and cyclist. Notes that at peak times traffic is already backed up from the roundabout with Masefield Drive beyond the planned exit opposite Ruby Drive. Considers that Levi Road is already too narrow for the volume and speed of traffic and that cars cannot be safely parked on the roadside.	Reject or amend the plan change	Reject. Traffic effects considered and addressed in expert evidence. Accept the expert evidence that Levi Road has an approximate carriageway width of 8m which is likely to be extended to around 9-11m (subject to engineering design at subdivision stage). Should parking controls be required, such as no stopping at all times markings, that can be addressed at that stage.
PC71-0002	Alistair Grant	002	Community Facilities	Oppose	Concerned about impact on wellbeing due to the increase in population, with no reasonable size parks or green space in this area as compared to other areas in Rolleston.	Reject or amend the plan change	Reject. Issue addressed in Interim Recommendation. Note changes in relation to park and the proximity to the proposed district park.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Considers that any deferred zoning and / or further residential zoning in such close proximity to the Air Noise Contour would be inappropriate and undermine the integrity of the Selwyn District Plan and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in relation to the establishment of noise sensitive activities in proximity to the Airport. Considers that the current Air Noise Contour, as shown on Map A in the CRPS, remains applicable	Delay any decision on the Plan Change until completion of the remodelling process, and incorporation of the new contours into the planning framework	Reject. Land within the air noise contour remains as Inner Plains. Any potential future residential will be subject to further application and assessment. Delay in overall decision is unnecessary/inappropriate.
PC71-0012	Mark Chambers	FS002	Residential and Business Development	Support	<i>The proposal needs to be refused at this point, pending consultation by the developers with CIAL</i>	<i>Accept the submission point</i>	<i>Reject.</i>
PC71-0005	Ivan & Barbara Court	001	Utilities	Support In Part	Requests clarification of ODP services and roads and of deferral timeframe for Living Z Zone (deferred).	Not stated	Accept in part and note the clarification in relation to ODP services and roads has been provided through evidence. Deferral addressed in Interim Recommendation.
PC71-0006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	001	Residential and Business Development	Neither Support Nor Oppose	The rezoning of the application site should be considered against the updated provisions of the Urban Development Strategy and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.	Give consideration to the implications of the Urban Development Strategy and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.	Accept in part. Issues in relation to the UDS and CRPS considered.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner's Recommendation
PC71-0006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	002	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Considers that additional opportunities for multi-modal transport, particularly for walking and cycling, through and adjoining the site, should be considered to promote internal connections within plan change areas and connections to wider network.	Incorporate opportunities for multi-modal transport through and adjoining the site	Accept in part. Multi-modal transport issues identified and addressed in evidence and Interim Recommendation.
PC71-0006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	003	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Considers that the plan change is likely to contribute to transport associated carbon emissions due to a reliance on private vehicle use as a consequence of limited job opportunities and local amenities in the Rolleston township, resulting in private commuter traffic into the city. Notes that as the site is outside the Projected Infrastructure Boundary there is limited planning for the provision of improved public transport to support future residents of this plan change area.	Assess the Plan Change against the objectives and policies of the National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity 2020 and other documents relating to carbon emissions. Consider what improvements could be made to reduce the contribution of carbon emissions from the site.	Reject in part. Assessment has been undertaken in the evidence and Interim Recommendation. Contribution to compact urban form in Rolleston assists in public transport provision. Agree with reply submissions that the benefits of the land's location in terms of proximity to Rolleston Centre and its proximity to employment areas are such that it represents consolidated development of Rolleston supporting minimising energy use and provision of greater modal choice.
PC71-0012	Mark Chambers	FS003	Community Facilities	Support	<i>The proposal needs to be refused at this point, pending consultation by the developers with Waka Kotahi</i>	<i>Accept the submission point</i>	<i>Reject for reasons recorded above.</i>
PC71-0006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	004	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Considers that an increase of road capacity, public and active transport coverage, as well as ongoing operations and maintenance may be required to provide a good range of sustainable transport options for the future population.	Consider these matters as part of the design of the development, with the Council and Waka Kotahi.	Accept in part but agree with Applicant that consolidated development in Rolleston assists.
PC71-0012	Mark Chambers	FS004	Community Facilities	Support	<i>The proposal needs to be refused at this point, pending consultation by the developers with Waka Kotahi</i>	<i>Accept the submission point</i>	<i>Reject.</i>
PC71-0007	Christchurch City Council	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	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 Christchurch sub-region, the direction in the NPS UD as a whole, and the CRPS framework.	Reject plan change unless concerns outlined in submission are addressed.	Reject. Significant development capacity in the context of the Greater Christchurch sub-region would require plan changes to meet an unreasonable threshold, risk undermining competitive land markets and a more nuanced approach is available. The direction of the NPS-UD and CRPS framework properly assessed and considered.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS008	Residential and Business Development	Support	<i>CIAL supports this for the reasons set out in its submission</i>	<i>Accept the submission point</i>	<i>Reject for reasons summarised in relation to primary submission.</i>
PC71-0007	Christchurch City Council	002	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	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.	Reject plan change unless concerns outlined in submission are addressed.	Reject for reasons recorded in the Interim Recommendation and consideration of the NPS-UD.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS009	Residential and Business Development	Support	<i>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.</i>	<i>Accept the submission point</i>	<i>Accept in part Area within the 50dBA Ldn noise contour remains Rural Inner Plains while identifying potential for residential development should the 50dBA Ldn noise contour be removed from the planning maps.</i>
PC71-0007	Christchurch City Council	003	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concerned that the proposal relies on a future public transport network which has not been planned or funded to provide connections. Considers that the distance from the site to bus stops will discourage public transport use and that location of the site does not provide sufficient local employment to meet the needs for potential residents and will promote reliance on car based transport, resulting in increased emissions, congestion and longer journey times. Considers that reducing private motor vehicle dependency is important for improving sustainability by reducing emissions and the significant adverse effects of downstream traffic within Christchurch City.	Reject plan change unless urban form and development controls are applied to ensure a funded and implemented public transport system is provided to service the site, including connections to Christchurch City, prior to any residential development.	Reject. The compact urban form and consolidated growth in Rolleston supports the provision of public transport.
PC71-0007	Christchurch City Council	004	Residential Density	Oppose	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.	Reject plan change unless a minimum level of density for the development of 15 households per hectare is provided, and the relevant recommendations of the review of minimum densities undertaken under	Reject but note increase in density to 15 hh/ha in northern part of the site. Action 3 requires a number of steps prior to increase in density. The density proposed is the most appropriate.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner's Recommendation
						Action 3 of Our Space are incorporated in the Plan Change.	
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS010	Residential Density	Support	<i>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.</i>	Accept the submission point	Accept in part.
PC71-0007	Christchurch City Council	005	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Notes that the Greater Christchurch Partnership are working on developing a Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan.	Incorporate the relevant recommendations of the Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan into the Plan Change.	Reject. The Action Plan not appropriate for incorporation into this private plan change.
PC71-0008	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	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 the anticipated settlement pattern.	Reject plan change; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission.	Reject. Infrastructure and wastewater disposal considered and addressed in Interim Recommendation.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS001	Residential and Business Development	Support	<i>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.</i>	Accept the submission point	Accept in part. Land under the air noise contour remains Rural Inner Plains but indicates potential residential development should the air noise contour in relation to the land be removed from the planning maps.
PC71-0008	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	002	Transport Networks	Oppose	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 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.	Reject the plan change; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission.	Accept in part. Land under the air noise contour remains Rural Inner Plains but indicates potential residential development should the air noise contour in relation to the land be removed from the planning maps.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS002	Transport Networks	Support	<i>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.</i>	Accept the submission point	Accept in part. Land under the air noise contour remains Rural Inner Plains but indicates potential residential development should the air noise contour in relation to the land be removed from the planning maps.
PC71-0008	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	003	Waste Disposal	Oppose	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 wastewater disposal.	Reject plan change; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission.	Reject. Infrastructure including wastewater disposal adequately addressed and considered in the Interim Recommendation.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS003	Waste Disposal	Support	<i>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.</i>	Accept the submission point	Accept in part. Infrastructure including wastewater disposal adequately addressed and considered in the Interim Recommendation.
PC71-0012	Mark Chambers	FS005	Community Facilities	Support	<i>The proposal needs to be refused at this point, pending consultation by the developers with Environment Canterbury</i>	Accept the submission point	Reject. CRC appeared and matters raised by it fully considered. Inappropriate to reject on the basis of pending consultation.
PC71-0008	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	004	Transport Networks	Oppose	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 public transport.	Reject plan change; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission.	Reject. Issues addressed and considered in the Interim Recommendation.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS004	Transport Networks	Support	<i>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.</i>	Accept the submission point	Reject in part. Issues addressed and considered in the Interim Recommendation.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner's Recommendation
PC71-0008	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	005	Land and Soil	Oppose	The submitter wishes to draw attention to the emerging national direction strengthening measures to protect highly productive land from development.	Reject plan change; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission.	Reject for reasons addressed in paragraphs [75] to [86] of the Interim Recommendation.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS005	Land and Soil	Support	<i>CIAL agrees that versatile soils and highly productive land are important considerations when looking at urban growth.</i>	Accept the submission point	<i>Reject for reasons addressed in paragraphs [75] to [86] of the Interim Recommendation.</i>
PC71-0013	Sam Carrick	FS001	Land and Soil	Support	<p>1. The proposed subdivision is located on a large area of highly versatile soils.</p> <p>2. Highly versatile soils are a finite and rare resource in NZ.</p> <p>3. The availability of highly versatile soils has already been significantly affected by urban and peri-urban development at both the district, regional and national level</p> <p>4. Highly versatile soils are currently protected from development in both the Selwyn District Plan and the Canterbury Regional Policy statement</p> <p>5. Central Government is currently developing a National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land, with the intent of providing stronger protection from development on Highly versatile soils. I note that whilst the NPS-HPL is still under development, the High Court has held that regard may be had to non-binding national policy documents, as relevant background material, even if those documents do not have any status under the RMA</p> <p>6. Alternative locations do exist for the township of Rolleston to grow, that are not located in an area dominated by Highly versatile soils</p>	Accept the submission point	<i>Reject for reasons addressed in paragraphs [75] to [86] of the Interim Recommendation.</i>
PC71-0013	Sam Carrick	FS002	Land and Soil	Support	<p>1. The proposed subdivision is located on a large area of highly versatile soils.</p> <p>2. Highly versatile soils are a finite and rare resource in NZ.</p> <p>3. The availability of highly versatile soils has already been significantly affected by urban and peri-urban development at both the district, regional and national level</p> <p>4. Highly versatile soils are currently protected from development in both the Selwyn District Plan and the Canterbury Regional Policy statement</p> <p>5. Central Government is currently developing a National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land, with the intent of providing stronger protection from development on Highly versatile soils. I note that whilst the NPS-HPL is still under development, the High Court has held that regard may be had to non-binding national policy documents, as relevant background material, even if those documents do not have any status under the RMA</p> <p>6. Alternative locations do exist for the township of Rolleston to grow, that are not located in an area dominated by Highly versatile soils</p>	Accept the submission point	<i>Reject for reasons addressed in paragraphs [75] to [86] of the Interim Recommendation.</i>
PC71-0013	Sam Carrick	FS003	Land and Soil	Support	<p>1. The proposed subdivision is located on a large area of highly versatile soils.</p> <p>2. Highly versatile soils are a finite and rare resource in NZ.</p> <p>3. The availability of highly versatile soils has already been significantly affected by urban and peri-urban development at both the district, regional and national level</p> <p>4. Highly versatile soils are currently protected from development in both the Selwyn District Plan and the Canterbury Regional Policy statement</p> <p>5. Central Government is currently developing a National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land, with the intent of providing stronger protection from development on Highly versatile soils. I note that whilst the NPS-HPL is still under development, the High Court has held that regard may be had to non-binding national policy documents, as relevant background material, even if those documents do not have any status under the RMA</p> <p>6. Alternative locations do exist for the township of Rolleston to grow, that are not located in an area dominated by Highly versatile soils</p>	Accept the submission point	<i>Reject for reasons addressed in paragraphs [75] to [86] of the Interim Recommendation.</i>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner's Recommendation
PC71-0008	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	006	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	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.	Reject plan change; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission.	Reject. Part of the plan change area has already been identified as an FDA. It satisfies the criteria in Policy 8 of the NPS and the rezoning, as amended, is the most efficient and appropriate method of achieving the objectives and purpose of the Act.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS006	Residential and Business Development	Support	<i>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.</i>	<i>Accept the submission point</i>	<i>Reject in part. The plan change, as amended, meets the criteria in Policy 8 of the NPS-UD and is efficient and achieves better outcomes. The protection of the airport is addressed.</i>
PC71-0008	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	007	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	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.	Reject plan change; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission.	Reject for reasons recorded in the Interim Recommendation. The plan change adds significantly to development capacity, contributes to a well functioning urban environment, will be well connected and gives effect to the various provisions in the NPS-UD.
PC71-0004	Christchurch International Airport Limited (CIAL)	FS007	Residential and Business Development	Support	<i>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.</i>	<i>Accept the submission point</i>	<i>Reject. The plan change adds significantly to development capacity, contributes to a well functioning urban environment, will be well connected and gives effect to the various provisions in the NPS-UD. As amended potential reverse sensitivity effects addressed.</i>
PC71-0009	Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Concerned that the site is not anticipated for future urban development and will result in adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity and traffic effects, on the intended use of the submitter's property. Considers that the proposed Outline Development Plans are not feasible, based on the submitter's intended use of their land and will not be able to be given effect to.	Reject Plan Change and/or Any alternative, additional or consequential amendments, deletions or additions that are necessary or appropriate to give effect to the matters raised in this submission	Reject. Reverse sensitivity and traffic effects addressed. Record the position addressed in Applicant's reply. Note the critical road connection and extension is outside of the area proposed for supermarket development and accords with the Rolleston Structure Plan.
PC71-0010	Ministry of Education (the Ministry)	001	Community Facilities		Concerned about the potential effects of the proposed rezoning on various schools within the district, particularly Rolleston Primary School, Rolleston College, Clearview Primary School and Te Rohutu Whio. Considers that the plan change is inconsistent with the CRPS including that it does not show any site for a school in the ODP and does not include an assessment of whether a new school is required due to the increase in residents arising from the rezoning and consequent development. Notes that the applicant has not undertaken any consultation with the Ministry or had any regard to the capacity of education infrastructure.	Only approve the plan change if the applicant consults with the Ministry and sufficient provision is made to accommodate additional school age children which could include amending the ODP to provide for a new school site.	Reject. Note ODP specifically records that some land may be required within the ODP area for new education facilities which will be determined in conjunction with the Ministry of Education.
PC71-0012	Mark Chambers	FS001	Community Facilities	Support	<i>The proposal needs to be refused at this point, pending consultation by the developers with the Ministry</i>	<i>Accept the submission point</i>	<i>Reject for reasons summarised in relation to the primary submission.</i>
PC71-0010	Ministry of Education (the Ministry)	002	Residential and Business Development		Considers that the plan change may set a precedent for development outside of existing planned areas, making planning for school capacity and networks increasingly difficult. Considers that Policy 8 of the NPS-UD should be balanced against other parts of the NPS-UD including requirement to ensure additional infrastructure, including schools, is provided.	Only approve the plan change if the potential inconsistencies between Policy 8 of the NPS-UD and the CRPS are satisfactorily resolved as it relates to development capacity and well-functioning urban environments.	Reject. Plan change does not set a precedent and possible provision of land for educational facilities identified in ODP.
PC71-0011	Blaine Morch	001	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned Levi Rd is already dangerously narrow, without sufficient space for traffic to pass a parked vehicle, particularly between Masefield Drive and Goldrush Lane, and will be further impacted by the proposed development.	Require Levi Road to be widened to provide sufficient width for vehicles to be parked safely on both sides of the road.	Reject. Traffic effects considered and addressed in expert evidence. Accept the expert evidence that Levi Road has an approximate carriageway width of 8m which is likely to be extended to around 9-11m (subject to engineering design at subdivision stage). Should parking controls be required, such as no stopping at all times markings, that can be addressed at that stage.