

## Recommendations by submission point

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0001	Katrina Studholme	001	Residential and Business Development		Prebbleton will lose its village like rural qualities. We have enough little sections elsewhere. What makes Prebbleton unique is the village rural qualities, so living zone 3 or 3A only.	Amended, Preferred options, are option 2 or 3, where land is rezoned to living 3 or living 3A.	Decline	Fails to make efficient use of the land in a suitable location.
PC72-0001	Katrina Studholme	002	Utilities		There will be less pressure on stormwater systems and other infrastructure.	Amended, Preferred options, are option 2 or 3, where land is rezoned to living 3 or living 3A.	Decline	The expert evidence is that infrastructure needs can be accommodated.
PC72-0003	Scott Watson	001	Transport Networks		<p>Since the major Residential Developments in the area, Traffic on Birches and Trices Rd has increased significantly. There is now major risk to pedestrians, cyclist, and children. Increased accidents at intersections, difficulty in crossing the road and major road noise are all issues. Further residential development will make this worse.</p> <p>The situation is compounded when Birches Rd meets Springs Rd within the Prebbleton Village. Even without further development a bypass for Prebbleton Village and direct connection the Southern Motorway needs to be considered</p>	Decline application and retain current Zoning	Accept in part.	Road frontages will be upgraded including shared paths with shared paths through the development.
PC72-0004	Peter Grundy	001	Transport Networks		I dispute that "transport matters are resolved". 5 new intersections on Hamptons will impact 80km/h ring road flow bypassing village. Access to Shands will become a bottleneck.	Decline plan request until Hampton/Springs and Hamptons/Shands intersection are upgraded and traffic impact investigated.	Decline	Improvements are planned for these intersections in 2024.25 irrespective PC 72.
PC72-0005	Hamish Crombie	001	District Plan General		<p>The statement appears highly subjective and for the benefit of the applicant. Stating that this rezoning is "both appropriate and necessary" is unfounded.</p> <p>Would the determination of necessary not sit with Council as part of wider planning activities, not through a private submission?</p> <p>How has the applicant determined that this is necessary, or appropriate? There is no clear supporting evidence for this statement.</p> <p>There are a number of possible zoning changes to allow for further subdivisions (both in Prebbleton and nearby to</p>	Decline	Decline	The Plan Changes are separate recommendations that can take into account recommendations made at that time. On balance the evidence supports a recommendation to approve the Plan Change.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					Lincoln University) being proposed to Council and these need to all be considered together, not as if these are independent and stand alone. The impact on the community, infrastructure, traffic volumes and supporting services (including the school) will be the sum of the parts, not each in isolation.			
PC72-0005	Hamish Crombie	002	Residential Density		The use of out of date information for statistical analysis and comparison is misleading. The quoted dwelling numbers are from 2018, after which time there has been considerable building, including further subdivision of land for residential use, and the approved plan for two retirement complexes. The village is already considerably larger (both built & approved to build) than this document states. Additionally, and as noted above with 3.a., there are a number of possible rezoning proposals being considered and these must be considered in total, not independent of one another. Why is this level of density required for this land? Rezoning of Prebbleton fringe land for this density does not appear to "contribute to a well-functioning urban environment". Allowing rezoning to accommodate large sections (e.g. 2,500 to 5,000 sqm) could also provide the "bridging the existing urban area to the proposed Birches Road reserve" (per Reason for Request 3.b.), without introducing a level of density that is not well suited to this location.	Decline	Decline	Extensive evidence was received on the current land and housing market. The density proposed will make efficient use of land which is well located for growth.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS001	Residential Density	Oppose	<i>"accommodate large sections (e.g. 2,500 to 5,000 sqm)" - suggested section sizes too small.</i>	<i>Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.</i>	<i>Decline</i>	<i>Living Z is overall more appropriate for this land</i>
PC72-0005	Hamish Crombie	003	Utilities		This statement "There is no additional cost to the Council in re-zoning the Site as there is capacity in the public utilities and the existing road network, including planned upgrades" cannot be accurate. Any increase in properties and the use of infrastructure can only increase the cost of delivering and maintaining these services.	Decline	Decline	The District Plan is required to provide sufficient development capacity for short, medium and long term.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0005	Hamish Crombie	004	Utilities		The statement "There is no additional cost to the Council in re-zoning the Site as there is capacity in the public utilities and the existing road network, including planned upgrades" cannot be accurate. Any increase in properties and use of infrastructure can only increase the cost of delivering and maintaining these services. This statement "There is no additional cost to the Council in re-zoning the Site as there is capacity in the public utilities and the existing road network, including planned upgrades" cannot be accurate. Any increase in properties and use of infrastructure can only increase the cost of delivering and maintaining these services.	Decline	Decline	The District Plan is required to provide sufficient development capacity for short, medium and long term.
PC72-0006	Glenn Laing	001	Subdivision of Land		This subdivision will impact the village feel of Prebbleton	Not stated	No recommendation as no decision requested.	
PC72-0007	Matthew Crozier	001	Residential and Business Development		I Agree this has considered Birches Road reserve, however too many housed in this development will devalue the area and increase pressure on local facilities and services	Decline	Decline	No evidence presented to support these contentions.
PC72-0007	Matthew Crozier	002	Transport Networks		Future planning Proposed are 290 sections and later development of 5 large sections. The local roads around this subdivision require a traffic assessment. There are three roads affected, footpaths and the Little River Cycle way. Given the proposed medium density housing proposed; the 290+ sections could generate upwards of 600 additional vehicle movements in the area as most households now have 2 vehicles. The proposed road cross section referred to in PPC 4.1.2.3 are 8m wide which is not wide enough for parking both sides and service/ emergency vehicles.	Selwyn DC to oppose the development of PCN 72 until amount of sections reduced, future traffic assessment is complete, road cross section are increased to fit parking and service/ emergency vehicle access, Local roads to be upgraded, and the amount of sections is reduced to increase individual section size.	Accept in part	Traffic assessment has been undertaken, and road frontages will be required to be upgraded including shared paths.
PC72-0007	Matthew Crozier	003	Transport Networks		Prebbleton is a linear town which is focused around the car, additional 600 vehicle movements, all businesses in the area are not equipped for additional parking requirements. Access to Birches road is not considered for the safety of the traffic from Lincoln nor the cycle path.	Selwyn DC to oppose the development of PCN 72 until amount of sections reduced, future traffic assessment is complete, road cross section are increased to fit parking and service/ emergency vehicle access, Local roads to be upgraded, and the	Accept in part	Traffic assessment has been undertaken, and road frontages will be required to be upgraded including shared paths.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
						amount of sections is reduced to increase individual section size.		
PC72-0007	Matthew Crozier	004	Utilities		Stormwater egress to Crosslands Drain Proposed are an additional 290+ sections with undetermined additional sections. Stormwater from 290+ sections and 600 vehicles over confined driveways and roads will be channelled in to local Crosslands Drain and infiltration to ground. There is no treatment considered for the additional contaminants in the stormwater. Nor the damage to the local environment, flora or fauna of Crosslands Drain.	Selwyn DC to oppose the development of PCN72 until ecological impact assessment of Crosslands drain is completed at the expense of the developers and a suitable treatment option is put in place, and the amount of sections is reduced to increase individual section size.	Decline	Expert evidence is that stormwater proposals are appropriate and will be subject to specific design and approval through the subdivision consent process. This will include treatment.
PC72-0007	Matthew Crozier	005	Waste Disposal		Wastewater infrastructure in Selwyn District Council will need to be upgraded as mentioned in the proposal. 290+ sections will add considerable wastewater to this system. this amount of sections will increase demand on an area which is not built to sustain an additional 290+ households.	Selwyn DC to oppose the development of PCN72 until amount of sections is reduced to increase section size, also developers to invest in the local wastewater prior to construction of the development.	Decline	At the consenting stage development contributions will be levied for infrastructure including wastewater.
PC72-0008	Jamie Powell	001	Transport Networks		The roading in Prebbleton is already congested and the Birchs and Trices Road corner is notorious for crashes.	Decline	Decline	This intersection is programme for safety improvements irrespective of PC 72.
PC72-0008	Jamie Powell	002	Residential Density		290 approximately will end up easily being 300+ sections and houses. Should be a Maximum number of 290 and not an approximate number	Amend to specify max number of houses	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS002	Residential Density	Oppose	"Maximum number of 290" - suggested maximum lot number too high.	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0008	Jamie Powell	003	Non-District Plan		Pine trees are already being cut down from one of the pieces of land already, were they causing any issues? Thought the goal was to reduce CO2 emissions not create more....	Decline	Decline	Pine trees are not protected. However edge treatment will be approved through subdivision consents as per the ODP.
PC72-0008	Jamie Powell	004	Transport Networks		Lincoln is only expanding. I personally think roading needs to be fixed and sorted because at 7am on a	Not stated	Decline	Traffic effects of PC 72 have been assessed by two

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					weekday it's a nightmare to get on to Springs Road off of Birchs Road.			expert witnesses and taken into account in the ODP.
PC72-0008	Jamie Powell	005	Transport Networks		Birchs Road is still roaded in 100km chip not 50km road chip yet the worry is to get more cars on an already busy set of roads.	Not stated		Traffic effects of PC 72 have been assessed by two expert witnesses and taken into account in the ODP.
PC72-0010	Owen Homan-Booth	001	Residential Density		I don't want further high density housing built into our village, it invites miscreants into the area, puts further pressure on the traffic infrastructure and threatens the very reason we shifted to Prebbleton. For peace and quiet.	Amend/ Rezone to living 3	Decline	<i>Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.</i>
PC72-0011	Claire Thomason	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	<p>I oppose change of the zone to Living Z which would then become General Residential Zone in the Proposed Selwyn District Plan. Currently Trices Road is the Southern boundary of the Prebbleton township. Council records indicate that the township boundary could move to Hamptons Road.</p> <p>The Proposed Selwyn District Plan states that Large Lot Residential Provide a transition between the township and the surrounding rural area' therefore it would be more appropriate and more in keeping with the Selwyn District plan for the proposed development to be Large Lot Residential.</p> <p>Other housing areas/developments nearby are either Living 3 - Stonebridge Way to the north of the proposed development, Living 2A to the west on the proposed development on south side of Trices Road, Living 3 to the north west of the proposed development on the north side of Trices Road and Living 2 - Confer Grove to the west of the proposed development. Allowing the land to be re-zoned into 290 sections with the largest being approx. 700 sqm is not blending the residential into the rural and is not in keeping with the surrounding properties.</p>	Amend the zone change to Large Lot Residential as per New proposed Selwyn District Plan	Decline	The new Park is an important factor in the suitability for Living Z and the Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate. The only nearby Living 3 is the area west of Birchs Road.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0011	Claire Thomason	002	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	The traffic assessment acknowledges that there is a proposed roundabout at the intersection of Springs and Hamptons but it doesn't acknowledge that that proposal also includes blocking Trices Road at Hamptons Road therefore making Trices Road a cul de sac. The traffic assessment that of 'low volume of trips via Hamptons Road' is inaccurate and hasn't taken into account the closing of Trices Road and the likely significant increase to traffic on Hamptons Road as residents will use Hamptons Road to access Springs Road given the congestion that already occurs at the Birchs Road and Springs Road intersection at peak times; or to access Shands Road and the Southern Motorway.	Give consideration to the traffic impacts of 290 dwellings on Hamptons Road	Decline	The traffic evidence for Council supports the rezoning subject to some ODP refinements. The wider network issues are addressed on a District wide basis.
PC72-0011	Claire Thomason	003	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Currently there is already congestion at the intersection of Birchs and Springs therefore this must increase dramatically with an extra 290 dwellings and the proposed 263 predicted peak hour trips. If residents don't use Birchs or Hamptons Roads then they will be using Trices Road heading east where there is already significant safety issues at the intersection of Trices and Tosswill.	Give consideration to the traffic impact on Trices and Birchs Roads.	Decline	The traffic evidence for Council supports the rezoning subject to some ODP refinements. The wider network issues are addressed on a District wide basis.
PC72-0011	Claire Thomason	004	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Birchs Road is a busy main arterial road between Prebbleton and Lincoln. While the rail trail officially runs from Hornby to Little River many people perceive it to start at the Trices Road, Birchs Road intersection as this is where the dedicated cycle way provides a safe cycling and running path for some distance; this is where many cyclists begin their cycling adventure. The proposed new road crosses the Rail Trail cycleway posing significant safety issues for cyclists and runners and would ruin the concept of safe cycleway that rail trail has established.  The proposed new road entrance also enters Birchs Road in a 60km zone where cars have barely reduced their speed from 80km to 60km. The traffic assessment has not taken into consideration the safety issues that this poses - is it best safety practice to have a residential street entering a 60km	Delete/remove the road entrance onto Birchs Road, keeping and access to footpath and cycleway only.	Accept in part	The ODP includes specific measures to be considered at the consenting stage to ensure safety of rail trail users.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					speed zone and so close to an 80km speed zone?			
PC72-0011	Claire Thomason	005	Community Facilities		Has any consideration been undertaken to the impact that 290 dwellings will have on Prebbleton School and subsequently on Lincoln High School.	Give consideration to impacts on schools and plan accordingly	Accept	Evidence was received from the Ministry of Education and the ODP has been amended to require further consultation before development.
PC72-0012	Timothy Studholme	001	Utilities		Too much pressure on Prebbleton's roading, sewerage, storm water and infrastructure.	Amend rezone to Living 3.	Decline	The expert evidence is that there will be no adverse effects for infrastructure at Living Z
PC72-0013	Greg Orange	001	Transport Networks	Oppose	Proposed are 290 sections and later development of 5 large sections. The local roads around this subdivision require a traffic assessment. There are three roads affected, footpaths and the Little River Cycle way. Given the proposed medium density housing proposed; the 290+ sections could generate upwards of 600 additional vehicle movements in the area as most households now have 2 vehicles. The proposed road cross section referred to in PPC 4.1.2.3 are 8m wide which is not wide enough for parking both sides and service/ emergency vehicles.	Amend and complete traffic, assessment, road cross section are increased to fit parking and service/ emergency vehicle access, Local roads to be upgraded, and the amount of sections is reduced to increase individual section size.	Acet in part	The road frontages are to be upgraded to an urban standard.
PC72-0013	Greg Orange	002	Waste Disposal	Oppose	Wastewater infrastructure in Selwyn District Council will need to be upgraded as mentioned in the proposal. 290+ sections will add considerable wastewater to this system. this amount of sections will increase demand on an area which is not built to sustain an additional 290+ households.	Amend to reduce amount of sections to increase section size, also developers to invest in the local wastewater prior to construction of the development.	Decline	Wastewater capacity is not a constraint.
PC72-0013	Greg Orange	002	Transport Networks		Prebbleton is a linear town which is focused around the car, additional 600 vehicle movements, all businesses in the area are not equipped for additional parking requirements. Access to Birches road is not considered for the safety of the traffic from Lincoln nor the cycle path.		Decline	Traffic evidence was carefully considered. The ODP includes measures to ensure safety at the Rail Trail side road.
PC72-0014	Ali Orange	001	Transport Networks	Oppose	Future planning - Proposed are 290 sections and later development of 5	Amend and complete traffic, assessment, road cross	Accept in part	The road frontages of all

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					large sections. The local roads around this subdivision require a traffic assessment. There are three roads affected, footpaths and the Little River Cycle way. Given the proposed medium density housing proposed; the 290+ sections could generate upwards of 600 additional vehicle movements in the area as most households now have 2 vehicles. The proposed road cross section referred to in PPC 4.1.2.3 are 8m wide which is not wide enough for parking both sides and service/ emergency vehicles.	section are increased to fit parking and service/ emergency vehicle access, Local roads to be upgraded, and the amount of sections is reduced to increase individual section size.		three roads are to be upgraded to an urban standard.
PC72-0014	Ali Orange	002	Waste Disposal	Oppose	Wastewater infrastructure in Selwyn District Council will need to be upgraded as mentioned in the proposal. 290+ sections will add considerable wastewater to this system. this amount of sections will increase demand on an area which is not built to sustain an additional 290+ households.	Amend to reduce amount of sections to increase section size, also developers to invest in the local wastewater prior to construction of the development.	Decline	Wastewater capacity is not a constraint.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS003	Waste Disposal	Oppose	<i>"increase individual section size to a minimum of 1,000m2" - suggested section size too small.</i>	<i>Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.</i>	Decline	<i>Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.</i>
PC72-0014	Ali Orange	002	Transport Networks		Prebbleton is a linear town which is focused around the car, additional 600 vehicle movements, all businesses in the area are not equipped for additional parking requirements. Access to Birches road is not considered for the safety of the traffic from Lincoln nor the cycle path.	Selwyn DC to oppose the development of PCN 72 until amount of sections reduced, future traffic assessment is complete, road cross section are increased to fit parking and service/ emergency vehicle access, Local roads to be upgraded, and the amount of sections is reduced to increase individual section size to a minimum of 1,000m2.	Decline	Traffic evidence was carefully considered. The ODP includes measures to ensure safety at the Rail Trail side road.
PC72-0016	Graham Douglas Heenan	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	To restrict the current application for exponential residential growth adjacent to Prebbleton- and highlight NSP.UD 2000 Issues	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0016	Graham Douglas Heenan	002	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	To stop this PC72 rezoning to living 2. It is inappropriate on several counts including incompatibility of its small section sizes with the surrounding neighbourhood.	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0016	Graham Douglas Heenan	003	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	To challenge the claim that this is a good location for residential development and that medium/high density housing is acceptable for this location.	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0016	Graham Douglas Heenan	004	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	To challenge the claim that the proposed development "best delivers on providing an important bridge" to the new Birchs Rd reserve.	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0016	Graham Douglas Heenan	005	District Plan General	Oppose	To stress that this PC 72 proposed runs against many SDC planning documents and precedents... and if approved it will set dangerous new precedents for Prebbleton.	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.. I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0016	Graham Douglas Heenan	006	Transport Networks	Oppose	To highlight many transport and road safety issues that the proposed subdivision will exacerbate.	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
								more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0017	HUME	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose In Part	We oppose the rezoning being Living Z. The zoning of this subdivision should be in keeping with the surrounding area which is Living 3 or 3A.	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0019	Bev Heenan	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	I want SDC to continue their current policy to not develop Prebbleton's residential base en masse, but to focus large new subdivisions in Rolleston	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0019	Bev Heenan	002	District Plan General	Oppose	This application does not comply with recommendations made by the commissioners at the 2014 SDC rural residential strategy hearing.	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0019	Bev Heenan	003	District Plan General	Oppose	Rezoning this land to living Z would set a precedent for all land south of Trices Rd. This area has already been planned to be per-rural, and a precedent for this has been set in the recently developed Conifer Grove.	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0019	Bev Heenan	004	Transport Networks	Oppose	Before further submissions are approved the safety of Prebbleton residents needs to be ensured by reducing the traffic volumes and speeds through the village. This development will add to the traffic problems on Birchs, Trices, Tosswill and Springs Rd.	Decline the living Z zoning. Accept Living 3 zone	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0020	David & Stephanie Withell	001	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	The section sizes should be in keeping with the sections sizes around the proposed area. On the west side of Birches Road the zone is L3/L2A and	Amend to either L2A or L3.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					the sections on the north side of Trices are 2000 sq/m. Therefore we feel changing to zone Living Z is not consistent with the surrounding properties. The smaller sized sections are on the north side of Prebbleton bordered by Hamptons/Springs & Shands. This is where the smaller sections should remain.			hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0020	David & Stephanie Withell	002	Transport Networks		We feel that traffic congestion on Trices & Birches Roads is already at capacity, and has a safety risk. These proposed changes will increase this current risk. and congestion.	No statement	Decline	Traffic effects have been assessed and found to be acceptable.
PC72-0021	Stephanie Withell	001	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	The section sizes should be in keeping with the section sizes around the proposed area. On the West side of Birches Road the zone is L3/L2A and the sections on the North side of Trices are 2000 sq. metres. Therefore we feel changing to Zone Living Z is not consistent with the surrounding properties. The smaller size sections are on the north side of Prebbleton bordered by Hamptons/Springs & Shands Roads. This is where the smaller sections should remain.	Amend to either L2A or L3.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0021	Stephanie Withell	002	Transport Networks		We feel the traffic congestion on Trices & Birches Roads is already at capacity, and has a safety risk. These proposed changes will increase the current risk & congestion.	No statement	Decline	Traffic effects have been assessed and found to be acceptable.
PC72-0022	Mike Knowles	001	Residential Density	Support In Part	Strongly object to section sizes less than 1000m2 . 290 sections is far to higher density for the community and surroundings	Amend to have section sizes as a combination of Living Zone 3 and Living Zone 3A.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes more efficient use of the land.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	001	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	There is opportunity within currently township/residential zoned land in Prebbleton to be zoned to a higher density. Rezone existing urban zones before expanding the township and letting in spread into rural zones. If this land, on the outskirts of Prebbleton, can be rezoned to Living Z, other neighbouring Living 3 Zone(s) should also be rezoned to Living Z, or similar	Amend - rezone the existing developed Conifer Grove from Living 3 to Living Z, or similar density. Amend – rezone other existing lower density, developed township zones to higher density zones i.e. Trices Rd (between	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land. Zoning of other land is a

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					density i.e. directly opposite land in Conifer Grove. If Living Z density is permissible for the majority of this land, and Prebbleton has the demand for this increased zoning density, existing urban zoned neighbouring land should be rezoned into higher density.	Shands/Springs), Aberdeen, and such like. Delete – the majority of this land being rezoned to Living Z.		matter for the Proposed District Plan.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS005	Residential Density	Oppose	"majority of this land being rezoned to Living Z" - none of this land should be zoned Living Z.	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	002	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	There is no distinction between the township and rural areas.	Amend – a clear distinction needs to be made at the boundary. Such as all of the following: larger lots on the boundary, open-scape fencing, large shelter belts and tree lines.	Decline	The south boundary adjoins in part the new Park. The remaining land on the south side of Hamptons Road is to remain Rural Inner Plains but is recommended to be reviewed through the Proposed District Plan.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	003	Utilities	Oppose In Part	Concerned that the existing underground or above ground infrastructure cannot service this rezoning. Will these lots be on restricted water supply and pressure sewer to coincide with other "outer" subdivisions of Prebbleton.	Amend – restricted water supply, pressure sewer systems, dedicated green space/reserve for stormwater management etc.	Decline	The evidence is that water and wastewater can be serviced without adverse effects and stormwater is managed through the ODP.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	004	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concern with the increase in traffic volume on Birchs, in the first instance, and Trices Road. And consequently Springs Rd.	Amend no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	Traffic effects have been assessed and found to be acceptable.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	005	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concern with the increase and management of traffic during (and after – delivery trucks etc) construction and building – particularly heavy vehicles. And the ongoing effects of this traffic – noise, visual, dust, environmental etc. Concerned with the pedestrian and cyclist safety.	Amend no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	Traffic effects have been assessed and found to be acceptable
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	006	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concern with the increase in traffic volume on the existing Birchs/Trices Road intersection. And consequently Birchs/Springs Rd intersection.	Amend - Birchs/Trices and Birchs/Springs intersections shall need an upgrade to	Decline	A number of intersection upgrades are separately

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
						cater for this extra traffic volume.		planned by SDC. The ODP requires the upgrade of the road frontages to urban standard.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	007	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concerned with the lack of safe and effective pedestrian management on both Birchs and Trices Rd, and particularly, the intersection of Birchs/Trices Roads. Pedestrian management and approach/exiting the intersection is dangerous. Very little visibility and/or adequate areas to stand when waiting on the Lincoln side of the footpath. This rezoning shall increase the demand on these roads/intersections and pedestrians/cyclist do not appear to be appropriately managed through the rezoned area – no safe, offroad routes through the rezoning near Trices Rd. Concerned with how the pedestrian and cyclists, coming across Birchs Rd, from Conifer Grove and Trices Rd, shall be effectively managed. Particular concern with primary/intermediate school aged children requiring to negate Birchs/Trices intersection, and Birchs or Trices Rd.	Amend- Appropriate safe islands and “wait” areas must be made available for cyclists, prams etc. Footpaths required both sides of Birchs and Trices Roads within the township zones.	Accept in part.	The ODP requires the upgrade of the road frontages to urban standard.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	008	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concerned with the lack of safe and effective cyclist management on both Birchs and Trices Rd, and particularly, the intersection of Birchs/Trices Roads. Cyclist management and approach/exiting the intersection is dangerous. Very little visibility. This rezoning shall increase the demand on these roads/intersections and pedestrians/cyclist do not appear to be appropriately managed through the rezoned area – no safe, offroad routes through the rezoning near Trices Rd. Concerned with how the pedestrian and cyclists, coming across Birchs Rd, from Conifer Grove and Trices Rd, shall be effectively managed. Particular concern with primary/intermediate school aged children requiring to negate Birchs/Trices intersection, and Birchs or Trices Rd.	Amend- Appropriate safe islands and “wait” areas must be made available for cyclists, prams etc. Footpaths required both sides of Birchs Decline and Trices Roads within th Decline e township zones.	Accept in part.	The ODP requires the upgrade of the road frontages to urban standard including a shared path on Trices Road west of the primary north south road.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	009	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concerned with this rezoning suggesting an access road off Birchs Rd. Either temporary or permanent.	Amend- no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	ODP requires specific design for

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					Concerned with the proposed road crossing the existing pedestrian/ cycleway to Lincoln. Concerned with the clash, on the opposite side of Birchs Rd, with Conifer Grove's walkway/cycleway onto Birchs Rd and the driveways from existing and future Conifer Gove properties. Concern with how the traffic volume and speed shall be mitigated. Concerned with the proximity of this access way to Birchs/Trices Rd intersection. Concerned with how public transport, cyclists and pedestrians will be safely managed with this access road.			safety and road frontage upgrade.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	010	Quality of the Environment	Oppose In Part	Concerned with the visual impact of the extra street-lighting or accessway lighting.	Amend- no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	ODP requires specific design for safety and road frontage upgrade.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	011	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned with the availability of bus stops and how bus movements shall work with the proposed rezoning.	Amend - allow a new bus stop each side of Birchs Rd, near the proposed rezoning.	Decline	This is beyond the jurisdiction of PC 72 but can be considered separately at a later date.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	012	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	Concerned with the visual impact of the rezoning, which shall likely be stripped to bare land with existing well-established vegetation removed, and how Prebbleton is perceived. Concerned with the "look" along Birchs and Trices Roads with existing well-established rural shelter belt/trees/hedging/plantations removed.	Amend- large established vegetation should be maintained where safe to do so.	Decline	Landscape effects have been considered in expert evidence. Edge treatments are required in the ODP with road frontage upgrades to include planting.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	013	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	Delete – large established vegetation should be maintained where safe to do so.	Delete – green space/reserve to be on this critical corner. Consideration required to open fencing along Birchs and Trices Roads.	Accept in poart	The ODP requires edge treatment and road frontage upgrades.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	014	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned with how reserves and off-road inter-connecting walk/cycle ways shall be managed within this proposed rezoning. Concerned that Prebbleton's traditional off-street pedestrian/cycle ways design will not be maintained.	Amend - pedestrian and cyclists must be kept off roads, as much as practical, like the existing Prebbleton "model"	Accept in part	The ODP provides for extensive on road and off road shared pathway connections.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	015	Quality of the Environment	Oppose In Part	Concerned with how reserves shall be designed within this rezoning to maintain the traditional off-street walkways and green spaces, from reserves to cul-de-sacs etc, through	Amend – more than one reserve/green area required.	Accept in part	The Stormwater Management Area will be a second green area.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					Prebbleton. Concerned the proposed one reserve/open space is insufficient.			
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	016	Residential Density	Oppose	Concerned with the likely number of rear allotments.	Amend – discourage high density housing practices where high numbers of rear allotments occur. Encourage more open zoning with additional roads/parking (i.e. cul de-sacs) and green spaces.	Decline	Subdivision will be assessed through the consent process against the Living Z provisions and ODP. This will include some medium density housing.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	001	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	<p>There is opportunity within currently township/residential zoned land in Prebbleton to be zoned to a higher density. Rezone existing urban zones before expanding the township and letting in spread into rural zones.</p> <p>If this land, on the outskirts of Prebbleton, can be rezoned to Living Z, other neighbouring Living 3 Zone(s) should also be rezoned to Living Z, or similar density i.e. directly opposite land in Conifer Grove.</p> <p>If Living Z density is permissible for the majority of this land, and Prebbleton has the demand for this increased zoning density, existing urban zoned neighbouring land should be rezoned into higher density.</p>	<p>Amend - rezone the existing developed Conifer Grove from Living 3 to Living Z, or similar density.</p> <p>Amend – rezone other existing lower density, developed township zones to higher density zones i.e. Trices Rd (between Shands/ Springs), Aberdeen, and such like.</p> <p>Delete – the majority of this land being rezoned to Living Z.</p>	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land. Zoning of other land is a matter for the Proposed District Plan.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS006	Residential Density	Oppose	<i>"majority of this land being rezoned to Living Z" - none of this land should be zoned Living Z.</i>	<i>Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.</i>	Decline	<i>Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.</i>
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	002	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	There is no distinction between the township and rural areas.	Amend – a clear distinction needs to be made at the boundary. Such as all of the following: larger lots on the Decline boundary, open-scape fencing, large shelter belts and tree lines.	Decline	The south boundary adjoins in part the new Park. The remaining land on the south side of Hamptons Road is to remain Rural Inner Plains but is recommended to be reviewed through the Proposed District Plan.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	003	Utilities	Oppose In Part	Concerned that the existing underground or above ground	Amend – restricted water supply, pressure sewer	Decline	Water supply and wastewater can be

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					infrastructure cannot service this rezoning. Will these lots be on restricted water supply and pressure sewer to coincide with other "outer" subdivisions of Prebbleton.	systems, dedicated green space/reserve for stormwater management etc.		prpvided to the site without adverse effects.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	004	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concern with the increase in traffic volume on Birchs, in the first instance, and Trices Road. And consequently Springs Rd.	Amend no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road	Decline	ODP requires specific design for safety and road frontage upgrade.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	005	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concern with the increase and management of traffic during (and after – delivery trucks etc) construction and building – particularly heavy vehicles. And the ongoing effects of this traffic – noise, visual, dust, environmental etc. Concerned with the pedestrian and cyclist safety.	Amend no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road	Decline	ODP requires specific design for safety and road frontage upgrade.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	006	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concern with the increase in traffic volume on the existing Birchs/Trices Road intersection. And consequently Birchs/Springs Rd intersection.	Amend - Birchs/Trices and Birchs/Springs intersections shall need an upgrade to cater for this extra traffic volume.	Decline	A number of intersection upgrades are separately planned by SDC. The ODP requires the upgrade of the road frontages to urban standard.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	007	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>Concerned with the lack of safe and effective pedestrian management on both Birchs and Trices Rd, and particularly, the intersection of Birchs/Trices Roads. Pedestrian management and approach/exiting the intersection is dangerous. Very little visibility and/or adequate areas to stand when waiting on the Lincoln side of the footpath.</p> <p>This rezoning shall increase the demand on these roads/intersections and pedestrians/cyclist do not appear to be appropriately managed through the rezoned area – no safe, offroad routes through the rezoning near Trices Rd. Concerned with how the pedestrian and cyclists, coming across Birchs Rd, from Conifer Grove and Trices Rd, shall be effectively managed.</p> <p>Particular concern with primary/ intermediate school aged children requiring to negate Birchs/Trices intersection, and Birchs or Trices Rd.</p>	Amend- Appropriate safe islands and "wait" areas must be made available for cyclists, prams etc. Footpaths required both sides of Birchs and Trices Roads within the township zones.	Accept in part	The ODP requires the upgrade of the road frontages to urban standard including a shared path on Trices Road west of the primary north south road.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	008	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>Concerned with the lack of safe and effective cyclist management on both Birchs and Trices Rd, and particularly, the intersection of Birchs/Trices Roads. Cyclist management and approach/ exiting the intersection is dangerous. Very little visibility.</p> <p>This rezoning shall increase the demand on these roads/intersections and pedestrians/cyclist do not appear to be appropriately managed through the rezoned area – no safe, offroad routes through the rezoning near Trices Rd.</p> <p>Concerned with how the pedestrian and cyclists, coming across Birchs Rd, from Conifer Grove and Trices Rd, shall be effectively managed.</p> <p>Particular concern with primary/intermediate school aged children requiring to negate Birchs/Trices intersection, and Birchs or Trices Rd.</p>	Amend- Appropriate safe islands and “wait” areas must be made available for cyclists, prams etc. Footpaths required both sides of Birchs and Trices Roads within the township zones.	Accept in part	The ODP requires the upgrade of the road frontages to urban standard including a shared path on Trices Road west of the primary north south road.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	009	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>Concerned with this rezoning suggesting an access road off Birchs Rd. Either temporary or permanent. Concerned with the proposed road crossing the existing pedestrian/cycleway to Lincoln.</p> <p>Concerned with the clash, on the opposite side of Birchs Rd, with Conifer Grove’s walkway/cycleway onto Birchs Rd and the driveways from existing and future Conifer Gove properties.</p> <p>Concern with how the traffic volume and speed shall be mitigated.</p> <p>Concerned with the proximity of this access way to Birchs/Trices Rd intersection.</p> <p>Concerned with how public transport, cyclists and pedestrians will be safely managed with this access road.</p>	Amend- no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	ODP requires specific design for safety and road frontage upgrade.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	010	Quality of the Environment	Oppose In Part	Concerned with the visual impact of the extra street-lighting or accessway lighting.	Amend- no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	ODP requires specific design for safety and road frontage upgrade.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	011	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned with the availability of bus stops and how bus movements shall work with the proposed rezoning.	Amend - allow a new bus stop each side of Birchs Rd, near the proposed rezoning.	Decline	This is beyond the jurisdiction of PC 72 but can be considered separately at a later date.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	012	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	Concerned with the visual impact of the rezoning, which shall likely be stripped to bare land with existing well-established vegetation removed, and how Prebbleton is perceived. Concerned with the "look" along Birchs and Trices Roads with existing well-established rural shelter belt/trees/hedging/plantations removed.	Amend- large established vegetation should be maintained where safe to do so.	Decline	Landscape effects have been considered in expert evidence. Edge treatments are required in the ODP with road frontage upgrades to include planting.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	013	District Plan General	Oppose	Concerned with how the rezoning shall be fenced on Birchs and Trices Roads, particularly at Birchs/Trices Rd intersection. Concerned with visibility issues	Delete – green space/reserve to be on this critical corner. Consideration required to open fencing along Birchs and Trices Roads.	Accept in part	The ODP requires edge treatment and road frontage upgrades.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	014	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned with how reserves and off-road inter-connecting walk/cycle ways shall be managed within this proposed rezoning. Concerned that Prebbleton's traditional off-street pedestrian/cycle ways design will not be maintained.	Amend - pedestrian and cyclists must be kept off roads, as much as practical, like the existing Prebbleton "model"	Accept in part	The ODP provides for extensive on road and off road shared pathway connections.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	015	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned with how reserves shall be designed within this rezoning to maintain the traditional off-street walkways and green spaces, from reserves to cul-de-sacs etc, through Prebbleton. Concerned the proposed one reserve/open space is insufficient.	Amend – more than one reserve/green area required.	Accept in part	The Stormwater Management Area will be a second green area.
PC72-0025	Angus Chisholm	016	Residential Density	Oppose	Concerned with the likely number of rear allotments.	Amend – discourage high density housing practices where high numbers of rear allotments occur. Encourage more open zoning with additional roads/parking (i.e. cul de-sacs) and green spaces.	Decline	Subdivision will be assessed through the consent process against the Living Z provisions and ODP. This will include some medium density housing.
PC72-0027	Andrew Dollimore	001	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	This land is outside the residential areas in the GCUDS and the SDP. It is also inner plains, which the SDP protects. However, I accept the new park means that this pocket of land is now in a different situation to what it was previously. Because this land will become houses on the new edge of Prebbleton the lot sizes need to be much larger and semi rural. This will both increase housing and make an	Amend- should only be for a zone that requires semi-rural sized lots.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					much more appealing housing area. It is also consistent with other residential developments on the edge of Prebbleton.			
PC72-0027	Andrew Dollimore	002	Utilities	Oppose In Part	This is a modest number of houses if lot sizes are kept larger as I have suggested. I am unsure what strain this development would put on the Prebbleton three waters. However, any upgrades or new works should be paid for by the developer. They are undertaking this for profit and the ratepayer should not subsidise them.	Amend- ensure developer pays for infrastructure.	Decline	The land can be serviced with 3 waters and development contributions will be levied at time of subdivision.
PC72-0027	Andrew Dollimore	003	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	I am very familiar with Springs Road. It does not have much more capacity. The lot sizes need to be made larger to reduce the number of new vehicle movements. Living Zone Z will be too dense (as stated above) and create too many new vehicle movements.	Amend- should only be for a zone that requires semi-rural sized lots	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land without adverse traffic effects.
PC72-0028	Elizabeth Duston	001	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	I do not think the village feel of Prebbleton will be in anyway enhanced with such small lots especially directly across the road from Stonebridge Way where the minimum lot size is 2000sq m and an open, uncrowded feel is achieved, along with the fact that Stonebridge Way has a semi rural border is one of the highly attractive things about it. Concession is being made because of larger sections on other borders and I would want the same concessions to be made for the Trices road border.	Amend- sections are a minimum 700sqm size.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS007	Residential Density	Oppose	<i>"Amend- sections are a minimum 700sqm size. " - suggested section size too small.</i>	<i>Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.</i>	Decline	<i>Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.</i>
PC72-0029	Dr Glyn Francis and Ms Catherine Munro	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Location There are several existing plans and strategies that identify preferred urban growth and development areas in Prebbleton. The Site: is outside the preferred growth area for Prebbleton in the Operative Selwyn District Plan (OSDP)is not consistent with Objective	Decline	Decline	Refer recommendation report particularly land supply, CRPS and NPS UD sections. Overall I am satisfied that the proposal

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>B4.3.3 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), as it is outside the future development areas and not a priority greenfield areas identified in that document is outside future residential development areas identified in the Prebbleton Structure Plan 2010 (PSP) is not aligned with Policy B4.3.6: Encourage townships to expand in a compact shape where practical will not provide a transitional buffer to adjoining rural land if medium/high density development is allowed</p> <p>Development in this area will contribute to ribbon development as housing marches down Birchs Road away from the village centre and towards Lincoln.</p> <p>Proximity to new reserve on Birchs Road is unlikely to increase connection with Prebbleton through walking/cycling. Informal observations of the Prebbleton Domain and the shopping centre in the village reveal that the vast majority of users of the domain and shop customers arrive at these locations by car. This observation is supported by the recent need to expand the amount of car parking in the Prebbleton Domain to satisfy the high demand for parking. In addition, the existing Little River Rail Trail already provides a good, safe, off-road connection between the township and the site of the new reserve.</p>			meets the requirements of the Act that apply.
PC72-0029	Dr Glyn Francis and Ms Catherine Munro	002	Residential Density		<p>Amenity value</p> <p>The District Development Strategy 2031 (DDS) identifies Prebbleton as a Service Township, with a population of 1500-6000 people. The DDS identifies the function of a Service Township to provide a high amenity residential environment and primary services to Rural Townships and the surrounding rural area.</p> <p>Large sections and high quality housing contribute to the character of Prebbleton, with section sizes quite generous in comparison to those in the newer urban areas of Christchurch. Section size has a significant effect on the character of a place because it affects the size and form of houses and</p>	Decline	Decline	<p>I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.</p> <p>Specific development proposals will be subject to scrutiny through the subdivision and development</p>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>the gaps between them. As stated in the PSP, higher density housing will need to be designed and located so that it does not detract from the character of Prebbleton. It will be appropriate in close proximity to the business area and the older core of the settlement where an intensification of activity will help to reinforce the focus of the village.</p> <p>The recent development of two retirement villages has significantly increased the amount of medium/high density housing in Prebbleton, with both of these appropriately occurring close to the village centre.</p> <p>Significant growth may undermine the discrete township amenity that currently characterises Prebbleton. A large driver of the popularity of Prebbleton as a place to live is its small population, larger section sizes, property values and rural aspect. All of these may be adversely impacted by the proposed development of medium/high density housing.</p> <p>The plan change application admits that the development will have significant effects on its immediate neighbours through a change in visual amenity value following the removal of trees and other rural views and the addition of many rooftops. This is contrary to Policy B4.1.11 of the OSDP that requires new developments to retain existing trees.</p>			consent processes.
PC72-0029	Dr Glyn Francis and Ms Catherine Munro	003	Residential Density		<p>Demand</p> <p>The areas identified for development in the PSP are noted as being sufficient to satisfy demand for many years. The addition of 290 sections from this (and other potential) developments will likely bring an oversupply to the market and the potential to exceed the number of sections required to satisfy demand for many years.</p>	Decline	Decline	The evidence to the hearing was that there is a serious shortage of land supply and housing capacity at Prebbleton.
PC72-0029	Dr Glyn Francis and Ms Catherine Munro	004	Transport Networks		<p>Traffic</p> <p>The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) has estimated that peak morning traffic associated with the proposed development will increase the current number of movements on Trices Road by more than 70% (from 276 departures to 471 departures). The ITA also shows</p>	Decline	Decline	The ITA has been reviewed by an independent expert who provided evidence to the hearing.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>that most movements will have Christchurch as the destination with many of this movements likely to be through the Trices Road/Birchs Road intersection as this is the shortest route to access the Christchurch Southern Motorway. The Trices Road/Birchs Road intersection is recognised as an intersection with a high accident rate - which will likely get worse as the volume of traffic increases. Turning right from Trices Road on to Birchs Road will likely encourage risky manoeuvres to enter an increasingly busy Birchs Road (due to increased population growth in Lincoln) and turning across an increasing amount of traffic that approaches the intersection along Trices Road from the west (due to increased population growth in Rolleston). Similarly, the increased volume of traffic turning right from Birchs Road on to Springs Road will also increase the risk of traffic accidents as vehicles drive towards Christchurch.</p> <p>The proposed development plan includes one primary road and two local roads entering on to Trices Road. The primary road and one of the primary roads are closer to Stonebridge Way than the required separation distance of 151 m (at 115 and 110m). This will provide additional hazards for vehicles entering Trices Road from Stonebridge Way, with an associated increased risk of accidents. These roads should be constructed at least 151m away from Stonebridge Way and other roads on the north side of Trices Road.</p>			
PC72-0029	Dr Glyn Francis and Ms Catherine Munro	005	Transport Networks		<p>Environmental impacts</p> <p>The Integrated Transport Assessment (Appendix 10) suggests that 71% of traffic movements resulting from this development will have Christchurch as the destination. Allowing medium/high density housing in Prebbleton will result in more greenhouse gas emissions from this travel, than if development were to occur in Christchurch itself, closer to places of employment. This is supported by the estimation that only about 20% of Prebbleton residents have employment in the village, which is likely to be an</p>	Decline	Decline	The ITA has been reviewed by an independent expert who provided evidence to the hearing. Prebbleton has good access to employment centre within Christchurch City.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					overestimate following the recent closure of Meadow Mushrooms – a major local employer.			
PC72-0029	Dr Glyn Francis and Ms Catherine Munro	006	District Plan General	Support	The Prebbleton Rural Residential Strategy 2014 (PRRS) identifies 14 locations for Rural Residential development. The Site in this plan change application is identified as Area 8 in the PRRS and is appropriate for this type of development as it is peri urban development that integrates rural residential into both rural and urban forms.	Support the rezoning to L3	Decline	The new park development changes the resource management context for this site making it more suitable for Living Z given the lack of hosing land supply.
PC72-0030	Elizabeth Bradley	001	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	I believe Prebbleton is not somewhere people come to live "check by jowl" in tiny town house lots. This is a semi rural district and township, where people like a family sized section of over 600m2 at least to build their dream house on. I would be happy to see half the number of lots with sections of 500-1000m2 in this re zoned area.	Amend to increase section size to between 500-100m2	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS008	Residential Density	Oppose	Amend to increase section size to between 500-100m2" - suggested section size too small.	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0030	Elizabeth Bradley	002	Utilities	Oppose In Part	I think by allowing 290 lots on this land there would be excessive pressure on the infrastructure of Prebbleton; the sewerage, water, and roading. Also the school, which is already full and the shops which have not yet been built. Let alone a medical centre that will be over run before it is even built but 2 old peoples facilities and a large community of people already living in Prebbleton without any infrastructure. By increasing the availability of large areas of land, at reduced prices, all our land values will reduce and these small sections and houses could become second class dwellings in the area and rentals.	Amend to increase section size to between 500-100m2	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS014	Utilities	Oppose	Amend to increase section size to between 500-100m2" - suggested section size too small.	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0030	Elizabeth Bradley	003	Utilities	Oppose In Part	Because of the need to provide water, sewerage, power, and roading for this	Amend to increase section size to between 500-100m2	Decline	Development contributions will

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					new development, we the rate payers will be subsidizing the developers. This rate increase, because of development, is not for the first or last time...as those of us who have lived in Prebbleton for some years well know.			be levied at the time of subdivision in accordance with the policy at that ytime.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS015	Utilities	Oppose	Amend to increase section size to between 500-100m2" - suggested section size too small.	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0030	Elizabeth Bradley	004	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	As for the traffic and roading problems they are significant already in and through Prebbleton. The que to get in and out of Prebbleton morning and night extends back to the Bridge at the motorway intersection and through Prebbleton, every week day...so what will it be like with an extra 300 households with 2 cars each, almost 600 extra vehicles on the roads daily!!	Amend to increase section size to between 500-100m2	Decline	Traffic assessment has been undertaken taking into account planned local improvements. Riad frontages of the development will be required to be upgraded.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS016	Transport Networks	Oppose	Amend to increase section size to between 500-100m2" - suggested section size too small.	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0031	Mike & Heather Glenday	001	Residential Density	Oppose	Heather and I would like the section size if this proposed plan goes ahead to be in keeping with the section sizes in the immediate area. Stonebridge subdivision on Trices Road opposite this proposal are all 2000 squares (1/2 acre). To have very small sections opposite is not in keeping with the area.	Reject Living Z Amend minimum lot size of 1000m2	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS009	Residential Density	Oppose	"Amend minimum lot size of 1000m2" - suggested section size too small.	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.		Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0031	Mike & Heather Glenday	002	Transport Networks		Traffic on Trices Road is going to increase greatly. With up to 290 sections in this proposed area will take away the semi rural aspect of the area. Each property will/may have up to 6-10 vehicle movements or more per day. The surrounding roads and intersections are not built for this amount of traffic. Intersections at Trices/Tosswill and Trices Longstaffs have seen serious/fatal crashes and we feel this will only increase. Safety will be	Reject.	Decline	Traffic generated by the proposal can be accommodated on the network. Various safety improvements are separately planned. Shared paths are provided for in the ODP.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					an issue. Longstaffs Rd and Whincops Rd leads into Christchurch City Council's area and will they ensure the roads are made wider to ensure it is safer for cyclists and the extra traffic - I wouldn't think so. Does Selwyn Council propose to widen the roads leading from Trices Rd into the city if this proposal goes ahead?			
PC72-0031	Mike & Heather Glenday	003	Residential Density		The area is a semi rural area, with this amount of development this will only take away that semi rural feeling we have in the neighbourhood.	Reject.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land
PC72-0032	Catriona Nicholls	001	Residential Density	Oppose	We live very close to the proposed land use change and believe it is going to have a severe detrimental effect on this area and ourselves.  The proposed housing is too dense for this rural village. It will put more pressure on the existing infrastructure. The housing will be a fair distance from the central village amenities encouraging residents to use cars to access the amenities thus increasing usage of the roads and increasing pollution.	Reject.	Decline	The proposal has been thoroughly assessed. The evidence is that services and traffic effects can be accommodated. The provision of extensive cycle paths will provide opportunity for non car access to amenities.
PC72-0032	Catriona Nicholls	002	Transport Networks	Oppose	Local roading is already over burdened with substantial traffic jams at key times during the day. This additional number of houses will increase this heavy traffic.	Reject.	Decline	The traffic effects have been independently assessed and subject to some changes which I have considered have been found to be acceptable.
PC72-0032	Catriona Nicholls	003	Residential Density	Oppose	Following the current pattern of the village dense housing is currently west/south west of the village. Why is dense house necessary all around the village when lifestyle or larger sections are more in keeping with what is already on the south east side of Prebbleton	Reject.	Decline	The location for growth is consistent with existing district plan policies and provides connection to the new Park.
PC72-0032	Catriona Nicholls	004	Residential Density	Oppose	It was stated that the housing would link the proposed park to the village. It does not need dense housing to accomplish	Reject.	Decline	The density is supported by the urban design

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					this. Connection to the proposed park can be made just as easily with access through lifestyle sections.			evidence submitted to the hearing.
PC72-0032	Catriona Nicholls	005	Transport Networks	Oppose	The proposed dense housing will need access to Trices and Birches road. The proposed access onto Trices road shows a junction opposite our boundary on Trices road. This will detrimentally effect our lifestyle and well being with additional car noise pollution at all times of the day and headlight pollution directly into our house at night time This is not acceptable to have this imposed on us	Reject.	Decline	There will be three primary accesses on to the network one each to Trices Road, Birchs Road, and Hamptons Road. These road frontages will be required to be upgraded. Extensive shared paths for cycles are also proposed.
PC72-0033	John and Sue Sheaf	001	District Plan General	Oppose In Part	This policy statement is a stimulus to developing land that is appropriate for urban development but we contend that Prebbleton is not the town for continued Living Z development.	Reject Living Z and accept Living 3	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land
PC72-0033	John and Sue Sheaf	002	District Plan General	Oppose	Land to the West of Area 8 is all in Living 3 sized plots, including much of the land on Trices Road heading all the way West to Springs Road. Land to the south is rural, apart from the proposed Recreation Reserve. This development, apart from the Tuff land, will not reflect the rest of the area.	Reject Living Z and accept Living 3	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land
PC72-0033	John and Sue Sheaf	003	Transport Networks	Oppose	Contrary to the traffic information in this application, access into and out of Prebbleton village (which has to be navigated prior to joining the new arterial routes into and out of the city), is already extremely congested at peak times, and the addition of 290 households with potentially 2 cars each, will add further stress and danger through a very small village area. It is not uncommon for the traffic queue to reach from the Springs Road roundabout back to the Birchs/Springs intersection at peak times.	Reject Living Z and accept Living 3	Decline	Traffic effects have been assessed and found to be acceptable.
PC72-0033	John and Sue Sheaf	004	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	Close to one third of the proposed site is on Class 1 and 2 land. Considering we	Reject Living Z and accept Living 3	Decline	The loss of some Class 1 and 2 land

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					are in a state of climate change crisis globally, it seems irresponsible to convert any of our remaining productive land into houses and concrete. While this land may not currently be productive, it may be needed in the future.			has been taken into account in the evaluation and weights towards the density now required.
PC72-0033	John and Sue Sheaf	005	District Plan General	Support	Any development of rural or semi-rural land in the greater Christchurch area, to Living Z, should surely pay close attention to this plan which calls for increased housing density to be in the central city, not in the outlying towns. We understand the NDS-UD 2020 calls for more land to be made available to meet current demands for urban development, however uncontrolled, inappropriate development of small, rural towns like Prebbleton should not be permitted.	Reject Living Z and accept Living 3	Decline	I am satisfied that the development is well planned and does not amount to uncontrolled or inappropriate development.
PC72-0034	Robert Marshall Carter and Heather Margaret Cartert	001	Subdivision of Land	Support In Part	We oppose the proposed Living Z rezoning. The subdivision should complement and be in keeping with the surrounding urban and rural areas.	Reject Living Z and accept Living 3 or 3A	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land
PC72-0035	Antony & Tarryn Deaker	001	Residential Density	Oppose	Rezoning the land to Living Z is at odds with the neighbouring subdivisions of Stonebridge Way & Conifer Grove which are zoned Living 1a and Living 3 respectively. It doesn't make sense to increase housing density on the outskirts of the Prebbleton township. Ms Lauenstein has previously suggested a "peri-urban boundary of rural residential properties could establish a pleasing urban form here" in paragraph 108 of the attached document. A 290 house subdivision does not fit with this recommendation. A rural-residential zoning would be more applicable.	Reject	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land
PC72-0036	Lea & Greg Bartram	001	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	The original proposed plan was for sections the size of 5000sqm, with smaller sections amounting to 290 in total this will put more demand on Prebbleton resources including 600-750 more vehicles utilising the Trices/Tosswill and Trices/	Provide additional evidence that this development will not adversely impact traffic at the Trices/Tosswill and Trices/Birches Roads intersections.	Decline	The Traffic assessment has been reviewed by suitable expertise and found to be acceptable given other planned

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					Birches Roads intersections. The Trices/Birches intersection is already at capacity at peak times with the potential for hazards to happen. There are many teenagers in the area on Restricted licences that could have fatal accidents, in particular at this intersection. Most homes have 2 cars with many having a third or more if they have children driving or other family members.			network improvements.
PC72-0036	Lea & Greg Bartram	002	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Springs Road - with Tosswills, Birches & Trents all feeding onto Springs Road and the majority of residents heading towards the city or motor way at peak times, this already congested road will experience more delays and potential hazards for drivers and pedestrians.	Provide additional evidence that this development will not adversely impact traffic at Springs Road intersections.	Decline	The Traffic assessment has been reviewed by suitable expertise and found to be acceptable given other planned network improvements.
PC72-0036	Lea & Greg Bartram	003	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	With an additional Retirement Complex being built on Springs Road this will put more demand on Springs Road. With more young families and elderly in the area then this will pose more issues with traffic and potential risk of accidents particularly in the village getting to the school, shops and using the bus services.	Provide additional evidence that this development will not adversely impact traffic on Springs Road.	Decline	The Traffic assessment has been reviewed by suitable expertise and found to be acceptable given other planned network improvements.
PC72-0036	Lea & Greg Bartram	004	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	With high density housing this will impact long term of property values with higher priced sections, lower cost housing potentially will be built.	Amend to provide larger sections	Decline	Living Z development will ad to the variety of housing available within the township which is a requirement of the NPS UD.
PC72-0037	Michael Schwass	001	District Plan General	Oppose	Directly undermines the intentions of the Prebbleton Structure plan and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy by directing too much growth towards Prebbleton and undermining the village aspect of the town which was to be preserved.	Reject the proposal and retain the existing zoning.	Decline	The development will form a clear southern edge to the village which is significantly influenced by the new Park.which was not anticipated in the Structure Plan.
PC72-0037	Michael Schwass	002	Residential Density	Oppose	Breaks down the "buffer zones" of low density housing on the perimeter of Prebbleton contemplated in the SDC planning by introducing intensified use	Reject the proposal and retain the existing zoning.	Decline	The Park will now provide the southern buffer to rural land.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					of this land well beyond the current limits.			
PC72-0037	Michael Schwass	003	Transport Networks	Oppose	Will further compound traffic issues in and around the Birchs Road and Trices road intersection and Birchs Road in general.	Reject the proposal and retain the existing zoning.	Decline	The Traffic assessment has been reviewed by suitable expertise and found to be acceptable. The road frontages are required to be upgraded.
PC72-0037	Michael Schwass	004	District Plan General	Oppose	Oppose this least preferred option 1 on the same grounds as the above	Reject the proposal and retain the existing zoning.	Decline	The Traffic assessment has been reviewed by suitable expertise and found to be acceptable. The road frontages are required to be upgraded.
PC72-0037	Michael Schwass	005	District Plan General	Oppose	Oppose this least preferred option 1 on the same grounds as the above	Reject the proposal and retain the existing zoning.	Decline	The Traffic assessment has been reviewed by suitable expertise and found to be acceptable. The road frontages are required to be upgraded.
PC72-0037	Michael Schwass	006	District Plan General	Support In Part	Support this for some of the area as it retains the intended low intensity buffer around Prebbleton	Amend- Provide Living 3 for some of the area	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS010	District Plan General	Oppose	006	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0037	Michael Schwass	007	Transport Networks	Oppose	Discharging further traffic from up to 290 dwellings onto Birchs and Hamptons road will exacerbate the traffic risk and pressure already present in this area.	Reject the proposal, if the overall rezoning is considered more extensive work upgrading the Birchs Road, Trices Road intersection and directing traffic South East on Trices to be preferred.	Accept in part	The road forntages are to be upgraded and a number of intersections are separately planned for upgrades.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0038	Christchurch - Little River Railtrail Trust	001	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	<p>The conversion of this parcel of land to urban use has some merit. It is well located near a bus and cycling route and is quite close to the amenities provided in Prebbleton Village. The trustees of the Christchurch – Little River Railtrail Trust do not want a repeat of the disruption to the trail caused by the urbanisation of Birchs Road in Lincoln. The numerous driveways across the trail are a safety hazard and do not need to be there. The trustees are currently in discussion with Selwyn District Council about re-routing the railtrail through Prebbleton. The preferred route is along Toswill Road from Springs Road to Oakwood Mews, along Oakwood Mews to the footpath access to the Domain, out of the Domain onto Stonebridge Way then to Trices Road and up to Birchs Road. This will have the rail trail on Trices Road close to where the proposed road into the new development meets Trices Road. We see the development plans to provide separated cycle paths and can appreciate the benefit of these to allow access to the proposed recreation area across Hamptons Road. We are also aware that 2021 has shown that the effects of climate change are upon us and planners must take all steps to ensure future developments have reduced carbon footprints. This not only includes providing good alternatives but also dis-incentivising travel by motor car. To this end we are encouraged by the plan in Appendix 1 for a walking and cycling route to the village centre. This is the preferred route of the railtrail through Prebbleton and we look forward to working with the Council on the enhancement of the route. Appendix 10 suggests that some building lots will have vehicle access directly onto Trices or Birchs Roads. The trustees are opposed to this because of the safety impacts on users of the cycle path. Whilst there may have been no accidents on the Birchs Road cycle path in Lincoln, it is the perception of safety that is required before people will use facilities. The current level of perceived safety on the cycle path along Birchs</p>	<p>Amend- All vehicle access to and from the site is via single exits onto Trices, Birchs and Hamptons Roads.</p> <p>In order to stop the proposed central road from Trices to Hamptons Road being used as a short cut it is suggested that it be cul-de-saced at some point, probably closer to Hamptons Road than Trices Road.</p> <p>The proposed extra exits onto Trices Road should be for pedestrians and cyclists only. Pedestrian and cycle access onto the existing roads from adjacent lots should be encouraged. Only very low fences on the sections fronting the existing streets.</p>	Accept in part	The ODP prpvides for primary road connections to each of the three roads with specific regard to safety of rail trail users at that edge.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					Road adjacent to where the proposed development will occur is high because of the trees on the edge. Replacing them with vehicle access ways will reduce perceived safety.			
PC72-0039	Prebbleton Community Association	001	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	<p>We request that Selwyn District Council fully consider the impact of any proposed development on the traffic flows through Prebbleton, and the 'Environment' of our village. We would like to remind Council that the 'environment' includes people and communities as defined by the RMA, Section 2. This specifically includes an assessment of downstream effects of traffic (in and through our town), not just at adjacent roadways. We strongly advocate for the safety and protection of our residents. This protection specifically includes the protection of a growing number of residents who need to cross Springs Rd and Birches Rd to access public transportation and community amenities. Increased traffic flow increases the danger to our vulnerable residents, specifically children and the elderly - which are growing in numbers. We do not want our community split into two halves by a major traffic corridor, which will happen by the cumulative effect and acceptance of developments such as these. We strenuously request that Council consider how to maintain the connectivity and integrity of Prebbleton Village, and proactively incorporate measures to allow residents to traverse our own town without excessive queuing for a gap in traffic.</p>	<p>We request that our association are consulted on any development which creates an effect on Prebbleton, including any increase of traffic on our roads.</p> <p>We specifically request the following measures: Lower speed limit in Prebbleton, Traffic calming measures on primary roads, Pedestrian crossings (or refuges) at key crossing points</p>	Decline	This is beyond the scope of the Plan Change.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	001	District Plan General	Oppose In Part	<p>There is opportunity within currently township/residential zoned land in Prebbleton to be zoned to a higher density. Rezone existing urban zones before expanding the township and letting in spread into rural zones.</p> <p>If this land, on the outskirts of Prebbleton, can be rezoned to Living Z, other neighbouring Living 3 Zone(s) should also be rezoned to Living Z, or similar density i.e.</p>	<p>Amend - rezone the existing developed Conifer Grove from Living 3 to Living Z, or similar density.</p> <p>Amend – rezone other existing lower density, developed township zones to higher density zones i.e. Trices Rd (between Shands/Springs), Aberdeen, and such like.</p> <p>Delete – the majority of this land being rezoned to Living Z.</p>	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land. Zoning of other land is a matter for the Proposed District Plan.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					directly opposite land in Conifer Grove. If Living Z density is permissible for the majority of this land, and Prebbleton has the demand for this increased zoning density, existing urban zoned neighbouring land should be rezoned into higher density.			
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS011	District Plan General	Oppose	<i>"majority of this land being rezoned to Living Z" - none of this land should be zoned Living Z.</i>	<i>Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.</i>	Decline	<i>Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.</i>
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	002	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	There is no distinction between the township and rural areas.	Amend – a clear distinction needs to be made at the boundary. Such as all of the following: larger lots on the boundary, open-scape fencing, large shelter belts and tree lines.	Accept in part	The ODP requires rural edge treatment with rural style fencing and landscaping.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	003	Utilities	Oppose In Part	Concerned that the existing underground or above ground infrastructure cannot service this rezoning. Will these lots be on restricted water supply and pressure sewer to coincide with other "outer" subdivisions of Prebbleton.	Amend – restricted water supply, pressure sewer systems, dedicated green space/reserve for stormwater management etc.	Accept in part	Water supply is available as is pumped sewer. A Stormwater Management Area is proposed.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	004	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concern with the increase in traffic volume on Birchs, in the first instance, and Trices Road. And consequently Springs Rd.	Amend no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road	Decline	Frontage upgrade is proposed with measures to protect cycle safety.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	005	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concern with the increase and management of traffic during (and after – delivery trucks etc) construction and building –particularly heavy vehicles. And the ongoing effects of this traffic – noise, visual, dust, environmental etc. Concerned with the pedestrian and cyclist safety.	Amend no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road	Decline	Frontage upgrade is proposed with measures to protect cycle safety.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	006	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concern with the increase in traffic volume on the existing Birchs/Trices Road intersection. And consequently Birchs/Springs Rd intersection.	Amend - Birchs/Trices and Birchs/Springs intersections shall need an upgrade to cater for this extra traffic volume.	Accept in part	Some safety improvements are proposed at this intersection.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	007	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concerned with the lack of safe and effective pedestrian management on both Birchs and Trices Rd, and particularly, the intersection of	Amend- Appropriate safe islands and "wait" areas must be made available for cyclists, prams etc. Footpaths	Accept in part	Safety improvements will be made along all frontages.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>Birchs/Trices Roads. Pedestrian management and approach/exiting the intersection is dangerous. Very little visibility and/or adequate areas to stand when waiting on the Lincoln side of the footpath.</p> <p>This rezoning shall increase the demand on these roads/intersections and pedestrians/cyclist do not appear to be appropriately managed through the rezoned area – no safe, offroad routes through the rezoning near Trices Rd. Concerned with how the pedestrian and cyclists, coming across Birchs Rd, from Conifer Grove and Trices Rd, shall be effectively managed.</p> <p>Particular concern with primary/intermediate school aged children requiring to negate Birchs/Trices intersection, and Birchs or Trices Rd.</p>	required both sides of Birchs and Trices Roads within the township zones.		
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	008	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>Concerned with this rezoning suggesting an access road off Birchs Rd. Either temporary or permanent. Concerned with the proposed road crossing the existing pedestrian/ cycleway to Lincoln.</p> <p>Concerned with the clash, on the opposite side of Birchs Rd, with Conifer Grove's walkway/cycleway onto Birchs Rd and the driveways from existing and future Conifer Gove properties.</p> <p>Concern with how the traffic volume and speed shall be mitigated.</p> <p>Concerned with the proximity of this access way to Birchs/Trices Rd intersection.</p> <p>Concerned with how public transport, cyclists and pedestrians will be safely managed with this access road.</p>	Amend- no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	Measures have been included in the ODP to provide for safety at the detailed design stage.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	009	Quality of the Environment	Oppose In Part	Concerned with the visual impact of the extra street-lighting or accessway lighting.	Amend- no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	Measures have been included in the ODP to provide for safety at the detailed design stage.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	010	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned with the availability of bus stops and how bus movements shall work with the proposed rezoning.	Amend - allow a new bus stop each side of Birchs Rd, near the proposed rezoning.	Decline	This will be able to be considered separately from the plan change

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
								as development proceeds.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	011	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	Concerned with the visual impact of the rezoning, which shall likely be stripped to bare land with existing well-established vegetation removed, and how Prebbleton is perceived. Concerned with the "look" along Birchs and Trices Roads with existing well-established rural shelter belt/trees/hedging/plantations removed.	Amend- large established vegetation should be maintained where safe to do so.	Decline	Edge treatment is proposed but protection of shelter belts is not required.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	012	District Plan General	Oppose	Concerned with how the rezoning shall be fenced on Birchs and Trices Roads, particularly at Birchs/Trices Rd intersection. Concerned with visibility issues	Delete – green space/reserve to be on this critical corner. Consideration required to open fencing along Birchs and Trices Roads.	Accept in part	Rural edge treatments are required.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	013	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned with how reserves and off-road inter-connecting walk/cycle ways shall be managed within this proposed rezoning. Concerned that Prebbleton's traditional off-street pedestrian/cycle ways design will not be maintained.	Amend - pedestrian and cyclists must be kept off roads, as much as practical, like the existing Prebbleton "model"	Accept in part	The ODP provides for extensive shared paths.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	014	Quality of the Environment	Oppose In Part	Concerned with how reserves shall be designed within this rezoning to maintain the traditional off-street walkways and green spaces, from reserves to cul-de-sacs etc, through Prebbleton. Concerned the proposed one reserve/open space is insufficient.	Amend – more than one reserve/green area required.	Accept	More than one green area is proposed.
PC72-0040	Olwyn Mulligan	015	Residential Density	Oppose	Concerned with the likely number of rear allotments.	Amend – discourage high density housing practices where high numbers of rear allotments occur. Encourage more open zoning with additional roads/parking (i.e. cul de-sacs) and green spaces.	Accept in part	A minimum overall density of 12 households per hectare is proposed which is not high density. The subdivision design will be tested against the ODP and Living Z provisions.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	001	District Plan General	Oppose In Part	There is opportunity within currently township/residential zoned land in Prebbleton to be zoned to a higher density. Rezone existing urban zones before expanding the township and letting in spread into rural zones. If this land, on the outskirts of Prebbleton, can be rezoned to Living Z,	Amend - rezone the existing developed Conifer Grove from Living 3 to Living Z, or similar density. Amend – rezone other existing lower density, developed township zones to higher density zones i.e.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					other neighbouring Living 3 Zone(s) should also be rezoned to Living Z, or similar density i.e. directly opposite land in Conifer Grove. If Living Z density is permissible for the majority of this land, and Prebbleton has the demand for this increased zoning density, existing urban zoned neighbouring land should be rezoned into higher density.	Trices Rd (between Shands/Springs), Aberdeen, and such like. Delete – the majority of this land being rezoned to Living Z.		land. Zoning of other land is a matter for the Proposed District Plan.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS012	District Plan General	Oppose	"majority of this land being rezoned to Living Z" - none of this land should be zoned Living Z.	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	002	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	There is no distinction between the township and rural areas.	Amend – a clear distinction needs to be made at the boundary. Such as all of the following: larger lots on the boundary, open-scape fencing, large shelter belts and tree lines.	Accept in part	Specific rural edge treatment is required.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	003	Utilities	Oppose In Part	Concerned that the existing underground or above ground infrastructure cannot service this rezoning. Will these lots be on restricted water supply and pressure sewer to coincide with other "outer" subdivisions of Prebbleton.	Amend – restricted water supply, pressure sewer systems, dedicated green space/reserve for stormwater management etc.	Accept in part	Water supply is available as is pumped sewer. A Stormwater Management Area is proposed.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	004	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concern with the increase in traffic volume on Birchs, in the first instance, and Trices Road. And consequently Springs Rd.	Amend no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road	Decline	Road frontage upgrades and intersection improvements will be prpvided.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	005	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concern with the increase and management of traffic during (and after – delivery trucks etc) construction and building – particularly heavy vehicles. And the ongoing effects of this traffic – noise, visual, dust, environmental etc. Concerned with the pedestrian and cyclist safety.	Amend no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road	Decline	Road frontage upgrades and intersection improvements will be prpvided.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	006	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concern with the increase in traffic volume on the existing Birchs/Trices Road intersection. And consequently Birchs/Springs Rd intersection.	Amend - Birchs/Trices and Birchs/Springs intersections shall need an upgrade to cater for this extra traffic volume.	Acceot in part	Some safety improvements are recommended.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	007	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>Concerned with the lack of safe and effective pedestrian management on both Birchs and Trices Rd, and particularly, the intersection of Birchs/Trices Roads. Pedestrian management and approach/exiting the intersection is dangerous. Very little visibility and/or adequate areas to stand when waiting on the Lincoln side of the footpath.</p> <p>This rezoning shall increase the demand on these roads/intersections and pedestrians/cyclist do not appear to be appropriately managed through the rezoned area – no safe, offroad routes through the rezoning near Trices Rd.</p> <p>Concerned with how the pedestrian and cyclists, coming across Birchs Rd, from Conifer Grove and Trices Rd, shall be effectively managed.</p> <p>Particular concern with primary/ intermediate school aged children requiring to negate Birchs/Trices intersection, and Birchs or Trices Rd.</p>	Amend- Appropriate safe islands and “wait” areas must be made available for cyclists, prams etc. Footpaths required both sides of Birchs and Trices Roads within the township zones.	Accept in part	Road frontage upgrades are required.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	008	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>Concerned with this rezoning suggesting an access road off Birchs Rd. Either temporary or permanent. Concerned with the proposed road crossing the existing pedestrian/cycleway to Lincoln.</p> <p>Concerned with the clash, on the opposite side of Birchs Rd, with Conifer Grove’s walkway/cycleway onto Birchs Rd and the driveways from existing and future Conifer Gove properties.</p> <p>Concern with how the traffic volume and speed shall be mitigated.</p> <p>Concerned with the proximity of this access way to Birchs/Trices Rd intersection.</p> <p>Concerned with how public transport, cyclists and pedestrians will be safely managed with this access road.</p>	Amend- no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	Access will be permitted onto Birchs Road but with safety protections.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	009	Quality of the Environment	Oppose In Part	Concerned with the visual impact of the extra street-lighting or accessway lighting.	Amend- no temporary or permanent road access permitted on to Birchs Road.	Decline	Access will be permitted onto Birchs Road but with safety protections.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	010	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned with the availability of bus stops and how bus movements shall work with the proposed rezoning.	Amend - allow a new bus stop each side of Birchs Rd, near the proposed rezoning.	Decline	This will be able to be considered separately from the plan change as development proceeds.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	011	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	Concerned with the visual impact of the rezoning, which shall likely be stripped to bare land with existing well-established vegetation removed, and how Prebbleton is perceived. Concerned with the "look" along Birchs and Trices Roads with existing well-established rural shelter belt/trees/hedging/plantations removed.	Amend- large established vegetation should be maintained where safe to do so.	Decline	Rural edge treatment is proposed but exiting shelter belts are likely to be removed.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	012	District Plan General	Oppose	Concerned with how the rezoning shall be fenced on Birchs and Trices Roads, particularly at Birchs/Trices Rd intersection. Concerned with visibility issues	Delete – green space/reserve to be on this critical corner. Consideration required to open fencing along Birchs and Trices Roads.	Accept in part	The ODP includes rural edge treatment.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	013	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Concerned with how reserves and off-road inter-connecting walk/cycle ways shall be managed within this proposed rezoning. Concerned that Prebbleton's traditional off-street pedestrian/cycle ways design will not be maintained.	Amend - pedestrian and cyclists must be kept off roads, as much as practical, like the existing Prebbleton "model".	Accept in part	The ODP includes extensive shared path network.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	014	Quality of the Environment	Oppose In Part	Concerned with how reserves shall be designed within this rezoning to maintain the traditional off-street walkways and green spaces, from reserves to cul-de-sacs etc, through Prebbleton. Concerned the proposed one reserve/open space is insufficient.	Amend – more than one reserve/green area required.	Accept	More than one green space is planned.
PC72-0041	Allan Mulligan	015	Residential Density	Oppose	Concerned with the likely number of rear allotments.	Amend – discourage high density housing practices where high numbers of rear allotments occur. Encourage more open zoning with additional roads/parking (i.e. cul de-sacs) and green spaces.	Accept in part	A minimum overall density of 12 households per hectare is proposed which is not high density. The subdivision design will be tested against the ODP and Living Z provisions.
PC72-0042	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	001	Residential Density	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Urban Development Strategy and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement Any rezoning of this application site should be considered against the	The Proposed Plan Change should be assessed against the objectives and policies of the NPSUD, UDS and CRPS	Accept	These documents have been carefully considered.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					updated UDS provisions and the provisions of the CPRS. If the proposed plan change does not align with the intentions of the updated UDS and provisions of the CPRS, then this may necessitate further consideration of the proposal and its potential approval.			
PC72-0042	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	002	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Multi-Modal Transport Options The applicant should further consider opportunities for multi-modal transport through and adjoining the site, and any options identified should be incorporated into the plan change to promote both internal connections within the plan change areas and connections to the wider network.	The Proposed Plan Change should be assessed against the objectives and policies of the NPSUD, UDS and CRPS		These documents have been carefully considered.
PC72-0042	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	003	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Carbon Emissions The proposed plan change will likely further contribute to the transport associated carbon emissions as there appears to be a reliance on private vehicle use due to the limited job opportunities and local amenities in the Prebbleton township, resulting in private vehicle commuter traffic into the city. As the plan change site is located outside of the Projected infrastructure Boundary, there is limited planning for the provision of improved public transport to support future residents of the plan change area.	The Proposed Plan Change should be assessed against the objectives and policies of the NPSUD, UDS and CRPS	Decline.	These documents have been carefully considered.
PC72-0043	Christchurch City Council	001	District Plan General	Oppose	National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS UD). The proposal is not anticipated by RMA planning documents as the site is located outside the greenfield priority areas identified on Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) and has not been included as a future development area in Change 1 to the CRPS.  Policy 8 of the NPS UD sets out two tests for unanticipated or out-of-sequence development. These tests are that: a. The plan change will provide significant development capacity; and b. The plan change will contribute to a well-functioning urban environment. The assumption that 290 houses within the Greater Christchurch Partnership	Decline.	Decline.	These documents have been carefully considered.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>sub-region constitutes significant development capacity needs to be further supported by evidence, The additional capacity is in excess of what is needed. Development in these areas is not meeting a capacity shortfall, but rather could delay other growth and urban regeneration areas identified in Our Space from being developed and regenerated.</p> <p>While it is important to assess the plan change as unanticipated, the rationale for why development was directed to particular areas in the CRPS is relevant for determining the appropriateness of the proposal.</p>			
PC72-0043	Christchurch City Council	002	District Plan General	Oppose	<p>Relationship with the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Under the RMA, district plans are required to give effect to any national policy statement and regional policy statement. If a proposed change to a district plan will, if accepted, fail to give effect to a regional policy statement, then a change should be sought to the RPS either in advance or at the same time.</p> <p>Plan Change 72 has not been accompanied by a change to the CRPS that would rectify any inconsistency or conflict with Objective 6.2.1 of the CRPS. Thus the plan change does not give effect to the CRPS and in our view must be declined.</p>	Decline.	Decline.	These documents have been carefully considered.
PC72-0043	Christchurch City Council	003	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>Wider transport effects on Christchurch City.</p> <p>The application does not address the difference between accessibility through public or active transport, and car based connections to employment. The location of the site does not provide sufficient local employment to meet the needs for the potential residents, and the travel times to reach major employment hubs such as the Christchurch city centre would take approximately 30 minutes via car and approximately 60 - 80 minutes via bus.</p>	Decline.	Decline.	Traffic assessment found these effects to be acceptable.
PC72-0043	Christchurch City Council	004	Residential Density	Oppose	<p>Density</p> <p>Require a minimum density of 15 households/hectare</p>	Decline.	Decline.	A density of 12 households / hectare was found

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
								to be more appropriate.
PC72-0024	Laura Chisholm	FS013	Residential Density	Oppose	"Require a minimum density of 15 households/hectare" - suggested density too dense.	Amend - 5000m2 sections minimum for this rezoning. In line with Living 3 or similar.	Decline	Expert evidence is that a minimum of 12 households per hectare is appropriate.
PC72-0043	Christchurch City Council	005	District Plan General	Oppose	Social and Affordable housing The relevant recommendations of the Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan be incorporated in the Plan Change.	Decline.	Decline.	This submission point was not advanced in evidence at the hearing.
PC72-0044	GM & J Drinnan	001	Utilities	Support In Part	The plan change includes a comprehensive plan for the subdivision of the site including the provision of stormwater basins and resultant outflow from the basins. The plans show stormwater flows from the plan change site connecting to a hollow on our property. No agreement is in place for such an arrangement and the hollow does not currently carry water from surrounding areas. In the heavy rain event in June this year (300mm) there was no water flowing through the hollow. We are naturally concerned that the plan change is relying on our property for stormwater disposal and may result in water flow through our property. This will affect how we operate part of our property and its future potential. It is questioned how a development could rely on disposing stormwater across our property, including the introduction of water where there currently isn't any, without forming any necessary arrangement with the landowner or altering the proposal so that there is not a reliance on our property	Ensure Stormwater runoff to adjacent land is addressed.	Accept	Stormwater is addressed in the ODP and this includes reference to a legal outfall.
PC72-0044	GM & J Drinnan	002	Residential and Business Development	Support In Part	The proposed plan change zoning applies to the block of properties as identified in the plan change documentation. It is appreciated that detailed assessments have been provided which demonstrate the feasibility of the rezoning but it does leave our property being inconsistent with the proposed character of the area. To address this, it is sought that part of our property is rezoned in a manner consistent with the plan change area. It	Amend- to include the area between the Plan Change and the new district park as part of the new residential zone.	Decline	This has considerable merits in principle but requires further investigation and assessment. The submission is out of scope of the Plan Change.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					is sought that the area on the appended plan is included as part of the plan change. As one can see, the identified area extends out as a finger of land along Hamptons Road and is opposite properties which would also face on to the road. Viewing this area on the ground will demonstrate the logic in including this area as part of the plan change but it is also considered the plan change would limit the use of this portion of our property if the rezoning is approved. For example, we run cattle on our property and currently walk the cattle along the road to the identified finger of land. If there were houses on the opposite side of the road, walking the cattle along the road would become be difficult and there is likely to be objections due to noise, smell etc. Hence our desire for this portion of our property to be included as part of the rezoning			
PC72-0045	Shane Heenan	001	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	The traffic report is not representative of the future state of traffic already expected in the area as: * Other developments are already being built which will notably increase traffic, especially at the Trices Rd/Tosswill Rd corner and Trices Rd/Whincops Rd corner. The later of these has already had major accidents in the last year. * The peak traffic in the given report is not accurate, as this report was conducted after the end of term for Lincoln university, meaning none of the Lincoln university traffic was accounted for.	Reject Living Z and 3A Support Living 3.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.
PC72-0045	Shane Heenan	002	Community Facilities	Oppose In Part	The proposed plans for living Z and living 3A would likely attract young families to the development. Prebbleton School has already had to build new classrooms to fit their growing student base and the school is already approaching maximum capacity with the other developments in the area. The current district plan does not include provisions for more schools in the vicinity of this development	Reject Living Z and 3A Support Living 3.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.
PC72-0045	Shane Heenan	003	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	Lack of alignment with future regional plans: By allowing higher density housing in the above plot, this would constitute a	Reject Living Z and 3A Support Living 3.		

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					significant shift in Prebbletons population, in both size and location, from the original district plans.			
PC72-0046	Sarah Heenan	001	Transport Networks	Oppose	The reason we moved into Prebbleton was its lovely rural village feel - we love the way it is laid out - with smaller section properties at the centre of the village (nearer the bus routes) and the larger section properties scaling out towards the edge of town and the farm lands. This new proposal goes against this (and the district plan), as it will be a large subdivision, made up of small sections, on the outskirts of town, away from the bus routes, and on the boundary of farm lands. This is only going to increase traffic on the already very busy roads (which were not designed to be major routes. The traffic management report submitted in support of the traffic flows doesn't accurately reflect the traffic as it was undertaken after Lincoln University had finished classes for the semester. There also isn't a strong reference to all the other developments and their impact on the roads around the proposal once they are completed, especially the new retail developments which can be reached by routes using Trices and Birches Road. As a resident that uses both Trices and Birches Roads as well as the feeder roads of Tosswill and Springs multiple times a day, I am very concerned about the traffic volumes and road safety. It is already extremely hard to cross Springs road during peak school times and peak travel times safely. There is also no consideration to the impact on the local school - the school is already near capacity (it has recently just built a new building to cope with the increased roll) but adding another 20% to the school population needs to be addressed with the Ministry of Education.	Reject Living Z Support Living 3.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.
PC72-0046	Sarah Heenan	002	Subdivision of Land	Support In Part	I understand why people are looking to move into the Prebbleton community - it is an amazing village to live in. But its appeal of open spaces and larger sections needs to be maintained (as previously outlined and recommended in the district plans), so approving the	Reject Living Z Support Living 3.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					change to Living 3 is a great way to ensure the rural/urban border and allow for the community to grow. If the council thinks adding another subdivision to the Prebbleton community is the way forward, then I would like them to approve the proposed rezoning from Rural inner Plains to Living 3 as listed as the Less Preferred Relief - option 3.			efficient use of the land.
PC72-0047	Canterbury Regional Council	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	<p>Settlement pattern</p> <p>The plan change site is not identified as a Greenfield Priority Area (GPA) for residential development and is located outside the projected infrastructure boundary shown on Map A. The plan change request is therefore considered to be inconsistent with Objective 6.2.1 (3) which “avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas for development”, and Policy 6.3.1 (4) to “ensure new urban activities only occur within existing urban areas or identified greenfield priority areas as shown on Map A, unless otherwise expressly provided for in the CRPS”.</p> <p>Neither Our Space 2018-2048 or Proposed Change 1 identified the land subject to Plan Change 72 as necessary to meet future growth demands in Greater Christchurch over the 30 year period to 2048</p> <p>It is considered that suitability of the subject land for more intensive, urban development would be more appropriately addressed through a comprehensive review of the settlement pattern and long-term strategic growth planning exercise for Greater Christchurch</p>	Reject	Decline	The recommendation report considers these issues in detail and finds that the proposal is in accord with the NPS UD and that there are conflicting objectives in the CRPS.
PC72-0047	Canterbury Regional Council	002	District Plan General	Oppose	<p>Infrastructure</p> <p>The plan change application may be inconsistent with Policy 6.3.5(2) which seeks to ensure that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development is co-ordinated with the development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure.</p>	Reject	Decline	There are no material infrastructure investment triggers resulting from this plan change.
PC72-0047	Canterbury Regional Council	003	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>Transport and Public Transport</p> <p>The plan change site is not currently well serviced by public transport.</p>	Reject	Decline	The Christchurch to Lincoln bus route passes

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>Without frequent public transport services being in place from the outset, that are competitive alternative modes, development in this location is likely to be dependent on private motor vehicle use.</p> <p>The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) has been completed in isolation of the potential for other proposed plan changes to further impact the efficiency and effectiveness of both the local and strategic transport network.</p> <p>Furthermore, the ITA and the Economic Assessment do not adequately address the wider transport and environmental impacts (e.g. congestion and carbon emissions) arising from trips into Christchurch City.</p> <p>The proposed plan change does not therefore meet the above policies or the wider transport network and land use integration outcomes sought by Objective 6.2.4 and Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5.</p>			<p>along Birchs Road directly adjacent to the site.</p> <p>The CRPS policies have been carefully considered in the Recommendation Report.</p>
PC72-0047	Canterbury Regional Council	004	Land and Soil	Oppose	<p>Highly Productive Land and Versatile Soils</p> <p>The plan change site is identified on Canterbury Maps as comprising Land Use Capability Classes 1, 2 and 4. The area will likely be impacted by the impending direction contained in a National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land (NPS-HPL) and conflicts with the Selwyn District Plan Township Volume contains Policy B1.1.8</p> <p>It is not agreed that identification of the site within the Rural Residential Strategy enables the urban densities promoted through the plan change request to comply with Objective 3 of the proposed NPS-HPL</p>	Reject	Decline	<p>The adjacent park development significantly changes the merits of this site for urban scale development. I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.</p>
PC72-0047	Canterbury Regional Council	005	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	<p>Strategic growth planning in Greater Christchurch</p> <p>Our Space 2018-2048 identifies sufficient development capacity to meet anticipated housing needs over a thirty year planning horizon out to 2048.</p> <p>Further development capacity in Prebbleton is not therefore required at this time to meet medium and long term</p>	Reject	Decline	<p>The evidence to the hearing was compelling that sufficient development capacity is not currently enabled to meet the objectives of the CRPS. The</p>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>housing targets, identified in Our Space 2018–2048 and expressed in the CRPS. Any reassessment regarding the desirability of additional growth at Prebbleton is therefore best considered as part of a future spatial planning exercise rather than ad-hoc and individual assessments prompted by private plan change requests.</p> <p>Such a spatial planning exercise has recently been initiated by the Greater Christchurch Partnership, in conjunction with delivery of the Greater Christchurch 2050 Strategic Framework and the establishment of an Urban Growth Partnership with the Crown.</p>			current supply of housing land in this location and the merits of the location do not need to await the future Spatial Plan.
PC72-0047	Canterbury Regional Council	006	District Plan General	Oppose	<p>National Policy Statement on Urban Development</p> <p>The anticipated yield of 290 allotments identified in the plan change appears to be insignificant when set against the medium term housing target of 32,300 households for Greater Christchurch as a whole.</p> <p>The proposed lot sizes and housing typologies identified in the plan change do not go far enough to align with these identified housing needs and gaps in housing supply and detract from a determination that the plan change adds significantly to development capacity.</p> <p>To create significant development capacity a proposal should also be able to demonstrate how infrastructure is committed and how it will be provided because development capacity includes 'the provision of adequate development infrastructure to support the development of land for housing or business use'</p> <p>This matter is not sufficiently addressed by the plan change.</p> <p>The well-functioning urban environment and well connected along transport corridors criteria together signal the importance of considering the location of a proposed development in relation to other areas and amenities, relative accessibility and transport infrastructure and / or options, when assessing unplanned development proposals such as this proposed plan change.</p>	Reject	Decline	<p>There are no material infrastructure investment triggers resulting from this plan change. The yield is significant in a Prebbleton urban area context given current supply.</p> <p>The proposal provides for a well functioning urban environment and is well located to amenities, transport and employment.</p>

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>The proposed plan change does not give effect to a number of other key objectives and policies in the NPS-UD, including but not limited to:</p> <p>Objective 6(a)-(b)</p> <p>Objective 8(a)</p> <p>Policy 6The proposed plan change draws attention to wording in the NPS-UD which states that local authorities provide 'at least' sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand. This point needs to be balanced with other responsibilities and functions of local authorities (for example Section 30(1)(ba) and (gb) of the RMA) that require the strategic integration and an efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Oversupply of land for urban development may support competition in land and development markets but could equally undermine urban form objectives, delay development in growth and urban regeneration areas already identified through the CRPS and thereby underutilise the associated supporting infrastructure in these locations.</p>			
PC72-0048	Jocelyn Humphreys	001	District Plan General	Oppose In Part	The land contained within Application 72 is outside the development areas identified on the maps in the Operative District Plan [Appendix 31] and in the Proposed District Plan for Prebbleton, DEV-PR1 and DEV-PR2	Reject rezoning to living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.
PC72-0048	Jocelyn Humphreys	002	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	The land subject to the application is currently zoned as Inner Plains under the Operational District Plan and General Rural Zone under the Proposed Selwyn District Plan. The current minimum lot size for a dwelling is 4ha. To change from that housing density to the Living Z density is visually inappropriate and does not conform to the section size of existing subdivisions to the West and North.	Reject rezoning to living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3.		I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.
PC72-0048	Jocelyn Humphreys	003	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Birchs Road and Trices Road are designated as collector roads. The question is where do the collector roads take the traffic? At present, traffic travelling North on Birchs Road meets	Reject rezoning to living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3.		I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					the Y intersection of Springs Road adjacent to the former Meadow Mushroom site. This intersection will become even more congested when traffic from the retirement village on the Meadow Mushroom site comes on stream.			requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land. Traffic effect have been found to be minimal but intersection and road frontage upgrades are required.
PC72-0048	Jocelyn Humphreys	004	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	The roading design for the proposed subdivision has single exits onto Hamptons, Birches and Trices Roads. However, the ODP shows two further potential exits onto Trices and 2 more East into the land towards Tosswills Road. If all these exits are developed, I believe that they will create danger for traffic on Trices Road.	Reject rezoning to living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3.	Decline	Side road intersection will be required to comply with Council design standards.
PC72-0048	Jocelyn Humphreys	005	Quality of the Environment	Oppose In Part	There is only one designated reserve of 900sqm surrounding existing trees which is inadequate to service the whole development. There is no open pocket reserve space for play. The developers are relying on the stormwater basins and the planned Reserve on Birchs Road to provide the necessary open space for the residents' enjoyment and recreation.	Reject rezoning to living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3.	Decline	The ODP open space shown is appropriate.
PC72-0048	Jocelyn Humphreys	006	Community Facilities	Oppose In Part	Prebbleton is not identified in the District Plan as a Key Activity Centre, rather it is a commuter village. Rolleston and Lincoln are identified as the preferred Key Activity Centres and are able to provide the full range of activities whether educational, residential, recreational, commercial or industrial. Therefore, Prebbleton lacks adequate facilities to provide for the exponential growth of the village. Shopping is limited with a supermarket only recently being opened. While there is currently some commercial development, it is constrained by the available commercial zoning in the village.	Reject rezoning to living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3.	Decline	Prebbleton has good access to KACs at Halswell and Hornby.
PC72-0048	Jocelyn Humphreys	007	District Plan General	Oppose In Part	I believe that the flurry of plan change applications lodged with the Selwyn District Council is to circumvent any amendments to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the Selwyn District Plan, after due consideration by the Council, that may	Reject rezoning to living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3.	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					inhibit the ambitions of the developers. Changes resulting from the National Policy Statement have yet to be tested so a cautious approach to these Plan Change applications should be taken. The Council must be given space to complete its Future Development planning in accordance with the timetable in Part 4 of the National Policy Statement.			efficient use of the land. Each Plan Change will be individually tested and recommendations made. This recommendation is limited to PC 72.
PC72-0049	Nigel Humphreys	001	District Plan General	Oppose In Part	The land contained within Application 72 is outside the development areas identified on the maps in the Operative District Plan [Appendix 31] and in the Proposed District Plan for Prebbleton, DEV-PR1 and DEV-PR2	Reject rezoning to Living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land.
PC72-0049	Nigel Humphreys	002	Residential Density	Oppose In Part	The land subject to the application is currently zoned as Inner Plains under the Operational District Plan and General Rural Zone under the Proposed Selwyn District Plan. The current minimum lot size for a dwelling is 4ha. To change from that housing density to the Living Z density is visually inappropriate and does not conform to the section size of existing subdivisions to the West and North.	Reject rezoning to Living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land. Also the ODP includes rural edge treatment requirements.
PC72-0049	Nigel Humphreys	003	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	Birchs Road and Trices Road are designated as collector roads. The question is where do the collector roads take the traffic? At present, traffic travelling North on Birchs Road meets the Y intersection of Springs Road adjacent to the former Meadow Mushroom site. This intersection will become even more congested when traffic from the retirement village on the Meadow Mushroom site comes on stream.	Reject rezoning to Living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land. Traffic effect have been found to be minimal but intersection and road frontage upgrades are required.
PC72-0049	Nigel Humphreys	004	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	The roading design for the proposed subdivision has single exits onto Hamptons, Birches and Trices Roads. However, the ODP shows two further potential exits onto Trices and 2 more East into the land towards Tosswills	Reject rezoning to Living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3	Decline	Side road intersection will be required to comply with Council design standards.



Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					Road. If all these exits are developed, I believe that they will create danger for traffic on Trices Road.			
PC72-0049	Nigel Humphreys	005	Quality of the Environment	Oppose In Part	There is only one designated reserve of 900sqm surrounding existing trees which is inadequate to service the whole development. There is no open pocket reserve space for play. The developers are relying on the stormwater basins and the planned Reserve on Birchs Road to provide the necessary open space for the residents' enjoyment and recreation.	Reject rezoning to Living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3	Decline	The ODP open space shown is appropriate.
PC72-0049	Nigel Humphreys	006	Community Facilities	Oppose In Part	Prebbleton is not identified in the District Plan as a Key Activity Centre, rather it is a commuter village. Rolleston and Lincoln are identified as the preferred Key Activity Centres and are able to provide the full range of activities whether educational, residential, recreational, commercial or industrial. Therefore, Prebbleton lacks adequate facilities to provide for the exponential growth of the village. Shopping is limited with a supermarket only recently being opened. While there is currently some commercial development, it is constrained by the available commercial zoning in the village.	Reject rezoning to Living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3	Decline	Prebbleton has good access to KACs at Halswell and Hornby.
PC72-0049	Nigel Humphreys	007	District Plan General	Oppose In Part	I believe that the flurry of plan change applications lodged with the Selwyn District Council is to circumvent any amendments to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the Selwyn District Plan, after due consideration by the Council, that may inhibit the ambitions of the developers. Changes resulting from the National Policy Statement have 8 yet to be tested so a cautious approach to these Plan Change applications should be taken. The Council must be given space to complete its Future Development planning in accordance with the timetable in Part 4 of the National Policy Statement.	Reject rezoning to Living Z. Support rezoning to Living 3	Decline	I am satisfied that Living Z with a minimum of 12 households per hectare meets the requirements of the Act and makes efficient use of the land. Each Plan Change will be individually tested and recommendations made. This recommendation is limited to PC 72
PC72-0050	Ministry of Education (the Ministry)	001	District Plan General	Oppose In Part	Policy Framework: The application acknowledges PPC72 is inconsistent with several provisions of the CRPS but considers the plan	The Ministry requests that PPC72 should only proceed if the following matters are addressed: • The potential inconsistencies between	Accept in part	The ODP includes a requirement to consult with the Ministry of Education at the time of subdivision

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>change is consistent with Policy 8 of the NPS-UD which states;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Local authority decisions affecting urban environments are responsive to plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well functioning urban environments, even if the development capacity is: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) unanticipated by RMA planning documents; or</li> <li>b) out-of-sequence with planned land release.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The Ministry considers that PPC72 is inconsistent with the following provisions of the CRPS as the plan change site is outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary identified in the CRPS (Map A):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objective 6.2.1 of the CRPS states that: "Recovery, rebuilding and development are enabled within Greater Christchurch through a land use and infrastructure framework that...</li> </ul> <p>3. avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas for development, unless expressly provided for in the CRPS;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Objective 6.2.2 outlines that: "urban form and settlement pattern in Greater Christchurch is managed to provide sufficient land for rebuilding and recovery needs and set a foundation for future growth, with an urban form that achieves consolidation and intensification of urban areas, and avoids unplanned expansion of urban areas"</li> <li>- Policy 6.3.1 outlines that: "In relation to recovery and rebuilding for Greater Christchurch:...</li> </ul> <p>4. ensure new urban activities only occur within existing urban areas or identified greenfield priority areas as shown on Map A, unless they are otherwise expressly provided for in the CRPS"</p> <p>It is also noted that PPC72 is inconsistent with the recent Greater Christchurch Partnership Our Space</p>	<p>Policy 8 of the NPS-UD in and the CRPS are satisfactorily resolved particularly as it relates to development capacity and well-functioning urban environments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Ministry requests ongoing liaison from the applicant regarding timeframes for the realising of the development to ensure there is adequate school capacity</li> <li>• The Ministry wishes to discuss with Council and the applicant the potential need to acquire land to establish a new primary school in Prebbleton</li> <li>• That Council considers the potential traffic effects of PPC72 on Prebbleton School</li> </ul>		consent applications.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>document which the Ministry generally supported (and reflects Map A).</p> <p>While the Ministry is aware of the national direction of the NPS-UD in relation to unanticipated growth, it is noted that if PPC72 is approved, it may set a precedent of development outside of existing planned areas in the Selwyn District and Canterbury, which makes planning for school capacity and networks increasingly difficult.</p> <p>Furthermore, the requirement of Policy 8 should also be balanced against other parts of the NPSUD, which require Councils to ensure sufficient additional infrastructure (which includes schools) is provided. Therefore, the Ministry also requests that SDC ensures 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.</p>			
PC72-0050	Ministry of Education (the Ministry)	002	Community Facilities	Oppose In Part	<p>School Capacity</p> <p>PPC72 will result in a considerable increase in the population of Prebbleton. The proposed rezoning of the plan change site would enable approximately 290 residential allotments. This will result in an increase of school age children within the catchment areas of Prebbleton School, Ladbrooks School, and Lincoln High School. The Ministry anticipates that an additional primary school will be required due to the cumulative increase in school aged population resulting from plan changes in the area. Consultation with the Ministry has not occurred and accordingly, the Ministry requests that PPC72 is only approved if the applicant and Council consult with the Ministry and sufficient provisions are made to accommodate additional school age children.</p>	<p>The Ministry requests that PPC72 should only proceed if the following matters are addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential inconsistencies between Policy 8 of the NPS-UD in and the CRPS are satisfactorily resolved particularly as it relates to development capacity and well-functioning urban environments</li> <li>• The Ministry requests ongoing liaison from the applicant regarding timeframes for the realising of the development to ensure there is adequate school capacity</li> <li>• The Ministry wishes to discuss with Council and the applicant the potential need to acquire land to establish a new primary school in Prebbleton</li> <li>• That Council considers the potential traffic effects of PPC72 on Prebbleton School</li> </ul>	Accept in part	The ODP includes a requirement to consult with the Ministry of Education at the time of subdivision consent applications.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
PC72-0050	Ministry of Education (the Ministry)	003	Transport Networks	Oppose In Part	<p>Traffic Congestion and Safety</p> <p>Prebbleton School have raised concerns regarding potential traffic safety issues resulting from PPC72 and the resultant increase in population. Prebbleton School is located on Springs Road and the Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA) commissioned by the applicant does not consider the impacts of the proposed development on traffic congestion and safety along Springs Road or past Prebbleton School. The Ministry requests that potential traffic effects on the school be considered by Council in their assessment of PPC72.</p>	<p>The Ministry requests that PPC72 should only proceed if the following matters are addressed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The potential inconsistencies between Policy 8 of the NPS-UD in and the CRPS are satisfactorily resolved particularly as it relates to development capacity and well-functioning urban environments</li> <li>• The Ministry requests ongoing liaison from the applicant regarding timeframes for the realising of the development to ensure there is adequate school capacity</li> <li>• The Ministry wishes to discuss with Council and the applicant the potential need to acquire land to establish a new primary school in Prebbleton</li> <li>• That Council considers the potential traffic effects of PPC72 on Prebbleton School</li> </ul>	Accept in part	The ODP includes a requirement to consult with the Ministry of Education at the time of subdivision consent applications.
PC72-0051	Elisha Young-Ebert	001	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>It is apparent that most commuters from Lincoln travelling into Christchurch use Prebbleton as a thoroughfare to reach the Southern Motorway. It is difficult enough, at peak hours, with current commuter stream coming through Prebbleton from Lincoln. PC72-0051 With the defective design of the main roundabout at Halswell Junction and Springs Road, it means that all commuters trickle into a single lane to round over to a bridge; they then have to cross over quickly to one left lane to get onto the motorway. At peak hours, trying to cross over safely is extremely risky.</p> <p>I believe Plan changes 69 and 72, jointly, will only increase the risk to drivers who have to take this commuters' route.</p> <p>My personal observation is many commuters from Lincoln treat Prebbleton as a place to get through,</p>	<p>Amend-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- lower speed limit in Prebbleton</li> <li>- effective protective measures on primary roads, including lights for the junction of Springs and Tosswill Road</li> <li>- pedestrian crossings at key crossing points.</li> <li>- Ensure any proposal does not effectively split the village in half because of a major traffic corridor.</li> </ul>	Decline	Traffic effects have been found to be acceptable with requirements for frontage upgrades and some intersection improvements.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason For Recommendation
					<p>and their driving behaviour reflects that. They are impatient and they will not stop for children, who have ONE crossing to access along the main village drag of Springs Road.</p> <p>I am certain the traffic flow will only increase if both Plan Changes 69 and 72 are approved.</p> <p>I do not outright oppose this proposed Plan Change. However, I do think the Council must consider the traffic challenges for existing Prebbleton residents when you add at least another 5,000 new households from Plan Change 69, who will more than likely use Springs Road as a main city commuting route.</p> <p>I urge Selwyn Council to fully assess the transport needs of Prebbleton, in this tandem context, for the safety and protection of our residents. This protection specifically includes a growing number of residents who need to cross Springs Rd and Birches Rd to access public transportation and community amenities. Increased traffic flow increases the danger to our vulnerable residents, specifically children and the elderly – which are growing in numbers.</p>			