

## PC76 Summary of Submissions

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Recommendation	Summary of Reasons
PC76-0001	Thomas Gourlay & Karli Goldsworthy	001	Subdivision of Land	Support	Supports the plan change but seeks that the termination point of the water race be relocated to within the road reserve of Chris Drive or council reserve, benefiting the current land owners, the plan change proponents and Council in terms of the future maintenance and use of land.	Requests that the plan change is approved but that the termination of the water is managed as part of the process.	Accept in part	Request that plan change be approved is appropriate but issues relating to termination of the water race is a matter for subdivision and/or other Council processes.
PC76-0002	Danielle and Daniel Corry	001	Transport Networks	Support In Part	Supports the plan change in principle but has concerns that the detail of the roading layout that may be included in the Outline Development Plan (ODP) may impact the amenity of the submitters property.	Requests that the plan change is approved but no additional roading connections are provided to East Maddisons Road beyond those indicated on the ODP as notified.	Accept in part	The plan change is approved. Roading connections have been appropriately considered and any impact on submitter's property are likely to be less than minor and simply related to urbanisation.
PC76-0003	Hayley and Michael Moynihan	001	Subdivision of Land	Support	Supports the plan change as it is a logical extension to the Residential Zone, is supported by infrastructure, consistent with the relevant Resource Management Act framework and includes the submitters land.	Requests that the plan change is approved and that the submitters dwelling and curtilage at 627 East Maddisons Road is recognised and accounted for within the ODP and PC76 documentation.	Accept in part	Accept the plan change is a logical extension to the residential zone, supported by infrastructure and consistent with relevant Resource Management Act framework. The protection of the dwelling and curtilage at 627 East Maddisons Road is protected by property rights and ultimately is in the hands of the submitters
PC76-0004	Ministry of Education	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose In Part	Considers that the plan change should consider the potential effects of the increase in school age children arising from the development on the capacity of the local schools.	Not specified.	Reject	In letter dated 11 October 2021 (tabled) MOE noted satisfaction that Waitaha School and Lemonwood Grove have capacity to accommodate future growth in their roles although consider cumulative effects of the numerous plan changes may adversely impact the capacity of schools.
PC76-0004	Ministry of Education	002	Transport Networks	Support In Part	Considers that the plan change may give rise to congestion and safety effects that may adversely impact of the operation of Waitaha and Lemonwood Schools.	Requests that the traffic effects are assessed and mitigated before the plan change is approved.	Accept in part	Again in letter of 11 October 2021 (tabled) MOE noted Mr Collins and Mr Friedel's recommendation and if adopted submission points are adequately addressed. Consider traffic effects have been assessed and appropriately addressed.
PC76-0005	Christchurch City Council	001	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Considers that wider transport effects on Christchurch City must be addressed.	Requests the plan change is amended to promote an urban form and include development controls that ensure a funded and implemented public transport system to service the site, including connections to Christchurch City, prior to any residential development.	Reject	Matters raised in relation to ensuring funding and implementation of public transport service to the site are subject to separate processes but ODP adequately enables public transportation connections once available.
PC76-0005	Christchurch City Council	002	Residential Density	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Considers that a higher minimum net density of 15 households per hectare consistent with the Greater Christchurch Partnership density report would better achieve efficiencies in coordinating land use and infrastructure, enabling mixed land use, supporting multi-modal transport systems and protecting productive land.	Requests the plan change to be amended to apply a minimum net density of 15 households per hectare to the development.	Reject	For the reasons provided in the Recommendation consider proposed 12hh/ha appropriate and meets or exceeds requirements in CRPS and SDP.
PC76-0005	Christchurch City Council	003	Residential and Business Development	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Considers that the relevant recommendations of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Social and Affordable Housing Report are incorporated into the plan change.	Requests the plan change is amended to include the recommendations of the Greater Christchurch Partnership Social and Affordable Housing Report.	Reject	The report specified is not appropriate for inclusion in this plan change, but rather it calls for assessment at a more strategic level.
PC76-0006	Canterbury Regional Council - Environment Canterbury	001	Residential and Business Development	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Considers that the plan change should give greater attention to identified housing needs, including by increasing the minimum net density to 15 households per hectare and including mechanisms for enabling social and affordable housing.	Requests that Council consider increasing the minimum net density to 15 households per hectare and including mechanisms for enabling social and affordable housing to meet identified housing needs.	Reject	For the reasons specified in relation to PC76-005 and for the reasons in the Recommendation.
PC76-0006	Canterbury Regional Council - Environment Canterbury	002	Transport Networks	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Considers that development of the site ahead of enhanced public transport services in this location is likely to create a dependency on private motor vehicle use.	Requests Council to consider how timely and effective public transport provision to and through the site can be achieved and any integrated transport options that would encourage uptake of existing services.	Reject	Issues have been assessed in consideration of the Request. Provision of timely and effective public transport is not within the control of the Applicant and is more appropriately addressed through the Greater Christchurch Partnership and associated processes.