

# **ATTACHMENT H:**

## **Summary of submissions and further submissions**

Submitter	Point	Topic	Type	
1404	Craig Fossey	1404.01	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Road connection via Williams Street and associated increase in vehicle movements will result in adverse effects, compromise the safety of children using the existing playground and affect the existing residents on Williams and Norris Streets. Will also result in through traffic down Williams Street to Springs Road to quicken the travel time to town.		<b>Relief sought</b> The road access point proposed in Williams Street adjacent to the playground to be amended to pedestrian access only.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1404.01		
1404	Craig Fossey	1404.02	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Reduction in section sizes and increase in housing density will create adverse effects on the village character and result in social problems. 400m <sup>2</sup> sections are contrary to the Prebbleton Structure Plan, which identifies that large sections contribute to the character of the township.		<b>Relief sought</b> Change the high density housing allocation to a minimum allotment size of 800m <sup>2</sup> to preserve the village character and to align with the Prebbleton Structure Plan.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1404.02		
1405	Judy Dixon	1405.01 <u>Wish to be heard</u>	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Cars already speed down Williams Street, which will be exacerbated by additional vehicle movements. Concerns with increased vehicle movements near the children's playground.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request. Does not want additional traffic down Williams Street.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1405.01		
1405	Judy Dixon	1405.02	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Minimum allotment size should stay at 800m <sup>2</sup> other than for over 60's units to avoid ghetto style living arising from high density housing, which has occurred in Christchurch City.		<b>Relief sought</b> Unclear.		
1405	Judy Dixon	1405.03	Cycle ways & walkways	Support
<b>Summary</b> Support the extension of the children's playground and the proposed cycle/walkway.		<b>Relief sought</b> Unclear.		
1406	Kim Gillespie	1406.01 <u>Wish to be heard</u>	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Williams Street is a quiet and safe street where the proposed increase in vehicle movements will compromise the safety of the elderly, children and residents with learning difficulties. The proposed new road near the playground is ridiculous and must not proceed.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request. Do not change Williams Street.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1406.01		
1406	Kim Gillespie	1406.02	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> The subdivision is a travesty as any additional intensification in Prebbleton will compromise the village character that attracted the resident to the area in the first place. This character has already been undermined by previous subdivisions.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request.		

Submitter	Point	Topic	Type
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1406.02	
1406 Kim Gillespie	1406.03	Natural habitat	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Birdlife has reduced since 2000 due to increased subdivisions. The subdivision of the rural land to residential will further reduce the bird habitat.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request. Conversion of rural land to residential will further reduce bird habitat.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1406.03	
1406 Kim Gillespie	1406.04	Infrastructure	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> No more capacity in the sewer network.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1406.04	
1406 Kim Gillespie	1406.05	Reserves	Unclear
<b>Summary</b> The 18.58ha land should be developed into a park with trees or left as rural.		<b>Relief sought</b> Unclear.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1604.05	
1406 Kim Gillespie	1406.06	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> The density of housing and change from rural to residential will compromise the rural outlook attributed to the area.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request. At the very least there should be no allotments below 800m <sup>2</sup> in size.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1606.06	
1407 Beverley Gomibuchi	1407.01	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> High density housing will create a confined, city living atmosphere with more people and activities in the same area that will undermine the spacious and open character of the area. The current medium to low density households attribute to high financial and lifestyle benefits, which should be retained to preserve the character of the township.		<b>Relief sought</b> Convert the high density housing allocation to either medium or low density households to preserve the character of the area and to align with the Prebbleton Structure Plan.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1407.01	
1408 Angela Berry	1408.01	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> High density housing is contrary to the Prebbleton Structure Plan and will have negative impacts on residents living in Williams and Norris Streets.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request or provide for low density housing (1,000m <sup>2</sup> ) and tighter restrictions on the numbers and density of development.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig F1461 Kate & Steve Coffey		Supports submission 1408.01 Supports submission 1408.01	
1408 Angela Berry	1408.02	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> High density housing will have negative impacts on Norris and Williams Streets, particularly on those living at the end of Williams Street or back onto the development site. High density housing will radically change the aesthetics of what is a quiet area valued for its rural outlook, which is why people moved to the area in the first place.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request or provide for low density housing (1,000m <sup>2</sup> ) and tighter restrictions on the numbers and density of development.	

Submitter	Point	Topic	Type	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1408.02		
1408	Angela Berry	1408.03	Infrastructure	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> The vehicle movements will result in additional noise and traffic pollution, whilst also placing a strain on community resources such as School, a road network that is already in a poor condition and the Williams Street playground.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request or provide for low density housing (1,000m²) and tighter restrictions on the numbers and density of development.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1408.03		
1408	Angela Berry	1408.04	Reserves	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Any extension to the Williams Street playground should include shade or shelter to protect children from the sun.		<b>Relief sought</b> That shade or shelter be provided if the Williams Street playground is extended.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1408.04		
1409	Alison Rudd	1409.01	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Concerns that additional vehicle movements entering and exiting Williams Street adjacent to the playground may compromise the safety of children due to poor visibility. Additional through traffic will undermine the serenity enjoyed by local residents, which was why the submitter moved into the area.		<b>Relief sought</b> No access from the development site to be provided onto Williams Street.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1409.01		
1409	Alison Rudd	1409.02	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> High density housing is contrary to the Prebbleton Structure Plan that prescribes an 800m² minimum lot size. It is a waste of land, which is some of the best in Canterbury.		<b>Relief sought</b> No high density housing of between 400m² to 600m².		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1409.02		
1410	Belinda Jeurson	1410.01	Nuisance effects	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Adverse noise nuisance will arise, which is of concern as the submitter works from home. Seeks clarification of what measures are to be undertaken to mitigate adverse noise effects.		<b>Relief sought</b> Seeks clarification of measures proposed to mitigate noise.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1410.01		
1410	Belinda Jeurson	1410.02	Nuisance effects	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Dust and dirt nuisance has previously resulted from the development of new subdivisions. Submitter seeks compensation for effects associated with earthworks, particularly as the property is located in the direction of the prevailing north-west and north-east winds.		<b>Relief sought</b> Seeks compensation payment for any extra costs incurred as a result of airborne pollution arising from earthworks to develop the site.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1410.02		

Submitter	Point	Topic	Type	
1411	Dianne Schurgers	1411.01	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Existing pressure on the sewer, water supply, road network, public transport and education facilities will be increased by additional high density housing.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1411.01		
1411	Dianne Schurgers	1411.02	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Increased vehicle movements on Williams Street at the cul-de-sac head and the location of the playground extension will compromise the safety of children travelling to the school and playground.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request. No additional vehicle movements down Williams Street.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1411.02		
1411	Dianne Schurgers	1411.03	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> High density housing will erode the peaceful village atmosphere and community spirit of the area, which is why the submitter moved to the area from Christchurch.		<b>Relief sought</b> Decline the plan change request. No high density development in Prebbleton.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1411.03		
1412	Grant Craig	1412.01	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Strongly opposed to the proposed access near the playground, which will result in adverse effects arising from increased vehicle movements, which include: noise, health and safety, parking spill over and child safety. Williams Street is not considered capable of handling additional vehicle movements. Children will no longer be able to play safely at the playground, which is the last remaining playground left in the original village.		<b>Relief sought</b> No access via Williams Street.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1412.01		
1412	Grant Craig	1412.02	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Original village needs to be retained and additional development restricted particularly where it relies on established streets for access and is residential expansion that does not benefit the residents of Norris or Williams Streets. People in Prebbleton have had to put up with too many major changes that benefit developers.		<b>Relief sought</b> No access via Williams Street. Leave the original village as it is.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1412.02		
1413	Marion Hollis	1413.01	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Difficulties experienced getting around the Blakes Road and Norris Street corner due to parked cars associated with the Primary School between 9am and 3pm.		<b>Relief sought</b> Unknown.		
1413	Marion Hollis	1413.02	Section size, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> A through road in the middle of the established township will fail to retain the character and atmosphere of Prebbleton.		<b>Relief sought</b> Restrict additional vehicle connections onto Williams Street, which should be a cycle/walkway link only.		

Submitter	Point	Topic	Type
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1413.02 F1461 Kate & Steve Coffey Supports submission 1413.02			
1413	Marion Hollis	1413.03	Vehicle movements Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Extra and unnecessary vehicle movements past the submitter's property will jeopardise the quiet amenity that attracted the residents to the area from Hornby. Submitter doesn't appreciate the likelihood of extra and unnecessary traffic going past their property.		<b>Relief sought</b> Restrict additional vehicle connections onto Williams Street, which should be a cycle/walkway link only.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1413.03			
1414	Neville Carlisle	1414.01	Cycle ways and walkways Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Strongly objects to any increase in vehicle movements along Williams Street, with the exception of a pedestrian/cycle way. Increased traffic flows could endanger children living in Williams Street and those attending the Primary School and Play Centre.		<b>Relief sought</b> Restrict additional vehicle connections onto Williams Street, which should be a cycle/walkway link only.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1414.01			
1414	Neville Carlisle	1414.02	Vehicle movements Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Williams Street is too narrow to accommodate two-way traffic, particularly at the Springs Road and Norris Street end.		<b>Relief sought</b> Restrict vehicles at the entrance to Williams Street, which should be a cycle/walkway link only.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1414.02			
1415	P & J Francis	1415.01	Vehicle movements Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Oppose any increase in vehicle movements on Williams Street, which will compromise the safety of the elderly, learning impaired children residing in the area and children using the Play Centre and playground.		<b>Relief sought</b> No access via Williams Street. Cul-de-sac to remain at the end of Williams Street.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1415.01			
1415	P & J Francis	1415.02	Section sizes, housing density Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Oppose the provision of high density housing that is contrary to the Prebbleton Structure Plan, which will increase traffic flows, crime and place a strain on local services. Does not fit well with the surrounding lifestyle blocks, low density residential housing and the Primary School.		<b>Relief sought</b> Change the high density housing allocation to medium to low density to preserve character and align with the Prebbleton Structure Plan.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1415.02			
1416	William Nicholson	1416.01	Vehicle movements Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Oppose any increase in vehicle movements on Williams Street arising from through traffic and the extension of the cul-de-sac. Additional vehicles will endanger the safety of children attending the Primary School and Plunket and elderly residents living in the area.		<b>Relief sought</b> Restrict additional vehicle connections onto Williams Street, which should be a cycleway/walkway link only.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1416.01			

Submitter		Point		Topic	Type
1417	Akaroa Orchards	1417.01	<a href="#">Wish to be heard</a>	Infrastructure	Support in part
<b>Summary</b> Supports the development on the conditions that the Council does not allow it to proceed until: (1) all existing sites within the developed area have sewer connections; and (2) All high density areas (below 500m <sup>2</sup> ) are subject to the same zoning provisions that have been applied to Akaroa Orchards to ensure consistency in the community. This includes the approval of full development plans, house designs, landscaping and colour palette.				<b>Relief sought</b> Council to ensure infill development occurs first and is subject to a consistent set of planning rules. Council should not change rules as each new development comes along.	
1417	Akaroa Orchards	1417.02		Section sizes, housing density	Support in part
<b>Summary</b> Supports the development on the conditions that the Council does not allow it to proceed until: (1) all existing sites within the developed area have sewer connections; and (2) All high density areas (below 500m <sup>2</sup> ) are subject to the same zoning provisions that have been applied to Akaroa Orchards to ensure consistency in the community. This includes the approval of full development plans, house designs, landscaping and colour palette.				<b>Relief sought</b> Council to ensure infill development occurs first and is subject to a consistent set of planning rules. Council should not change rules as each new development comes along.	
1418	B & D Craddock	1418.01		Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Oppose any increase in vehicles along Williams Street arising from through traffic and cul-de-sac extension, which will endanger the safety of children attending the Primary School and create a thoroughfare along Norris, Williams and Charles Streets.				<b>Relief sought</b> Restrict additional vehicle connections onto Williams Street, which should be a cycle/walkway link only.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig				Support submission 1418.01	
1418	B & D Craddock	1418.02		Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Poor visibility and significant traffic flows already make it difficult to connect from Williams, Charles and Norris Streets to Springs Road, which is compounded by the disrepaired state of the existing roads.				<b>Relief sought</b> Restrict additional vehicle connections onto Williams Street, which should be a cycle way/walkway link only.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig				Supports submission 1418.02	
1418	B & D Craddock	1418.03		Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Williams, Norris and Charles Streets are too narrow to accommodate higher numbers and have not been designed or built to support additional vehicles.				<b>Relief sought</b> Restrict additional vehicle connections onto Williams Street, which should be a cycle way/walkway link only.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig				Supports submission 1418.03	
1418	B & D Craddock	1418.04		Cycle ways and walkways	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Concerns that increased vehicle movements will compromise the safety of children at the Williams Street playground, where the road will be busier and drivers will be focused on manoeuvring rather than being aware of children.				<b>Relief sought</b> Restrict additional vehicle connections onto Williams Street, which should be a cycle way/walkway link only.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig				Supports submission 1418.04	

Submitter	Point	Topic	Type	
1418	B & D Craddock	1418.05	Infrastructure	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Concerns that increased population base will increase the pressure on Prebbleton's already minimal amenities and infrastructure.		<b>Relief sought</b> Seek assurances that the necessary investment will be given to ease the pressure on stretched infrastructure.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1418.05		
1418	B & D Craddock	1418.06	Cycle ways and walkways	Support
<b>Summary</b> Support the efforts to encourage cycling and walking linkages and would like to see a dedicated cycle way and path from the new development along Williams Street linking Norris and Charles Streets.		<b>Relief sought</b> Support and encourage the proposed cycling and pedestrian linkages.		
1419	D & P Williams	1419.01	ODP's and District Plan rules	Oppose in part
<b>Summary</b> Oppose proposed subdivision Rule 12.1.3.33 as the Kingcraft Drive Existing Development Area (EDA) is not identified in the Outline Development Plan (ODP), as suggested in the new rule. The rule itself relates to a land use and should not be included in the subdivision rules.		<b>Relief sought</b> Move proposed Rule 12.1.3.33 to the land use section of the District Plan as new Rule 4.9.12 under the heading Prebbleton on Page C4-007. Alternatively, the matter of building setbacks should be addressed as a subdivision assessment matter or via a resource consent.		
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1419.01		
1419	D & P Williams	1419.02	ODP's and District Plan rules	Oppose in part
<b>Summary</b> Proposed Rule 12.1.3.34, that requires the subdivision of land affected by the application to be in accordance with the ODP in Appendix 19, is an unnecessary duplication of an existing rule in the District Plan.		<b>Relief sought</b> Delete Rule 12.1.3.34. Alternatively, existing Rule 12.1.3.21 should be amended to include the requirement for the LXA Zone to accord with Appendix 19.		
1419	D & P Williams	1419.03	ODP's and District Plan rules	Amend
<b>Summary</b> Oppose proposed Rule 12.1.3.35, that requires a landscape plan to be submitted at the time of subdivision consent, as it does not specify the minimum width of planting required to achieve a restricted discretionary subdivision consent activity status.		<b>Relief sought</b> Amend Rule 12.1.3.35 to specify the minimum width of planting required for the 'landscape buffer' in order to retain a restricted discretionary activity status. A 5m buffer is provided in the ODP.		
1419	D & P Williams	1419.04	ODP's and District Plan rules	Amend
<b>Summary</b> PC2 proposes that the 4ha minimum lot size detailed in Table C12.1 of the District Plan should remain until either: (a) Council passes a resolution that there is adequate sewage capacity; or (b) All necessary consents have been obtained to ensure a method for treating and disposing of wastewater and stormwater is provided. Oppose this rule as the granting of consent does not guarantee the availability of connections or capacity.		<b>Relief sought</b> There is no need to include the requirement to either obtain a Council resolution or all the necessary resource consents to uplift the deferral from 4ha to Living XA, as the necessary provisions already exist in the 'standards and terms' in the Plan that are applicable to subdivision in Prebbleton.		
1419	D & P Williams	1419.05	ODP's and District Plan rules	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Oppose a number of assessment matters that are already covered in the District Plan.  12.1.4.37 sets out the reasons for providing 1,000m² along the boundary with the Kingcraft Drive EDA, which is considered to be justifying the reason for the provision rather than the assessment criteria (Continued...)		<b>Relief sought</b> Either delete assessment matter 12.1.4.37 or redraft it to achieve the intended purpose.  Amend assessment matter 12.1.4.38 relating to the 5m building setback to address submission points 1419.01 and 1419.03 (Continued...)		



Submitter	Point	Topic	Type
(...Continued)		(...Continued)	
The requirement for the 5m building setback should be a new land use rule and should be limited to the consideration of whether a consent notice or other encumbrance is necessary to protect the rural-urban interface. Assessment matters 12.1.4.39 and 12.1.4.40 relate directly to the proposed road network and the interaction with the pedestrian/cycle network, carriageway widths, footpaths, lighting, street furniture and landscaping. These matters are already covered in the District Plan in 12.1.4.11 to 12.1.4.14.		Delete assessment matters 12.1.4.39 and 12.1.3.40	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1419.05	
1419	D & P Williams	1419.06	ODP's and District Plan rules Amend
<b>Summary</b> The ODP for PC2 needs to be amended to include the necessary linkages and landscape buffer. Selwyn District Council has acknowledged the merits in the future road linkage between the submitters property and the land affected by PC2 by providing linkages in the Draft Prebbleton Structure Plan. There is also an inconsistency between Rules 12.1.33 and Rule 12.1.3.35 and the ODP for PC2 as the 5m building setback and planted landscape buffer are not included on the Kingcraft Drive EDA boundary of the submitters land.		<b>Relief sought</b> To amend the PC2 ODP to include a road linkage outlined in the Draft Prebbleton Structure Plan. That the landscape buffer and 5m building setback between the land subject to PC2 and the submitters land that forms part of the Kingcraft Drive EDA are included until such time as the submitters land is rezoned for residential purposes or is included within the PC1 RPS Urban Limit for Prebbleton.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1458 ECan		Supports submission 1419.06	
1420	Hope Steer	1420.01	Nuisance effects Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Concerns that dust may be generated from the subdivision development. Submitter seeks compensation for nuisance effects associated with earthworks, particularly as the property is located in the direction of the prevailing north-west and north-east winds and directly adjoins the development site.		<b>Relief sought</b> Seek compensation payment for any extra cleaning costs incurred as a result of earthworks.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1420.01	
1420	Hope Steer	1420.02	Section sizes, housing density Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Opposed to medium density housing to the rear of properties on Norris Street, which will undermine the country atmosphere, small town charm, rural aspect, sense of space, privacy and character that attracted the resident from Leeston to Prebbleton. This could result in a loss in house value. The community is characterised by people who are drawn to the country life and enjoy gardening or keeping animals. Strongly opposed to Prebbleton becoming another Halswell.		<b>Relief sought</b> Low density development to be provided at the rear of properties located on Norris Street and restrictions to be placed on multi-level buildings.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1420.02	
1421	Pam Reveley	1421.01 <u>Wish to be heard</u>	Section sizes, housing density Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Oppose the placement of medium density housing to the rear of Norris Street properties, which will compromise the rural views, privacy of backyards and amenity treasured by land owners. Low density zoning would result in less impact, particularly if building restrictions on multi-level housing are provided on back boundaries.		<b>Relief sought</b> Housing densities to be a minimum of 600m <sup>2</sup> for allotments that adjoin the Norris Street properties and to restrict multi-level buildings. Further submission clarified that housing densities of 600m <sup>2</sup> were too high.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig F1460 A Meaclem & R Hyndman F1461 K & S Coffey		Supports submission 1421.01 Supports submission 1421.01 Supports submission 1421.01	

Submitter	Point	Topic	Type
1421 Pam Reveley	1421.02	Nuisance effects	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Dust and dirt nuisance has previously resulted from the development of new subdivisions. The submitter seeks compensation for nuisance effects associated with earthworks, particularly as the property is located in the direction of the prevailing north-west and north-east winds.		<b>Relief sought</b> Seeks compensation payment for any extra cleaning costs incurred as a result of airborne pollution.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1421.02	
1421 Pam Reveley	1421.03	Infrastructure	Unclear
<b>Summary</b> Concerned that the area behind 22 to 26 Norris Street is zoned for medium density housing as this is the location of a drainage area and soak pit to manage the areas stormwater. A long term resident has established that the soak pit was formed in this location and that a water race previously ran diagonally across the paddock. Any development of the site needs to recognise these drainage issues to ensure the adjoining properties are not subject to excessive run-off.		<b>Relief sought</b> Seeks reassurance that the existing soak pit is recognised and factored into any development to avoid any adverse drainage problems caused to the submitter's property. This has already been an issue in a year of high rainfall.	
1422 G & R Savage	1422.01 <u>Wish to be heard</u>	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Williams Street is a clu-de-sac with a narrow carriageway and should remain as such because: (i) of the large numbers of children walking across the Norris/Williams Street intersection, (ii) there is a playground used by small children; (iii) vehicles will compromise the safety of the proposed cycle/pedestrian footpath from the new subdivision to Williams Street; (iv) it is possible to pick up high speeds from the closed end of Williams Street, which arose from a rogue teenager living in the areas; and (v) there is a Play Centre and Plunket rooms at the Springs Road end of Williams Street.		<b>Relief sought</b> Williams Street from Norris Street to the opposite end of Springs Road to remain a cul-de-sac and the connection past the Williams Street playground be for pedestrian/cycle use only.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1422.01	
1422 G & R Savage	1422.02	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> High density housing is not in keeping with the character of Prebbleton, with the submitter being attracted to the area for the rural setting, outdoor living spaces and rural outlook. Support a retirement complex to attract quiet and non-threatening forms of development, but not general high density.		<b>Relief sought</b> High density housing should not be constructed unless as retirement housing. If there is no demand for elderly housing then high density housing should be restricted.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1422.02	
1422 G & R Savage	1422.03	Infrastructure	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Difficulties in draining stormwater have been experienced over the years and there is a concern that the new subdivision may increase the risk of flooding into adjacent properties.		<b>Relief sought</b> Reassurance is provided that steps have been taken to ensure that there will not be an increased drainage problem adjacent to existing properties.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig		Supports submission 1422.03	
1422 G & R Savage	1422.04	Nuisance effects	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Concerns with adverse construction effects, including dust and noise that will be increased by high winds. There needs to be sufficient notice of construction works and compensation paid where nuisance effects arise.		<b>Relief sought</b> Notification should be provided several months prior to construction commencing.	

Submitter		Point		Topic	Type
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1422.04					
1458	ECan	1458.01	<a href="#">Wish to be heard</a>	ODP's and District Plan rules	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Fails to include specifications for the internal road network, which adequately promote and facilitate the pedestrian movement network in the medium and hider density residential areas. (Notified as 1423.01)				<b>Relief sought</b> Road specifications for internal roads that provide footways on both sides of the roads. Exemption requested from Rule 5.1.1.4 and Rule 5.1.1.5 (specification for roads) to provide footpaths on both sides of the roads.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1458.01					
1458	ECan	1458.02		ODP's and District Plan rules	Amend
<b>Summary</b> The ODP fails to provide for connections from the subject site to the Meadow Mushrooms site to the south-east, as sought by the Draft Prebbleton Structure Plan. (Notified as 1423.02)				<b>Relief sought</b> Provide for connections to the Meadow Mushrooms site to the south-east.	
1458	ECan	1458.03		Cycle ways and walkways	Unclear
<b>Summary</b> Fails to fully have regard to the provisions of the Urban Development Strategy and the Selwyn District Walking and Cycling Strategy. (Notified as 1423.03)				<b>Relief sought</b> Unknown.	
1459	V & J Cannell LATE SUBMISSION	1459.01	<a href="#">Wish to be heard</a>	Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Attracted to Cairnbrae Drive and Waratah Park because it was a small scale subdivision that would be restricted to mainly residents 'traffic'. This site was carefully chosen for a future home as it was accessible by one 'through' road. This was to avoid the constant and large traffic movements currently being experienced at the submitter's lifestyle block, which is now on a thoroughfare for commuters. (Notified as 1433.01)				<b>Relief sought</b> No through road connecting Waratah Park with the application site.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1459.01					
1459	V & J Cannell LATE SUBMISSION	1459.02		Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Building 200 new households will severely affect the submitter's dream of a lifestyle in a nice quiet area. (Notified as 1433.02)				<b>Relief sought</b> No through road connecting Waratah Park with the application site.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1459.02					
1459	V & J Cannell LATE SUBMISSION	1459.03		Vehicle movements	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Major concern that the safety and security provided by a 'closed' subdivision that has only one access will be compromised. (Notified as 1433.03)				<b>Relief sought</b> No through road connecting Waratah Park with the application site.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412 Grant Craig Supports submission 1459.03					

Submitter		Point	Topic	Type
1459	V & J Cannell LATE SUBMISSION	1459.04	Section sizes, housing density	Oppose
<b>Summary</b> Advocate that the Council ensure that subdivisions don't become too big and continue to be of a similar size to existing developments to provide lifestyle, safety and security for residents. (Notified as 1433.04)			<b>Relief sought</b> Development is too large and should be a similar size to existing development in Prebbleton.	
<b>Further submissions were made by:</b> F1412      Grant Craig			Supports submission 1459.04	