

---

# ADDENDUM TO THE S42A REPORT FOR HEARING 30.3 REZONE - GENERAL RURAL

---

**DATE:** 16 February 2023

**HEARING:** Hearing 30.3: Rezone – General Rural

**HEARING DATE:** 20 February 2023

**PREPARED BY:** Jon Trewin – Policy Planner



## Introduction

The purpose of this report is to highlight several further submissions that were missed in error in the drafting of the S42a report for the Rezone – General Rural topic.

## Submitters/Further Submitters Affected

The further submitters affected and the original submissions to which they relate are as follows:

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0028	Tony Stewart	001	REZONING	Oppose in Part	Amend density controls in SCA-RD9 - Claremont to provide the option for further subdivision.
<u>DPR-0371</u>	<u>Christchurch International Airport Limited</u>	<u>FS006</u>	<u>REZONING</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Reject</u>
<u>DPR-0375</u>	<u>Waka Kotahi/NZTA</u>	<u>FS244</u>	<u>REZONING</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.</u>

The additional further submissions to the report are underlined above.

The S42a recommended the following in relation to submission point DPR-0028.001:

- 7.4 Tony Stewart<sup>3</sup> seeks that density controls in SCA-RD9 (Claremont) are amended to provide the option to subdivide to a minimum of 2,500m<sup>2</sup> given its location in close proximity to Templeton and the boundaries of Christchurch. Claremont is within the 50dBA airport noise contour. Under the CRPS, Policy 6.3.5.4, district plans must avoid noise sensitive activities within the 50dBA airport noise contour for Christchurch International Airport, unless the activity is within an existing residentially zoned urban area, residential greenfield area identified for Kaiapoi, or residential greenfield priority area identified in Map A. As Claremont falls under none of these categories, I recommend the submission point is rejected.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submission Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested
DPR-0397	Survus Consultants Ltd	001	REZONING	Oppose in Part	Rezone the Malvern and Ellesmere Area Plan Preferred Future Development Areas to enable urban development now,

					consistent with the zoning identified for these locations in these plans.
<u>DPR-0032</u>	<u>Christchurch City Council</u>	<u>FS159</u>	<u>REZONING</u>	<u>Oppose</u>	<u>Oppose submission.</u>
<u>DPR-0488</u>	<u>Dally Family Trust and Julia McIlraith</u>	<u>FS002</u>	<u>REZONING</u>	<u>Support in Part</u>	<u>Accept in part subject to the submitter establishing how the proposed rezoning will be integrated with the rezoning of the land the subject of submission 488, including in terms of connectivity, access, servicing and boundary treatments</u>

The additional further submissions to the report are underlined above.

The S42a recommended the following in relation to submission point DPR-0397.001:

- 7.16 *Survus*<sup>18</sup> seek that the Malvern and Ellesmere Area Plan Preferred Future Development Areas be rezoned to enable urban development now, consistent with the zoning identified for these locations in those plans. The Area Plans were adopted in September 2016. Their primary purpose was to serve as a high-level planning direction to guide growth and sustainable management of the townships in the Malvern and Ellesmere wards through to 2031. Both Area Plans reached the conclusion that there is sufficient available land to accommodate projected population growth within each township through to 2031 without the need to rezone any additional land for residential or business needs. The Area Plans did identify potential areas for further intensification beyond 2031.
- 7.17 Council have made the decision not to proactively rezone new areas of greenfield land based on the overall level of growth expected over the life of the Plan (including based on the assessments under the Area Plans). The Area Plans preferred future development areas have however been incorporated into the PDP as 'Urban Growth Overlays' as indicative of future growth direction. While the Overlays identify suitable areas for future growth, the PDP includes direction on specific things any rezoning of land within the overlay is to be considered against (essentially a merits-based assessment). The submitter has not provided any evidence to show how rezoning these areas would meet the objectives and policies set out for Urban Growth in the PDP. I therefore recommend the submission point is rejected.

## Conclusion

All four further submitters that were missed, with respect to the above points, appear in the S42a report tagged to other original submission points. It is therefore considered that all of these further submitters would have received notice of the Hearing and been able to view the S42a report. In addition, with the exception of the Dally Family Trust further submission point (DPR-0488.FS002), the S42a report

recommendations align with the relief sought by the further submitters. It is therefore considered that no further submitter has been unduly prejudiced by the above error.