

APPENDIX I

Summary of Submissions on the Notified PDP and Variation 1 –
General Support for the Proposed District Plan as Notified

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested																																																																																																												
Glenthorne Holdings Ltd & Glenthorn Station Ltd (393.20)	The submitter supports the submission from Federated Farmers.	Support for the submission from Federated Farmers (submission number 385).																																																																																																												
Philippa Innes (440.04)	Note: it would appear that the submitter seeks the same relief as sought by Federated Farmers in their submission (submission number 385).	Support submission by Federated Farmers of New Zealand (Inc.).																																																																																																												
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (385.01)	<p>With respect to the parts of the Proposed Plan that the submitter supports, they are satisfied that the Issues, Policies, Methods and Rules are necessary, appropriate and adequately justified in the Council's deliberations, extensive consultative process and Section 32 analysis. Any persons or organisations opposing such policies should be required to present their own Section 32 analysis.</p> <p>With respect to the parts of the Plan that the submitter opposes, or for which amendments are sought, the submitter is not satisfied that the Issues, Policies, Methods and Rules are necessary, appropriate and adequately justified in relation to the Council's intentions or the outcome of the extensive consultative process or their Section 32 analysis.</p>	Refer to Appendix A within the original submission for the submitter's Section 32 analysis.																																																																																																												
<i>Further Submissions</i>	<table> <tr> <td>F345</td><td>Department of Conservation</td><td>Oppose</td></tr> <tr> <td>952F</td><td>Mark Robert McAtamney</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>950F</td><td>Dwight William Love</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>890F</td><td>Lawrence Croft</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>921F</td><td>Christopher C A Gray</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>868F</td><td>Matthew Davis Bradley</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>869F</td><td>M G Bradley</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>894F</td><td>George Timothy Deans</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>931F</td><td>Scott Hussey</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>974F</td><td>Mount White Station Ltd</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>902F</td><td>P J Fleming</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>977F</td><td>Bruce Nell</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>936F</td><td>R F James</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>1026F</td><td>Philip W Wareing</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>996F</td><td>I H Reed</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>944F</td><td>Garry & Honoria Lamers</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>928F</td><td>B L & D J Haylock</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>920F</td><td>Peter Graham</td><td>Support</td></tr> </table>	F345	Department of Conservation	Oppose	952F	Mark Robert McAtamney	Support	950F	Dwight William Love	Support	890F	Lawrence Croft	Support	921F	Christopher C A Gray	Support	868F	Matthew Davis Bradley	Support	869F	M G Bradley	Support	894F	George Timothy Deans	Support	931F	Scott Hussey	Support	974F	Mount White Station Ltd	Support	902F	P J Fleming	Support	977F	Bruce Nell	Support	936F	R F James	Support	1026F	Philip W Wareing	Support	996F	I H Reed	Support	944F	Garry & Honoria Lamers	Support	928F	B L & D J Haylock	Support	920F	Peter Graham	Support	<table> <tr> <td>901F</td><td>Craig Eggleston</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>909F</td><td>Kelly Frame</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>958F</td><td>L McKenzie</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>908F</td><td>Bridget Frame</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>904F</td><td>David Florance</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>867F</td><td>L I Bradley</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>881F</td><td>Castle Hill Partnership</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>930F</td><td>Fiona J Hussey</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>919F</td><td>Brian Goddard</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>980F</td><td>L M Nicoll</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>903F</td><td>A D Florance</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>934F</td><td>H G and P M Innes</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>1039F</td><td>Guy Martin</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>978F</td><td>Lyn Nell</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>954F</td><td>John McDermott</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>926F</td><td>Rodger & Caroline Hardwick</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>913F</td><td>Margaret C George</td><td>Support</td></tr> <tr> <td>953F</td><td>Jim Macartney</td><td>Support</td></tr> </table>	901F	Craig Eggleston	Support	909F	Kelly Frame	Support	958F	L McKenzie	Support	908F	Bridget Frame	Support	904F	David Florance	Support	867F	L I Bradley	Support	881F	Castle Hill Partnership	Support	930F	Fiona J Hussey	Support	919F	Brian Goddard	Support	980F	L M Nicoll	Support	903F	A D Florance	Support	934F	H G and P M Innes	Support	1039F	Guy Martin	Support	978F	Lyn Nell	Support	954F	John McDermott	Support	926F	Rodger & Caroline Hardwick	Support	913F	Margaret C George	Support	953F	Jim Macartney	Support
F345	Department of Conservation	Oppose																																																																																																												
952F	Mark Robert McAtamney	Support																																																																																																												
950F	Dwight William Love	Support																																																																																																												
890F	Lawrence Croft	Support																																																																																																												
921F	Christopher C A Gray	Support																																																																																																												
868F	Matthew Davis Bradley	Support																																																																																																												
869F	M G Bradley	Support																																																																																																												
894F	George Timothy Deans	Support																																																																																																												
931F	Scott Hussey	Support																																																																																																												
974F	Mount White Station Ltd	Support																																																																																																												
902F	P J Fleming	Support																																																																																																												
977F	Bruce Nell	Support																																																																																																												
936F	R F James	Support																																																																																																												
1026F	Philip W Wareing	Support																																																																																																												
996F	I H Reed	Support																																																																																																												
944F	Garry & Honoria Lamers	Support																																																																																																												
928F	B L & D J Haylock	Support																																																																																																												
920F	Peter Graham	Support																																																																																																												
901F	Craig Eggleston	Support																																																																																																												
909F	Kelly Frame	Support																																																																																																												
958F	L McKenzie	Support																																																																																																												
908F	Bridget Frame	Support																																																																																																												
904F	David Florance	Support																																																																																																												
867F	L I Bradley	Support																																																																																																												
881F	Castle Hill Partnership	Support																																																																																																												
930F	Fiona J Hussey	Support																																																																																																												
919F	Brian Goddard	Support																																																																																																												
980F	L M Nicoll	Support																																																																																																												
903F	A D Florance	Support																																																																																																												
934F	H G and P M Innes	Support																																																																																																												
1039F	Guy Martin	Support																																																																																																												
978F	Lyn Nell	Support																																																																																																												
954F	John McDermott	Support																																																																																																												
926F	Rodger & Caroline Hardwick	Support																																																																																																												
913F	Margaret C George	Support																																																																																																												
953F	Jim Macartney	Support																																																																																																												
Crown Public Health Limited (219.37)	The submitter supports the general tenor, or words to the like effect, of classes of activities defined as Non-Complying Activities, and Discretionary Activities, in Rules 1 and 2 as consistent with sustainable management and measures promoting the avoidance, remedy and mitigation of adverse noise effects on people and communities.	<p>Adopt Rules 1 and 2.</p> <p>Make such consequential amendments including words to the like effect, to any provision of the plan to conform or complement the amendments sought in these submissions, with such amendments to syntax as the context may justify.</p>																																																																																																												
Crown Public Health Limited (219.49)	The submitter supports the general tenor, or words to the like effect, of classes of activities defined as Non-Complying Activities, and Discretionary Activities in Rules 1-7 as consistent with sustainable management and measures promoting the avoidance, remedy and mitigation of adverse noise effects on people and communities.	<p>Adopt 3.2 - Listed Activities, Rules 1-7.</p> <p>Make such consequential amendments including words to the like effect, to any provision of the plan to conform or complement the amendments sought in these submissions, with such amendments to syntax as the context may justify.</p>																																																																																																												
Saville, J.W. & J.L. (67.1)	The submitter supports the Proposed Plan.	Support for the Proposed Plan, and specifically pertaining to the Prebbleton area.																																																																																																												

Submission Point	Summary			Decision Requested		
Buckley, M.J. (139.2)	The submitter generally supports the Plan.			That the remainder of the Proposed Plan (apart from the amendments requested by the submitter under submission point 139.1(refer page 328)) be adopted.		
Ian Allen Upston (693.01)	The submitter relies on the Federated Farmers to protect their interests.			Support for Federation Farmers submission in opposition to the Proposed District Plan i.e. seek same amendments etc as sought by Federated Farmers (submission number 385).		
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (385.92)	The submitter supports all issues, objectives, policies and methods in Part II of the Proposed Plan except for those specifically commented on in other parts of this submission.			<p>Adopt all the issues, objectives, policies and methods in Part II of the Proposed Plan except for those specifically commented on in other parts of this submission (refer to submission points 385.03 to 385.56 and 385.88 for submissions on the issues, objectives and methods).</p> <p>Note: the submitter has placed this decision under '1.1 Land and Soil' in their submission. However, it appears as though the intention was that it be placed under 'Part II - Issues, Objectives and Policies'.</p>		
<i>Further Submissions</i>	953F	Jim Macartney	Support	950F	Dwight William Love	Support
	952F	Mark Robert McAtamney	Support	954F	John McDermott	Support
	958F	L McKenzie	Support	974F	Mount White Station Ltd	Support
	977F	Bruce Nell	Support	978F	Lyn Nell	Support
	980F	L M Nicoll	Support	996F	I H Reed	Support
	1026F	Philip W Wareing	Support	1039F	Guy Martin	Support
	944F	Garry & Honoria Lamers	Support	867F	L I Bradley	Support
	868F	Matthew Davis Bradley	Support	869F	M G Bradley	Support
	881F	Castle Hill Partnership	Support	890F	Lawrence Croft	Support
	894F	George Timothy Deans	Support	901F	Craig Eggleston	Support
	902F	P J Fleming	Support	903F	A D Florance	Support
	904F	David Florance	Support	908F	Bridget Frame	Support
	909F	Kelly Frame	Support	913F	Margaret C George	Support
	919F	Brian Goddard	Support	920F	Peter Graham	Support
	921F	Christopher C A Gray	Support	926F	Rodger & Caroline Hardwick	Support
	928F	B L & D J Haylock	Support	930F	Fiona J Hussey	Support
	931F	Scott Hussey	Support	936F	R F James	Support
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (385.90)	The submitter supports all the rules in the Rural Volume of the Proposed Plan except for as specifically commented in other parts of this submission.			Adopt all the rules in the Rural Volume of the Proposed Plan except for as specifically commented in other parts of this submission (refer to submission points 385.57 to 385.89 for submissions on the rules).		
<i>Further Submissions</i>	901F	Craig Eggleston	Support	950F	Dwight William Love	Support
	952F	Mark Robert McAtamney	Support	909F	Kelly Frame	Support
	869F	M G Bradley	Support	958F	L McKenzie	Support
	908F	Bridget Frame	Support	890F	Lawrence Croft	Support
	904F	David Florance	Support	868F	Matthew Davis Bradley	Support
	867F	L I Bradley	Support	881F	Castle Hill Partnership	Support
	894F	George Timothy Deans	Support	931F	Scott Hussey	Support
	919F	Brian Goddard	Support	930F	Fiona J Hussey	Support
	974F	Mount White Station Ltd	Support	980F	L M Nicoll	Support
	902F	P J Fleming	Support	937F	Warrick Roger James	Support
	951F	Antonia Louise McAtamney	Support	903F	A D Florance	Support
	1024F	Ross Urquhart	Support	968F	Bruce Miles	Support
	977F	Bruce Nell	Support	1023F	Louise Urquhart	Support
	979F	Oliver Newbegin	Support	934F	H G and P M Innes	Support
	1039F	Guy Martin	Support	936F	R F James	Support
	1026F	Philip W Wareing	Support	978F	Lyn Nell	Support
	996F	I H Reed	Support	954F	John McDermott	Support
	944F	Garry & Honoria Lamers	Support	926F	Rodger & Caroline Hardwick	Support

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	928F B L & D J Haylock Support	913F Margaret C George Support
	920F Peter Graham Support	953F Jim Macartney Support
	921F Christopher C A Gray Support	

APPENDIX II

Summary of Submissions on the Notified PDP and Variation 1 Submissions Addressed in Section 6.2 – General Provisions for Financial Contributions

(b)(i) General Support or Opposition

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Nancy Catherine Borrie (285.02)	The submitter supports Objective 1 and Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8.	Adopt Objective 1 and Policies 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 8. Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 285.03, page 165.
Springston Recreation Reserve and Associated Sports Clubs (104.1)	No particular reason given.	In relation to Financial Contributions Rules (Variation 1) adopt Objectives 1 and 2 on page 8 of the Variation.

(b)(ii) Application of Financial Contributions to Network Utility Operators

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Telecom New Zealand Limited (3.17)	The financial contribution rules for subdivision provide a specific exemption for lots for utilities, but there is not an equivalent exemption for utilities in the rules for developments. Utilities do not create a demand for these facilities, and accordingly should not be subject to any such contributions.	Amend Rule 4 to provide an exemption for "utilities" from payment of any development contributions.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	10 Transit New Zealand	Support
TrustPower Limited (6.6)	This provision is supported as it recognises that utilities include significant positive social and economic effects to the local community and that it is appropriate that in these circumstances financial contributions be reduced or waived.	Adopt Policy 7. Any similar amendments with like effect.
TrustPower Limited (690.14)	This provision is supported in principle, as it is important for the local authority to recognise circumstances where a financial contribution is inappropriate. However, provision should be made in Policy 10 for other circumstances where requiring a financial contribution may be inappropriate. In this respect, utilities should not be required to pay financial contributions where it can be demonstrated that the utility provides significant social and economic benefits to the community and/or does not increase the demand for other services as a result of its development. Policy 10 is otherwise contrary to the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act and does not promote sound planning practice.	Amend Policy 10 by including the following: "h. The utility provided significant social and economic benefit to the community. i. It can be demonstrated that the development or enhancement of the utility will not create additional demand for other services." Any similar amendments with like effect; Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Policy 10 as proposed in this Submission.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	579 Orion New Zealand Ltd	Support
	687 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support
Meteorological Service of New Zealand Ltd (516.09)	Meteorological activities do not make a demand on Council provided services and should not be subject to any requirements in respect of financial contributions when they do not have any adverse effects that require mitigation.	No financial contribution will be imposed on meteorological activities establishing on sites less than or equal to 500m ² in area. Any consequential amendments required to give full effect to the relief sought by this submission or any alternative relief that gives the same or similar effect. Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 516.14, page 303.
Orion New Zealand Ltd	Network utility operators should not have to pay financial contributions on the "subdivision"	Delete Rule 1.27.

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
(579.19)	<p>or "development" of sites for utility purposes. The stated purpose of financial contributions is that the subdivision or development of land may require the extension of public infrastructure to service the subdivision or development, and create a need for open space. Utility sites and developments make no such demands, and actually build up the public infrastructure. They should not be penalised for doing so.</p> <p>The "Reasons for Rules" on page 314 state that the rules "enable the Council to take financial contributions from 'developers'". Network utility operators service developments and are not "developers" in the sense referred to in this section. It should therefore be clarified that financial contributions are not levied on sites created for network utility buildings or structures.</p>	<p>And any consequential amendments to the Plan to reflect the relief sought in this submission.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 579.11 and 579.12, page 321, 517.18, page 302, 579.19, page 236 and 579.20, page 236.</p> <p>Note: the submitter also made a submission on the Township Volume of the Proposed Plan - refer submission 170.</p>
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	516 Meteorological Service of New	Support
	687 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support
Orion New Zealand Ltd (579.20)	<p>Network utility operators should not have to pay financial contributions on the "subdivision" or "development" of sites for utility purposes. The stated purpose of financial contributions is that the subdivision or development of land may require the extension of public infrastructure to service the subdivision or development, and create a need for open space. Utility sites and developments make no such demands, and actually build up the public infrastructure. They should not be penalised for doing so.</p> <p>The "Reasons for Rules" on page 314 state that the rules "enable the Council to take financial contributions from 'developers'". Network utility operators service developments and are not "developers" in the sense referred to in this section. It should therefore be clarified that financial contributions are not levied on sites created for network utility buildings or structures.</p>	<p>Delete Rule 10.1.</p> <p>And any consequential amendments to the Plan to reflect the relief sought in this submission.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 579.11 and 579.12, page 321, 517.18, page 302, 579.19, page 236 and 579.20, page 236.</p> <p>Note: the submitter also made a submission on the Township Volume of the Proposed Plan - refer submission 170.</p>
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	516 Meteorological Service of New	Support
	753 Telecom New Zealand Limited	Support
	687 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support
Orion New Zealand Ltd (579.18)	<p>Network utility operators should not have to pay financial contributions on the "subdivision" or "development" of sites for utility purposes. The stated purpose of financial contributions is that the subdivision or development of land may require the extension of public infrastructure to service the subdivision or development, and create a need for open space. Utility sites and developments make no such demands, and actually build up the public infrastructure. They should not be penalised for doing so.</p> <p>The "Reasons for Rules" on page 314 state that the rules "enable the Council to take financial contributions from 'developers'". Network utility operators service developments and are not "developers" in the sense referred to in this section. It should therefore be clarified that financial contributions are not</p>	<p>That a new paragraph be added at the end of the introduction to read:</p> <p>"Nothing in this Part applies to network utility operators in relation to subdivision and/or development of utility sites."</p> <p>And any consequential amendments to the Plan to reflect the relief sought in this submission.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 579.11 and 579.12, page 321, 517.18, page 302, 579.19, page 236 and 579.20, page 236.</p> <p>Note: the submitter also made a submission on the Township Volume of the Proposed Plan - refer submission 170.</p>

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	levied on sites created for network utility buildings or structures.	
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	516 Meteorological Service of New	Support
	687 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support
Transpower New Zealand Limited (687.09)	<p>It is the submitter's view that financial contributions on resource consents are taken for essentially three reasons - reserve contributions, meeting servicing and infrastructure requirements and avoiding, remedying or mitigating environmental effects from the activity concerned. The submitter considers that while network utilities should be required to pay connection fees they should not be subject to the other requirements for financial contributions. The reasons for this are listed below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Utilities do not generate a demand for services, most are not staffed and thus do not require the provision of services for which financial contributions are required, such as reserves, reserve fund contributions and roads. Facilities such as substations are usually planned with the inclusion of visual buffers and landscaping so that the impacts on the visual attractiveness are mitigated as far as possible. 2. Utilities are essential services which promote the social and economic well being of the community and thereby warrant specific consideration. Expansion of network utility services is undertaken in response to consumer demand and as such the provision of these services should not be subject to additional costs. 3. Any financial contribution should directly relate to the effects that are being generated or provide some positive benefit to mitigate the effects generated. Any new or upgraded transmission line does not generate a demand for reserves. Nor do transmission lines have any real effect on the infrastructure as they form part of the essential infrastructure of the district and their sole purpose is to service the demand of other activities. <p>The submitter is opposed to the general imposition of financial contributions on permitted activities, particularly in relation to matters other than "connection fees". Such ability, as proposed in the provision will enable the Council to effectively tax all development.</p>	<p>That Network Utilities such as the submitter be exempt from financial contributions.</p> <p>And any consequential amendments made necessary as a result of the matters raised in these submissions and any other relief as to give effect to the submissions.</p>
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	385 Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose
	950 Dwight William Love	Oppose
	909 Kelly Frame	Oppose
	869 M G Bradley	Oppose
	908 Bridget Frame	Oppose
	857 Dian Anderson	Oppose
	868 Matthew Davis Bradley	Oppose
	934 H G and P M Innes	Oppose
	864 The Big River Company Ltd	Oppose
	881 Castle Hill Partnership	Oppose
	872 Samuel Bernard Bradley	Oppose
	870 Meredith Verna Bradley	Oppose
	930 Fiona J Hussey	Oppose

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	885 Terry Anthony Clemens	Oppose
	1033 Windwhistle District Society Inc	Oppose
	937 Warrick Roger James	Oppose
	1024 Ross Urquhart	Oppose
	977 Bruce Nell	Oppose
	979 Oliver Newbegin	Oppose
	887 K J Coe	Unclear
	1039 Guy Martin	Oppose
	978 Lyn Nell	Oppose
	1011 G E Sime	Oppose
	884 B E Clark	Unclear
	753 Telecom New Zealand Limited	Support
	952 Mark Robert McAtamney	Oppose
	925 J A H Guild	Oppose
	958 L McKenzie	Oppose
	890 Lawrence Croft	Oppose
	889 Amanda Jane Crow	Oppose
	867 L I Bradley	Oppose
	874 Jack Bernard Bradley-Diggie	Oppose
	866 David Orion Bradley	Oppose
	871 Penelope Ann Bradley	Oppose
	873 Tisha Jane Bradley	Oppose
	933 Gerard Wright Innes	Oppose
	931 Scott Hussey	Oppose
	932 Diana Margaret Innes	Oppose
	1012 Jacqueline Mary Sime	Oppose
	951 Antonia Louise McAtamney	Oppose
	968 Bruce Miles	Oppose
	1023 Louise Urquhart	Oppose
	862 S T and C J Bell Ltd and R D Bell	Oppose
	1000 Margaret Robertson	Oppose
	1026 Philip W Wareing	Oppose
	954 John McDermott	Oppose
	944 Garry & Honoria Lamers	Oppose
	1022 Tripp Partnership	Oppose
TrustPower Limited (690.19)	Rule X is opposed because it implies that utilities will be required to pay financial contributions for any effects their development induces. Utilities provide the community with significant social and economic benefits. Furthermore, the development of utilities seldom results in an increase in demand for a service in the community (such as recreational reserves). In this respect, Rule X is contrary to the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act and does not promote sound planning practice.	<p>Add the following note to Rules 1, 2, 3, 4 of Rule X:</p> <p>“Given the significant social and economic benefits induced, utilities will not be required to pay financial contributions.”</p> <p>Any similar amendments with like effect;</p> <p>Any consequential amendments that stem from the amendment of Rule X as proposed in this Submission.</p>
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	687 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support
Meteorological Service of New Zealand Ltd (516.14)	Meteorological activities do not make a demand on Council provided services and should not be subject to any requirements in respect of financial contributions when they do not have any adverse effects that require mitigation.	<p>No financial contribution will be imposed on meteorological activities establishing on sites less than or equal to 500m² in area.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 516.09, page 236.</p>
Transpower New Zealand Limited (100)	The submitter considers that network utilities should not be subject to the other requirements for financial contributions for the following reasons: Utility operators, such as Transpower do not generate a demand for services as most are not staffed and thus do not require the provision of services for which financial contributions are required, such as reserves and reserve fund contributions; utilities are an essential service that promote	Amend the financial contribution rules as they relate to Variation 1 of the Proposed Plan to ensure that financial contributions will not be required on permitted activities and activities associated with the transmission and distribution of electricity.

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	the social and economic well being of the community and thereby warrant specific consideration; any financial contribution should directly relate to the effects that are being generated or provide some positive benefit to mitigate the effects generated. Any new upgrade of transmission line does not generate a demand for reserves nor do transmission lines have any real effect on the infrastructure with a sole purpose to service the demand of other activities.	
Orion New Zealand Limited (170.7)	Network utility operators should not have to pay financial contributions on the "subdivision" or "development" of sites for utility purposes. The stated purpose of financial contributions is that the subdivision or development of land may require the extension of public infrastructure to service the subdivision or development, and create a need for open space. Utility sites and developments make no such demands, and actually build up the public infrastructure. They should not be penalised for doing so.	That a new paragraph be added at the end of "5.1 Purposes" on page 366 to read: Nothing in this Part applies to network utility operators in relation to subdivision and/or development of utility sites. Consequential amendments to the plan to reflect the relief sought in this submission.
	Further Submission	Support/Oppose
	49 Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support
Meteorological Service of New Zealand Limited (194.17)	Meteorological activities do not make a demand on Council provided services and should not be subject to any requirements in respect of financial contributions when they do not have any adverse effects that require mitigation.	Amend Section 5 to include the following: "No financial contribution will be imposed on meteorological activities establishing on sites less than or equal to 400m2 in area." AND any consequential amendments required to give full effect to the relief sought in this submission OR any alternative relief that gives the same or similar effect.
Telecom Mobile Limited (83.12)	The financial contribution rules for subdivision provide a specific exemption for lots for utilities, but there is not an equivalent exemption for utilities in the rules for developments. Utilities do not create a demand for open space and recreation facilities, and accordingly should not be subject to any such contributions.	Amend Rule 4 to provide an exemption for "utilities" from payment of any development contributions.
	Further Submission	Support/Oppose
	10 Transit New Zealand	Support

(b)(iii)Payment of Financial Contributions at Subdivision or Land Use

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Eclectic Energy (374.10a)	The submitter requests that if the Council has already charged a financial contribution for each lot on a subdivision, it should not be able to put a rule in the Plan which allows it to 'double-dip' by charging a second time when a residential unit is erected.	That if the Council has already charged a financial contribution for each lot on a subdivision, it should not be able to put a rule in the Plan which allows it to charge a second time when a residential unit is erected. Note: the Rule 1.21 relates to Rule X Financial Contributions, X(2) - Reserves and Recreation Areas and Facilities, page 306, in particular Form and Method to Determine Contribution - Land Use ii. Note: the submitter also refers to Rule 2, page 306. Refer to submission point

		374.11, page 306.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	Eclectic Energy (F374)	Support

(b)(v) Use of Discretion to Take Financial Contributions

Submission No.	Summary	Decision Requested
Nancy Catherine Borrie (285.03)	The submitter opposes Objective 2, and Policy 10 (f) and (g). A reduction in financial contributions is tantamount to a subsidy by Council and existing ratepayers. Ratepayers should be advised and consulted prior to the granting of a subsidy. This would be a more transparent process.	Where Council wishes to grant a reduction in financial contributions, the matter be referred to the relevant Area Community Board, Area Board, Advisory Committee, Township Community etc. for comment and confirmation. Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 285.02, page 165.
Prebbleton Community Association Inc. (191.43)	The reduction of financial contributions for recreation reserves and recreation facilities should not be considered lightly as a reduction in these facilities within any particular community could have adverse affects on the amenity value of that area at the expense of increased benefit to another area. Therefore reductions in contributions should only be considered if Council is completely satisfied that there will not be such an adverse effect. To ensure that there is a commitment to the proper provision of these services the reduction should not exceed 50% of the contribution payable. It is considered unreasonable to expect other contributors or ratepayers to subsidise facilities for development in certain areas. The authority for Council to reduce the amount of financial contributions levied in any other circumstances where it thinks fit is not a transparent provision and should be deleted.	That policy 10 be amended by maximising the discretion of Council to reduce financial credits to 50% of the financial contribution payable. That Policy 10 f. and g. (of Variation No.1) be deleted. The decision sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross referencing of policies. It is expected that if Council adopts the submission then it will make any subsequent alterations which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	190 Borrie, N.C.	Support
Victor Melvyn Challies (332.08)	The reduction of financial contributions for recreation reserves and recreational facilities should not be considered lightly as a reduction in these facilities within any particular community could have adverse affects on the amenity value of that area at the expense of increased benefit to another area. Therefore reductions in contributions should only be considered if Council is completely satisfied that there will not be such an adverse effect. To ensure that there is a commitment to the proper provision of these services the reduction should not exceed 50% of the contribution payable. It is considered unreasonable to expect other contributors or ratepayers to subsidise facilities for development in certain areas. The authority for Council to reduce the amount of financial contributions levied in any other circumstances where it thinks fit is not a transparent provision and should be deleted.	Amend Policy 10 by maximising the discretion of Council to reduce financial credits to 50% of the financial contribution payable. Delete Policy 10 f. and g. Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan. Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 332.05, page 163, 332.06, page 164, 332.07, page 167, 332.08, page 170, 332.28, page 306 and 332.29, page 312.
Prebbleton Community Association (599.08)	The reduction of financial contributions for recreation reserves and recreational facilities should not be considered lightly as a reduction in these facilities within any particular community could have adverse affects on the amenity value of that area at the expense of increased benefit to another area. Therefore	Amend Policy 10 by maximising the discretion of Council to reduce financial credits to 50% of the financial contribution payable. Delete Policy 10 f. and g. Note: Some of the decisions sought may

Submission No.	Summary	Decision Requested
	<p>reductions in contributions should only be considered if Council is completely satisfied that there will not be such an adverse effect. To ensure that there is a commitment to the proper provision of these services the reduction should not exceed 50% of the contribution payable.</p> <p>It is considered unreasonable to expect other contributors or ratepayers to subsidise facilities for development in certain areas.</p> <p>The authority for Council to reduce the amount of financial contributions levied in any other circumstances where it thinks fit is not a transparent provision and should be deleted.</p>	<p>require some alterations to the wording or cross referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 599.05, page 163, 559.06, page 164, 559.07, page 167, 559.08, page 170, 559.28, page 306 and 559.29, page 312.</p>
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	1020 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Support

(c)(i) Taking Financial Contributions in Land

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
CDL Land New Zealand Limited (135.5)	<p>The way the provisions are worded presently leaves no room for discussion or negotiation. There may well be site specific matters that determine the form of contribution that should be taken. It is submitted that it would be better to be able to discuss the form the contribution is to take before the consent is issued rather than having to appeal the decision.</p>	<p>Amend Rule 1 by adding after the words "The form of the contribution shall be determined by the Council." the following:</p> <p>"This determination will be made following the consideration of any request by the party paying the contribution as to what form it should take. The reasons for this determination shall be included in the resource consent granted including why any request by the party paying the contribution has been accepted or rejected."</p> <p>And all other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to issues, strategies, objectives, policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested another decision on this issue - refer submission point 135.8 page 339.</p>
	Further Submission	Support/Oppose
	837 White, C.E.	Oppose

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
K.J. & J.J. Partnership (180.11)	The way the provisions are worded presently leaves no room for discussions or negotiations. It would be better to be able to discuss the form the contribution is to take before a consent is issued rather than having to appeal the decision to have the matter resolved.	<p>Amend Section 5.3 Financial Contribution Rules - Rule 1, by adding after the words "The form of the contribution shall be determined by the Council." the following words: " This determination will be made following the consideration of any request by the party paying the contribution as to what form it should take.</p> <p>The reasons for this determination shall be included in any resource consent granted including why any request by the party paying the contribution has been accepted or rejected."</p> <p>All other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to issues, strategies, objectives, policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer submission point 180.12 page 340.</p>
CDL Land New Zealand Limited (135.8)	The way the provisions are worded presently leaves no room for discussion or negotiation. It is submitted that it would be better to be able to discuss the form the contribution is to take before the consent is issued rather than having to appeal the decision.	<p>Amend Rule 3 by adding after the words "The form of the contribution shall be determined by the Council." the following: "This determination will be made following the consideration of any request by the party paying the contribution as to what form it should take. The reasons for this determination shall be included in the resource consent granted including why any request by the party paying the contribution has been accepted or rejected."</p> <p>And all other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to issues, strategies, objectives, policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer submission point 135.5 page 337.</p>
	Further Submission	Support/Oppose
	837 White, C.E.	Oppose
K.J. & J.J. Partnership (180.12)	The way the provisions are worded presently leaves no room for discussions or negotiations. It would be better to be able to discuss the form the contribution is to take before a consent is issued rather than having to appeal the decision to have the matter resolved.	<p>Amend Section 5.3 Financial Contribution Rules - Rule 3, by adding after the words "The form of the contribution shall be determined by the Council." the following words: " This determination will be made following the consideration of any request by the party paying the contribution as to what form it should take.</p> <p>The reasons for this determination shall be included in any resource consent granted including why any request by the party paying the contribution has been accepted or rejected."</p> <p>All other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to issues, strategies, objectives,</p>

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
		<p>policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer submission point 180.11 page 337.</p>
Eclectic Energy (374.10b)	The submitter requests that if the Council has already charged a financial contribution for each lot on a subdivision, it should not be able to put a rule in the Plan which allows it to 'double-dip' by charging a second time when a residential unit is erected.	<p>The Council should not have the decision as to whether money or land is taken as a contribution for the erection of a new residential unit. The payment should be money, unless the Council and the owner mutually agree on land as the form of payment.</p> <p>Note: the Rule 1.21 relates to Rule X Financial Contributions, X(2) - Reserves and Recreation Areas and Facilities, page 306, in particular Form and Method to Determine Contribution - Land Use ii.</p> <p>Note: the submitter also refers to Rule 2, page 306. Refer to submission point 374.11, page 306.</p>
	Further Submission	Support/Oppose
	374 Eclectic Energy	Support
Eclectic Energy (374.11)	That the Council should not have the decision as to whether money or land is taken as a contribution for the erection of a new residential unit. The payment should be money, unless the Council and the owner mutually agree on land as the form of payment.	<p>Objection to Rule X - Financial Contributions in particular with reference to Rule 1.21, page 216.</p> <p>Note: the submitter also refers to Rule 1.21, page 216. Refer to submission point 374.10, page 216.</p> <p>Note: The Rule 1.21 relates to Rule X Financial Contributions, X(2) - Reserves and Recreation Areas and Facilities, page 306, in particular Form and Method to Determine Contribution - Land Use ii.</p>
	Further Submission	Support/Oppose
	374 Eclectic Energy	Support

(c)(ii) Provisions for Infrastructure and Utilities

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Transit New Zealand (686.25)	Policy 1 (for the District Council to take financial contributions for the upgrading and provision of new roads) is supported by the submitter.	Retain current wording of Policy 1.
Transit New Zealand (10.6)	Policy 1 needs to be broadened to make it clear that the Council may also recover up to 100% of the costs of upgrading road networks and intersections as a result of new residential and business activities.	Amend Policy 1 in Section 4.4 - Financial Contributions by inserting the following words between "utilities" and ", services": "(including road networks and intersections)".
Richardson, J. (58.7)	The submitter supports this Policy but comments that the pedestrian and cycle recreation routes away from roads are a valuable resource for Lincoln township. They are particularly desirable if substantial residential expansions is envisaged. If Lincoln is to be a desirable place to live then outdoor recreational facilities need to be provided for and maintained.	Add to Policy 3 "To acquire or negotiate access routes for walkways in the vicinity of townships."
Selwyn District Council (238.1)	The addition of a note to the section of Rule 4 which explains how costs are calculated is sought, to clarify that any financial contribution for upgrades to the road network	<p>Add the following note beneath Rule 4.2.1 (of Variation 1 - Financial Contributions):</p> <p>"Note – any works to the road network</p>

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	may also include the costs of ancillary works, e.g. street lighting, signage, landscaping or beautification, and traffic calming.	include ancillary works such as street lighting, signage, landscaping or beautification, and traffic calming."
Catholic Diocese of Christchurch (171.16)	The submitter opposes Policy 12, which limits the period in which the Council levies financial contributions for privately funded works (beyond those required to serve the developers own activities), to a maximum of 10 years. The time limit may discourage development from what may be far-sighted proposals to provide excess capacity in anticipation of further development, and thereby avoid or reduce the need to upsize or duplicate roading or utility services in the future. It is not unusual for development of neighbourhood to extend beyond a 10 year period, and it would be unfair for another developer to be able to take advantage of the original developer's excess capacity without compensating him/her accordingly. By contrast, there is no limit on the recovery of costs of excess capacity funding by the Council.	Amend Policy 12 of Variation 1 on page 15 (Section 5 Financial Contributions Rule) by deleting " - 10 years from the time the excess capacity is able to be used by other activities"
	Further Submission	Support/Oppose
	163 Chaney, K.F.	Oppose

(d) Reserves (i) General Submissions

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Prebbleton Community Association (599.05)	<p>It is submitted that this Section does not recognise that reserves and public facilities are used by all sections of the community. The creation of any allotment capable of having a dwelling unit erected upon it, regardless of size (density) and zoning, should be subject to the payment of a reserve contribution for the purposes of providing for local reserves and public facility requirements.</p> <p>That the financial contribution section be amended and that objective, policies and rules are amended or re-written to ensure that the principles embodied in submission points 599.01, page 151, 599.35, page 26, 599.02, page 83, 599.03, page 109 and 599.04, page 159 are included and implemented.</p>	<p>Amend the financial contribution section and that objective, policies and rules are amended or re-written to ensure that the principles embodied in submissions 599.01, page 151, 599.35, page 26, 599.02, page 83, 599.03, page 109 and 599.04, page 159 are included and implemented.</p> <p>Council should prepare a proper reserve and public facilities development plan for each community following a full assessment of the present and future needs of the local community areas. The development plan should be prepared in consultation with residents.</p> <p>Local reserve contributions should only be used within the community area in which they are collected.</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 599.01, page 151, 599.35, page 26, 599.02, page 83, 599.03, page 109, 599.04, page 159, 599.05, page 163, 599.06, page 164, 599.07, page 167, 599.08, page 170, 599.28, page 306 and 599.29, page 312.</p>
Victor Melvyn Challies (332.05)	It is submitted that this Section does not recognise that reserves and public facilities are	Amend the financial contribution section and that objective, policies and rules are amended

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	<p>used by all sections of the community. The creation of any allotment capable of having a dwelling unit erected upon it, regardless of size (density) and zoning, should be subject to the payment of a reserve contribution for the purposes of providing for local reserves and public facility requirements.</p> <p>That the financial contribution section be amended and that objective, policies and rules are amended or re-written to ensure that the principles embodied in submission points 332.01, page 151, 332.35, page 26, 332.02, page 83, 332.03, page 109 and 332.04, page 159 are included and implemented.</p>	<p>or re-written to ensure that the principles embodied in submissions 332.01, page 151, 332.35, page 26, 332.02, page 83, 332.03, page 109 and 332.04, page 159 are included and implemented.</p> <p>Council should prepare a proper reserve and public facilities development plan for each community following a full assessment of the present and future needs of the local community areas. The development plan should be prepared in consultation with residents.</p> <p>Local reserve contributions should only be used within the community area in which they are collected.</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 332.01, page 151, 332.35, page 26, 332.02, page 83, 332.03, page 109, 332.04, page 159, 332.05, page 163, 332.06, page 164, 332.07, page 167, 332.08, page 170, 332.28, page 306 and 332.29, page 312.</p>
New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (140.63)	The submitter supports the discussion under Maintaining and Enhancing the Environment that refers to the contribution heritage sites make to the attractiveness of Selwyn.	Adopt the reference to heritage sites in the discussion under Maintaining and Enhancing the Environment.
Victor Melvyn Challies (332.06)	The key features of the strategy do not refer to a reserve contribution as a percentage of the market value of a property.	<p>Add the following to the Key features in II - Strategy:</p> <p>"A reserve contribution is also charged for residential units on the basis of a % of market value."</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 332.05, page 163, 332.06, page 164, 332.07, page 167, 332.08, page 170, 332.28, page 306 and 332.29, page 312.</p>
Prebbleton Community Association (599.06)	The key features of the strategy do not refer to a reserve contribution as a percentage of the market value of a property.	<p>Add the following to the Key features in II - Strategy:</p> <p>"A reserve contribution is also charged for residential units on the basis of a % of market value."</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the</p>

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
		Plan. Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 599.05, page 163, 559.06, page 164, 559.07, page 167, 559.08, page 170, 559.28, page 306 and 559.29, page 312.
Prebbleton Community Association Inc. (191.41)	The key features of the strategy do not refer to a reserve contribution as a percentage of the market value of a property.	Amend the Financial Contribution, II -Strategy (page 7) of Variation No.1 so that a reserve contribution is charged for residential units on the basis of a % of market value. The decision sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies. It is expected that if Council adopts the submission then it will make any subsequent alterations which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.
Springston Recreation Reserve and Associated Sports Clubs (104.2)	No particular reason given.	In relation to Financial Contributions Rules (Variation 1) adopt Policy 5 on page 10.
Christchurch City Council (295.31)	The submitter supports the collection of reserve contribution from residential development for reserve purposes and the protection of special landscape and ecological values. Flexibility to offset that contribution where land is given or works undertaken towards protection or enhancement of environmental or cultural values is also supported. Increased financial contributions will allow SDC greater potential capability to partner with the City on joint venture open space initiatives, walkways and protection of ecological and scenic areas of value to people of both authorities eg. the inner plains in the Prebbleton to Halswell area and the southern Port Hills.	Retain Policy 5. Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 295.32, page 168.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	293 RD, JR & DJ Butt, JS Bisphan, DJ Clark	Oppose
Lincoln Community Committee (129.20)	Support Policy 9.	Adopt Policy 9.
Borrie, N.C. (201.11)	Amend Policy 9, by adding a definition of "sufficient". Reserves are used for many activities and are important for the well being of present and future generations in terms of S.5 of the Act. "Sufficient" is vague and uncertain in its effect. It needs to be more specific and not left to Council's discretion.	Add a definition of "sufficient" in relation to Policy 9. Policy 9 states "Ensure residents in Selwyn District have access to sufficient reserve areas to meet their needs for space for active and passive recreation." Note: refer also to submission 201.12 (page 342) for inclusion in the Definitions Section of the Plan.
Borrie, N.C. (201.12)	Reserves are used for many activities and are important for the well being of present and future generations in terms of S.5 of the Act. "Sufficient" is vague and uncertain in its effect. It needs to be more specific and not left to Council's discretion.	Add a definition of "sufficient". Note: the submitter seeks under submission 201.11(page 98) that a definition be added to the Plan in respect of Policy 9 on page 98. Policy 9 states "Ensure residents in Selwyn District have access to sufficient reserve areas to meet their needs for space for active and passive recreation."
New Zealand	The submitter supports Environmental Result 2	Retain Environmental Result 2.

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (559.58)	that refers to the contribution new residential units are required to make towards protecting and enhancing areas of special landscape, cultural, heritage values.	
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	912 Friends of Otahuna Valley	Support
Prebbleton Community Association Inc. (191.44)	One of the main purposes of the financial contributions is to provide both recreation reserves and recreational facilities for communities. This is not clearly identified in the Rule. The provision of these facilities should be determined by proper assessment of each community's needs, and the production of Asset Development and Management Plans with associated Long-Term Financial Strategies to show how and when the necessary facilities will be provided. District contributions (flat fee) should be used for projects which benefit the District and Local contributions should only be used for the benefit of the communities in which they are collected.	That a further "Purpose" be added to Rule (2) as follows: "7. To provide recreation reserves and recreational facilities to service Communities. Such facilities to be determined by an assessment of the needs of each community and provide for in an Recreation Reserve and Recreational Facilities Development and Management Plan including a Long-Term Financial Strategy." The decision sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies. It is expected that if Council adopts the submission then it will make any subsequent alterations which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.
Prebbleton Community Association (599.28)	One of the main purpose of the financial contributions is to provide both recreation reserves and recreational facilities for communities. This is not clearly identified in the Rule. The provision of these facilities should be determined by a proper assessment of each community's needs, and the production of Asset Management Plans with associated Long Term Financial Strategies to show how and when the necessary facilities will be provided and or developed. District contributions (flat fee) should be used for projects which benefit the District and Local contributions should only be used for the benefit of the communities in which they are collected.	Add a further "Purpose" to Rule (2) as follows: "7. To provide recreation reserves and recreational facilities to service local communities. Such facilities to be determined by an assessment of the needs of each community and provided for in Asset Management Plan with associated Long Term Financial Strategies to provide for and develop the required facilities." Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan. Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 599.05, page 163, 559.06, page 164, 559.07, page 167, 559.08, page 170, 559.28, page 306 and 559.29, page 312.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	385 Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose
Victor Melvyn Challies (332.28)	One of the main purpose of the financial contributions is to provide both recreation reserves and recreational facilities for communities. This is not clearly identified in the Rule. The provision of these facilities should be determined by a proper assessment of each community's needs, and the production of Asset Management Plans with associated Long Term Financial Strategies to show how and when the necessary facilities will be provided and or developed. District contributions (flat fee) should be used for projects which benefit the District and Local contributions should only be used for the benefit of the communities in which they are collected.	Add a further "Purpose" to Rule (2) as follows: "7. To provide recreation reserves and recreational facilities to service local communities. Such facilities to be determined by an assessment of the needs of each community and provided for in Asset Management Plan with associated Long Term Financial Strategies to provide for and develop the required facilities." Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
		Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 332.05, page 163, 332.06, page 164, 332.07, page 167, 332.08, page 170, 332.28, page 306 and 332.29, page 312.

(d)(ii) Reserve Contributions in Rural and Business Zones

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Springston Recreation Reserve and Associated Sports Clubs (104.3)	This appears to have been missing. Add for consistency.	In relation to Financial Contributions Rules (Variation 1) amend Policy 6 on page 10 by adding after "for outdoor recreation reserves," and before "within" the words and "community facilities".
Prebbleton Community Association Inc. (191.42)	The policy is not adequately worded in that it does not refer to recreational facilities and to residential neighbourhoods rather than communities. Reserves and recreational facilities are not just for the benefit neighbourhood but for the wider community. (Reference - Community reserve rating areas). The explanation given for reserve contributions not being levied on allotments of more than 4 hectares does not recognise the reality of the use of reserves and recreational facilities. The fact is that people on areas of more than 4 hectares use these facilities as much as Township people. The comment that Council will not in most cases take money as a reserve contribution cannot be substantiated until a full assessment has been made of the various needs of the communities from which the contributions are taken. The comment shows lack of appreciation of the benefits of planned local recreational facilities in developing environments.	<p>That the wording of Policy 6 be deleted and the following substituted: "To take a further financial contribution from any additional residential unit erected in a Business, Rural or Living Zone to provide for recreation reserves and recreational facilities, within local community areas."</p> <p>Under the Explanation and Reasons for Policy 6 (second to last paragraph) that the reason a reserve contribution is to be taken from allotments of more than 4 hectares be deleted.</p> <p>Also under the Explanation and Reasons for Policy 6 (final paragraph) the reference: "In most cases the Council will take the contribution as money and use the money to purchase the allotments within the subdivision, which it thinks will make appropriate reserves and playgrounds." be deleted. And rewrite the last sentence of that paragraph to read "The Council may choose to take land, if the land offered is of a suitable size, and shape and in an appropriate location for a community recreation reserve or recreational facility."</p> <p>The decision sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies. It is expected that if Council adopts the submission then it will make any subsequent alterations which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p>
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	190 Borrie, N.C.	Support
Federated Farmers of New Zealand (385.56)	The submitter supports the policy that a "reserve contribution is not levied on rural allotments which are 4 hectares or more in size because these allotments are large enough to maintain open space and to have their own areas for outdoor recreation on site.	The submitter supports Policy 6 - Explanation and Reasons.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	901 Craig Eggleston	Support
	952 Mark Robert McAtamney	Support
	869 M G Bradley	Support
	908 Bridget Frame	Support
	904 David Florance	Support
	868 Matthew Davis Bradley	Support
	894 George Timothy Deans	Support
	919 Brian Goddard	Support
	930 Fiona J Hussey	Support
	902 P J Fleming	Support

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	977 Bruce Nell	Support
	1039 Guy Martin	Support
	978 Lyn Nell	Support
	996 I H Reed	Support
	926 Rodger & Caroline Hardwick	Support
	913 Margaret C George	Support
	920 Peter Graham	Support
	921 Christopher C A Gray	Support
	950 Dwight William Love	Support
	958 L McKenzie	Support
	909 Kelly Frame	Support
	890 Lawrence Croft	Support
	867 L I Bradley	Support
	881 Castle Hill Partnership	Support
	931 Scott Hussey	Support
	980 L M Nicoll	Support
	974 Mount White Station Ltd	Support
	903 A D Florance	Support
	934 H G and P M Innes	Support
	936 R F James	Support
	1026 Philip W Wareing	Support
	944 Garry & Honoria Lamers	Support
	928 B L & D J Haylock	Support
	954 John McDermott	Support
	953 Jim Macartney	Support
Victor Melvyn Challies (332.07)	<p>The policy is not adequately worded in that it does not refer to recreational facilities, and, refers to residential neighbourhoods rather than communities. Reserves and recreational facilities are not just for the benefit of the neighbourhood but for the wider community. The explanation given for reserve contributions not being levied on allotments of more than 4 hectares does not recognise the reality of the use of reserves and recreational facilities. The fact is that people on areas of more than 4 hectares use these facilities as much as Township people.</p> <p>The comment that Council will in most cases take money as a reserve contribution cannot be substantiated until a full assessment has been made of the various needs of the communities from which the contributions are taken. This comment shows a lack of appreciation of the benefits of planned local recreational facilities in developing environments.</p>	<p>Delete the wording of Policy 6 and substitute with the following:</p> <p>"To take a further financial contribution from any additional residential unit erected in a Business or Living or Rural Zone to provide for recreation reserves and recreational facilities, within local community areas."</p> <p>Explanation and Reason - Policy 6 That the reason a reserve contribution is to be taken from allotments of more than 4 hectares be deleted.</p> <p>Delete the reference "In most cases the Council will take the contribution as money and use the money to purchase the allotments within the subdivision, which it thinks will make appropriate reserves and playgrounds."</p> <p>And rewrite the last sentence of that paragraph to read: "The Council may choose to take land, if the land offered is of a suitable size, and shape, is in an appropriate location and is assessed as being required for a community recreation reserve or recreational facility in that area."</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 332.05, page 163, 332.06, page 164, 332.07, page 167, 332.08, page 170, 332.28, page 306 and 332.29, page 312.</p>

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Prebbleton Community Association (599.07)	<p>The policy is not adequately worded in that it does not refer to recreational facilities, and, refers to residential neighbourhoods rather than communities. Reserves and recreational facilities are not just for the benefit of the neighbourhood but for the wider community. The explanation given for reserve contributions not being levied on allotments of more than 4 hectares does not recognise the reality of the use of reserves and recreational facilities. The fact is that people on areas of more than 4 hectares use these facilities as much as Township people.</p> <p>The comment that Council will in most cases take money as a reserve contribution cannot be substantiated until a full assessment has been made of the various needs of the communities from which the contributions are taken. This comment shows a lack of appreciation of the benefits of planned local recreational facilities in developing environments.</p>	<p>Delete the wording of Policy 6 and substitute with the following:</p> <p>"To take a further financial contribution from any additional residential unit erected in a Business or Living or Rural Zone to provide for recreation reserves and recreational facilities, within local community areas."</p> <p>Explanation and Reason - Policy 6 That the reason a reserve contribution is to be taken from allotments of more than 4 hectares be deleted.</p> <p>Delete the reference "In most cases the Council will take the contribution as money and use the money to purchase the allotments within the subdivision, which it thinks will make appropriate reserves and playgrounds."</p> <p>And rewrite the last sentence of that paragraph to read: "The Council may choose to take land, if the land offered is of a suitable size, and shape, is in an appropriate location and is assessed as being required for a community recreation reserve or recreational facility in that area."</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 599.05, page 163, 599.06, page 164, 599.07, page 167, 599.08, page 170, 599.28, page 306 and 599.29, page 312.</p>
Prebbleton Community Association (599.04)	<p>People who live in the Rural area use local community reserves and recreational facilities. This policy should be amended to include contributions to these local community facilities.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 8 (2) by adding after the words ".....heritage values of the District" the words "and "Local Communities."</p> <p>That the relevant rules of the Plan are re-written to ensure that this policy is implemented.</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 599.05, page 163.</p>
Christchurch City Council (295.20)	<p>The submitter supports the taking of financial contributions toward the costs of purchasing or upgrading reserves or recreational facilities. Continued residential development in the rural areas will lead to greater residential demand for public open space, especially for off road walkways, multiuse sports areas and larger parks suitable for day trip outings and community facilities.</p>	<p>Adopt Policy 4.</p>

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	382 North Canterbury Fish & Game	Support
	293 RD, JR & DJ Butt, JS Bisphan, DJ	Oppose
Victor Melvyn Challies (332.04)	People who live in the Rural area use local community reserves and recreational facilities. This policy should be amended to include contributions to these local community facilities.	<p>Amend Policy 8 (2) by adding after the words ".....heritage values of the District" the words "and "Local Communities."</p> <p>That the relevant rules of the Plan are re-written to ensure that this policy is implemented.</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 332.05, page 163.</p>
Springston Recreation Reserve and Associated Sports Clubs (104.5)	People owning lots larger than 4 ha still use local reserve facilities and therefore they should pay a reserve contribution of 2% of the market value of all the allotments over 4ha in area being created by subdivision.	Amend Financial Contributions Rules (Variation 1) Table 1 (page 26), to specify that lots greater than 4 hectares should pay 2% of the market value.
New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (559.54)	The submitter supports the taking of financial contributions for the purpose of protecting the cultural and heritage values of the District.	<p>Retain Policy 8 (b).</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 559.80, page 306.</p>
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	912 Friends of Otahuna Valley	Support
Victor Melvyn Challies (332.29)	As referred to earlier there is no justification for not levying Reserve Contributions on allotments of more than 4 hectares. These residents utilise the community facilities and this is recognised by the payment of charges for local Recreation Reserve and Community Centre facilities. To be fair and accountable Council should divide the whole of the District into Community Centre/Reserve rating areas as all parts of the District benefit from these facilities. Therefore the subdivision and erection of new/additional dwelling units on these allotments should require the payment of a Local Contribution.	<p>That the title to Table One inserting the number 2 (2%) under the heading of Local Contribution (% of market value of allotments) for a Density of > 4ha.</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 332.05, page 163, 332.06, page 164, 332.07, page 167, 332.08, page 170, 332.28, page 306 and 332.29, page 312.</p>
Prebbleton Community Association (599.29)	As referred to earlier there is no justification for not levying Reserve Contributions on allotments of more than 4 hectares. These residents utilise the community facilities and this is recognised by the payment of charges for local Recreation Reserve and Community Centre facilities. To be fair and accountable Council should divide the whole of the District into Community Centre/Reserve rating areas as all parts of the District benefit from these facilities. Therefore the subdivision and erection of new/additional dwelling units on these allotments should require the payment of a Local Contribution.	<p>That the title to Table One inserting the number 2 (2%) under the heading of Local Contribution (% of market value of allotments) for a Density of > 4ha.</p> <p>Note: Some of the decisions sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies and rules. It is expected that if Council adopts a submission then it will make any subsequent alterations, which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 599.05, page 163, 599.06,</p>

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
		page 164, 559.07, page 167, 559.08, page 170, 559.28, page 306 and 559.29, page 312.
Prebbleton Community Association Inc. (191.15)	There is no justification for not levying Reserve Contributions on allotments of more than 4 hectares. These residents utilise the community facilities and this is recognised by the payment of charges for local Recreation Reserve and Community Centre facilities. To be fair and accountable Council should divide the whole of the District into Community Centre/reserve rating areas as all parts of the District benefit from these facilities. Therefore the subdivision and erection of new/additional dwelling units on these allotments should require the payment of a Local Contribution.	That Table 1 be amended by including the number 2 (2%) under the heading of Local Contribution (% of market value of allotments) for a Density of >4ha. The decision sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies. It is expected that if Council adopts the submission then it will make any subsequent alterations which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.
Prebbleton Community Association Inc. (191.45)	No particular reason given.	That the title to Table 1 be amended as follows: "TABLE ONE - RESERVE CONTRUBUTION FEES FOR RESIDENTIAL UNITS IN THE LIVING, BUSINESS AND RURAL ZONES" The decision sought may require some alterations to the wording or cross-referencing of policies. It is expected that if Council adopts the submission then it will make any subsequent alterations which may be necessary to other parts of the Plan.
Kajens Trading and Development Limited (164.17)	The submitter oppose the imposition of a reserve contribution payable on the development of Business Zoned Land. The creation of additional businesses within the township does not increase the demand for reserve purposes.	Delete Rule 3(ii). That all other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to issues, strategies, objectives, policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission.

(d) Reserves - Amount of Reserve Contributions

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Aylesford Management Limited (173.19)	<p>The submitter seeks rezoning from Rural to Rural Living of two blocks of land near Prebbleton, referred to as the Mair and Shands blocks. The Mair block is located on the corner of Blakes and Shands Roads. The Shands block is located on the western side of Shands Road, between Blakes and Trents Roads. Refer submission point 173.20 Map 13. This submission is made in the context of this rezoning request.</p> <p>The submitter opposes this part of the Plan. The maximum contribution of 5% of the market value of the land in the additional lots authorised by any subdivision consent within the Rural Living (Mair) Zone is considered too high and should be somewhat reduced. This zone is proposed to provide a minimum allotment size of 0.5ha and based on market values at the time a 3.0% contribution would be reasonable.</p>	<p>Amend Section 5, Rule 3, i. All Living Zones by amending the first sentence under "Maximum Contribution" to read as follows: "3% of the market value of the land ..."</p> <p>All other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to issues, strategies, objectives, policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission.</p> <p>Note: The submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer submission points 173.2 page 150, 173.2 page 150, 173.3-4 page 151, 173.5 page 155, 173.6-7 page 153, 173.8 page 165, 173.9-10 page 168, 173.11 page 184, 173.12-13 page 211, 173.14 page 342, 173.15 page 269, 173.16 271, 173.17 page 327, 173.18 page 328, 173.20 Map 13.</p>
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	217 Canterbury Regional Council	Oppose
K.J. & J.J. Partnership (180.13)	The submitter supports the maximum quantum of contribution payable being 5% of the market value of the land involved. The quantum of the contribution is appropriate and sufficient to meet the reserve requirements necessitated by the creation of additional business development.	<p>The maximum contribution payable under Section 5.3 Financial Contribution Rules - Rule 3 (ii) be adopted.</p> <p>All other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to</p>

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
		issues, strategies, objectives, policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission.
Britnell, E.C. (21.3)	The submitter considers the 5% contribution is inappropriate for both Living 1 and Living 2 zones.	Delete the 5% financial contribution in Rule 3 over all Living Zones and adopt the existing system 3.5% for Rural Residential (Living 2) and 7.5% for Residential (Living 1)
CDL Land New Zealand Limited (135.6)	The submitter supports the maximum quantum contribution payable being 5% of the market value of the land involved. The quantum of the contribution is appropriate and sufficient to meet the reserve requirements necessitated by the creation of additional business development.	That the maximum contribution payable under Rule 3(ii) be adopted in the Plan as it presently exists. And all other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to issues, strategies, objectives, policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	837 White, C.E.	Oppose
Kajens Trading and Development Limited (164.16)	The submitter opposes the maximum contribution payable of 5%. In some parts of the District reserve areas are lacking and the Council requires a greater level of funding than would be provided through 5% levy to ensure sufficient additional reserves are established.	That Rule 3(i) page 340 be amended such that the value 5% is replaced with the value 7.5%. That all other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to issues, strategies, objectives, policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission.
Fraser, B. (112.1)	The submitter opposes the fees set. If a reserve contribution is paid by the developer in RR1 zone now they pay 3.5% of an understood valuation. The document states that the owner of the lot will be required to pay 4% of the market value of the allotment plus \$500.00 for District Contribution but they will be credited for original reserve contribution.	Delete the Financial Contribution Rules. Raise District rates elsewhere. Note: it is not clear whether the submitter opposes the financial contribution rules for all living zones, or just the lower density zones ie. 2500m2 and larger
Springston Recreation Reserve and Associated Sports Clubs (104.4)	The submitter is opposed to the granting of credits to developers/subdividers and seek that contributions should be paid as set out in the decision sought.	In relation to Financial Contributions Rules (Variation 1) Rule 2 Reserves and Recreation Areas and Facilities- Method to Determine Calculation - iv. Credits...(page 21), - all developers/subdividers should pay at least \$500 per case towards district facilities, and pay a contribution of at least 50% of the assessed amount towards local reserves and facilities, no matter what credits are available in their development. All lots should pay a local reserves/ facilities contribution.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	190 Borrie, N.C.	Support
Lincoln University and R. Wheeler (116.1)	The submitter opposes this proposed rule because it does not allow a reserve contribution credit to those existing vacant allotments created prior to 1 November 1989 that could be built on as of right without paying a reserve contribution. It is currently accepted practice that any existing lot carries a reserve contribution credit.	Add to Rule 2 the following: "A financial contribution under Rule X(2) is not required if a single residential unit is to be erected on an existing allotment which was created prior to 7 September 2001." Note: The Proposed Plan reference to Rule X(2) under Exemption (iii) page 20 is incorrectly referenced. It should read Rule (2) Land Use (ii), All other appropriate, necessary and consequential amendments including those to issues, strategies, objectives, policies, environmental results, rules and reasons to rules be amended to give full effect to this submission.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	190 Borrie, N.C.	Oppose
New Zealand	Equally important as collecting financial	Amend Policy 7 to include reference to the

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (140.59)	contributions is the potential to have land containing cultural and heritage sites vested in reserve and/or covenanted, at the subdivision stage. This can be considered as part of the required financial contribution, resulting in important sites being protected and conserved.	possibility to have land vested in reserve and/or covenanted as part of the required financial contribution.
Christchurch City Council (295.32)	The submitter supports the collection of reserve contribution from residential development for reserve purposes and the protection of special landscape and ecological values. Flexibility to offset that contribution where land is given or works undertaken towards protection or enhancement of environmental or cultural values is also supported. Increased financial contributions will allow SDC greater potential capability to partner with the City on joint venture open space initiatives, walkways and protection of ecological and scenic areas of value to people of both authorities eg. the inner plains in the Prebbleton to Halswell area and the southern Port Hills.	Retain Policy 7ii. Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 295.31, page 167.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	293 RD, JR & DJ Butt, JS Bisphan, DJ	Oppose
New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (559.57)	The submitter supports the waiving of financial contributions where land has been given or work undertaken towards the protection or enhancement of sites with significant cultural and heritage values.	Retain Policy 7ii.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	912 Friends of Otahuna Valley	Support
New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga (559.80)	The submitter supports the references in this section of allowing financial contributions to be taken in money or land for the purpose of protecting or enhancing heritage and cultural sites.	Retain Rule (2) Purpose 6, Form and assessment criteria under 'Credits for payments Made at Subdivision', with regard to heritage and cultural sites (pages 306 to 307). Retain Form with regard to heritage and cultural sites. Retain the assessment criteria under Credits for Payments made at Subdivision with regard to heritage and cultural sites. Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this matter - refer to submission point 559.54, page 159.
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	1020 Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu	Support
	912 Friends of Otahuna Valley	Support

(f) Definition of Development

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
North Canterbury Federated Farmers (40.14)	Oppose bullet points 1, 2 and 3, ie. Fencing, draining, earthworks and other similar developments should be exempt from financial contributions.	Delete bullet points 1, 2 and 3 from the definition of development

APPENDIX III

Summary of Submissions on the Notified PDP and Variation 1
Environmental Damages Provisions and
Maximum Amount of Financial Contributions Payable

Summary of Submissions on Environmental Damages Provisions

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
North Canterbury Fish & Game Council (382.19)	<p>Financial contributions should be available as a mitigation tool for any activity that uses physical or natural resources and should not be restricted to subdivisions.</p> <p>Activities in the District are predominantly agriculture-based. Agriculture has had ongoing environmental impacts that are likely to exacerbate with land intensification. Financial contributions are a valuable tool for remedying or mitigating environmental effects. Financial contributions embrace a polluter pays philosophy that recognises the impacts of activities and allows a compensatory measure to be included as conditions of consents. The allocation of financial contributions should be effects-based and not activities-based as suggested by the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Extend Issue 1 (page 163) to include – "Protecting, maintaining and enhancing the health and of waterways and their margins."</p> <p>Environmental results – 2 – "All additional activities in the District Council contribute to the costs of developing reserves and recreational facilities and towards protecting, enhancing and maintaining areas with* landscape, cultural, heritage or ecological values."</p> <p>*Remove the term "special" as it is subjective and restricts the policy to existing values.</p> <p>Rule X - Extend to activities other than subdivision including agricultural and forestry activities for example,</p> <p>(a) plantation forestry (b) dairy conversions. Extension of the provision to include all activities with 20m of a waterway or wetland for which a consent is required, such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - earthworks - tree planting - roading & utilities - buildings - waste or hazardous substance related activities.
	Further Submission	Support/Oppose
	385 Federated Farmers of NZ	Oppose
	952 Mark Robert McAtamney	Oppose
	901 Craig Eggleston	Oppose
	958 L McKenzie	Oppose
	857 Dian Anderson	Oppose
	889 Amanda Jane Craw	Oppose
	867 L I Bradley	Oppose
	872 Samuel Bernard Bradley	Oppose
	864 The Big River Company Ltd	Oppose
	871 Penelope Ann Bradley	Oppose
	870 Meredith Verna Bradley	Oppose
	894 George Timothy Deans	Oppose
	1033 Windwhistle District Society Inc	Oppose
	974 Mount White Station Ltd	Oppose
	933 Gerard Wright Innes	Oppose
	931 Scott Hussey	Oppose
	951 Antonia Louise McAtamney	Oppose
	1023 Louise Urquhart	Oppose
	979 Oliver Newbegin	Oppose
	977 Bruce Nell	Oppose
	934 H G and P M Innes	Oppose
	1014 Rosalie Joy Snoyink	Support
	887 K J Coe	Oppose
	1039 Guy Martin	Oppose
	1026 Philip W Wareing	Oppose
	978 Lyn Nell	Oppose
	954 John McDermott	Oppose
	944 Garry & Honoria Lamers	Oppose
	1036 Neil Robertson	Oppose
	928 B L & D J Haylock	Oppose
	953 Jim Macartney	Oppose
	869 M G Bradley	Oppose
	909 Kelly Frame	Oppose
	950 Dwight William Love	Oppose
	908 Bridget Frame	Oppose

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	904 David Florance	Oppose
	868 Matthew Davis Bradley	Oppose
	923 J M Grigg	Oppose
	874 Jack Bernard Bradley-Diggle	Oppose
	866 David Orion Bradley	Oppose
	873 Tisha Jane Bradley	Oppose
	881 Castle Hill Partnership	Oppose
	885 Terry Anthony Clemens	Oppose
	930 Fiona J Hussey	Oppose
	932 Diana Margaret Innes	Oppose
	1012 Jacqueline Mary Sime	Oppose
	902 P J Fleming	Oppose
	903 A D Florance	Oppose
	1024 Ross Urquhart	Oppose
	968 Bruce Miles	Oppose
	623 Santa Enterprises	Oppose
	1013 Jules J Snoyink	Support
	1037 EPA Canterbury	Support
	1000 Margaret Robertson	Oppose
	1011 G E Sime	Oppose
	936 R F James	Oppose
	996 I H Reed	Oppose
	1022 Tripp Partnership	Oppose
	884 B E Clark	Oppose
	926 Rodger & Caroline Hardwick	Oppose
	920 Peter Graham	Oppose
	921 Christopher C A Gray	Oppose
Heinz Watties Australasia (419.27)	The submitter opposes Rule 3 for the reason that financial contributions should be restricted to meeting the costs of any upgrades for servicing or provision for reserves and land for open space. It is considered that this provision is arbitrary and unnecessary. Any significant adverse effects should be avoided or mitigated by conditions of consent or requirements for a bond.	Delete Rule 3. Or Any other decision to provide relief consistent with what is sought. And Any necessary consequential amendments to give effect to the above relief.
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu & Te Taumutu Runanga (681.36)	The submitter opposes Policy 8. It is considered that the suggested wording will provide clarification and is consistent with the provisions of Part II of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Add the following additional wording to Policy 8: "To undertake financial contribution's necessary to fund the cost of mitigating the actual or potential effects on sites of cultural significance to tangata whenua (e.g. damage to waahi tapu, waahi taonga, silent file or mahinga kai areas)". That any other consequential amendments to the Plan required to explain, provide clarity or give effect to these changes be made. Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 681.40, page 308.
	Further Submission	Support/Oppose
	559 New Zealand Historic Places Trust	Support
	925 J A H Guild	Oppose
	857 Dian Anderson	Oppose
	1011 G E Sime	Oppose
	933 Gerard Wright Innes	Oppose
	931 Scott Hussey	Oppose
	932 Diana Margaret Innes	Oppose
	1012 Jacqueline Mary Sime	Oppose
	937 Warrick Roger James	Oppose
	903 A D Florance	Oppose
	977 Bruce Nell	Oppose
	936 R F James	Oppose

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	1026 Philip W Wareing	Oppose
	954 John McDermott	Oppose
	944 Garry & Honoria Lamers	Oppose
	913 Margaret C George	Oppose
	953 Jim Macartney	Oppose
	901 Craig Eggleston	Oppose
	890 Lawrence Croft	Oppose
	904 David Florance	Oppose
	934 H G and P M Innes	Oppose
	930 Fiona J Hussey	Oppose
	885 Terry Anthony Clemens	Oppose
	1033 Windwhistle District Society Inc	Oppose
	980 L M Nicoll	Oppose
	902 P J Fleming	Oppose
	968 Bruce Miles	Oppose
	887 K J Coe	Oppose
	1039 Guy Martin	Oppose
	978 Lyn Nell	Oppose
	884 B E Clark	Oppose
	926 Rodger & Caroline Hardwick	Oppose
	920 Peter Graham	Oppose
	921 Christopher C A Gray	Oppose
Te Runanga o Ngai Tahu & Te Taumutu Runanga (681.40)	The submitter opposes Rule 3. It is considered that the suggested wording will provide clarification.	<p>Amend the third sentence of the explanation for Rule 3, as an example of possible circumstances resulting in financial contribution as follows:</p> <p>"For example, damage to waahi tapu, waahi taonga, silent file or mahinga kai areas, work to reduce potential flooding or slips..."</p> <p>That any other consequential amendments to the Plan required to explain, provide clarity or give effect to these changes be made.</p> <p>Note: the submitter has requested another decision in relation to this issue - refer to submission point 681.36, page 169.</p>
	Further Submissions	Support/Oppose
	884 B E Clark	Oppose

Summary of Submissions on Maximum Amount Payable

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Lincoln University (27.11)	The submitter opposes Rule 4 as it does not define with certainty the method for determining the form of contribution or method of calculating any cash contribution or equivalent value.	<p>Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions and credits for some other contributions.</p> <p>Note: the submission notes that the relief sought is unable to be achieved by way of Council decision on submission and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan. Variation 1 - Financial Contributions was notified on 7 September 2001.</p>
Ministry of Education (87.19)	The Ministry opposes Rule 1, 2, 4 and 5 insofar as they do not define with certainty the method for determining the form that any contribution will take and the method of calculation the amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value. The term	Develop methods for defining with certainty the method for determining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	<p>"maximum contribution" is not defined in the Plan. There are strong grounds for the rules to provide exemptions from recreation and open space contributions for Developments on school sites given the extensive amount of formal and informal open spaces that are provided on school sites.</p>	<p>recreation contributions.</p> <p>Note: the submitter notes that this relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of Council decision on submissions and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan. Variation 1 Financial Contributions was publicly notified on 7 September 2001.</p> <p>The submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 87.15 page 337 and 87.17 page 338 and 87.21 page 341.</p>
N.Z. Police (93.10)	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 4 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value. In addition, there are strong grounds for the rules to provide exemptions from recreation and open space contributions for Developments on Police station sites given insignificant demand they place on reserves and the fact that such facilities are often used as community meeting places.</p>	<p>Develop methods for defining with certainty the method for determining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions.</p> <p>This relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of a Council decision on submissions and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan.</p> <p>There may, however, be other methods of achieving the desired relief.</p>
Lincoln University (27.12)	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 5 as it does not define with certainty the method for determining the form of contribution or method of calculating any cash contribution or equivalent value.</p>	<p>Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions and credits for some other contributions.</p> <p>Note: the submission notes that the relief sought is unable to be achieved by way of Council decision on submission and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan. Variation 1 - Financial Contributions was notified on 7 September 2001.</p>
Ministry of Education (87.21)	<p>The Ministry opposes Rule 1, 2, 4 and 5 insofar as they do not define with certainty the method for determining the form that any contribution will take and the method of calculation the amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value. The term "maximum contribution" is not defined in the Plan. There are strong grounds for the rules to provide exemptions from recreation and open space contributions for Developments on school sites given the extensive amount of formal and informal open spaces that are provided on school sites.</p>	<p>Develop methods for defining with certainty the method for determining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions.</p> <p>Note: the submitter notes that this relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of Council decision on submissions and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan. Variation 1 Financial Contributions was publicly notified on 7 September 2001.</p> <p>The submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 87.15 page 337 and 87.17 page 338 and 87.19 page 340.</p>
AgResearch Limited (25.10)	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 1 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value.</p>	<p>Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution</p>

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
Lincoln University (27.8)	The submitter opposes Rule 1 as it does not define with certainty the method for determining the form of contribution or method of calculating any cash contribution or equivalent value.	Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions and credits for some other contributions. Note: the submission notes that the relief sought by way of Council decision is unable to be achieved by way of Council decision on submissions and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan. Variation 1 Financial Contributions was notified on 7 September 2001.
New Zealand Institute for Crop and Food Research Limited (62.12)	The submitter opposes Rule 1 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value.	Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. Note: the submitter notes that the relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of Council decision, and therefore a variation is requested. Variation 1 Financial Contributions was notified on 7 September 2001.
Landcare Research New Zealand Limited (64.11)	The submitter opposes Rule 1 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value.	Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. Note : the submitter notes that the relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of Council decision, and therefore requests a variation. Variation 1 Financial Contributions was notified on 7 September 2001.
Ministry of Education (87.15)	The Ministry opposes Rule 1, 2, 4 and 5 insofar as they do not define with certainty the method for determining the form that any contribution will take and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value. The term "maximum contribution" is not defined in the Plan. There are strong grounds for the rules to provide exemptions from recreation and open space contributions for Developments on school sites given the extensive amount of formal and informal open spaces that are provided on school sites.	Develop methods for defining with certainty the method for determining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions. Note: the submitter notes that this relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of Council decision on submissions and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan. Variation 1 Financial Contributions was publicly notified on 7 September 2001. The submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 87.17 page 338 and 87.19 page 340 and 87.21 page 341.
N.Z. Police (93.8)	The submitter opposes Rule 1 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value. In addition, there are strong grounds for the rules to provide exemptions from recreation and open space contributions for Developments on Police station sites given insignificant demand they place on reserves and the fact that such facilities are often used as community meeting places.	Develop methods for defining with certainty the method for determining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions. This relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of a Council decision on submissions and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
		Plan. There may, however, be other methods of achieving the desired relief.
AgResearch Limited (25.4)	The submitter opposes Rule 2 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value.	Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution
Lincoln University (27.10)	The submitter opposes Rule 2 as it does not define with certainty the method for determining the form of contribution or method of calculating any cash contribution or equivalent value.	Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions and credits for some other contributions. Note: the submission notes that the relief sought is unable to be achieved by way of Council decision on submission and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan. Variation 1 - Financial Contributions was notified on 7 September 2001.
New Zealand Institute for Crop and Food Research Limited (62.5)	The submitter opposes Rule 2 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value.	Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. Note: the submitter notes that the relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of Council decision and therefore a variation is requested. Variation 1 Financial Contributions was notified on 7 September 2001.
Landcare Research New Zealand Limited (64.5)	The submitter opposes Rule 2 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value.	Develop methods for defining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. Note: The submitter notes that the relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of Council decision and therefore requests a variation. Variation 1 Financial Contributions was notified on 7 September 2001.
Ministry of Education (87.17)	The Ministry opposes Rule 1, 2, 4 and 5 insofar as they do not define with certainty the method for determining the form that any contribution will take and the method of calculation the amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value. The term "maximum contribution" is not defined in the Plan. There are strong grounds for the rules to provide exemptions from recreation and open space contributions for Developments on school sites given the extensive amount of formal and informal open spaces that are provided on school sites.	Develop methods for defining with certainty the method for determining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions. Note: the submitter notes that this relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of Council decision on submissions and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan. Variation 1 Financial Contributions was publicly notified on 7 September 2001. The submitter has requested other decisions in relation to this issue - refer to submission points 87.15 page 337 and 87.19 page 340 and 87.21 page 341.
N.Z. Police (93.9)	The submitter opposes Rule 2 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value. In	Develop methods for defining with certainty the method for determining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash

Submission Point	Summary	Decision Requested
	<p>addition, there are strong grounds for the rules to provide exemptions from recreation and open space contributions for Developments on Police station sites given insignificant demand they place on reserves and the fact that such facilities are often used as community meeting places.</p>	<p>contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions.</p> <p>This relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of a Council decision on submissions and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan.</p> <p>There may, however, be other methods of achieving the desired relief.</p>
<p>N.Z. Police (93.11)</p>	<p>The submitter opposes Rule 5 as it does not define with certainty any method for determining the form or maximum amount of any cash contribution or equivalent value. In addition, there are strong grounds for the rules to provide exemptions from recreation and open space contributions for Developments on Police station sites given insignificant demand they place on reserves and the fact that such facilities are often used as community meeting places.</p>	<p>Develop methods for defining with certainty the method for determining the form of the contribution and the method of calculating the amount of any cash contribution. This may include exemptions from open space and recreation contributions.</p> <p>This relief is unlikely to be achieved by way of a Council decision on submissions and it is therefore requested that the Council proceed with a variation to the Plan.</p> <p>There may, however, be other methods of achieving the desired relief.</p>