

Proposed Selwyn District Plan



Right of Reply Report

Urban Growth Chapter

Ben Baird

01 July 2022

Contents

1. Purpose of Report.....	3
2. Hearing Panel’s Questions to the s42a Reporting Officer and their Response	3
3. Reporting Officer’s Proposed Provision Amendments	17
4. Conclusion.....	26
Appendix 1: Table of Submission Points.....	27
Appendix 2: Recommended amendments	99
Appendix 4: Legal memo.....	119

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to respond to the questions raised by the Hearings Panel during Hearing 3: Urban Growth, and for the Officer to propose any further amendments to the notified version of the Proposed District Plan above those recommended in the Officer's original s42a report.

2. Hearing Panel's Questions to the s42a Reporting Officer and their Response

- 2.1 The following questions were received from the Hearings Panel at the conclusion of the hearing for the Urban Growth, which was held on 29 and 30 November 2021.

[1] Outline the history of the Future Proof areas within the Rural-Residential Strategy.

- 2.2 During the hearing, the panel asked a question regarding certain areas identified as 'future proof' within the Rural-Residential Strategy. Some areas within Prebbleton were notated for future proofing in order that rural-residential development did not constrain future more intensive forms of development in the future.
- 2.3 Future proofing is an idea that was introduced at the Rural Residential hearing. The idea is that infrastructure and legal mechanisms can be established at the rural-residential stage in order to enable higher densities in the future. There were two sites where future proofing were required and two sites where they should be considered during the plan change or subdivision process. All these sites have been developed or are subject to a plan change process, as outline in the Table below.

Area	Description	Development
Rolleston Area 2 South Rolleston, east of Springston-Rolleston Road	Future Proof Required.	Developed through HASHA. Decision 2016.
Prebbleton Area 4 South West Prebbleton, corner of Shands and Trents Road	Future Proof Appropriate.	Plan Change 41. Rural-residential development. Operative 2015.
Prebbleton Area 5 South West Prebbleton, Shands Road	Future Proof Appropriate.	Plan Change 47. Rural-residential development. Operative 2016.
Prebbleton Area 7 South Prebbleton, between Trents and Hamptons Road	Future Proof Required.	Private Plan Change 68, awaiting decision.

[2] Are any changes to important infrastructure policies consistent with the s42A report recommendations for the Energy and Infrastructure hearing?

- 2.4 During the hearing, the panel raised that if any changes proposed consider the discussion and recommendation from the Energy and Infrastructure hearing. Generally, the recommended chapter is consistent with the Energy and Infrastructure recommended chapter. Specific changes to infrastructure policies, especially revisions to UG-P11 outlined below are consistent with the EI Reply Report prepared by Ms Vicki Barker.

- 2.5 The key provisions are EI-O3 and EI-P6. EI-O3, as recommended “The safe and efficient operation and security of important infrastructure is not compromised by incompatible activities and reverse sensitivity effects”. EI-P6, as recommended “Avoid incompatible activities that may affect or cause reverse sensitivity effects on the efficient operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, upgrading, renewal, or development of important infrastructure and renewable electricity generation unless the activity is located:
1. at a distance or in a position that does not adversely affect the important infrastructure or renewable electricity generation activity; and
 2. in a position that does not obstruct access to important infrastructure as required for operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, upgrading, renewal, development, or emergency purposes”.

[3] Consider recent Council legal advice from the Re-zoning Framework s42A report and recommend any changes following that.

- 2.6 Trices Rd and submitters represented by Fiona Aston asked whether there would be changes to the Urban Growth s42A in response to the Council’s legal advice that is attached to the re-zoning s42A report. The Council legal advice and re-zoning report was prepared after the Urban Growth s42A and so the Urban Growth s42A did not consider the advice.
- 2.7 The key shift in position between the two S42A reports is the ‘softening’ on the interpretation of the NPS-UD’s Policy 8. This direction has informed the development of the re-zoning request decision process. Adderley Head’s 13 September 2021 memo outlines in paragraph 169 that the avoid direction should stay but guidance within the policy should be added to help identify what is unanticipated or out of sequence.
- 2.8 I agree with the Adderley Head memo and will discuss changes to UG-P3 below to incorporate policy direction on unanticipated or out of sequence development.

[4] Consider whether moving the objectives to the Strategic Directions chapter is appropriate.

- 2.9 Kāinga Ora has recommended that the objectives within the Urban Growth chapter be moved to the Strategic Directions section. The memo from Hearing 1 – Strategic Directions¹ outlined how the Urban Growth Objectives would be incorporated into the Strategic Directions chapter. The Strategic Directions hearing discussed changes to the subsection ‘Urban Form and Development’ and I support the direction outlined by the reporting officer.
- 2.10 If these changes were to be accepted then the Urban Growth chapter will have no objectives with the remaining policies having no line of sight as to what they are trying to achieve. I disagree with Kāinga Ora that it is acceptable for a District Plan chapter to have no objectives and no alternate objective has been proposed.
- 2.11 The change requested by Kāinga Ora modifies the intent of the chapter, which is to set out a framework for assessing where the most appropriate areas for potential growth are. The objectives clearly articulate these outcomes, and if moved, will likely cause confusion and affect the integrity

¹ https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0005/490154/KO-Memorandum-of-Counsel-Strategic-Objectives.pdf

of the plan as a whole if objectives are not located with their supporting policies. If this is the intent of Kāinga Ora's recommendation then it doesn't go far enough and the policies within the overlay also need to move. The policies ensure that the approach to re-zoning is appropriate and consistent. Following on from this, if both the objectives and policies framework is moved, the Urban Growth Overlay Chapter's role would change and be focused only on the Council's response of identifying future growth areas through an overlay and this would need to be considered if redrafting the objectives and policies framework.

- 2.12 Therefore, for the reasons above, I do not recommend that the objectives within the Urban Growth chapter be moved to the Strategic Directions chapter.

[5] Respond to submitters' memorandums regarding whether the relief sought in evidence is within the scope of their original submission.

- 2.13 The panel requested the following submitters (Woolworths, Foodstuffs, M House) to provide memorandums outlining how the relief sought is within scope.
- 2.14 Woolworths has provided a response² to how their submission is within scope. I support the reasoning outlined within the Woolworths memo and agree that their submission and changes to the Urban Growth chapter are within scope.
- 2.15 M House has provided amendments to the Urban Growth policies to give effect to the NPS-UD and these are considered when discussing changes to UG-P2, UG-P3, and UG-P14 below. I agree that their submission and changes to the Urban Growth chapter are within scope.
- 2.16 Foodstuffs has provided a response to how their submission is within scope. I support the reasoning outlined within the Foodstuffs memo and agree that their submission and changes to the Urban Growth chapter are within scope.

[6] Legal response to CCC presentation and any other evidence.

- 2.17 During the hearing, the panel requested that the Council's legal team provide a response to the further legal submissions and presentations at the hearing. This is outlined in Appendix 4 of this report.

[7] Consider additional wording in UG-O1 referencing 'rural production' as well as 'highly productive land'.

- 2.18 HortNZ sought changes to clause 10 of UG-O1, which was recommended to be added in the s42A report. Clause 10 was added to provide a link through to UG-P10 and UG-P11 that deal with highly productive land and rural production. HortNZ seek amended wording of 'does not compromise the use of highly productive land for rural production'.
- 2.19 I accept that a link to both highly productive land and rural production is required within UG-O1, however, rural production is not limited to highly productive land. Further, the effect on rural production and highly productive land is slightly different. Highly productive land is valued because it is a limited resource and the policies should address the potential cumulative loss caused by urban

² [Link to Woolworths Memo](#)

growth, whereas the impact on rural production is the potential reverse sensitivity impact at the interface of rural and urban activities.

- 2.20 Therefore, for the reasons above, I recommend the following additional clause in UG-O1 – ‘does not compromise the ability to use adjoining rural land for rural production’.

[8] Consider whether UG-O1 needs to include a reference to ‘significantly’ affecting important infrastructure.

- 2.21 Kāinga Ora sought the reference to affecting important infrastructure be amended to be significantly affecting important infrastructure. The concern is this ‘could be interpreted to mean that any effect of urban growth..., however minor, is unacceptable’³. However, the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) – Objective 6.2.1 Clause 10. uses the phrase ‘does not adversely affect the efficient operation... of strategic infrastructure and freight hubs’.
- 2.22 As the use of the term ‘significantly’ would be a narrower interpretation than outlined in the CRPS, I recommend that the change is rejected.

[9] Consider whether to broaden the wording of operation of important infrastructure in UG-O1.

- 2.23 CIAL sought that the wording ‘operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading, and safety’ be included to align with the CRPS, especially Objective 5.2.2; Objective 6.2.1; and Policy 6.3.5. The reference to only operation was that the other elements could be considered as part of the operation in general. As the CRPS specifically references each element as distinct, it is worth including each element to avoid confusion.
- 2.24 As a consequence of this changes, the reference in P11 to only ‘operation’ should also be changed to ‘operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading, and safety.’
- 2.25 Therefore, for the reasons above, I recommend the following wording is added to Clause 9 of UG-O1 – ‘operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading, and safety’ and Clause 2 of UG-P11.

[10] Could UG-O3 be improved to provide flexibility to respond to different requirements of supermarkets?

- 2.26 Woolworths and Foodstuffs sought changes to the urban growth framework to provide flexibility that enables supermarkets to establish.
- 2.27 Woolworths sought changes to UG-O3 Clause 3 that provides flexibility for commercial growth in accordance with the Strategic Directions and a ‘centres plus’ approach to commercial growth, especially the unique nature of supermarkets. The additional wording is shown in their post-hearing correspondence⁴. The wording is as follows (changes shown in **bold** and underline) ‘Commercial and industrial growth is supported by a range of working environments and places to **appropriately** locate and operate businesses consistent with, **and complementary to**, the District’s Activity Centre Network **and the needs of residents**’.

³ Statement of Evidence of Nick Roberts 13 August 2021 ([LINK](#))

⁴ [Link to Woolworths Memo](#)

- 2.28 Foodstuffs sought similar changes to UG-O3 Clause 3. The wording is as follows ‘Commercial and industrial growth is supported by a range of working environments and places to locate and operate businesses consistent with and complementary to the District’s Activity Centre Network and the needs of the catchment they serve’.
- 2.29 The addition of ‘appropriately’ still supports the activity centre network as the key direction for commercial growth while providing enough flexibility, however the reference to ‘and complementary to’ is not required as the addition of ‘appropriate’ includes the idea of complementary. Further, the additional wording could be construed to infer that any business zoning to not only has to be consistent with the activity centre network but also complementary.
- 2.30 The addition of the wording ‘and the needs of residents’ is appropriate. Growth should meet the needs of residents and the objectives should reflect that. The alternate proposed reference to the catchment is more appropriate within the policy, with the objective referencing the needs of the people first and the policy discussing a catchment approach to understanding the need. However, this is more appropriate in UG-O1. UG-O1 Clause 8 focuses on people and communities wellbeing and health and safety and could be expanded to consider their needs.
- 2.31 Therefore, for the reasons above, I recommend the following wording is added to UG-O3 Clause 3 - ‘Commercial and industrial growth is supported by a range of working environments and places to appropriately locate and operate businesses consistent with the District’s Activity Centre Network’.
- 2.32 Further, I recommend the following wording is added to UG-O1 Clause 8 – ‘enables people and communities, now and future, to provide for their needs, their wellbeing, and their health and safety’.

[11] Consider changes to UG-P2 outlined by Michael House to better align with the NPS-UD.

- 2.33 M House provided alternate wording for UG-P2 as requested by the panel⁵. The changes seek to provide direction on when growth occurs outside the Urban Growth Overlay. UG-P2 provides for urban growth within the overlay while UG-P3 and UG-P4 manage growth outside of the overlays. Therefore I do not support changes to UG-P2 but rather this is addressed in UG-P3.

[12] Consider changes to UG-P3 that provides criteria for when ‘avoid, unless’ as a pathway consistent with the direction within the NPS-UD but not replicating the NPS-UD.

- 2.34 Most submitters (Woolworths, Birchs Village, M House, ECan, Trices Rd, Fiona Aston, RWRL, IRHL, RIHL, RIDL, and CCC) discussed changes to UG-P3 to include criteria that is consistent with the NPS-UD alongside the current avoid approach of the policy. This topic was discussed comprehensively throughout the submissions and hearing. The key issue is around maintaining the consistency with the higher order documents, namely the CRPS and the NPS-UD.
- 2.35 The question is whether provisions within the PDP can enable development beyond what is outlined in the CRPS and whether including criteria within the PDP resolves the issue. If the PDP provides criteria that enables development outside of Map A of the CRPS then the outcome is an urban form

⁵ [Link to M House Post Hearing Memo](#)

that does not give effect to the CRPS. However, providing development beyond what is enabled through the CRPS is the intent of the 'responsiveness element' of the NPS-UD.

- 2.36 The PDP process sits between the release of the NPS-UD and the insertion of criteria within the CRPS. It is acknowledged that the CRPS does not give full effect to the NPS-UD as it has not included criteria yet. Once the CRPS has included criteria, either criteria within the PDP will no longer be required or criteria will need to be updated to be consistent.
- 2.37 Current plan changes within Selwyn have individually addressed Policy 8 and the criteria outlined in the NPS-UD. This has occurred without criteria within the CRPS or the district plan. The evidence provided outlines why the development contributes to a well-functioning urban environment and is well-connected along transport corridors to justify why it is significant development. In other words, the evidence shows how it meets the criteria within the NPS-UD. However, each plan change has interpreted it differently and therefore, the addition of criteria within UG-P3 will improve consistency.
- 2.38 The inclusion of criteria will lead to enabling development that is inconsistent with the CRPS, specifically Map A. This is caused by the gap between the release of the NPS-UD and the CRPS responding. A weakness of the NPS-UD is the lack of a timeframe for criteria to be included. However, the NPS-UD section is described as 'responsive planning' and therefore a responsive approach is favoured. Therefore, the PDP responding before the CRPS is consistent with the intent of the NPS-UD.
- 2.39 I recommend that UG-P3 is amended to include criteria that is consistent with the NPS-UD.
- 2.40 Policy 8 and Implementation Part 3.8 of the NPS-UD articulates the intent and the approach to significant development that is unanticipated or out-of-sequence development. Part 3.8 outlines three factors for assessing plan changes, essentially describing how to determine whether the development is significant or not. This criteria is: contributes to a well-functioning urban environment (as defined by Policy 1 of the NPS-UD); well-connected along transport corridors; and criteria within a regional policy statement. The regional policy statement criteria is only one element of the overall criteria.
- 2.41 It is important that the criteria covers all elements identified within the NPS-UD but not necessarily just replicate them. A more detailed discussion on how the NPS-UD criteria aligns with the PDP is outlined in Appendix 3. This discussion identifies the following elements that will need to be added to the Urban Growth Objective and Policies:
 - The impact of competitiveness within the market;
 - Greenhouse gas reduction; and
 - Resilience to future effects of climate change.
- 2.42 The elements can be added within the current objectives. Objective 2 can add a sub-clause to support the reduction in future effects of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions. Objective 3 can add a sub-clause to ensure the competitiveness of the market. These changes are recommended.

- 2.43 The other issue is that these criteria are throughout the Urban Growth objectives and policies making it harder to define what is the criteria and where it is located. The approach to the policy wording needs to reference the objectives. The recommended wording is 'Avoid the zoning of land to establish any new urban areas or extensions to any township boundary in the Greater Christchurch area of the District outside the Urban Growth Overlay, **unless it is demonstrated to contribute to a well-functioning urban environment as articulated in UG-O1, UG-O2, and UG-O3**'.

[13] Consider changing UG-P8 and the reference to airport noise contours to include noise sensitive activities.

- 2.44 CIAL and Kāinga Ora sought changes to UG-P8 so that the reference to avoiding the airport noise contours was limited to noise sensitive activities. I agree with the change. The CRPS outlines it is only noise sensitive activities that should be limited under the contour and commercial or industrial development could be appropriate and should not be unnecessarily avoided.
- 2.45 Therefore, for the reasons above, I recommend the following wording is added to UG-P8 Clause 4 - 'The 50 dB Ldn Air Noise Contours **for noise sensitive activities**'.

[14] Consider, within UG-P9, changing the phrase 'protect, to the extent reasonably possible' to be less subjective and align with the CRPS phrasing of 'foreclose'.

- 2.46 Several submitters (HortNZ, Davina Penny, and ECan) commented on the phrase 'to the extent reasonably possible' and its potential subjectivity. HortNZ outline in their Hearing Submitter notes that the phrase 'to the extent reasonably possible' has been included within the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission's Policy 10 and has been adopted throughout NZ without any issues. The CRPS, in Policy 5.3.2 states 'enable development...which ensures that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated, including where these would compromise or foreclose the productivity of the region's soil resources, without regard to the need to make appropriate use of soil which is valued for existing or foreseeable future primary production, or through further fragmentation of rural land'.
- 2.47 When people seek re-zoning, they will need to demonstrate how highly productive land is protected to the extent reasonably possible. This could include how it will not compromise or foreclose the use of highly productive land or further fragments rural land. The phrase 'to the extent reasonably possible' means re-zoning applications do not need to avoid 'at all costs' but rather allows the protection of highly productive land to be considered in the broader context. The expected release of a National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land will hopefully clarify how to consider highly productive land in the context of urban growth.
- 2.48 Therefore, for the reasons above, I do not recommend any changes.

[15] Consider the extension of UG-P9 to cover adjoining rural land.

- 2.49 HortNZ consider that UG-P9 should be expanded to include the impact on adjoining land, whereas Kāinga Ora opposed this expansion. There is a distinction between UG-P9 and its focus on highly productive land and UG-P11 and its focus on avoiding reverse sensitivity effects on any adjoining rural zone. The wording of UG-P11 'any existing or anticipated activity in an adjoining rural... zone'

provides consideration of rural production on adjoining sites as it is an anticipated activity within a rural zone.

2.50 Therefore, for the reasons above, I do not recommend any changes.

[16] Consider the addition of the phrase to UG-P10 clause (b) 'to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects do not arise from proximity to rural production activities'.

2.51 HortNZ consider changes to UG-P10 so that the impact of reverse sensitivity on rural production is considered beyond what is outlined in UG-P11. The distinction between UG-P10 and UG-P11 is UG-P10 is focused on the establishment of high-quality urban environments, whereas UG-P11 is focused on the zoning of land. The proposed wording of UG-P10 Clause 3 covers the impact on neighbouring rural land and the addition is considered unnecessary.

2.52 Therefore, for the reasons above, I do not recommend any changes.

[17] Reconsider the insertion of 'significant' within UG-P11 so it better aligns with CRPS Policy 5.3.12 and the tabled wording for UG-P11.

2.53 HortNZ and Fonterra questioned the insertion of 'significant' within UG-P11. The word 'significant' was added in response to a question raised by the Hearing Panel. HortNZ outline whether there is scope and whether the change is consistent with the CRPS. In the context of reverse sensitivity on the rural zone, the CRPS does not use the phrase 'significant' and therefore, for UG-P11 to be consistent with the CRPS, the phrase 'significant' should not be used in that context. Fonterra raised similar concerns when considering reverse sensitivity and proposed alternate wording in their evidence. Their proposed wording distinguishes the effects by changing 'avoid significant adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects' to 'avoid reverse sensitivity effects or any other significant adverse effect'.

2.54 Transpower tabled alternate wording for UG-P11 to better address concerns of infrastructure providers. The alternate wording helps distinguish what level of adverse effects affect either adjoining land or important infrastructure. This builds on the discussion above.

2.55 For adjoining rural, dairy processing, industrial, inland or knowledge zones, as discussed above, all reverse sensitivity effects should be considered, however, significant adverse effects are also worth considering. Whereas for important infrastructure it is all adverse effects, as outlined in CRPS Objective 5.2.1. Therefore wording that reflects this distinction is supported. Transpower option 2 is the closest to providing wording but the wording outlined above is a better phrasing for adjoining land.

2.56 ECan also proposed a minor change from 'on' adjoining zone to 'in an' adjoining zone. This change is appropriate.

2.57 The wording used here is consistent with the Energy and Infrastructure hearing direction and Reply Report prepared by Ms Vicki Barker.

2.58 Therefore for the reasons above, I recommend the following amendments to UG-P11 – 'When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary:

1. **avoid reverse sensitivity effects and significant adverse effects on any** existing or anticipated activity in an adjoining rural, dairy processing, industrial, inland port, or knowledge zone; and
2. **avoid adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects,** on the safe, efficient and cost-effective operation of important infrastructure, land transport infrastructure, and the strategic transport network.

[18] Use of the term ‘future’ or ‘planned’ in UG-P12 especially in the context of public transport.

- 2.59 ECan and Kāinga Ora sought that the reference to ‘planned transport’ be changed to ‘future transport’. This change is based on whether the term ‘planned’ captures all strategies or not or whether it is limited to operational. Conversely, the term ‘future’ is ambiguous as to whether it is limited to strategic plans or any potential undetermined future option. I support the use of the term planned in its full definition of any strategy not just operational.
- 2.60 Therefore, for the reasons above, I do not recommend any changes.

[19] Consider wording within UG-P13 around the reference to Housing Bottom Lines to improve responsiveness.

- 2.61 Kāinga Ora sought changes to UG-P13 to better reflect the direction of the NPS-UD, especially Policy 2. Policy 2 requires that local authorities provide at least sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand. Kāinga Ora suggest that the intent is that bottom lines are not a constraint on development but rather enable development and therefore seek clause 1 is deleted.
- 2.62 Clause 1 is in response to the NPS-UD requiring bottom lines to be within the district plan and therefore need to remain. However, the wording of the clause can be improved to align with the NPS-UD intent of enabling ‘at least’ the bottom lines and not necessarily restricting development to achieving the bottom line.
- 2.63 Therefore a change to UG-P13 to reflect this is supported. UG-P13 Clause 1. to read ‘Extensions assist in **at least providing for** ~~meeting~~ the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium-term period through to 2028’.

[20] Consider wording within UG-P13 that adds additional exemptions to achieving 15hh/ha beyond stormwater or natural hazard constraints, potentially amenity and character?

- 2.64 Hughes Development sought additional exemptions to achieving the minimum 15hh/ha in UG-P13 that potentially reflected the amenity and character of the township. The CRPS identifies constraints to achieving density within the ‘net density’ definition. These are stormwater areas, geotechnical constraints, significant landscaping values or access strips, and community or retail facilities. The Greater Christchurch Greenfield Density Analysis outlined additional constraints that are needing to be addressed in order to achieve 15hh/ha (outlined in Table 9, Pg 92 – Appendix 3 of s42A Report). Some of these constraints are tasks for Council to undertake, however some can be addressed by developers before Council completes this work. These include locating higher densities in appropriate walkable catchments and accessibility, and improve place-making. The phrase ‘demonstrated constraints’ is not restricted to the CRPS but rather potential constraints that can be proven as supporting lower densities.

2.65 Therefore, for the reasons above, I do not recommend any changes.

[21] Consider proposed revisions to UG-P13, especially in the context of the NPS-UD and UG-P3 and UG-P4.

2.66 Trices Rd submitted that UG-P13, specifically clause 3, may need to change depending on the response to UG-P3 and UG-P4 changes. Clause 3 seeks that new residential only occurs where the land is subject to an Urban Growth Overlay and identified within the CRPS. Trices Rd proposed changes to the wording of UG-P13⁶ that separated the bottom line table and listing criteria for when growth should occur. However, as discussed above when looking at UG-P3, the NPS-UD, especially through Policy 8, provides an avenue for growth to occur outside of what is identified. Changes to UG-P3 mean that UG-P13 Clause 3 is not necessary.

2.67 Therefore, for the reasons above, I recommend Clause 3 is deleted.

2.68 Further, UG-P14 Clause 2 requires a change for consistency and it is recommended that the beginning of UG-P14 Clause 2 that references the overlay, is deleted.

[22] Consider changes to UG-P14 outlined by Michael House to better align with the NPS-UD.

2.69 M House provided alternate wording for UG-P14 as requested by the panel. Development outside of Greater Christchurch does not face the same 'Map A constraint' as outlined in UG-P13 and the current UG objectives and policies seek to manage growth. The changes are more suitable to UG-P13 and have been already addressed above.

2.70 Therefore, for the reasons above, I do not recommend any changes.

[23] It is unclear how to read UG-P15 Clause 2.

2.71 Woolworths and Foodstuffs sought clarification when interpreting UG-P15 Clause 2. Woolworths have outlined the deletion of Clause 2 in their post-hearing memo, with the subsequent justification of the scope to support the changes. Foodstuffs, in their post-hearing memo, with the subsequent justification of the scope to support the changes, have outlined an addition that references accordance with the NPS-UD and minimising adverse effects.

2.72 Clause 2 seeks to outline where new growth is supported, however the wording duplicates what it is covering. All land that is within an overlay is already a greenfield area or signalled within a development plan and so the clause should not require the land to be both within the overlay and a greenfield area. Further, the overlay currently only identifies greenfield growth areas so its contradictory to be both within the overlay and consolidating within an existing zone. The policy should also not limit business growth to within signalled areas but also consolidated around existing areas. This also better reflects the NPS-UD direction as sought by Foodstuffs.

2.73 An additional sub-clause relating to 'minimising significant adverse effects, and managing other adverse effects, of business growth' is sought by Foodstuffs. This change would apply to land outside

⁶<https://extranet.selwyn.govt.nz/sites/consultation/DPR/Shared%20Documents/Hearing%203%20Evidence/Hearing%203%20Submitter%20notes/DPR-0298%20Trices%20Road%20Rezoning%20Group%20-%20Evidence%20Summary.pdf>

of the overlay and not around a centre or commercial zone. This additional clause is not recommended as the consideration of the potential adverse effects may not cover the impact on the township network or the impact on the other identified land. These new areas are better considered through an evaluation against the objectives and policies.

- 2.74 As discussed above regarding UG-P13 and UG-P14, the reference to the overlay is not necessary and therefore is recommended to be deleted from Clause 2. However, a reference to a relevant development plans is recommended as it will assist in establishing new commercial areas in existing residential areas.
- 2.75 Therefore, Clause 2 should read 'It is identified within a relevant Development Plan or consolidated within or around a Key Activity Centre or an existing General Industrial Zone, Port Zone or Commercial and Mixed Use Zone'.
- 2.76 Further changes to UG-P15 are discussed below.

[24] Could UG-P15 be improved to provide flexibility to respond to different requirements of supermarkets?

- 2.77 Woolworths and Foodstuffs sought changes to the urban growth framework to provide flexibility that enables supermarkets to establish. Woolworths and Foodstuffs have outlined changes in their post-hearing memo, with the subsequent justification of the scope to support the changes.
- 2.78 The change from 'shall only occur' to 'shall primarily occur' is not recommended. The elements identified in the sub-clauses describe what business growth is supported. The argument for business growth should be focused on how it meets the sub-clauses not whether the sub-clause is applicable. The other changes to UG-P15 should provide appropriate flexibility within the sub-clauses.
- 2.79 The change to Clause 1 'within the township and the additional' to 'within the township or the additional' is also not recommended. The BDCA and FDS provides for capacity that supports the rebuild and recovery. The other changes to UG-P15 should provide appropriate flexibility.
- 2.80 Foodstuffs sought a change to Clause 3. The change is 'A diverse range of services and opportunities is provided for to respond to the social and economic needs associated with additional suitable development capacity identified in a BDCA, FDS or any relevant Development Plan,'. Development capacity is defined in the plan as an area zoned with the provision of infrastructure. Development Plan includes future potential areas that may not yet be zoned. The change limits the focus to what is in place now rather than what strategic spatial plans are working on. Therefore the change is not recommended.
- 2.81 There are several changes to Clause 4 proposed. The changes are 'The type, scale and function of new commercial areas are consistent with, and complementary to, the Activity Centre Network and the needs of the catchment that the activities serve and support mixed use activities, unless located in a Large Format Retail Zone'. Foodstuffs sought 'and meets the needs of residents in the intended catchment'. A reference to the needs of the catchment is appropriate and references back to the proposed change to Objective 1. The addition of 'and complementary to', as discussed in 2.26 is not recommended. Requiring new areas to be consistent with the activity centre network is sufficient.

- 2.82 A change to Clause 5 is supported. The change from Woolworths seeks consistency within the clause by referring to land-use zones. However, I propose a further step where this consistency sees the two sub-clauses merged. The clause would read 'The location, dimensions and characteristics of the land are appropriate to support: ~~a. activities, that are anticipated within the existing General Industrial Zone, Knowledge Zone or Commercial and Mixed Use Zone b.~~ community facilities, and public spaces where these are anticipated by the land use zone; and'.
- 2.83 Therefore, for the reasons above, I recommend the changes above.

[25] Could UG-P16 be improved to provide flexibility to respond to different requirements of supermarkets?

- 2.84 Woolworths and Foodstuffs sought changes to the urban growth framework to provide flexibility that enables supermarkets to establish. Woolworths and Foodstuffs have outlined changes in their post-hearing memo, with the subsequent justification of the scope to support the changes.
- 2.85 As discussed above regarding UG-P13 and UG-P14, the reference to the overlay is not necessary and therefore is recommended to be deleted from Clause 2. A reference to Development Plans is not required as it is within Clause 1 and 3.
- 2.86 Similar to Foodstuffs changes to UG-P15 Clause 2 and 4, they also seek changes to UG-P16 Clause 2 and 4 with reference to adverse effects. As discussed above the changes are recommended.
- 2.87 Similar to the changes sought for UG-P15, the changes sought are so the policy is consistent with the proposed changes to UG-O3. The change to Clause 4 to be consistent with the proposed changes to Objective 3 is appropriate. The changes to UG-P16 Clause 4 and 5 are recommended to be consistent with UG-P15.
- 2.88 Therefore, for the reasons above, I recommend the changes above.

[26] Could UG-P17 be improved to provide flexibility to respond to different requirements of supermarkets?

- 2.89 Woolworths and Foodstuffs sought changes to the urban growth framework to provide flexibility that enables supermarkets to establish. Woolworths and Foodstuffs have outlined changes in their post-hearing memo, with the subsequent justification of the scope to support the changes.
- 2.90 Woolworths seek an additional clause 'Provide for the functional need of commercial activities to be located accessibly in relation to the residential catchment they serve'. This change adds flexibility and is consistent with the proposed changes to UG-O3. The wording provides support for redevelopment of current urban areas to be re-zoned commercial if it serves the catchment. This flexibility is important as intensification grows and subsequently the demand for commercial activities in certain areas grows.
- 2.91 Woolworths and Foodstuffs seek a change to Clause 8 by adding the word 'significant' when referencing 'adverse amenity effects'. This change is recommended as the significance of the adverse effect is more appropriate.
- 2.92 Therefore, for the reasons above, I recommend the changes above.

[27] Consider the addition of 'avoid or' to UG-SCHED1 Clause 3.d.

- 2.93 HortNZ sought the addition of 'avoid or' to UG-SCHED1 Clause 3.d. in relation to reverse sensitivity. This change is appropriate as, in the first instance, boundary treatments can avoid the effect.
- 2.94 Therefore for the reasons above, I recommend the change.

[28] Should the Urban Growth Overlay identified within the UG Overlay on Hoskyns Rd be amended so that it excludes the transmission lines and setback?

- 2.95 Transpower sought changes to the area identified on Hoskyns Road that recognised the transmission lines and the associated potential constraint on development. The PDP identifies the land on Hoskyns Rd as within the overlay and includes transmission lines classified as National Grid. The EI chapter permits some activities within the setback of national grid and limits structures. However, there are some activities and structures that could occur. The rezoning of the site will need to comply with the PDP rules around what can occur within the setback of national grid and the area could be used for complementary activities such as car parking or storage.
- 2.96 Therefore for the reasons above, I do not recommend any changes.

[29] Clarification of use of Overlay when considering medium-term capacity (3.4 (1) b. of the NPS-UD).

- 2.97 ECan discussed the use of an overlay if it is in fact needed to respond to a medium-term shortfall. The medium-term capacity is to identify the bottom line of capacity. The overlay allows Council to identify potential preferred growth areas to cater for unexpected growth and provides developers certainty as to where long-term growth is potentially occurring and where it would be supported. The Council, in response to a medium-term shortfall should rezone land.
- 2.98 Therefore, for the reasons above, I do not recommend any changes.

[30] Consider distinguishing areas identified within the Overlay for identified purposes (e.g. Rural-Residential, Industrial).

- 2.99 ECan sought that overlay areas are distinguished for different purposes, e.g. rural-residential and industrial. This will help clarify the general intent of these different areas.
- 2.100 Therefore, for the reason above, I recommend each overlay area is identified as either Urban Growth Overlay – Greenfield; Urban Growth Overlay – Business; or Urban Growth Overlay – Rural Residential. Further, I recommend these classifications are explained in Part 1, How the Plan Works, Relationship between Spatial Layers, HPW25 – Overlays.

[31] For the Trices Rd site, check recommendation and reference to what is within the overlay and not.

- 2.101 Trices Rd sought clarification on the officer's recommendation specifically in terms of what is within the overlay and what isn't. Trices Rd is within the overlay and is identified in the Rural Residential Strategy whereas the submission and private plan change is seeking a higher density than supported within the Rural Residential Strategy.

[32] Clarify how overlay areas are identified and what the level of reliance is when considering future re-zoning. The submitters seek to ascertain whether the overlay area should be expected capacity or potential capacity.

- 2.102 RWRL, IRHL, RIHL, and RIDL sought clarification on the status of the overlay and to what extent it can be considered in future capacity. Medium-term capacity, as outlined in the NPS-UD, is required to be zoned within a district plan (operative or proposed). As the land is rurally zoned with an overlay it is not capacity in the medium-term. For long-term capacity, land is required to be identified for future urban use in a Future Development Strategy. The only additional land that meets the long-term capacity is the Future Urban Development Areas within the CRPS. All other overlay land is not considered capacity currently but the Council would seek to re-zone some of this land in response to an identified shortfall.

[33] Clarify position on overlay re-zonings to highlight that recommendations to reject the overlay re-zoning does not prejudice the re-zoning request.

- 2.103 M Springer sought clarification on how the position taken on overlay re-zonings may prejudice the re-zoning request. The rejection of an overlay rezoning is based on the policy direction stating that the overlay identifies areas supported by relevant plans and strategies. It is not an assessment of the merits of re-zoning and should not prejudice the rezoning request process.

[34] Check whether the use of a noise overlay from a railway is still appropriate if the line is not in use.

- 2.104 The panel asked about the noise overlay from the Prebbleton railway in regards to M Springer's site. The noise overlay and its relevancy should be dealt with in the Noise Chapter hearing. The noise rules control noise sensitive activities within the overlay, which would not preclude potential development.

[35] Would including more classes or sub-classes of soil classification within the definition be consistent with the CRPS definition?

- 2.105 HortNZ sought whether more classes or sub-classes of the soil classification system be included in the definition. More work is required to determine what sub-classes to be identified and the change is more appropriately done first in the CRPS or in response to a National Policy Statement on Highly Productive Land.

- 2.106 Therefore, for the reason above, I do not recommend any changes.

[36] Consider changing the Housing Bottom Lines definition to recognise the gap between new information being released and the update to the CRPS.

- 2.107 RWRL, IRHL, RIHL, and RIDL sought that the Housing Bottom Lines definition be amended to recognise the gap between the information being released and the subsequent update to the CRPS.
- 2.108 The NPS-UD outlines that the housing bottom lines are to be updated 'as soon as practicable' and done without using a Schedule 1 process. These start with the regional bottom line and then a territorial authority as a proportion of the regional number.

2.109 The concern is raised because of the current situation. The Housing Capacity Assessment was completed by Greater Christchurch on July 31st 2021 and, as of writing, the bottom lines have not been updated. Consequentially, the numbers referred to within the PDP reflect the figures within the CRPS that are from the previous capacity assessment. However, the number referenced is a bottom line and does not preclude development beyond this and the use of a current capacity assessment requiring more than the current bottom line would be appropriate evidence to support plan changes.

2.110 Therefore, based on the reasons above, I do not recommend any changes.

3. Reporting Officer's Proposed Provision Amendments

3.1 On review of the submitter's evidence and the matters raised within the Hearing the following amendments to the proposed provisions are recommended. Note this does not include any amendments as recommended in the s42a evidence. For a full summary of all proposed amendments to provisions see **Appendix 2**.

3.2 Objective 1

Proposed amendments:

Urban growth is provided for in a strategic manner that:

1. Achieves attractive, pleasant, high quality, and resilient urban environments;
2. Achieves the built form, amenity values and character anticipated within each residential, kainga nohoanga, or business area;
3. Recognises and protect identified Heritage Sites, Heritage Settings, and Notable Trees;
4. Protects the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments;
5. Provides for the intensification and redevelopment of existing urban sites;
6. Integrates with existing residential neighbourhoods, commercial centres, industrial hubs, inland ports, or knowledge areas;
7. Is coordinated with the provision of available infrastructure, the strategic transport network, and utilities, including land transport infrastructure; and
8. Enables people and communities, now and future, to provide for their needs, their wellbeing, and their health and safety;
9. Does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading, and safety of important infrastructure;
10. Does not compromise the use of adjoining land for rural production; and
11. Has particular regard to the finite nature and life supporting capacity of highly productive land.

Submission scope:

3.3 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-O1 for the following; Clause 8 through both Woolworths (DPR-0396) and Foodstuffs (DPR-0373); and Clause 10 through both HortNZ (DPR-0353.223) and Fonterra (DPR-0370.074). While the wording proposed here is not the same as the relief sought in their respective submission points, the intent is the same. Scope is provided for

proposed amendments to UG-O1 Clause 9 through CIAL (DPR-0371.057). The relief sought is the exact wording.

Reasoning:

- 3.4 The above amendments are recommended to ensure consistency and improve clarity. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment is inherently already part of the objective.

3.5 **Objective 2**

Proposed amendments:

Townships maintain a consolidated and compact urban form to support:

1. Accessible, sustainable and resilient residential neighbourhoods, commercial centres, industrial hubs, inland ports, or knowledge areas;
2. **The reduction in future effects of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions;**
3. The role and function of each urban area within the District's Township Network and the economic and social prosperity of the District's commercial centres; and
4. The efficient servicing of townships and integration with existing and planned infrastructure.

Submission scope:

- 3.6 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-O2 sub-clause 2 through numerous submissions (DPR-0136, DPR-0137, DPR-0140, DPR-0157, DPR-0160, DPR-0176, DPR-0178, DPR-0180, DPR-0209, DPR-0282, DPR-0298, DPR-0302, DPR-0344, DPR-0355, DPR-0358, DPR-0363, DPR-0373, DPR-0374, DPR-0376, DPR-0384, DPR-0397, DPR-0399, DPR-0460, DPR-0461, DPR-0488, DPR-0491, DPR-0492, and DPR-0493).

Reasoning:

- 3.7 The above amendments are recommended to ensure flexibility when dealing with the unique requirements for supermarkets. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment is inherently already part of the objective.

3.8 **Objective 3**

Proposed amendments:

There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within Greater Christchurch to ensure:

1. The housing bottom lines are met;
2. **Competitiveness within the market;**
3. A wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities are available to satisfy social and affordability needs and respond to demographic change; and
4. Commercial and industrial growth is supported by a range of working environments and places to **appropriately** locate and operate businesses consistent with the District's Activity Centre Network.

Submission scope:

- 3.9 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-O3 sub-clause 2 through numerous submissions (DPR-0136, DPR-0137, DPR-0140, DPR-0157, DPR-0160, DPR-0176, DPR-0178, DPR-0180, DPR-0209, DPR-0282, DPR-0298, DPR-0302, DPR-0344, DPR-0355, DPR-0358, DPR-0363, DPR-0373, DPR-0374, DPR-0376, DPR-0384, DPR-0397, DPR-0399, DPR-0460, DPR-0461, DPR-0488, DPR-0491, DPR-0492, and DPR-0493). Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-O3 sub-clause 4 through Woolworths (DPR-0396) and Foodstuffs (DPR-0373) submissions. The scope of their submissions are outlined in their post-hearing memos.

Reasoning:

- 3.10 The above amendments are recommended to ensure flexibility when dealing with the unique requirements for supermarkets. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment is inherently already part of the objective.

3.11 **Policy 3***Proposed amendments:*

Avoid the zoning of land to establish any new urban areas or extensions to any township boundary in the Greater Christchurch area of the District outside the Urban Growth Overlay, **unless it is demonstrated to contribute to a well-functioning urban environment as articulated in UG-O1, UG-O2, and UG-O3.**

Submission scope:

- 3.12 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-P3 through numerous submissions (DPR-0136, DPR-0137, DPR-0140, DPR-0157, DPR-0160, DPR-0176, DPR-0178, DPR-0180, DPR-0209, DPR-0282, DPR-0298, DPR-0302, DPR-0344, DPR-0355, DPR-0358, DPR-0363, DPR-0373, DPR-0374, DPR-0376, DPR-0384, DPR-0397, DPR-0399, DPR-0460, DPR-0461, DPR-0488, DPR-0491, DPR-0492, and DPR-0493).

Reasoning:

- 3.13 The above amendments are recommended to ensure flexibility when dealing with the unique requirements for supermarkets. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment is inherently already part of the objective.

3.14 **Policy 8***Proposed amendments:*

Avoid the following locations and areas when zoning land to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas:

1. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori;
2. Significant Natural Areas;
3. Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Visual Amenity Landscapes;
4. The 50 dB Ldn Air Noise Contours **for noise sensitive activities**; and
5. High Hazard Areas.

Submission scope:

- 3.15 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-P8 through CIAL submission (DPR-0371.059), which sought to include the contour as a constraint within UG-P8 and their hearing submitter notes, which clarified that it should only preclude noise sensitive activities.

Reasoning:

- 3.16 The above amendments are recommended to ensure consistency with the CRPS and to not unduly avoid appropriate activities establishing within the contour. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment limits the extent of its potential effect.

3.17 **Policy 11**

Proposed amendments:

When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, ~~avoid significant adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects on:~~

1. Avoid reverse sensitivity effects and significant adverse effects on any ~~Any~~ existing or anticipated activity ~~in an~~ ~~on~~ adjoining rural, dairy processing, industrial, inland port, or knowledge zone; and

2. Avoid adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, on the safe, efficient and cost-effective operation of important infrastructure, land transport infrastructure, and the strategic transport network.

Submission scope:

- 3.18 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-P11 through Transpower's submission (DPR-0446.135), which sought amendments to the policy regarding reverse sensitivity.

Reasoning:

- 3.19 The above amendments are recommended to ensure consistency with the CRPS and clarification when dealing with zones or infrastructure. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment limits the extent of its potential effect.

3.20 **Policy 13**

Proposed amendments:

Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:

1. Extensions assist in ~~at least providing for meeting~~ the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium-term period through to 2028;
2. A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch;
3. ~~The land is subject to an Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either:~~
 - a. ~~a 'greenfield priority area', or any subsequent urban growth areas or urban containment boundaries, in the CRPS where it is a residential activity; or~~

~~b. identified in an adopted Rural Residential Strategy and in accordance with CRPS Policy 6.3.9 where it is a rural residential activity.~~

- ~~3.~~ **4.** A minimum net density of 15hh/ha for residential activities is met, unless there are demonstrated constraints in which case a minimum net density of no less than 12hh/ha is met, or for rural residential activities a minimum net density of 1 to 2 hh/ha is met;
- ~~4.~~ **5.** A diversity in housing types, sizes and densities is demonstrated to respond to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs identified in a HDCA, FDS or outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and
- ~~5.~~ **6.** An ODP is prepared that addresses the matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.

Submission scope:

- 3.21 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-P13 through Kāinga Ora's submission (DPR-0414.162) and Trices Road Re-zoning Group's submission (DPR-0298.014).

Reasoning:

- 3.22 The above amendments are recommended to ensure consistency with the CRPS and the NPS-UD. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment provides greater alignment with higher order documents.

3.23 **Policy 14**

Proposed amendments:

Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:

1. There is a demonstrated need for additional development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan;
2. ~~The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or the The~~ township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed;
3. The minimum net densities support a range of housing types that respond to demographic change, social needs and outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and
4. An ODP is prepared that addresses the matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.

Submission scope:

- 3.24 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-P14 through Trices Rd Re-zoning Group's submission (DPR-0298.014), as above.

Reasoning:

- 3.25 The above amendments are recommended to ensure consistency with the CRPS, the NPS-UD and the Urban Growth chapter provisions. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment provides greater alignment with higher order documents.

3.26 **Policy 15**

Proposed amendments:

Any new areas to support commercial activities, industrial activities, or activities provided for in the Port Zone or Knowledge Zone in the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:

1. A BDCA and FDS demonstrates a need for additional suitable development capacity within the township and the additional suitable development capacity supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch;
2. ~~The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either:~~
 - ~~a. a 'greenfield priority area', or any subsequent urban growth areas or urban containment boundaries, in the CRPS where it is an industrial activity; or~~
 - ~~b. It is identified within a relevant Development Plan or consolidated within or around a Key Activity Centre or within an existing General Industrial Zone, Port Zone or Commercial and Mixed Use Zone.~~
3. A diverse range of services and opportunities is provided for to respond to the social and economic needs identified in a BDCA, FDS or any relevant Development Plan;
4. The type, scale and function of new commercial areas are consistent with the Activity Centre Network and the needs of the catchment that the activities serve ~~support mixed use activities, unless located in a Large Format Retail Zone;~~
5. The location, dimensions and characteristics of the land are appropriate to support:
 - ~~a. activities, that are anticipated within the existing General Industrial Zone, Knowledge Zone or Commercial and Mixed Use Zone;~~
 - ~~b. community facilities, and public spaces where these are anticipated by the land use zone; and~~
6. An ODP is prepared that addresses the relevant matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.

Submission scope:

- 3.27 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-P15 through Woolworths (DPR-0396) and Foodstuffs (DPR-0373) submissions. The scope of their submissions are outlined in their post-hearing memos.

Reasoning:

- 3.28 The above amendments are recommended to ensure consistency and clarity. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment provides greater alignment with higher order documents.

3.29 **Policy 16**

Proposed amendments:

Any new areas to support commercial or industrial activities outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:

1. There is a demonstrated need for additional suitable development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan;
2. ~~The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or~~ It is consolidated within or around an existing Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone or General Industrial Zone;

3. A diverse range of services and opportunities is provided for to respond to any specific social and economic needs, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan;
4. The type, scale and function of new commercial areas are consistent with the Activity Centre Network ~~and the needs of the catchment that the activities serve, including supporting mixed use activity in the Town Centre Zone;~~
5. The location, dimensions and characteristics of the land are appropriate to support:
 - a. activities, ~~that are anticipated within the existing General Industrial Zone, Knowledge Zone or Commercial and Mixed Use Zone;~~
 - b. community facilities, and public spaces where these are anticipated by the land use zone; and
6. An ODP is prepared that addresses the relevant matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.

Submission scope:

- 3.30 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-P16 through Woolworths (DPR-0396) and Foodstuffs (DPR-0373) submissions. The scope of their submissions are outlined in their post-hearing memos.

Reasoning:

- 3.31 The above amendments are recommended to ensure consistency and clarity. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment provides greater alignment with higher order documents.
- 3.32 **Policy 17**

Proposed amendments:

Encourage the intensification of urban activities or redevelopment of existing land within urban zones to assist in supporting the district's urban growth needs, including through the implementation of an adopted Urban Intensification Plan or any relevant Development Plan, to:

1. Minimise the loss of the rural land resource, particularly highly productive land;
2. Maintain the effective and efficient use of infrastructure and the strategic transport network;
3. Support housing choice, increase the availability of affordable housing and enable economically resilient and diverse commercial centres, including by providing mixed use activities in Key Activity Centres' or Local Centre Zones;
4. Promote consolidated and compact townships that support resilient, diverse and self-sufficient settlements;
5. Promote the regeneration of buildings and land;
6. Achieve higher residential densities in and around Key Activity Centres, Town Centres, Core Public Transport Routes and in locations where there is safe and convenient access to public transport and public transport facilities; ~~and~~
7. Achieve higher floor area ratios in the Commercial and Mixed Use Zone and General Industrial Zone to optimise the use of commercial and industrial land; and

8. **Provide for the functional need of commercial activities to be located accessibly in relation to the residential catchment they serve;**

provided that intensification or redevelopment does not

- 9. generate **significant** adverse amenity effects on surrounding environments; or
- 10. undermine the safe, efficient or cost-effective operation of infrastructure or utility services;
or
- 11. generate reverse sensitivity effects on important infrastructure.

Submission scope:

- 3.33 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-P17 through Woolworths (DPR-0396) and Foodstuffs (DPR-0373) submissions. The scope of their submissions are outlined in their post-hearing memos.

Reasoning:

- 3.34 The above amendments are recommended to ensure consistency and clarity. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment provides greater alignment with higher order documents.

3.35 **UG-SCHED1**

Proposed amendments:

- 1. A single ODP shall be prepared for each new residential and business growth area and incorporated into the Planning Maps and the relevant Development Area chapter of this Plan;
- 2. Each ODP shall illustrate how the site characteristics and topography have been addressed through the identification of:
 - a. Principal through roads and connections both within and adjoining the ODP area, including principal walking and cycling networks and public transport and freight routes;
 - b. Methods for the integrated management of water, stormwater, and wastewater and associated infrastructure consistent with UG-P15;
 - c. How each ODP area will when required to:
 - i. Achieve the minimum net density requirements and outcomes listed in UG-P5 or UG-P6 are to be achieved;
 - ii. Be staged to allow the subdivision development to align with the timing, funding, and availability of network infrastructure capacity; and
 - iii. Integrate into any adjoining land that is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay;
- 3. The following features shall be considered and where relevant provided for:
 - a. Any land to be set aside to protect or enhance environmental, conservation, landscape, heritage or cultural (including to provide for the interests of nga rūnanga) values;

- b. Any land to be set aside for community facilities, schools, open space reserve or commercial activities and how accessibility and connectivity between these locations is supported in the land transport network;
- c. Any land to be set aside to effectively manage hazard risk or contaminated land;
- d. Any methods or boundary treatments required to **avoid or** mitigate reverse sensitivity effects and promote compatible land use activities, including protecting important infrastructure, or a designated site; and
- e. Any other information which is relevant to the understanding of the development and its proposed zoning.

Submission scope:

- 3.36 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to UG-SCHED1 through Hort NZ's submission (DPR-0353.230).

Reasoning:

- 3.37 The above amendments are recommended to ensure consistency with the CRPS and the NPS-UD. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment provides greater alignment with higher order documents.

3.38 HPW25 - Overlays

Proposed amendments:

Name	Description
Urban Growth Overlay	Maps the spatial locations identified in Development Plans that have been adopted by SDC. These assist in determining where new urban areas can locate around townships and delivering the outcomes that are anticipated to be achieved within these environments.
Urban Growth Overlay – Business	<u>Maps the spatial locations for new business areas identified in Development Plans that have been adopted by SDC. These assist in determining where new business areas can locate within townships and delivering the outcomes that are anticipated to be achieved within these environments.</u>
Urban Growth Overlay – Greenfield	<u>Maps the spatial locations for new greenfield areas identified in Development Plans that have been adopted by SDC. These assist in determining where new urban areas can locate around townships and delivering the outcomes that are anticipated to be achieved within these environments.</u>
Urban Growth Overlay – Rural Residential	<u>Maps the spatial locations for new rural-residential areas identified in Development Plans that have been adopted by SDC. These assist in determining where new rural-residential areas can locate around townships and delivering the outcomes that are anticipated to be achieved within these environments.</u>

Submission scope:

- 3.39 Scope is provided for the proposed amendments to HPW25-Overlays through ECan's submission (DPR-0260).

Reasoning:

- 3.40 The above amendments are recommended to ensure clarity. No s32aa assessment is deemed necessary given that the extent of the amendment provides greater alignment with higher order documents.

4. Conclusion

- 4.1 For the reasons included throughout this report, I consider that the amended provisions will be efficient and effective in achieving the purpose of the RMA.

Appendix 1: Table of Submission Points

Amendments to this table from that included in the s42a report are highlighted below.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Submitter Point	Plan Reference	Position	Decision Requested	Recommendation	Section of Report
DPR-0032	CCC	004	UG-P13	Support in Part	Amend as follows: Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: ... 4. The minimum net densities of 12 15 hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to 2hh/ha for rural residential activities are met; ...	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS014	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS027	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission with respect to SD (Strategic Directions), UG (Urban Growth) and TRAN (Transport) and any other matters not consistent with or with implications for the our submission (157)	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS005	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS004	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission point	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS031	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS222	UG-P13	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Delete the policy in its entirety.	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS222	UG-P13	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Delete the policy in its entirety.	Reject Accept in Part	26

DPR-0374	RIHL	FS222	UG-P13	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Delete the policy in its entirety.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS208	UG-P13	Support	Accept proposed amendment.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	26
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS222	UG-P13	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Delete the policy in its entirety.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0432	Birchs Village Limited	FS004	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS005	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS015	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS808	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS019	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0580	Kersey Park Limited	FS005	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0587	Lloyd Bathurst	FS004	UG-P13	Oppose	Submission points be disallowed in full as does not support higher density living in Rolleston or the requirement to provide for public transport in all new developments.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0125	BE Faulkner	014	UG-O2	Support	Not specified.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	12
DPR-0125	BE Faulkner	015	UG-O3	Support	Not specified.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	13
DPR-0125	BE Faulkner	017	UG-P3	Support	Not specified.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	16
DPR-0125	BE Faulkner	028	UG-P14	Support	Not specified.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	27
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	004	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16

DPR-0032	CCC	FS018	UG-P3	Support In Part	The proposed plan not be amended as sought by the submitter.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0422	NCFF	FS165	UG-P3	Oppose	Disallow the submission point. Retain the policy as notified.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	009	UG-P11	Oppose	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> reverse sensitivity effects on:....	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS206	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS206	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS206	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS210	UG-P11	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS206	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0422	NCFF	FS169	UG-P11	Oppose	Disallow the submission point. Retain the policy as notified.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0446	Transpower	FS008	UG-P11	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	010	UG-P13	Oppose	Amend as follows: Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. Extensions assist in meeting the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium term period through to 2028; 2 A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch. 3. 1	Reject Accept in Part	26

					4- <u>2</u> The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to <u>5</u> 2hh/ha for rural residential activities are met; <u>5</u> 3...and/or 4. The new residential growth is in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement - Urban Development 2020; and <u>6</u> 7		
DPR-0032	CCC	FS038	UG-P13	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policy.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS211	UG-P13	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0422	NCFF	FS170	UG-P13	Oppose	Disallow the submission point. Retain the policy as notified.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	011	UG-P15	Oppose	Amend as follows: ...or 5. The new business growth area meets 1-3 above and/or is in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement - Urban Development 2020.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0032	CCC	FS039	UG-P15	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policy.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0422	NCFF	FS171	UG-P15	Oppose	Disallow the submission point. Retain the policy as notified.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0137	Pinedale & Kintyre	004	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0032	CCC	FS022	UG-P3	Support In Part	The proposed plan not be amended as sought by the submitter.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS212	UG-P3	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0137	Pinedale & Kintyre	007	UG-P15	Oppose	Amend UPG-P15 as follows: ...or 5. The new business growth area meets 1-3 above and/or is in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement - Urban Development 2020.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0032	CCC	FS040	UG-P15	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policy.	Accept in Part	28

DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS214	UG-P15	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0140	Jenkins	002	UG-P14	Oppose	Amend UG-P14 as follows: 1. There is a demonstrated need for additional development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan. Amend the Proposed Plan to the extent appropriate to ensure the Plan is consistent and gives effect to the NPS-UD 2020.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0142	NZ Pork	041	UG-SCHED1	Oppose In Part	Amend UG-SCHED1.3.d as follows: d. Any methods or boundary treatments required to mitigate reverse sensitivity effects and promote compatible land use activities, including protecting important infrastructure, or a designated site; <u>and encourage the use of generous setbacks, public roads and reserves as buffers between urban and rural land uses.</u>	Reject Accept in Part	33
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS273	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	33
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS079	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	33
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS072	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	33
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS909	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	33
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS199	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	33
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS199	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	33
32DPR-0374	RIHL	FS199	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	33
DPR-0378	MoE	FS027	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	33
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS199	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	33

DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS272	UG-SCHED1	Oppose In Part	Reject submission in part	Accept in Part	33
DPR-0157	The Williams	003	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0032	CCC	FS024	UG-P3	Support In Part	The proposed plan not be amended as sought by the submitter.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0548	Debbie & Andrew Maples	FS002	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	16
DPR-0582	Andrew and Debbie Maples	FS002	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject	Accept <u>in Part</u>	16
DPR-0588	Michael House	FS023	UG-P3	Support	The proposed changes to the PDP objectvies and policies to be accepted	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0157	The Williams	008	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: 3. The type, scale and function of new commercial areas are consistent with the Activity Centre Network and support mixed use activities, unless located in a Large Format Retail Zone; or 4. <u>The new business growth area meets 1-2 above and/or is in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement - Urban Development 2020, including by supplying significant development capacity, supporting competitive land and development markets and contributing to well-functioning urban environments.</u>	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	28
DPR-0032	CCC	FS042	UG-P15	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policy.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	28
DPR-0588	Michael House	FS028	UG-P15	Support	The proposed changes to the PDP objectvies and policies to be accepted	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	28
DPR-0160	West Melton Three Ltd	002	UG-P15	Oppose	Amend UG-P15 to read:.... 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either: a. b. consolidated within a Key Activity Centre or within an existing General Industrial Zone, Port Zone or Commercial and Mixed Use Zone; or	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	28

					3. The new business growth area meets 1-2 above and/or is in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020; 4. A diverse range of services and opportunities is provided for to respond to the social and economic needs identified in a BDCA, FDS or any relevant Development Plan;....		
DPR-0032	CCC	FS043	UG-P15	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policy.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0176	Macauley & Reid	004	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0246	Craig Robertson	FS005	UG-P3	Support In Part	Support the submission subject to the rezoning proposal providing for appropriate integration and connectivity with residential development of my land.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0176	Macauley & Reid	009	UG-P11	Oppose	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> reverse sensitivity effects on: 1. any adjoining rural, industrial, inland port, or knowledge zone; and 2. on the safe, efficient and cost-effective operation of important infrastructure, land transport infrastructure, and the strategic transport network.	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0246	Craig Robertson	FS010	UG-P11	Support In Part	Support the submission subject to the rezoning proposal providing for appropriate integration and connectivity with residential development of my land.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS207	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS207	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS207	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS218	UG-P11	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	24

DPR-0384	RIDL	FS207	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0176	Macauley & Reid	010	UG-P13	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</p> <p>1. Extensions assist in meeting the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium term period through to 2028;</p> <p>2. A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch;</p> <p>3.1. The land is subject to an Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either:</p> <p>a. a 'greenfield priority area', or any subsequent urban growth areas or urban containment boundaries, in the CRPS where it is a residential activity; or</p> <p>b. identified in an adopted Rural Residential Strategy and in accordance with CRPS Policy 6.3.9 where it is a rural residential activity; <u>and/or</u></p> <p><u>2. The new residential growth is in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020; and</u></p> <p>3. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to 2hh/ha for rural residential activities are met;</p> <p>4. <u>If zoned General Residential</u>, there is a diversity in housing types, sizes and densities;</p> <p>7.5. An ODP is prepared that addresses the matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.</p>	Reject Accept in Part	26

DPR-0246	Craig Robertson	FS011	UG-P13	Support In Part	Support the submission subject to the rezoning proposal providing for appropriate integration and connectivity with residential development of my land.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS219	UG-P13	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0178	Manson	007	UG-P14	Oppose	Amend as follows: Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. There is a demonstrated need for additional development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan; 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or the township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed; 3. Except for the LLRZ, the minimum net densities support a range of housing types that respond to demographic change, social needs and outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and 4. An ODP is prepared that addresses the matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0180	The Bonds	004	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete UG-P3 in its entirety	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0032	CCC	FS028	UG-P3	Support In Part	Amend the UG Overview as follows; "... there is at least sufficient urban development capacity ...". In all other respects the proposed plan not be amended as sought by the submitter.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0180	The Bonds	006	UG-P11	Oppose	Amend UG-P11 to read: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on: 1.	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS218	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24

DPR-0363	IRHL	FS218	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS218	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS221	UG-P11	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS218	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0180	The Bonds	007	UG-P14	Oppose	Amend UG-P14 to read: Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. There is a demonstrated need for additional development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan; 2.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS222	UG-P14	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0192	Merf Ag & Reed	004	UG-P14	Oppose	Amend UG-P14 to read: Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. There is a demonstrated need for additional development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan;	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0205	Lincoln University	040	UG-O2	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0205	Lincoln University	041	UG-O3	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0205	Lincoln University	044	UG-P3	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0342	AgResearch	FS009	UG-P3	Support	Allow in full	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0205	Lincoln University	055	UG-P14	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0342	AgResearch	FS020	UG-P14	Support	Allow in full	Accept in Part	27

DPR-0209	M Singh	005	UG-O3	Oppose	Amend UG-O3 to read: <u>As a minimum, there</u> There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within <u>each township within Selwyn</u> Greater Christchurch to ensure: 1.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	13
DPR-0032	CCC	FS046	UG-O3	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the objective.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	13
DPR-0209	M Singh	006	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete UG-P3 as notified.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0032	CCC	FS029	UG-P3	Support In Part	Amend the UGO Overview as follows; "... there is at least sufficient urban development capacity ...". In all other respects the proposed plan not be amended as sought by the submitter.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0209	M Singh	010	UG-P11	Oppose	Amend UG-P11 to read: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>or mitigate</u> reverse sensitivity effects on: 1.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS208	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS208	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS208	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS223	UG-P11	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS208	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0209	M Singh	011	UG-P13	Oppose	Amend UG-P13 to read: Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. Extensions assist in meeting the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium-term period through to 2028.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26

					<p>2. A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch;</p> <p>3.</p> <p>5. The growth area corrects a zoning anomaly; and</p> <p>6. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1-25hh/ha for rural residential activities are met, except where the land although identified in a Rural Residential Strategy, is an appropriate location for General Residential growth, in which case minimum densities of 12 hh/ha shall apply; and</p> <p>a. For General Residential zoned areas, A there is a diversity in housing types, sizes and densities. demonstrated to respond to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs identified in a HDCA, FDS or outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and</p> <p>b.</p>		
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS224	UG-P13	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept	26
DPR-0260	CRC	148	UG-O2	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS019	UG-O2	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	12
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS927	UG-O2	Oppose In Part	Reject in part the amendments sought.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS087	UG-O2	Oppose	Reject the submission in part.	Reject Accept in Part	12
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS037	UG-O2	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	12
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS036	UG-O2	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Reject Accept in Part	12

DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS903	UG-O2	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	12
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS020	UG-O2	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS786	UG-O2	Oppose	Reject Submission	Reject Accept in Part	12
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS053	UG-O2	Oppose	Reject submission in part being the amendments sought and the notified provisions sought to be retained	Reject Accept in Part	12
DPR-0260	CRC	149	UG-O3	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS020	UG-O3	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS928	UG-O3	Oppose In Part	Reject in part the amendments sought.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS088	UG-O3	Oppose	Reject the submission in part.	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS038	UG-O3	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS037	UG-O3	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS904	UG-O3	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS021	UG-O3	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS787	UG-O3	Oppose	Reject Submission	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS054	UG-O3	Oppose	Reject submission in part being the amendments sought and the notified provisions sought to be retained	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0260	CRC	150	UG-P3	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS021	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS929	UG-P3	Oppose In Part	Reject in part the amendments sought.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS089	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject the submission in part.	Reject Accept in Part	16

DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS039	UG-P3	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS038	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS905	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS022	UG-P3	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS788	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS055	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject submission in part being the amendments sought and the notified provisions sought to be retained	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0260	CRC	160	UG-P14	Support	Retain as notified.	<u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS030	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS939	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject in part the amendments sought.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1063	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission in part.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS049	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS048	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS416	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS032	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS797	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS065	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submission in part being the amendments sought and the notified provisions sought to be retained	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	008	UG-O3	Oppose In Part	Amend UG-O3 as follows: <u>As a minimum, there</u> There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within <u>each township</u> Greater Christchurch to ensure:....	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	13

DPR-0032	CCC	FS047	UG-O3	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the objective.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	13
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	009	UG-P3	Oppose In Part	Delete UG-P3 as notified	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0032	CCC	FS334	UG-P3	Support In Part	Amend the UGO Overview as follows; "... there is at least sufficient urban development capacity ...". In all other respects the proposed plan not be amended as sought by the submitter.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	013	UG-P11	Oppose In Part	Amend UG-P11 to read: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>or mitigate</u> reverse sensitivity effects on: 1.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS219	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS219	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS219	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS219	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	014	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Amend UG-P13 as follows: Any new residential growth area within the <u>Selwyn</u> Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. Extensions assist in meeting the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium term period through to 2028; 2. A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch; 3. The land is subject to an Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either:	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26

					<p>a. is a 'greenfield priority area', or any subsequent urban growth areas or urban containment boundaries, in the CRPS where it is a residential activity; or</p> <p>b. is identified in an adopted Rural Residential Strategy and in accordance with CRPS Policy 6.3.9 where it is a rural residential activity; or</p> <p>c. is in accordance with the <u>National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, including areas that have been identified for rural residential activity in an adopted Rural Residential Strategy but that are better suited to residential activity.</u></p> <p>4. Subject to 3c above, the minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to 2hh/ha for rural residential activities are met, or</p> <p>5. The new residential growth meets 1-4 above and/or is in accordance with and will give effect to the <u>National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020</u></p> <p>6. A diversity in housing types, sizes and densities is demonstrated to respond to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs identified in a HDCA, FDS or outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and</p> <p>7. An ODP is prepared that addresses the matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.</p>		
DPR-0032	CCC	FS033	UG-P13	Support In Part	Amend the UGO Overview as follows; "... there is at least sufficient urban development capacity ...". In all other respects the proposed plan not be amended as sought by the submitter.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	004	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	16

DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS004	UG-P3	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Neutral	Accept <u>in Part</u>	16
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	008	UG-P11	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> sensitivity effects on: 1.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0215	Winstone Aggregates	FS002	UG-P11	Oppose	Reject the submission.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	24
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS228	UG-P11	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	24
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS008	UG-P11	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Neutral	Accept <u>in Part</u>	24
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	009	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. 4. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to 5hh/ha for rural residential activities are met;; <u>or</u> 5. The new residential growth meets 1-4 above and/or is <u>in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020, including by supplying significant development capacity, supporting competitive land and development markets and contributing to well-functioning urban environments.</u> 6. A diversity in housing types, sizes and densities is demonstrated to respond to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs identified in a HDCA,	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26

					FDS or outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan provided; and....		
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS009	UG-P13	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Neutral	Accept <u>in Part</u>	26
DPR-0343	CDHB	037	UG-P3	Support	Retain as notified	Accept <u>in Part</u>	16
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS107	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS046	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject those parts of the submission inconsistent with the National Policy Statement – Urban Development	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS095	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject those parts of the submission inconsistent with the by my submission (209)	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS361	UG-P3	Oppose In Part	Reject submission points identified	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS124	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS872	UG-P3	Oppose In Part	Reject those submission points inconsistent with the National Policy Statement - Urban Development.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS107	UG-P3	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS461	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS385	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject the submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0343	CDHB	048	UG-P14	Support	Retain as notified	Accept <u>in Part</u>	27
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS118	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS057	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject those parts of the submission inconsistent with the National Policy Statement – Urban Development	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS106	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject those parts of the submission inconsistent with the by my submission (209)	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS372	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject submission points identified	Accept in Part	27

DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS135	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS883	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject those submission points inconsistent with the National Policy Statement - Urban Development.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS118	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS472	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS396	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0344	Four Stars Development Ltd & Gould Developments Ltd	009	UG-O3	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: <u>As a minimum, there</u> There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within <u>each township</u> Greater Christchurch to ensure:	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0344	Four Stars Development Ltd & Gould Developments Ltd	010	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0344	Four Stars Development Ltd & Gould Developments Ltd	014	UG-P11	Oppose In Part	Amend UG-P11 to read: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>or mitigate</u> reverse sensitivity effects on: 1.	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS220	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS220	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS220	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS220	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0344	Four Stars Development	015	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows:	Reject Accept in Part	26

	Ltd & Gould Developments Ltd				<p>Any new residential growth area within the <u>Selwyn Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</u></p> <p>1. Extensions assist in meeting the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium term period through to 2028;</p> <p>2. A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch;</p> <p>3. The land is subject to an Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either:</p> <p>a. <u>is</u> a 'greenfield priority area', or any subsequent urban growth areas or urban containment boundaries, in the CRPS where it is a residential activity;</p> <p>b. <u>is</u> identified in an adopted Rural Residential Strategy and in accordance with CRPS Policy 6.3.9 where it is a rural residential activity; or</p> <p>c. <u>is in accordance with the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020</u></p> <p>4. Subject to 3c above, the minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to 2hh/ha for rural residential activities are met, or</p> <p><u>5. The new residential growth meets 1-4 above and/or is in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020</u></p> <p>6. A diversity in housing types, sizes and densities is demonstrated to respond to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs identified in a HDCA, FDS or outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and</p> <p>7....</p>		
--	------------------------------	--	--	--	--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	--	--

DPR-0355	Ellis Darusette	003	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</p> <p>1. Extensions assist in meeting the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium term period through to 2028.</p> <p>2. A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch;</p> <p>3. The land is subject to an Urban Growth Overlay; <u>or</u></p> <p><u>4. The growth area is in accordance with the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020; or</u></p> <p><u>5. The growth area is minor in scale, will correct a zoning anomaly and achieve a compact and consolidated urban form; and</u></p> <p>6. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1-2 hh/ha for rural residential activities are met; <u>and</u></p> <p>a. <u>For General Residential zoned areas,</u> A there is a diversity in housing types, sizes and densities demonstrated to respond to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs identified in a HDCA, FDS or outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and</p> <p>b.</p>	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0358	RWRL	325	UG-O2	Support	Retain as notified	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS146	UG-O2	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS446	UG-O2	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	12

DPR-0209	M Singh	FS534	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS491	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS163	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS537	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS144	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS421	UG-02	Support	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS514	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0358	RWRL	326	UG-03	Support	Retain as notified	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS147	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS447	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS535	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS492	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS164	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS538	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS145	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS422	UG-03	Support	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS515	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0358	RWRL	329	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject Accept in Part	16

DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS150	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS449	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS538	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS495	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS167	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS540	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS148	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS425	UG-P3	Support	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS518	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0358	RWRL	339	UG-P13	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0032	CCC	FS051	UG-P13	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policies.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS160	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS458	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS412	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS505	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission in part	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS177	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS030	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26

DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS158	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS353	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS528	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0358	RWRL	340	UG-P14	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Residential growth —Outside the Greater Christchurch area Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: ... 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or the township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed; ...	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0032	CCC	FS052	UG-P14	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policies.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS161	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS065	UG-P14	Support	Accept the submission to the extent that the UGO should not be the sole or principal with respect to the GRZ, and accept any other amendments consistent with our submission	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS417	UG-P14	Support	Accept the submission in part	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS506	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS178	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS028	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS159	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	27

DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS351	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS529	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission and Amend the Proposed Selwyn District Plan to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0358	RWRL	341	UG-P15	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0032	CCC	FS053	UG-P15	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policies.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS162	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS459	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS548	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS507	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS179	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS549	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS160	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS437	UG-P15	Support	Accept submission in part	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS530	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0358	RWRL	342	UG-P16	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Residential growth —Outside the Greater Christchurch area Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: ...	Reject Accept in Part	29

					2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or the township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed; ...		
DPR-0032	CCC	FS054	UG-P16	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policies.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS163	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS460	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS549	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS508	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS180	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS550	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS161	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS438	UG-P16	Support	Accept submission in part	Reject Accept in Part	29
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS531	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0361	The Wrights	004	UG-O2	Support In Part	Retain Urban Growth Overlay notation on this property and the associated objectives and policies should the request to rezone the site be unsuccessful.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0361	The Wrights	015	UG-P14	Support In Part	Retain Urban Growth Overlay notation on this property and the associated objectives and policies should the request to rezone the site be unsuccessful.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0363	IRHL	314	UG-O2	Support	Retain as notified	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS174	UG-O2	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS779	UG-O2	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	12

DPR-0209	M Singh	FS703	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS658	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS191	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS696	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS172	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS313	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS580	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0363	IRHL	315	UG-03	Support	Retain as notified	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS175	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS780	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS704	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS659	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS192	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS697	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS173	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS314	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS581	UG-03	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0363	IRHL	318	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject Accept in Part	16

DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS178	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS783	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS587	UG-P3	Support	Accept the submission in part	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS662	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS195	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS034	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS176	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS195	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS584	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0363	IRHL	328	UG-P13	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0032	CCC	FS055	UG-P13	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policies.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS188	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS791	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS583	UG-P13	Support	Accept the submission in part	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS672	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26

DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS204	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS037	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS186	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS191	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS327	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS594	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0363	IRHL	329	UG-P14	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Residential growth —Outside the Greater Christchurch area Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: ... 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or the township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed; ...	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0032	CCC	FS056	UG-P14	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policies.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS189	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS071	UG-P14	Support	Accept the submission to the extent that the UGO should not be the sole or principal with respect to the GRZ, and accept any other amendments consistent with our submission	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS589	UG-P14	Support	Accept the submission in part	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS673	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27

DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS205	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS234	UG-P14	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS036	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS187	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS197	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS595	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0363	IRHL	330	UG-P15	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0032	CCC	FS057	UG-P15	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policies.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS190	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS794	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS715	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS674	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS206	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS235	UG-P15	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS707	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS188	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	28

DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS329	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS596	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0363	IRHL	331	UG-P16	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Business growth — Outside the Greater Christchurch area Any new areas to support commercial or industrial activities outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: ... 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or is consolidated with an existing Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone or General Industrial Zone; ...	Reject Accept in Part	29
DPR-0032	CCC	FS058	UG-P16	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policies.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS191	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS792	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS716	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS675	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS207	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS708	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS189	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS330	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS597	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0367	Orion	045	UG-P3	Support	Retain as notified.	Accept in Part	16

DPR-0407	Forest & Bird	FS614	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject aspects of the submission which do not directly relate to electricity lines and services as critical infrastructure.	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0367	Orion	049	UG-P15	Support In Part	Amend as follows: 6. An ODP is prepared <u>that addresses the matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria</u> and incorporated into this plan before any subdivision proceeds.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0407	Forest & Bird	FS618	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject aspects of the submission which do not directly relate to electricity lines and services as critical infrastructure.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0367	Orion	050	UG-P16	Support In Part	Amend as follows: 6. An ODP is prepared <u>that addresses the matters listed in the UG-ODP Criteria</u> and incorporated into this plan before any subdivision proceeds.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0407	Forest & Bird	FS619	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject aspects of the submission which do not directly relate to electricity lines and services as critical infrastructure.	Reject Accept in Part	29
DPR-0367	Orion	051	UG-P17	Support In Part	Amend as follows: <u>10. generate adverse reverse sensitivity effects on important infrastructure.</u>	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0407	Forest & Bird	FS620	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject aspects of the submission which do not directly relate to electricity lines and services as critical infrastructure.	Reject Accept in Part	30
DPR-0370	Fonterra Limited	075	UG-P11	Support In Part	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects on: a. b. on the safe, efficient and cost effective operation, <u>use, maintenance, upgrade and development</u> of important infrastructure, land transport infrastructure, and the strategic transport network.	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS807	UG-P11	Oppose In Part	Reject submission in part	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0371	CIAL	058	UG-P3	Support	Retain as notified	Accept in Part	16

DPR-0353	HortNZ	FS121	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0371	CIAL	059	UG-P8	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Avoid the following locations and areas when zoning land to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas: ... <u>d. The 50 dB Ldn Air Noise Contours; and</u>	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0353	HortNZ	FS122	UG-P8	Oppose	Reject	Reject Accept in Part	21
DPR-0371	CIAL	061	UG-P13	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 3. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities <u>in urban areas</u> or 1 to 2hh/ha for rural residential activities <u>in Specific Control Areas where higher density residential activity is anticipated in the rural zones</u> are met;	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0353	HortNZ	FS124	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0371	CIAL	063	UG-SCHED1	Support	Amend as follows: 3. The following features and outcomes are to be illustrated on an indicative subdivision concept plan containing lot configurations and sizes that is to accompany the ODP; ... <u>d. Any land to be set aside to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on important infrastructure;</u> e. Any methods or boundary treatments required to mitigate <u>avoid</u> reverse sensitivity effects and promote compatible land use activities, including protecting important infrastructure, or a designated site; and ...	Reject Accept in Part	33
DPR-0353	HortNZ	FS041	UG-SCHED1	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	33

DPR-0373	Foodstuffs	007	UG-03	Support	Amend UG-03 to provide for supermarkets outside of the TCZ.	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0032	CCC	FS059	UG-03	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the objective and policy.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS175	UG-03	Support In Part	Adopt to the extent the relief applies to the LFRZ.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS175	UG-03	Support In Part	Adopt to the extent the relief applies to the LFRZ.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS175	UG-03	Support In Part	Adopt to the extent the relief applies to the LFRZ.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS175	UG-03	Support In Part	Adopt to the extent the relief applies to the LFRZ.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0373	Foodstuffs	008	UG-P15	Oppose	Amend UG-P15 to provide for supermarkets outside of the TCZ.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0032	CCC	FS060	UG-P15	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the objective and policy.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS230	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS230	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS230	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS230	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0373	Foodstuffs	009	UG	Oppose	Amend the provisions in the Plan to include the strategic ability to enhance commercial development capacity and to give effect to the NPS on Urban Development.	Reject Accept in Part	9
DPR-0032	CCC	FS045	UG	Oppose	Retain the existing wording of the policy.	Accept in Part	9
DPR-0374	RIHL	320	UG-02	Support	Retain as notified	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS222	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS594	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS959	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS809	UG-02	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	12

DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS238	UG-O2	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS839	UG-O2	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS220	UG-O2	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS157	UG-O2	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS718	UG-O2	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0374	RIHL	321	UG-O3	Support	Retain as notified	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS223	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS595	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS960	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS810	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS239	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS840	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS221	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS158	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS719	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0374	RIHL	324	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0032	CCC	FS065	UG-P3	Oppose	Retain the Urban Growth Overlay or include alternative provisions that give direction as to the location of urban development. Retain the existing wording of the overview, Policies 3 and 4, UG-R1 and UG-MAT1.	Accept in Part	16

DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS226	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS598	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0206	Urban Holdings Limited, Suburban Estates Limited & Cairnbrae Developments Limited	FS003	UG-P3	Support In Part	Remove the urban growth overlay and amend associated policies or specify that the overlay while being a priority area is not the only area where growth can or should occur.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS842	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS813	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS242	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0411	Hughes Developments Limited	FS011	UG-P3	Support	Remove the urban growth overlay and amend associated policies or specify that the overlay while being a priority area is not the only area where growth can or should occur.	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS042	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS224	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS039	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS722	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part and Amend the Proposed District Plan to achieve consistency with the NPSUD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0374	RIHL	334	UG-P13	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	26

DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS235	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS608	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS970	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept the submission	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS823	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS252	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS045	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS234	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS002	UG-P13	Support	Accept the Submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS732	UG-P13	Support	Accept the submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0374	RIHL	335	UG-P14	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Residential growth — Outside the Greater Christchurch area Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: ... 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or the township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed; ...	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS236	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS609	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS844	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	27

DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS824	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS253	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS044	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS235	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS041	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject the submission but amend the PDP to achieve consistency with the NPS-UD with respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS733	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0374	RIHL	336	UG-P15	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS237	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS610	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS971	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS825	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS254	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS851	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS236	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS173	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS734	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part and Amend the Proposed District Plan to achieve consistency with the NPSUD with	Accept in Part	28

					respect to responding to urban development proposals outside the UGO		
DPR-0374	RIHL	337	UG-P16	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Business growth — Outside the Greater Christchurch area Any new areas to support commercial or industrial activities outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: ... 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or is consolidated with an existing Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone or General Industrial Zone; ...	Reject Accept in Part	29
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS238	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS611	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS972	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS826	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS255	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS852	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS237	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS174	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part. Reject the submission seeking removal of the UGO.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS735	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept the submission in part.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	164	UG-P4	Support In Part	Request that consideration is given as to whether these policies should be extended and lead into the development of an appropriate set of rules and requirements to achieve minimum density standards.	Reject Accept in Part	17

DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS126	UG-P4	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	17
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS990	UG-P4	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	17
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS332	UG-P4	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	17
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS143	UG-P4	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	17
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS179	UG-P4	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	17
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS179	UG-P4	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	17
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS179	UG-P4	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	17
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS179	UG-P4	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	17
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS125	UG-P4	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	17
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	168	UG-P8	Support In Part	Request that consideration is given as to whether these policies should be extended and lead into the development of an appropriate set of rules and requirements to achieve minimum density standards.	Reject Accept in Part	21
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS130	UG-P8	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS994	UG-P8	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS336	UG-P8	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS147	UG-P8	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS183	UG-P8	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS183	UG-P8	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS183	UG-P8	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS183	UG-P8	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS129	UG-P8	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	21
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	171	UG-P11	Support In Part	Request that consideration is given as to whether these policies should be extended and lead into the development of an appropriate set of rules and requirements to achieve minimum density standards.	Reject Accept in Part	24

DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS133	UG-P11	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS997	UG-P11	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS339	UG-P11	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS150	UG-P11	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS186	UG-P11	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS186	UG-P11	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS186	UG-P11	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS186	UG-P11	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS132	UG-P11	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	173	UG-P13	Support In Part	Request that consideration is given as to whether these policies should be extended and lead into the development of an appropriate set of rules and requirements to achieve minimum density standards.	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS135	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1048	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS341	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS152	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS188	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS188	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS188	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS188	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS134	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	174	UG-P14	Support In Part	Request that consideration is given as to whether these policies should be extended and lead into the development of an appropriate set of rules and requirements to achieve minimum density standards.	Reject Accept in Part	27

DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS136	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS025	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS342	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS153	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS189	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS189	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS189	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS189	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS135	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	175	UG-P15	Support In Part	Request that consideration is given as to whether these policies should be extended and lead into the development of an appropriate set of rules and requirements to achieve minimum density standards.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS137	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS056	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS343	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS154	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS190	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS190	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS190	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS190	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS136	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	176	UG-P16	Support In Part	Request that consideration is given as to whether these policies should be extended and lead into the development of an appropriate set of rules and requirements to achieve minimum density standards.	Reject Accept in Part	29

DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS138	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept <u>in Part</u>	29
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS057	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept <u>in Part</u>	29
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS344	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept <u>in Part</u>	29
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS155	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	29
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS191	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject	Accept <u>in Part</u>	29
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS191	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject	Accept <u>in Part</u>	29
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS191	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject	Accept <u>in Part</u>	29
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS191	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject	Accept <u>in Part</u>	29
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS137	UG-P16	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	177	UG-P17	Support In Part	Request that consideration is given as to whether these policies should be extended and lead into the development of an appropriate set of rules and requirements to achieve minimum density standards.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	30
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS139	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept <u>in Part</u>	30
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS058	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept <u>in Part</u>	30
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS345	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept <u>in Part</u>	30
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS156	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	30
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS192	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject	Accept <u>in Part</u>	30
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS192	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject	Accept <u>in Part</u>	30
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS192	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject	Accept <u>in Part</u>	30
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS192	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject	Accept <u>in Part</u>	30
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS138	UG-P17	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0376	Fox & Associates	007	UG-P11	Oppose	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> sensitivity effects on:	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24

					1. any adjoining rural, industrial, inland port, or knowledge zone; and 2. on the safe, efficient and cost-effective operation of important infrastructure, land transport infrastructure, and the strategic transport network.		
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS209	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS209	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS209	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0381	Coleridge Downs Limited	FS060	UG-P11	Support	Allow	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS209	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0486	Coleridge Downs Limited	FS060	UG-P11	Support	Allow	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0376	Fox & Associates	008	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Amend UG-P14 to read: Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. There is a demonstrated need for additional development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan; 2. 3. Except for the LLRZ, the The minimum net densities support a range of housing types that respond to demographic change, social needs and outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and 4.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS362	UG-P14	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is enabled.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0384	RIDL	332	UG-O2	Support	Retain as notified	Accept in Part	12
DPR-0384	RIDL	333	UG-O3	Support	Retain as notified	Accept in Part	13

DPR-0384	RIDL	336	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0384	RIDL	346	UG-P13	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0384	RIDL	347	UG-P14	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Residential growth —Outside the Greater Christchurch area Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: ... 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or the township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed; ...	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0384	RIDL	348	UG-P15	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	28
DPR-0384	RIDL	349	UG-P16	Support In Part	Amend as follows: Business growth —Outside the Greater Christchurch area Any new areas to support commercial or industrial activities outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: ... 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or is consolidated with an existing Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone or General Industrial Zone;	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0397	Survus Consultants Ltd	006	UG-P11	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> sensitivity effects on: 1.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS210	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS210	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS210	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24

DPR-0384	RIDL	FS210	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0397	Survus Consultants Ltd	007	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. There is a demonstrated need for additional development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan; 2. 3. <u>For the General Residential Zone</u> , the minimum net densities support a range of housing types that respond to demographic change, social needs and outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and 4.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0399	Gulf Central & Apton	008	UG-P11	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> reverse sensitivity effects on:	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS211	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS211	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS211	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS211	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0415	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS020	UG-P11	Oppose	Disallow the submission as proposed. If the submission is accepted, ensure any amendments appropriate reflect the purpose of the RMA and do not adversely impact Fulton Hogan's proposed Roydon Quarry.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	24
DPR-0574	Macrocarpa Supplies Limited	FS008	UG-P11	Support In Part	Re-zone the area identified in DPR-0399 in order to provide for the efficient operation of businesses which	Accept in Part	24

					support rural land use activity.		
DPR-0575	Makz Trailers Limited	FS008	UG-P11	Support In Part	Re-zone the area identified in DPR-0399 in order to provide for the efficient operation of businesses which support rural land use activity.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0577	Southern Horticultural Products Ltd	FS008	UG-P11	Support In Part	Re-zone the area identified in DPR-0399 in order to provide for the efficient operation of businesses which support rural land use activity.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0584	Barron Family Trust	FS008	UG-P11	Support In Part	Re-zone the area identified in DPR-0399 in order to provide for the efficient operation of businesses which support rural land use activity.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0399	Gulf Central & Apton	009	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Any new areas to support commercial activities, industrial activities, or activities provided for in the Port Zone or Knowledge Zone in the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</p> <p>1. A BDCA and FDS demonstrates a need for additional suitable development capacity within the township and the additional suitable development capacity supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch;</p> <p>2.</p> <p>c. A diverse range of services and opportunities is provided for to respond to the social and economic needs identified in a BDCA, FDS or any relevant Development Plan;</p> <p>3.</p> <p><u>4. The new business growth area meets 1-2 above and/or is in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020;</u></p> <p><u>5. The new business growth area will resolve a zoning anomaly;</u></p> <p>6.</p>	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	28

DPR-0415	Fulton Hogan Limited	FS021	UG-P15	Oppose	Disallow the submission as proposed. If the submission is accepted, ensure any amendments appropriate reflect the purpose of the RMA and do not adversely impact Fulton Hogan's proposed Roydon Quarry.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0574	Macrocarpa Supplies Limited	FS009	UG-P15	Support In Part	Re-zone the area identified in DPR-0399 in order to provide for the efficient operation of businesses which support rural land use activity.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0575	Makz Trailers Limited	FS009	UG-P15	Support In Part	Re-zone the area identified in DPR-0399 in order to provide for the efficient operation of businesses which support rural land use activity.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0577	Southern Horticultural Products Ltd	FS009	UG-P15	Support In Part	Re-zone the area identified in DPR-0399 in order to provide for the efficient operation of businesses which support rural land use activity.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0584	Barron Family Trust	FS009	UG-P15	Support In Part	Re-zone the area identified in DPR-0399 in order to provide for the efficient operation of businesses which support rural land use activity.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	003	UG-O3	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within Greater Christchurch to ensure: ...	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS197	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS870	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1049	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS844	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS213	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS195	UG-O3	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	13

DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	007	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS201	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS874	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1053	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS848	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS217	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS199	UG-P3	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	009	UG-P11	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>limit potential</u> reverse sensitivity effects on: ...	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS203	UG-P11	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS876	UG-P11	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1055	UG-P11	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS850	UG-P11	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS219	UG-P11	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS221	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS221	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24

DPR-0374	RIHL	FS221	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS241	UG-P11	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS221	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording.	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS201	UG-P11	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	010	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Include a definition of outline development plan and provide a statement and/or explanatory note confirming the relationship between outline development plans and development areas.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS204	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS877	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS150	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS851	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS220	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS224	UG-P13	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS224	UG-P13	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS224	UG-P13	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS224	UG-P13	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS046	UG-P13	Support	Accept Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS202	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	26

DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS031	UG-P13	Support	Accept Submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS753	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	011	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Include a definition of outline development plan and provide a statement and/or explanatory note confirming the relationship between outline development plans and development areas.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS205	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS878	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS151	UG-P14	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS852	UG-P14	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS221	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS225	UG-P14	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS225	UG-P14	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS225	UG-P14	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS225	UG-P14	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS047	UG-P14	Support	Accept Submission	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS203	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS032	UG-P14	Support	Accept Submission	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS754	UG-P14	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	27

DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	012	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Include a definition of outline development plan and provide a statement and/or explanatory note confirming the relationship between outline development plans and development areas.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS206	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS879	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS153	UG-P15	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS853	UG-P15	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS222	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS226	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS226	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS226	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS226	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS048	UG-P15	Support	Accept Submission	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS204	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS033	UG-P15	Support	Accept Submission	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS755	UG-P15	Support	Accept submission	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	013	UG-P16	Oppose In Part	Include a definition of outline development plan and provide a statement and/or explanatory note confirming the relationship between outline development plans and development areas.	Reject Accept in Part	29

DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS207	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS880	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS154	UG-P16	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS854	UG-P16	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS223	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS227	UG-P16	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS227	UG-P16	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS227	UG-P16	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS227	UG-P16	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS049	UG-P16	Support	Accept Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS205	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS034	UG-P16	Support	Accept Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS756	UG-P16	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	29
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	014	UG-P13	Oppose	Delete UG-P13 and UG-P14 and replace with one policy as follows: <u>New residential growth within the District shall provide for a diversity in housing types, sizes and densities which responds to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs.</u>	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS208	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	26

DPR-0157	The Williams	FS881	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS156	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS855	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS224	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS228	UG-P13	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS228	UG-P13	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS228	UG-P13	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0375	Waka Kotahi	FS417	UG-P13	Oppose	Further consideration is given to the submission prior to determining whether an increased density is appropriate.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	26
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS228	UG-P13	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS050	UG-P13	Support	Accept Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS206	UG-P13	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS029	UG-P13	Support	Accept Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS757	UG-P13	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	015	UG-P14	Oppose	Delete UG-P13 and UG-P14 and replace with one policy as follows: <u>New residential growth within the District shall provide for a diversity in housing types, sizes and densities which responds to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs.</u>	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS209	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27

DPR-0157	The Williams	FS882	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS157	UG-P14	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS856	UG-P14	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS225	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS229	UG-P14	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS229	UG-P14	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS229	UG-P14	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS229	UG-P14	Support	Adopt.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS051	UG-P14	Support	Accept Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS207	UG-P14	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS030	UG-P14	Support	Accept Submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS758	UG-P14	Support	Accept submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	27
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	016	UG-P15	Oppose	Delete UG-P15 and UG-P16 and replace with one policy as follows: <u>New areas supporting commercial and industrial growth shall provide for a diverse range of services and opportunities responding to the social and economic needs of business, residents and visitors.</u>	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	28
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS210	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS883	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28

DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1056	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS857	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS226	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS231	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS231	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS231	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS231	UG-P15	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS208	UG-P15	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	017	UG-P16	Oppose	Delete UG-P15 and UG-P16 and replace with one policy as follows: <u>New areas supporting commercial and industrial growth shall provide for a diverse range of services and opportunities responding to the social and economic needs of business, residents and visitors.</u>	Reject Accept in Part	29
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS211	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS884	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1057	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS858	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS227	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS232	UG-P16	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	29

DPR-0363	IRHL	FS232	UG-P16	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	29
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS232	UG-P16	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	29
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS232	UG-P16	Support	Adopt.	Reject Accept in Part	29
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS209	UG-P16	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0412	Hughes Developments	018	UG-P17	Support In Part	Amend as follows: <u>Encourage the intensification of urban activities or redevelopment of existing land within urban zones to assist in supporting the districts urban growth needs.</u>	Reject Accept in Part	30
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS212	UG-P17	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS885	UG-P17	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS859	UG-P17	Support In Part	Accept submission in part	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS228	UG-P17	Support In Part	Accept submissions in part.	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS234	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS234	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS234	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS234	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS210	UG-P17	Support In Part	Accept in part	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	161	UG-P12	Support In Part	Amend as follows and move to Strategic Directions: Ensure the zoning of land to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas demonstrates how it will integrate with existing urban environments, optimise the efficient and cost-effective provision of infrastructure, and protect natural and physical resources, by:	Accept in Part	25

					<p>1. Aligning the zoning, subdivision and development with network capacity and availability of existing or new <u>planned</u> infrastructure, including through the staging of development;</p> <p>2. ...</p> <p>3. Ensuring the land is located where solid waste collection and disposal services are available <u>or planned</u>;</p> <p>4. Prioritising accessibility and connectivity between the <u>through zoning</u> land and adjoining neighbourhoods, commercial centres, open space reserves, and community facilities, including education providers, public reserves, and health services; and</p> <p>...</p>		
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS050	UG-P12	Oppose	Reject submission	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	25
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS227	UG-P12	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	25
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1006	UG-P12	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	25
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS187	UG-P12	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	25
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS067	UG-P12	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	25
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS213	UG-P12	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	25
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS051	UG-P12	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	25
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS583	UG-P12	Oppose In Part	Reject submission points in part	Accept in Part	25
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS207	UG-P12	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission points in part.	Accept in Part	25

DPR-0565	Shelley Street Holdings Ltd	FS098	UG-P12	Support In Part	Support the submission subject to amendments to the MDRZ boundary at Rolleston to include properties on the east side of George Street including no. 30 George Street & any other amendments/changes to the relevant provisions as are consistent with enabling our MDH proposal.	Accept in Part	25
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	162	UG-P13	Support In Part	Amend policy as follows and move to Strategic Directions: Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. Extensions assist in meeting the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium term period through to 2028. 2. ... ; 3. The land is within the Future Urban Zone subject to an Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either: ... 4. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to 2hh/ha for rural residential activities are met;...	Reject Accept in Part	26
DPR-0032	CCC	FS066	UG-P13	Oppose	Retain the existing provisions in the Proposed District Plan, except to the extent that an increase in the minimum net densities has been sought in the City Council submissions.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS051	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS228	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1007	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS188	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS068	UG-P13	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	26

DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS214	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS052	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS584	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject submission points in part	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS208	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission points in part.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0565	Shelley Street Holdings Ltd	FS099	UG-P13	Support In Part	Support the submission subject to amendments to the MDRZ boundary at Rolleston to include properties on the east side of George Street including no. 30 George Street & any other amendments/changes to the relevant provisions as are consistent with enabling our MDH proposal.	Accept in Part	26
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	163	UG-P14	Support In Part	Amend policy as follows and move to Strategic Directions: Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. ... ; 2. The land is <u>within the Future Urban Zone</u> subject to an Urban Growth Overlay , or the township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed; <u>and</u> 3. The minimum net densities support a range of housing types that respond to demographic change, social needs and outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and 4. ...	Reject Accept in Part	27
DPR-0032	CCC	FS067	UG-P14	Oppose	Retain the existing provisions in the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS052	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	27

DPR-0157	The Williams	FS229	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1008	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS189	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS069	UG-P14	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS215	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS053	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS585	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject submission points in part	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS209	UG-P14	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission points in part.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0565	Shelley Street Holdings Ltd	FS100	UG-P14	Support In Part	Support the submission subject to amendments to the MDRZ boundary at Rolleston to include properties on the east side of George Street including no. 30 George Street & any other amendments/changes to the relevant provisions as are consistent with enabling our MDH proposal.	Accept in Part	27
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	164	UG-P15	Support In Part	Amend as follows and move to Strategic Directions: Any new areas to support commercial activities, industrial activities, or activities provided for in the Port Zone or Knowledge Zone in the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. ... ; 2. The land <u>is within the Future Urban Zone</u> subject to an Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either: ...	Reject Accept in Part	28
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS053	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	28

DPR-0157	The Williams	FS230	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1009	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS190	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS070	UG-P15	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS216	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS054	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS586	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Reject submission points in part	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS210	UG-P15	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission points in part.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0565	Shelley Street Holdings Ltd	FS101	UG-P15	Support In Part	Support the submission subject to amendments to the MDRZ boundary at Rolleston to include properties on the east side of George Street including no. 30 George Street & any other amendments/changes to the relevant provisions as are consistent with enabling our MDH proposal.	Accept in Part	28
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	165	UG-P16	Support In Part	Amend as follows and move to Strategic Directions: Any new areas to support commercial or industrial activities outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. ... ; 2. The land is <u>within the Future Urban Zone</u> subject to an Urban Growth Overlay , or is consolidated with an existing Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone or General Industrial Zone; ...	Reject Accept in Part	29
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS054	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	29

DPR-0157	The Williams	FS231	UG-P16	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1010	UG-P16	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS191	UG-P16	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS071	UG-P16	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS217	UG-P16	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS055	UG-P16	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS587	UG-P16	Oppose In Part	Reject submission points in part	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS211	UG-P16	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission points in part.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0565	Shelley Street Holdings Ltd	FS102	UG-P16	Support In Part	Support the submission subject to amendments to the MDRZ boundary at Rolleston to include properties on the east side of George Street including no. 30 George Street & any other amendments/changes to the relevant provisions as are consistent with enabling our MDH proposal.	Accept in Part	29
DPR-0414	Kāinga Ora	166	UG-P17	Support In Part	Amend follows and move to Strategic Directions: Encourage the intensification of urban activities or redevelopment of existing land within urban zones to assist in supporting the district's urban growth needs, including through the implementation of an adopted Urban Intensification Plan or any relevant Development Plan, to: ...	Reject Accept in Part	30
DPR-0136	Stewart Townsend & Fraser	FS055	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject submission	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0157	The Williams	FS232	UG-P17	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	30

DPR-0209	M Singh	FS1011	UG-P17	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission in part	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0298	Trices Rd	FS192	UG-P17	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS072	UG-P17	Oppose	Reject submissions.	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	FS218	UG-P17	Oppose In Part	Reject submission	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	FS056	UG-P17	Oppose In Part	Reject in part	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	FS588	UG-P17	Oppose In Part	Reject submission points in part	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	FS212	UG-P17	Oppose In Part	Reject the submission points in part.	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0565	Shelley Street Holdings Ltd	FS103	UG-P17	Support In Part	Support the submission subject to amendments to the MDRZ boundary at Rolleston to include properties on the east side of George Street including no. 30 George Street & any other amendments/changes to the relevant provisions as are consistent with enabling our MDH proposal.	Accept in Part	30
DPR-0446	Transpower	135	UG-P11	Support In Part	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid adverse reverse sensitivity effects, <u>including reverse sensitivity effects</u> on:	Accept in Part	24
DPR-0460	Marama Te Wai Ltd	010	UG-O3	Oppose In Part	Amend UG-O3 to read: <u>As a minimum, there</u> There is sufficient ample feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within Greater Christchurch to ensure: 1. The housing bottom lines are met; 2. A wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities are available to satisfy social and affordability needs and respond to demographic change; and	Reject Accept in Part	13

DPR-0347	Richard Erskine & Trish Standfield	FS010	UG-O3	Oppose	That all affected homeowners are consulted with, along with the rest of the West Melton township. Considers that a larger scale development would be more in keeping with the existing land owners on the eastern side of the proposal, would still retain the amenity value of the neighbouring properties. Refer to original further submission for full decision requested.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0537	Stephen Lycett	FS009	UG-O3	Oppose	Disallow in full	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0578	Elene (Helen) Anderson	FS028	UG-O3	Oppose	Submission point to be disallowed in full. Should SDC choose to approve this submission either in full or part, then requests that 16 Shepherd Ave to be excluded from any rezoning, i.e. remain at the current LLRZ/GRUZ zoning.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0594	Andrew and Amanda Diehl	FS009	UG-O3	Oppose	Reject submission point and maintain zoning and policy as drafted in PDP.	Accept in Part	13
DPR-0460	Marama Te Wai Ltd	011	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete UG-P3 as notified	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0347	Richard Erskine & Trish Standfield	FS011	UG-P3	Oppose	That all affected homeowners are consulted with, along with the rest of the West Melton township. Considers that a larger scale development would be more in keeping with the existing land owners on the eastern side of the proposal, would still retain the amenity value of the neighbouring properties. Refer to original further submission for full decision requested.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0578	Elene (Helen) Anderson	FS029	UG-P3	Oppose	Submission point to be disallowed in full. Should SDC choose to approve this submission either in full or part, then requests that 16 Shepherd Ave to be excluded from any rezoning, i.e. remain at the current LLRZ/GRUZ zoning.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0594	Andrew and Amanda Diehl	FS011	UG-P3	Oppose	Reject submission point and maintain zoning and policy as drafted in PDP.	Accept in Part	16
DPR-0460	Marama Te Wai Ltd	015	UG-P11	Oppose	Amend as follows:	Reject Accept in Part	24

					When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> sensitivity effects on: 1.		
DPR-0347	Richard Erskine & Trish Standfield	FS015	UG-P11	Oppose	That all affected homeowners are consulted with, along with the rest of the West Melton township. Considers that a larger scale development would be more in keeping with the existing land owners on the eastern side of the proposal, would still retain the amenity value of the neighbouring properties. Refer to original further submission for full decision requested.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS212	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS212	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS212	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS212	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0537	Stephen Lycett	FS011	UG-P11	Oppose	Disallow in full	Accept <u>in Part</u>	24
DPR-0578	Elene (Helen) Anderson	FS033	UG-P11	Oppose	Submission point to be disallowed in full. Should SDC choose to approve this submission either in full or part, then requests that 16 Shepherd Ave to be excluded from any rezoning, i.e. remain at the current LLRZ/GRUZ zoning.	Accept <u>in Part</u>	24
DPR-0460	Marama Te Wai Ltd	016	UG-P13	Oppose	Amend UG-P13 to read: Residential growth – Greater Christchurch area Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. Extensions assist in meeting the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium-term period through to 2028.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26

					<p>2. A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch;</p> <p>3. The land is subject to an Urban Growth Overlay; <u>or</u></p> <p>4. The growth area is in accordance with the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020); and</p> <p>5. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1-2 <u>1-5</u> hh/ha for rural residential activities are met; or; <u>and</u></p> <p>a. <u>For General Residential zoned areas, A there is a diversity in housing types, sizes and densities. demonstrated to respond to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs identified in a HDCA, FDS or outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and</u></p> <p>b. An ODP is prepared that addresses the matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.</p>		
DPR-0347	Richard Erskine & Trish Standfield	FS016	UG-P13	Oppose	<p>That all affected homeowners are consulted with, along with the rest of the West Melton township. Considers that a larger scale development would be more in keeping with the existing land owners on the eastern side of the proposal, would still retain the amenity value of the neighbouring properties. Refer to original further submission for full decision requested.</p>	Accept <u>in Part</u>	26
DPR-0578	Elene (Helen) Anderson	FS034	UG-P13	Oppose	<p>Submission point to be disallowed in full. Should SDC choose to approve this submission either in full or part, then requests that 16 Shepherd Ave to be excluded from any rezoning, i.e. remain at the current LLRZ/GRUZ zoning.</p>	Accept <u>in Part</u>	26
DPR-0594	Andrew and Amanda Diehl	FS010	UG-P13	Oppose	<p>Reject submission point and maintain zoning and policy as drafted in PDP.</p>	Accept <u>in Part</u>	26

DPR-0461	Dunweavin	005	UG-O3	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: As a minimum, there There is sufficient plentiful feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within Greater Christchurch to ensure:....	Reject Accept in Part	13
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	006	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	010	UG-P11	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> sensitivity effects on: 1.	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS213	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS213	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS213	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS213	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0461	Dunweavin	011	UG-P13	Oppose In Part	Amend as follows: Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. Extensions assist in meeting the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium term period through to 2028; 2. A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch; 3. 4. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to 2hh/ha for rural residential activities are met;or	Reject Accept in Part	26

					<p>5. The new residential growth meets 1-4 above and/or is in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020</p> <p>6. A diversity in housing types, sizes and densities is demonstrated to respond to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs identified in a HDCA, FDS or outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and....</p>		
DPR-0488	Dally Family & McIlraith	007	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0588	Michael House	FS004	UG-P3	Support	The proposed changes to the PDP objectives and policies to be accepted	Reject Accept in Part	16
DPR-0491	The Robinsons	008	UG-P11	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> sensitivity effects on:</p> <p>1.</p>	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS214	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS214	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS214	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS214	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject Accept in Part	24
DPR-0491	The Robinsons	009	UG-P14	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</p> <p>1. There is a demonstrated need for additional development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan;</p>	Reject Accept in Part	27

					<p>2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or the township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed;</p> <p>3. Except for the LLRZ, The the minimum net densities support a range of housing types that respond to demographic change, social needs and outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and</p> <p>4.</p>		
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	006	UG-P11	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> sensitivity effects on:</p> <p>1.</p>	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS215	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS215	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS215	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS215	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0492	Kevler Development	007	UG-P13	Oppose	<p>Amend as follows:</p> <p>Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</p> <p>1.</p> <p>4. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to 5hh/ha for rural residential activities are met,; <u>or</u></p> <p>5. The new residential growth meets 1-4 above and/or is <u>in accordance with and will give effect to the National Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020, including by supplying significant development capacity, supporting</u></p>	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26

					competitive land and development markets and contributing to well-functioning urban environments. 6. A diversity in housing types, sizes and densities <u>is provided</u> ; and 7.		
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	004	UG-P3	Oppose	Delete as notified.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS007	UG-P3	Support	Support subject to being consistent with the relief sought by submission 302.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	16
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	008	UG-P11	Oppose	Amend as follows: When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid <u>mitigate</u> sensitivity effects on: 1.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS011	UG-P11	Support	Support subject to being consistent with the relief sought by submission 302.	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0358	RWRL	FS216	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0363	IRHL	FS216	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0374	RIHL	FS216	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0384	RIDL	FS216	UG-P11	Support In Part	Adopt subject to wording	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	24
DPR-0493	Gallina & Heinz-Wattie	009	UG-P13	Oppose	Amend as follows: Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where: 1. 4. The minimum net densities of 12hh/ha for residential activities or 1 to 5hh/ha for rural residential activities are met,;or 5. <u>The new residential growth meets 1-4 above and/or is in accordance with and will give effect to the National</u>	Reject <u>Accept in Part</u>	26

					Policy Statement – Urban Development 2020, including <u>by supplying significant development capacity, supporting competitive land and development markets and contributing to well-functioning urban environments.</u> 6. A diversity in housing types, sizes and densities <u>is provided</u> ; and 7.		
DPR-0302	Smith, Boyd & Blanchard	FS012	UG-P13	Support	Support subject to being consistent with the relief sought by submission 302.	Reject Accept in Part	26

Appendix 2: Recommended amendments

Legend:

- Proposed amendments recommended by the s42a report are highlighted in yellow.
- Proposed amendments recommended by the right of reply report are highlighted in blue.

UG-Overview	
UG-Overview	<p>The Selwyn District is a desirable place to live, work, and play, which is generating a demand for housing and business opportunities to support the needs of the growing community now and into the future. The Urban Growth chapter assists in meeting these demands by encouraging a consolidated and compact settlement pattern that optimises the use and development of resources. This chapter also assists in ensuring there is enough urban development capacity available to meet the District's housing and business needs while assuring that high quality living and business environments continue to be developed to implement the adopted Development Plans.</p> <p>Ongoing urban development capacity is provided through the identification of new urban areas that are subject to the Urban Growth Overlay and by enabling existing sites to be intensified or redeveloped. <u>This chapter also provides a framework for assessing development outside of the areas identified⁷ Urban Growth Overlay.⁸</u> The need for zoning processes to demonstrate consistency with all of the urban growth policies and to consider relevant Development Plans will ensure that new urban growth areas do not conflict with legitimately established land use activities, compromise the quality of the environments that people value, and result in adverse environmental effects.</p> <p>The <u>Urban⁹</u> intensification of activities and redevelopment of existing land within urban zones is encouraged to support the District's urban growth needs. This includes through increased housing densities and the development and implementation of Urban Intensification Plans and Development Plans to achieve integrated settlement patterns and to complement the ongoing provision of new urban areas.</p> <p>The Urban Growth Overlay maps the spatial locations identified in Development Plans that have been adopted by SDC. These assist, <u>but are not determinative in determining identifying¹⁰</u> where new urban areas can locate around townships and delivering the outcomes that are anticipated to be</p>

⁷ S42A Response - DPR-0136.003, DPR-0137.003, DPR-0157.004, DPR-0176.003, DPR-0178.003, DPR-0180.002, DPR-0209.004, DPR-0298.007, DPR-0302.003, DPR-0344.008, DPR-0376.003, DPR-0397.003, DPR-0399.004, DPR-0460.009, DPR-0461.004, DPR-0488.006, DPR-0491.004, DPR-0492.003, and DPR-0493.003.

⁸ Panel Question Response

⁹ S42A Response - DPR-0422.058

¹⁰ S42A Response - DPR-0491.004

	<p>achieved within these environments. Any urban development or subdivision of land outside of the existing township boundaries is precluded unless the urban growth policies have been fulfilled through the zoning process under Schedule 1 of the RMA.</p> <p>The General Rural Zone activity-based rules continue to¹¹ apply to the land that is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay to enable the majority of rural land uses to continue. Additional rules apply to ensure that land use and subdivision development does not undermine the future zoning or development of the land that will assist in meeting the growth needs of the district. All other site-specific rules to achieve the urban growth outcomes will be determined through the zoning process.</p>
UG-Objectives	
UG-01	<p>Urban growth is provided for in a strategic manner that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Achieves attractive, pleasant, high quality, and resilient urban environments; 2. Maintains and enhances the Achieves the built form,¹² amenity values and character anticipated within each residential, kainga nohoanga, or business area; 3. Recognises and protects¹³ identified Heritage Sites, Heritage Settings, and Notable Trees; 4. Protects the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments; 5. Provides for the intensification and redevelopment of existing urban sites; 6. Integrates with existing residential neighbourhoods, commercial centres, industrial hubs, inland ports, or knowledge areas; 7. Is coordinated with the provision of¹⁴ available infrastructure, the strategic transport network,¹⁵ and utilities, including land transport infrastructure; and 8. Enables people and communities, now and future, to provide for their needs,¹⁶ their wellbeing, and their health and safety; 9. Does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading, and safety¹⁷ of important infrastructure¹⁸; 10. Does not compromise the ability to use adjoining rural land for rural production¹⁹; and 11. Has particular regard to the finite nature and life supporting capacity of highly productive land.²⁰

¹¹ Panel Question Response

¹² S42A Response - DPR-0414.147

¹³ Minor edit

¹⁴ S42A Response - DPR-0367.044

¹⁵ S42A Response - DPR-0032.002

¹⁶ Submitter Evidence Response – DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

¹⁷ Submitter Evidence Response – DPR-0371.057

¹⁸ S42A Response - DPR-0370.074, and DPR-0371.057

¹⁹ Submitter Evidence Response – DPR-0353.223 and DPR-0370.074

²⁰ S42A Response - DPR-0353.223, and DPR-0370.074

UG-02	<p>Townships maintain a consolidated and compact urban form to support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accessible, sustainable and resilient residential neighbourhoods, commercial centres, industrial hubs, inland ports, or knowledge areas; 2. The reduction in future effects of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions;²¹ 3. The role and function of each urban area within the District's Township Network and the economic and social prosperity of the District's commercial centres; and 4. The efficient servicing of townships and integration with existing and planned infrastructure.
UG-03	<p>There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within Greater Christchurch to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The housing bottom lines are met; 2. Competitiveness within the market;²² 3. A wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities are available to satisfy social and affordability needs and respond to demographic change; and 4. Commercial and industrial growth is supported by a range of working environments and places to appropriately²³ locate and operate businesses consistent with the District's Activity Centre Network.
UG-Policies	
UG-P1	Spatially identify new greenfield ²⁴ urban growth areas supported by a Development Plan
UG-P2	Provide for the rezoning of land to establish new urban areas within the Urban Growth Overlay
UG-P3	Avoid the zoning of land to establish any new urban areas or extensions to any township boundary in the Greater Christchurch area of the District outside the Urban Growth Overlay, unless it is demonstrated to contribute to a well-functioning urban environment as articulated in UG-01, UG-02, and UG-03 ²⁵ .

²¹ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0136, DPR-0137, DPR-0140, DPR-0157, DPR-0160, DPR-0176, DPR-0178, DPR-0180, DPR-0209, DPR-0282, DPR-0298, DPR-0302, DPR-0344, DPR-0355, DPR-0358, DPR-0363, DPR-0373, DPR-0374, DPR-0376, DPR-0384, DPR-0397, DPR-0399, DPR-0460, DPR-0461, DPR-0488, DPR-0491, DPR-0492, and DPR-0493

²² Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0136, DPR-0137, DPR-0140, DPR-0157, DPR-0160, DPR-0176, DPR-0178, DPR-0180, DPR-0209, DPR-0282, DPR-0298, DPR-0302, DPR-0344, DPR-0355, DPR-0358, DPR-0363, DPR-0373, DPR-0374, DPR-0376, DPR-0384, DPR-0397, DPR-0399, DPR-0460, DPR-0461, DPR-0488, DPR-0491, DPR-0492, and DPR-0493

²³ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

²⁴ S42A Response - DPR-0414.150

²⁵ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0136, DPR-0137, DPR-0140, DPR-0157, DPR-0160, DPR-0176, DPR-0178, DPR-0180, DPR-0209, DPR-0282, DPR-0298, DPR-0302, DPR-0344, DPR-0355, DPR-0358, DPR-0363, DPR-0373, DPR-0374, DPR-0376, DPR-0384, DPR-0397, DPR-0399, DPR-0460, DPR-0461, DPR-0488, DPR-0491, DPR-0492, and DPR-0493

UG-P4	Manage the zoning of land to establish any new urban areas or extensions to any township boundary outside the Greater Christchurch area of the District outside the Urban Growth Overlay, where it maintains a consolidated and compact urban form.
UG-P5	Enable land to be rezoned Maori Purpose Zone where it is consistent with the outcomes identified in the Māori Purpose Zone.
UG-P6	Enable rural production to continue in on land that is subject to an Urban Growth Overlay, while avoiding the establishment of those activities that may unreasonably hinder any future urban zoning required to assist in meeting the District's urban growth needs.
Urban Form	
UG-P7	<p>Any new urban areas shall deliver the following urban form and scale outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Township boundaries maintain a consolidated and compact urban form; 2. The form and scale of new urban areas support the settlements role and function within the District's Township Network; 3. The natural features, physical forms, opportunities, and constraints that characterise the context of individual locations are identified and addressed to achieve appropriate land use and subdivision outcomes, including where these considerations are identified in any relevant Development Plans; and <p>The extension of township boundaries along any strategic transport network is discouraged where there are more appropriate alternative locations available it would adversely affect the safe efficient and effective functioning of the network, including the ability to support freight and passenger transport services, or would foreclose the opportunity for the development of the network to meet planned strategic transport requirements²⁶.</p>
UG-P8	<p>Avoid the following locations and areas when zoning land to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori; 2. Significant Natural Areas; 3. Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Visual Amenity Landscapes; 4. The 50 dB Ldn Air Noise Contours²⁷ for noise sensitive activities²⁸; and <p>High Hazard Areas.</p>

²⁶ S42A Response - DPR-0260.154

²⁷ S42A Response - DPR-0371.059

²⁸ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0371.059

UG-P9	Recognise and provide for the finite nature of the versatile soil resource when zoning land to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas. Protect, to the extent reasonably possible²⁹, highly productive land and adjoining rural land for rural production³⁰ from inappropriate³¹ urban subdivision growth³².
UG-P10	Ensure the establishment of high-quality urban environments by requiring that new urban areas: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maintain the Achieve the built form,³³ amenity values and character anticipated within each township and the outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; 2. Recognise and protect identified Heritage Sites, Heritage Settings, and Notable Trees; and 3. Preserving Preserve³⁴ the rural outlook amenity values³⁵ that characterises the General Rural Zone at the interface between rural and urban environments³⁶ through appropriate landscape mitigation, densities, or development controls at the interface between rural and urban environments³⁷.
UG-P11	When zoning land to establish any new urban area or to extend any township boundary, avoid significant³⁸ adverse effects, including³⁹ reverse sensitivity effects on⁴⁰. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Avoid reverse sensitivity effects and significant adverse effects on any⁴¹ Any existing or anticipated activity on⁴² in an⁴³ adjoining rural, dairy processing,⁴⁴ industrial, inland port, or knowledge zone; and

²⁹ S42A Response - DPR-0353.225

³⁰ Panel Question Response

³¹ Panel Question Response

³² Panel Question Response

³³ S42A Response - DPR-0414.159

³⁴ S42A Response - DPR-0136.008, and DPR-0302.007

³⁵ Panel Question Response

³⁶ S42A Response - DPR-0176.008, DPR-0178.006, DPR-0209.009, DPR-0298.012, DPR-0344.013, DPR-0376.006, DPR-0397.005, DPR-0399.007, DPR-0461.009, and DPR-0491.007

³⁷ S42A Response - DPR-0176.008, DPR-0178.006, DPR-0209.009, DPR-0298.012, DPR-0344.013, DPR-0376.006, DPR-0397.005, DPR-0399.007, DPR-0461.009, and DPR-0491.007

³⁸ Panel Question Response

³⁹ S42A Response - DPR-0370.075, DPR-0371.060, and DPR-0446.135

⁴⁰ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0446.135

⁴¹ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0446.135

⁴² S42A Response - DPR-0142.040

⁴³ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0446.135

⁴⁴ S42A Response - DPR-0370.077

	2. Avoid adverse effects, including reverse sensitivity effects, ⁴⁵ on the safe, efficient and cost-effective operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading, and safety ⁴⁶ of important infrastructure, land transport infrastructure, and the strategic transport network.
UG-P12	<p>Ensure the zoning of land to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas demonstrates how it will integrate with existing urban environments, optimise the efficient and cost-effective provision of infrastructure and public transport⁴⁷, and protect natural and physical resources, by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aligning the zoning, subdivision and development with network capacity and availability of existing or new planned⁴⁸ infrastructure and public transport services⁴⁹ including through the staging of development; 2. Avoiding adverse effects on the groundwater⁵⁰ and surface water resource by requiring connections to reticulated water, wastewater, and stormwater networks where they are available, or where they are not available⁵¹ by demonstrating that the necessary discharge approvals can be obtained for all on-site wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal facilities; 3. Ensuring the land is located where solid waste collection and disposal services are available or planned⁵²; 4. Prioritising accessibility and connectivity between the through zoning⁵³ within and between the land to be zoned⁵⁴ and adjoining neighbourhoods, commercial centres, open space reserves, and community facilities, including education providers, public reserves, and health services; and <p>Requiring safe, attractive and convenient land transport infrastructure that promotes walking, cycling, and access to public transport and public transport facilities to encourage energy efficiency and improve peoples' health and wellbeing.</p>
Development Capacity	
UG-P13	<p>Residential growth – Greater Christchurch area</p> <p>Any new residential growth area within the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</p>

⁴⁵ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0446.135

⁴⁶ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0446.135

⁴⁷ S42A Response - DPR-0032.003

⁴⁸ S42A Response - DPR-0414.161

⁴⁹ S42A Response - DPR-0032.003

⁵⁰ Panel Question Response

⁵¹ S42A Response - DPR-0260.158

⁵² S42A Response - DPR-0414.161

⁵³ S42A Response - DPR-0414.161

⁵⁴ Panel Question Response

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Extensions assist in <u>at least providing for meeting</u>⁵⁵ the housing bottom lines (minimum housing targets) of 8,600 households over the medium-term period through to 2028;⁵⁶ 2. A HDCA and FDS identify a need for additional feasible development capacity for the township and the additional residential land supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch; 3. The land is subject to an Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. a 'greenfield priority area', or any subsequent urban growth areas or urban containment boundaries, in the CRPS where it is a residential activity; or b. identified in an adopted Rural Residential Strategy and in accordance with CRPS Policy 6.3.9 where it is a rural residential activity;⁵⁷ 4. The A⁵⁸ minimum net densities <u>density</u>⁵⁹ of <u>12 15</u>⁶⁰ hh/ha for residential activities <u>is met</u>⁶¹, <u>unless there are demonstrated constraints then in which case a minimum net density of</u>⁶² <u>no less than 12hh/ha</u>⁶³ <u>is met</u>⁶⁴, or <u>1 to 2hh/ha</u>⁶⁵ for rural residential activities <u>a minimum net density of 1 to 2 hh/ha is are</u>⁶⁶ met; 5. A diversity in housing types, sizes and densities is demonstrated to respond to the demographic changes and social and affordability needs identified in a HDCA, FDS or outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and 6. An ODP is prepared that addresses the matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.
UG-P14	<p>Residential growth – Outside the Greater Christchurch area</p> <p>Any new residential growth area outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a demonstrated need for additional development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan; 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or the⁶⁷ township-based opportunities and constraints identified in any relevant Development Plan are addressed;

⁵⁵ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0414.162

⁵⁶ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0414.162

⁵⁷ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0298.014

⁵⁸ Panel Question Response

⁵⁹ Panel Question Response

⁶⁰ S42A Response - DPR-0032.004 and DPR-0260.159

⁶¹ Panel Question Response

⁶² Panel Question Response

⁶³ S42A Response - DPR-0032.004 and DPR-0260.159

⁶⁴ Panel Question Response

⁶⁵ Panel Question Response

⁶⁶ Panel Question Response

⁶⁷ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0298.014

	<p>3. The minimum net densities support a range of housing types that respond to demographic change, social needs and outcomes identified in any relevant Development Plan; and</p> <p>4. An ODP is prepared that addresses the matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.</p>
UG-P15	<p>Business growth – Greater Christchurch area</p> <p>Any new areas to support commercial activities, industrial activities, or activities provided for in the Port Zone or Knowledge Zone in the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A BDCA and FDS demonstrates a need for additional suitable development capacity within the township and the additional suitable development capacity supports the rebuild and recovery of Greater Christchurch; 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay and the area is either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. a 'greenfield priority area', or any subsequent urban growth areas or urban containment boundaries, in the CRPS where it is an industrial activity; or b. It is identified within a relevant Development Plan or⁶⁸ consolidated within or around⁶⁹ a Key Activity Centre or within⁷⁰ an existing General Industrial Zone, Port Zone or Commercial and Mixed Use Zone. 3. A diverse range of services and opportunities is provided for to respond to the social and economic needs identified in a BDCA, FDS or any relevant Development Plan; 4. The type, scale and function of new commercial areas are consistent with the Activity Centre Network and the needs of the catchment that the activities serve support mixed use activities, unless located in a Large Format Retail Zone⁷¹; 5. The location, dimensions and characteristics of the land are appropriate to support:⁷² <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. activities, that are anticipated within the existing General Industrial Zone, Knowledge Zone or Commercial and Mixed Use Zone⁷³; b. community facilities, and public spaces where these are anticipated by the land use zone; and <p>An ODP is prepared that addresses the relevant matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria⁷⁴ and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.</p>
UG-P16	<p>Business growth – Outside the Greater Christchurch area</p> <p>Any new areas to support commercial or industrial activities outside the Greater Christchurch area shall only occur where:</p>

⁶⁸ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁶⁹ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁷⁰ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁷¹ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁷² Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁷³ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁷⁴ S42A Response - DPR-0367.049

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is a demonstrated need for additional suitable development capacity within the township, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan; 2. The land is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay, or It⁷⁵ is consolidated with in or around⁷⁶ an existing Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone or General Industrial Zone; 3. A diverse range of services and opportunities is provided for to respond to any specific social and economic needs, including where identified in any relevant Development Plan; 4. The type, scale and function of new commercial areas are consistent with the Activity Centre Network and the needs of the catchment that the activities serve, including supporting mixed use activity in the Town Centre Zone⁷⁷; 5. The location, dimensions and characteristics of the land are appropriate to support:⁷⁸ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. activities, that are anticipated within the Town Centre Zone, Local Centre Zone or General Industrial Zone;⁷⁹ b. community facilities, and public spaces where these are anticipated by the land use zone; and <p>An ODP is prepared that addresses the relevant matters listed in UG-ODP Criteria⁸⁰ and incorporated into this Plan before any subdivision proceeds.</p>
UG-P17	<p>Urban⁸¹ Intensification and redevelopment</p> <p>Encourage the intensification of urban activities or redevelopment of existing land within urban zones to assist in supporting the district's urban growth needs, including through the implementation of an adopted Urban Intensification Plan or any relevant Development Plan, to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Minimise the loss of the rural land resource, particularly highly productive land⁸²; 2. Maintain the effective and efficient use of infrastructure and the strategic transport network; 3. Support housing choice, increase the availability of affordable housing and enable economically resilient and diverse commercial centres, including by providing mixed use activities in Key Activity Centres' or Local Centre Zones; 4. Promote consolidated and compact townships that support resilient, diverse and self-sufficient settlements; 5. Promote the regeneration of buildings and land; 6. Achieve higher residential densities in and around Key Activity Centres, Town Centres, Core Public Transport Routes and in locations where there is safe and convenient access to public transport and public transport facilities; and⁸³

⁷⁵ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁷⁶ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁷⁷ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁷⁸ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁷⁹ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁸⁰ S42A Response - DPR-0367.050

⁸¹ S42A Response - DPR-0422.058

⁸² S42A Response - DPR-0353.228

⁸³ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

	<p>7. Achieve higher floor area ratios in the Commercial and Mixed Use Zone and General Industrial Zone to optimise the use of commercial and industrial land; and</p> <p>8. Provide for the functional need of commercial activities to be located accessibly in relation to the residential catchment they serve;⁸⁴ provided that intensification or redevelopment does not</p> <p>9. generate significant⁸⁵ adverse amenity effects on surrounding environments; or</p> <p>10. undermine the safe, efficient or cost-effective operation of infrastructure or utility services; or</p> <p>11. generate reverse sensitivity effects on important infrastructure.⁸⁶</p>	
UG-Rules		
Note for Plan Users	<p>Any activity that establishes and operates on land that is located in the Urban Growth Overlay is to be subject to the rules and requirements of the General Rural Zone, unless specifically managed by a rule listed in UG-Rules List.</p> <p>The subdivision of any land that is located in the Urban Growth Overlay is managed as a restricted discretionary activity under SUB-REQ13 of the Subdivision chapter of this Plan.</p>	
UG-R1	Activities in the Urban Growth Overlay	
Urban Growth Overlay	<p>Activity status: NC</p> <p>1. Any new activity, or change in use that increases the intensity or scale of an existing activity, that is for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. Commercial composting;b. Mineral extraction.	<p>Activity status when compliance not achieved: N/A</p>
UG	Matters for Control or Discretion	
UG-MAT1	Subdivision and Urban Growth	
Urban Growth Overlay	<p>1. The extent to which the subdivision will limit, restrict or compromise the ability to zone, subdivide and develop the land as a new urban area in the future, including its impacts on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a. The ability to achieve the anticipated urban form, capacity, density or amenity outcomes, including those identified in any relevant development plan;b. The ongoing operation of strategic infrastructure;	

⁸⁴ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁸⁵ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0396 Legal Submission and DPR-0373 Legal Submission

⁸⁶ S42A Response - DPR-0367.051

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> c. Cost effective and efficient infrastructure provision; d. Safe, efficient and integrated land transport networks; and e. Managing potential adverse reverse sensitivity effects, including with adjacent zones.⁸⁷
UG – Schedules	
UG-SCHED1	Residential¹⁸⁸ Growth Area ODP Criteria
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A single ODP shall be prepared for each new residential and business⁸⁹ growth area and incorporated into the Planning Maps and the relevant Development Area chapter of this Plan; 2. Each ODP shall illustrate how the site characteristics and topography have been addressed through the identification of: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Principal through roads and connections both within and adjoining the ODP area, including principal walking and cycling networks and public transport and freight routes; b. Methods for the integrated management of water, stormwater, and wastewater and associated infrastructure consistent with UG-P15; c. How each ODP area will when required to⁹⁰: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Achieve the minimum net density requirements and outcomes listed in UG-P5 or UG-P6 are to be achieved; ii. Be staged to allow the subdivision development to align with the timing, funding, and availability of network infrastructure capacity; and iii. Integrate into any adjoining land that is subject to the Urban Growth Overlay; 3. The following features and outcomes are to be illustrated on an indicative subdivision concept plan containing lot configurations and sizes that is to accompany the ODP; shall be considered and where relevant provided for:⁹¹ <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Any land to be set aside to protect or enhance environmental, conservation, landscape, heritage or cultural (including to provide for the interests of nga rūnanga) values; b. Any land to be set aside for community facilities, schools, open space reserve or commercial activities and how accessibility and connectivity between these locations is supported in the land transport network; c. Any land to be set aside to effectively manage hazard risk or contaminated land; d. Any methods or boundary treatments required to avoid or⁹² mitigate reverse sensitivity effects and promote compatible land use activities, including protecting important infrastructure, or a designated site; and <p>Any other information which is relevant to the understanding of the development and its proposed zoning.</p>

⁸⁷ S42A Response - DPR-0353.229

⁸⁸ Consequential Change

⁸⁹ S42A Response - DPR-0367.053

⁹⁰ S42A Response - DPR-0367.053

⁹¹ S42A Response - DPR-0412.019

⁹² Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0353.230

HPW25	Overlays
Name	Description
Urban Growth Overlay	Maps the spatial locations identified in Development Plans that have been adopted by SDC. These assist in determining where new urban areas can locate around townships and delivering the outcomes that are anticipated to be achieved within these environments.
<u>Urban Growth Overlay – Business</u>	<u>Maps the spatial locations for new business areas identified in Development Plans that have been adopted by SDC. These assist in determining where new business areas can locate within townships and delivering the outcomes that are anticipated to be achieved within these environments.</u>
<u>Urban Growth Overlay – Greenfield</u>	<u>Maps the spatial locations for new greenfield areas identified in Development Plans that have been adopted by SDC. These assist in determining where new urban areas can locate around townships and delivering the outcomes that are anticipated to be achieved within these environments.</u>
<u>Urban Growth Overlay – Rural Residential</u>	<u>Maps the spatial locations for new rural-residential areas identified in Development Plans that have been adopted by SDC. These assist in determining where new rural-residential areas can locate around townships and delivering the outcomes that are anticipated to be achieved within these environments.⁹³</u>

⁹³ Submitter Evidence Response - DPR-0260

Appendix 3: Criteria Table

NPS-UD Criteria		PDP Objective or Policy (as recommended in UG Reply Report) <i>*emphasis added</i>
Would contribute to a well-functioning urban environment (as defined in the NPS-UD)	Have or enable a variety of homes that meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households	<p>UG-O3</p> <p>There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within Greater Christchurch to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The housing bottom lines are met; 2. Competitiveness within the market; 3. A wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities are available to satisfy social and affordability needs and respond to demographic change; and 4. Commercial and industrial growth is supported by a range of working environments and places to appropriately locate and operate businesses consistent with the District's Activity Centre Network.
	Have or enable a variety of homes that enable Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms	<p>UG-O3</p> <p>There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within Greater Christchurch to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The housing bottom lines are met; 2. Competitiveness within the market; 3. A wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities are available to satisfy social and affordability needs and respond to demographic change; and 4. Commercial and industrial growth is supported by a range of working environments and places to appropriately locate and operate businesses consistent with the District's Activity Centre Network. <p>UG-P5</p> <p>Enable land to be rezoned Maori Purpose Zone outside an Urban Growth Overlay, where it is consistent with the outcomes identified in the Māori Purpose Zone.</p>
	Have or enable a variety of sites that are suitable for different business sectors in terms of location and site size	<p>UG-O3</p> <p>There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within Greater Christchurch to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The housing bottom lines are met;

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Competitiveness within the market; 3. A wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities are available to satisfy social and affordability needs and respond to demographic change; and 4. Commercial and industrial growth is supported by a range of working environments and places to appropriately locate and operate businesses consistent with the District's Activity Centre Network.
	<p>Have good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and opens spaces, including by way of public or active transport</p>	<p>UG-O2</p> <p>Townships maintain a consolidated and compact urban form to support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accessible, sustainable and resilient residential neighbourhoods, commercial centres, industrial hubs, inland ports, or knowledge areas; 2. The reduction in future effects of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions; 3. The role and function of each urban area within the District's Township Network and the economic and social prosperity of the District's commercial centres; and 4. The efficient servicing of townships and integration with existing and planned infrastructure. <p>UG-P12</p> <p>Ensure the zoning of land to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas demonstrates how it will integrate with existing urban environments, optimise the efficient and cost-effective provision of infrastructure and public transport, and protect natural and physical resources, by:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aligning the zoning, subdivision and development with network capacity and availability of existing or planned infrastructure and public transport services including through the staging of development; 2. Avoiding adverse effects on the groundwater and surface water resource by requiring connections to reticulated water, wastewater, and stormwater networks where they are available, or where they are not available by demonstrating that the necessary discharge approvals can be obtained for all on-site wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal facilities;

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. Ensuring the land is located where solid waste collection and disposal services are available or planned; 4. <i>Prioritising accessibility and connectivity within and between the land to be zoned and adjoining neighbourhoods, commercial centres, open space reserves, and community facilities, including education providers, public reserves, and health services;</i> and 5. Requiring safe, attractive and convenient land transport infrastructure that promotes walking, cycling, and access to public transport and public transport facilities to encourage energy efficiency and improve peoples' health and wellbeing. <p>UG-P17 Urban Intensification and redevelopment</p> <p>Encourage the intensification of urban activities or redevelopment of existing land within urban zones to assist in supporting the district's urban growth needs, including through the implementation of an adopted Urban Intensification Plan or any relevant Development Plan, to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Minimise the loss of the rural land resource, particularly highly productive land; 3. <i>Maintain the effective and efficient use of infrastructure and the strategic transport network;</i> 4. <i>Support housing choice, increase the availability of affordable housing and enable economically resilient and diverse commercial centres, including by providing mixed use activities in Key Activity Centres' or Local Centre Zones;</i> 5. Promote consolidated and compact townships that support resilient, diverse and self-sufficient settlements; 6. Promote the regeneration of buildings and land; 7. Achieve higher residential densities in and around Key Activity Centres, Town Centres, Core Public Transport Routes and in locations where there is safe and convenient access to public transport and public transport facilities; 8. Achieve higher floor area ratios in the Commercial and Mixed Use Zone and General Industrial Zone to optimise the use of commercial and industrial land; and
--	--	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

		<p>9. Provide for the functional need of commercial activities to be located accessibly in relation to the residential catchment they serve; provided that intensification or redevelopment does not</p> <p>10. generate significant adverse amenity effects on surrounding environments; or</p> <p>11. undermine the safe, efficient or cost-effective operation of infrastructure or utility services.; or</p> <p>12. generate reverse sensitivity effects on important infrastructure.</p>
	Support, and limit as much as possible adverse impacts on, the competitive operation of land and development markets	<p>UG-O3</p> <p>There is sufficient feasible housing and sufficient business development capacity within Greater Christchurch to ensure:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The housing bottom lines are met; 2. Competitiveness within the market; 3. A wide range of housing types, sizes, and densities are available to satisfy social and affordability needs and respond to demographic change; and 4. Commercial and industrial growth is supported by a range of working environments and places to appropriately locate and operate businesses consistent with the District's Activity Centre Network.
	Support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions	<p>UG-O2</p> <p>Townships maintain a consolidated and compact urban form to support:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Accessible, sustainable and resilient residential neighbourhoods, commercial centres, industrial hubs, inland ports, or knowledge areas; 2. The reduction in future effects of climate change and greenhouse gas emissions; 3. The role and function of each urban area within the District's Township Network and the economic and social prosperity of the District's commercial centres; and 4. The efficient servicing of townships and integration with existing and planned infrastructure.
	Are resilient to the likely current and future effects of climate change	<p>UG-O1</p> <p>Urban growth is provided for in a strategic manner that:</p>

		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Achieves attractive, pleasant, high quality, and resilient urban environments; 2. Achieves the built form, amenity values and character anticipated within each residential, kainga nohoanga, or business area; 3. Recognises and protects identified Heritage Sites, Heritage Settings, and Notable Trees; 4. Protects the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments; 5. Provides for the intensification and redevelopment of existing urban sites; 6. Integrates with existing residential neighbourhoods, commercial centres, industrial hubs, inland ports, or knowledge areas; 7. Is coordinated with the provision of available infrastructure, the strategic transport network, and utilities, including land transport infrastructure; 8. Enables people and communities, now and future, to provide for their wellbeing, and their health and safety; 9. Does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading, and safety of important infrastructure; 10. Does not compromise the use of adjoining land for rural production; and 11. Has particular regard to the finite nature and life supporting capacity of highly productive land. <p>UG-P8</p> <p>Avoid the following locations and areas when zoning land to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori; 2. Significant Natural Areas; 3. Outstanding Natural Landscapes and Visual Amenity Landscapes; 4. The 50 dB Ldn Air Noise Contours for noise sensitive activities ; and 5. High Hazard Areas.
Well-connected along transport corridors		<p>UG-O1</p> <p>Urban growth is provided for in a strategic manner that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Achieves attractive, pleasant, high quality, and resilient urban environments;

12. Achieves the built form, amenity values and character anticipated within each residential, kainga nohoanga, or business area;
13. Recognises and protects identified Heritage Sites, Heritage Settings, and Notable Trees;
14. Protects the health and well-being of water bodies, freshwater ecosystems, and receiving environments;
15. Provides for the intensification and redevelopment of existing urban sites;
16. ***Integrates with existing residential neighbourhoods, commercial centres,*** industrial hubs, inland ports, or knowledge areas;
17. ***Is coordinated with the provision of available infrastructure, the strategic transport network,*** and utilities, including land transport infrastructure;
18. Enables people and communities, now and future, to provide for their wellbeing, and their health and safety;
19. Does not affect the efficient operation, use, development, appropriate upgrading, and safety of important infrastructure;
20. Does not compromise the use of adjoining land for rural production; and
21. Has particular regard to the finite nature and life supporting capacity of highly productive land.

UG-P12

Ensure the zoning of land to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas demonstrates how it will integrate with existing urban environments, ***optimise the efficient and cost-effective provision of infrastructure and public transport,*** and protect natural and physical resources, by:

1. ***Aligning the zoning, subdivision and development with network capacity and availability of existing or planned infrastructure and public transport services including through the staging of development;***
2. Avoiding adverse effects on the groundwater and surface water resource by requiring connections to reticulated water, wastewater, and stormwater networks where they are available, or where they are not available by demonstrating that the necessary discharge approvals can be obtained for all on-site wastewater and stormwater treatment and disposal facilities;

3. Ensuring the land is located where solid waste collection and disposal services are available or planned;
4. Prioritising accessibility and connectivity within and between the land to be zoned and adjoining neighbourhoods, commercial centres, open space reserves, and community facilities, including education providers, public reserves, and health services; and
5. ***Requiring safe, attractive and convenient land transport infrastructure that promotes walking, cycling, and access to public transport and public transport facilities to encourage energy efficiency and improve peoples' health and wellbeing.***

UG-P17 Urban Intensification and redevelopment

Encourage the intensification of urban activities or redevelopment of existing land within urban zones to assist in supporting the district's urban growth needs, including through the implementation of an adopted Urban Intensification Plan or any relevant Development Plan, to:

1. Minimise the loss of the rural land resource, particularly highly productive land;
2. ***Maintain the effective and efficient use of infrastructure and the strategic transport network;***
3. ***Support housing choice, increase the availability of affordable housing and enable economically resilient and diverse commercial centres, including by providing mixed use activities in Key Activity Centres' or Local Centre Zones;***
4. ***Promote consolidated and compact townships that support resilient, diverse and self-sufficient settlements;***
5. Promote the regeneration of buildings and land;
6. Achieve higher residential densities in and around Key Activity Centres, Town Centres, Core Public Transport Routes and in locations where there ***is safe and convenient access to public transport and public transport facilities;***
7. Achieve higher floor area ratios in the Commercial and Mixed Use Zone and General Industrial Zone to optimise the use of commercial and industrial land; and

	<p>8. Provide for the functional need of commercial activities to be located accessibly in relation to the residential catchment they serve; provided that intensification or redevelopment does not</p> <p>9. generate significant adverse amenity effects on surrounding environments; or</p> <p>10. undermine the safe, efficient or cost-effective operation of infrastructure or utility services.; or</p> <p>11. generate reverse sensitivity effects on important infrastructure.</p>
Regional council criteria	n/a

Appendix 4: Legal memo

Memo

DATE: 18 February 2022
TO: Ben Baird
FROM: Paul Rogers
CLIENT: Selwyn District Council
OUR MATTER: 038777\425
SUBJECT: RIGHT OF REPLY- URBAN GROWTH CHAPTER

PURPOSE

- 1 The purpose of this memoranda is to provide a reply to the legal submissions from Christchurch City Council (CCC) and Canterbury Regional Council (CRC) relating to their interpretation and application of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD) and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) in the review of the Operative Selwyn District Plan context, relating to the Urban Growth chapter of the Proposed District Plan (PDP).
- 2 The particular points of difference arising from our legal submissions and those of CRC and CCC concern how to:
 - 2.1 reconcile the response planning provisions¹ of the NPS-UD with its balance provisions; and
 - 2.2 reconcile objective 6.2.2 of the CRPS with those responsive planning provisions; and
 - 2.3 finally, how to provide for the responsive planning framework provisions within the PDP, and whether the PDP can, or should, be drafted so as to give primacy to the NPS-UD responsive planning framework over the CRPS.
- 3 Endeavouring to be succinct, this memorandum replies to the legal submissions provided to the panel by CCC and CRC, both dated 19 November 2021.
- 4 Broadly there is commonality in the interpretive approach to the NPS-UD and the application of the CRPS as between submitters on the urban growth chapter and our legal advice.² Given that commonality we will not unduly reference the submitter's legal submissions. However, appreciating resolution of interpretative legal issues is not a numbers game, we do nevertheless note that a number of the submitters legal counsel disagree with the outcomes of CRC and CCC legal submissions.

¹ Objective 6, Policy 8, Subpart 2 Clause 3.8.

² Dated 13 September 2021.

Topic 1: Reconciling the response planning provisions of the NPS-UD with its balance provisions.

- 5 CCC/CRC submits our interpretation is flawed for the following reasons:
- 5.1 Firstly, because we focus on select provisions of the NPS-UD, giving them primacy over balance NPS-UD provisions, rather than seeking to reconcile the NPS-UD as a whole.
- 5.2 Secondly, CCC/CRC contend we are wrong in interpreting the responsive planning framework provisions as providing for immediate effect and argues that they are of substantive rather than procedural effect.
- 5.3 Thirdly, CCC/CRC submits our interpretation is flawed because it is provided against a context of a national housing supply crisis, but there is no reference within the NPS-UD to a housing crisis.
- 6 We address each of these in turn below.

Issue 1: Focus on select NPS-UD provisions.

- 7 We reject the criticism. It is very clear the NPS-UD does include select provisions, being objectives, policies and provisions that serve a particular and distinctive purpose from the balance provisions. They are the responsive planning provisions.
- 8 CCC does recognise those provisions are distinct.³ The dictionary meaning of "Distinct" means:
- "Separate, not being each and everyone the same. Distinct indicates something is distinguished by the mind as being apart or different from others. Distinct often stresses a lack of connection or a difference in identity between two things."*
- 9 Both CCC and CRC challenge our interpretive outcome that Objective 6, Policy 8 and Clause 3.8 should be seen as being distinctive from the balance of the NPS - UD provisions. We say they are distinctive in part because they deal with the circumstance where RMA planning documents include constraints on urban development. In that way they are distinctive from the balance NPS-UD provisions.
- 10 In particular, Policy 8 is distinct because, prior to it coming into force, if a proposed development was either unanticipated by a Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) planning document or out of sequence with planned land release that development would face significant hurdles in obtaining approval, usually requiring a potentially challenging resource consenting or plan change process. Generally, planning documents are not supportive of out of sequence or unanticipated development.
- 11 Policy 8 now requires decision-makers to be responsive to plan changes, provided they add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments, even if that development capacity is unanticipated by an

³ Paragraph 2.2(g)

RMA planning document or out of sequence with planned land release. This is a significant change.

- 12 CCC and CRC respond by submitting that there is no hierarchy⁴ of provisions in the NPS-UD and all of the objectives and policies in the NPS-UD interact to affect the interpretation and implementation of each other. As a broad proposition we agree there is no hierarchy. But in our submission the absence of any hierarchy should not influence the outcome of the interpretative exercise.
- 13 However, we submit which NPS-UD objectives and policies are applied and given weight is influenced by the context to which they are applied. Clearly, if the context includes a planning document that contains a restraint, then Objective 6, Policy 8 and perhaps Clause 3.8 are more applicable than other provisions of the NPS-UD. So, no hierarchy is needed.
- 14 We contend a proper interpretative exercise must recognise that these provisions are distinctive. They are different from the balance provisions. We contend the words within these provisions are clear so that recourse to the balance provisions other than for an overall context is not needed. The responsive provisions are clear enough on their own. Also, if the purpose of recourse to balance provisions is an attempt to diminish the weight or significance of those distinct provisions then we submit that is not a correct interpretative approach.
- 15 So, to be clear, we are not contending that the NPS-UD does not need to be read as a whole. Our advice does consider the NPS-UD as a whole. However, our overview of the NPS-UD recognises the NPS-UD is a structured instrument that contains many directions to Councils, some of which are immediate directions and others of a longer-term nature.⁵
- 16 The NPS-UD utilises a range of different means of implementation to achieve its purpose, such as planning decisions taken now,⁶ and longer-term action steps based on monitoring,⁷ development of future development strategies,⁸ consultation and plan changes.⁹ If anything, that overview of the NPS-UD reinforced our interpretation of the distinctive nature of the responsive planning provisions.

Issue 2: Immediate action: The responsive planning framework provisions do not provide for immediate action and have no substantive effect rather they are procedural.

- 17 Our opinion relating to immediacy has a simple and direct foundation. We rely on the word "responsive" in Policy 8 and Objective 6. The dictionary meaning of responsive is to react quickly and positively, especially to meet the needs of someone or something.
- 18 We are giving the words as they appear in Objective 6 and Policy 8 their plain ordinary meaning. That is not a flawed interpretation.
- 19 We have found no support in the words used in NPS-UD for the CCC and CRC position that the responsive planning framework is procedural rather than having substantive effect. We consider a provision has substantive effect if it directs the

⁴ CRC submissions Paragraph 8

⁵ NPS-UD Part 4

⁶ NPS-UD Objective 2 & 5, Policy 1, 6 & 8

⁷ NPS-UD Subpart 3

⁸ NPS-UD Subpart 4

⁹ NPS-UD Subpart 4 - 3.15

decision-maker to take into account various matters when reaching a decision. Objective 6 and Policy 8, in our opinion, require local authorities, when making decisions, to be responsive. That direction is not a process direction but directs the decision-maker to act or respond in a particular way. That is why we say these provisions are not procedural rather they are substantive.

Issue 3: Housing Crisis

- 20 We accept the NPS-UD does not explicitly reference a national housing supply crisis. However objective 2 states:

"Planning decisions improve housing affordability by supporting competitive land development markets."

- 21 Reading those words and giving them their plain ordinary meaning, we say housing affordability is an issue that the NPS-UD seeks to address by supporting competitive land and development markets in providing greater intensification in urban environments.

- 22 The introductory guide to the NPS-UD on page 6 provides that: ¹⁰

"The NPS-UD is designed to improve the responsiveness and competitiveness of land development markets."

- 23 On page 7 of the Guide, it states:

"... the NPS-UD will contribute to the urban growth agenda's objectives and address restrictive Resource Management Act (RMA) planning practices. Ultimately it will help local authorities allow more urban development and housing through their plans, to better meet the different housing needs and preferences of New Zealanders."

- 24 Asking the questions, why it is desirable and/or necessary to improve the responsiveness and competitiveness of land development markets, why is it desirable or necessary to address restrictive RMA planning practices and finally why is it desirable to help local authorities allow more urban development and housing, the answer, drawing on real-world context, is to provide a means to deal with New Zealand's housing supply crisis.

- 25 We do not accept the CCC criticism that in our interpretation references to the context of a national housing supply crisis are either inappropriate or result in a flawed interpretation. Quite simply, we say reference to that housing crisis context, coupled with considering the objectives and purpose of the NPS-UD, leads to the inescapable outcome that an important purpose the NPS-UD is to provide for planning decisions which will improve housing affordability and supply.

Topic 2: How to reconcile Objective 6.2.1 of the CRPS with the responsive planning provisions of the NPS-UD.

- 26 Objective 6, being the parent objective to Policy 8, directs decisions on urban development that are responsive, particularly in relation to proposals that would supply significant development capacity. This objective and policy along with

¹⁰ Introductory Guide July 2020.

Subpart 2 Clause 3.8, are the NPS-UD provisions that we say specifically recognise and provide for an exception or legitimate departure from restrictive objectives such as CRPS Objective 6.2.1.

- 27 For support in this interpretive outcome, we rely on the plain ordinary meaning of the words in Objective 6 and Policy 8 in clause 3.8, as well as the MfE Responsive Planning fact sheet, which records when considering objective 6(c): ¹¹

"... A hard rural urban boundary without the ability to consider change or movement of the boundary would not meet the requirements of the responsive planning policy".

- 28 As we noted in our advice, the weight attributed to such guidance document has recently been considered by the environment court in *Eden-Epsom v Auckland City Council*,¹² where the court held that, given the guidance documents originate from a government source, they should be carefully considered and weighed accordingly.
- 29 So, we say Policy 6.2.1 is the exact type of policy that the NPS-UD is attempting to cure or at least respond to through the responsive planning provisions of the NPS-UD. We do not accept that a selective interpretation of the NPS-UD is what is required especially is such a reading is used to support a reading down of Objective 6.2.1. Rather than a selective interpretation we submit we are simply giving the words as they appear on the page their plain ordinary meaning.
- 30 We note that CCC acknowledge,¹³ that given the relevant criteria directed by clause 3.8(3) NPS-UD are yet to be included in the CRPS, the CRPS does not fully give effect to the NPS-UD.
- 31 Given the clash between the NPS-UD responsive provisions and Objective 6.2.1 we think the submission that the CRPS does not fully give effect to the NPS-UD is an understatement. Any decision to amend Policy 6.2.1 will inevitably include consideration of whether the 'hard line' approach is appropriate, given the NPS-UD. It is likely that a more significant change than simply adding into the CRPS criteria will be required to satisfy clause 3.8 of the NPS-UD.
- 32 These two points demonstrate it is very difficult to reconcile the NPS-UD and the CRPS. In its current form the CRPS cannot be giving effect to the NPS-UD, as required by s62 (3) RMA.
- 33 It follows if the CRPS fails to achieve s62 (3) then, in our submission, the decision-maker must interpret the CRPS with caution. Exercising that caution in our view requires a detailed assessment of whether a strict interpretation of the CRPS avoid policy is consistent with the purposes of the NPS-UD and in particular the responsive planning provisions.
- 34 If decision-makers adopted a strict interpretation of the word "avoid", the consequence would be to give primacy to the CRPS when clearly s62 (3) is not satisfied. The wording in s62(3) of note is that:

"a regional policy statement must give effect to a national policy statement"

¹¹ MfE Fact Sheet, Responsive Planning- Responsive-Planning Factsheet pdf (www.environment.govt.nz)

¹² *Eden-Epsom v Auckland City Council* [2021] NZEnvC82 at [15]

¹³ Page 6 Paragraph 3.3

- 34.1 For the reasons advanced a strict interpretation of the word "*avoid*" would not lead to that outcome.
- 35 We understand from the CRC evidence the solution to this problem is for plan change applicants, submitters and or the Council to seek amendment to the CRPS. However, that approach in our submission does not provide a practical mechanism to respond to current development pressures for housing supply. Nor does it allow this Council to meet its obligations under the RMA when making decisions of the proposed plan. In our view the purpose of the NPS-UD is to respond to New Zealand's housing crisis as a matter of urgency, and further delay in delivering on this outcome while the CRPS is amended would not be meeting the purpose of the NPS-UD.
- 36 While this outcome is far from ideal it is our view that, despite the difficulties presented by the current state of the CRPS, there is sufficient guidance available to decision-makers under the NPS-UD to make decisions relating to urban environments. We point to Objective 1, 6, Policy 1, 6 and 8. As well we point to subpart 2 - Responsive planning Clause 3.8.

Topic 3: How to provide for the responsive planning framework provisions within the PDP and whether or not the PDP can or should be drafted so as to give primacy to the NPS-UD responsive planning framework over the CRPS.

- 37 CCC submit that any drafting of the urban growth provisions of the PDP that undermines the role of the CRPS, and its directive, unqualified avoid framework, would be inappropriate and fail to comply with s 75(3) RMA. However, that submission fails to recognise that the CRPS itself does not comply with s62 (3).
- 38 We consider that the PDP can and should be drafted to give primacy to the NPS-UD responsive planning framework over the CRPS because the NPS-UD is a higher order document dealing with matters of national significance, containing express and specific provisions as to what decision-makers, when making planning decisions, are to take into account, particularly when dealing with planning instruments that include provisions that could constrain development. As well, it needs to be remembered that not only is the NPS-UD a higher order document, but it is a later in time document.
- 39 We consider s 55 RMA, which requires local authority recognition of national policy statements support giving precedence to the NPS-UD. Part 4 of the NPS-UD directs both regional and district councils to give effect to the provisions of the NPS as soon as practicable. The PDP hearing process provides such an opportunity to this Council. The Regional Council, in our view, should be amending the CRPS as soon as it is able to do so.
- 40 Due to the timing of the PDP process, the NPS-UD coming into force and a CRPS that does not include a Clause 3.8(3) criteria for unanticipated or out of sequence developments the commissioners face a difficult decision. That decision is made all the more difficult when s75 (3) requires a district plan to give effect to a regional policy statement and a national policy statement.
- 41 However, in reaching a decision on whether or not the PDP can or should be drafted in such a way to give primacy to the responsive planning provisions of the NPS-UD over the avoid objective in the CRPS, we conclude such a decision can and should be made. Such a decision recognises the importance of the NPS in the planning hierarchy and the requirement the district plan must give effect to any national policy statement. We consider such a decision is supportable on the basis

that the CRPS does not give effect to the NPS-UD as required by s62 (3). In our view a pragmatic approach is required that recognises that the role of the CRPS and its directive, unqualified avoid framework is already compromised.

- 42 CCC and CRC are concerned if precedence is given to the responsive planning framework, particularly having regard to Change 1 to the CRPS having recently been approved by the Minister, the end result could be a proliferation of ad hoc and significant and speculative unplanned growth outside the areas contemplated by the CRPS, with resulting impacts on integration, and strategic funding and planning decisions.
- 43 In our view, as earlier stated, we consider there is ample guidance within the NPS-UD and within MFE guides to avoid such an outcome. That guidance can also inform the content of any PDP provision.
- 44 We observe that there are a significant number of plan changes to the operative district plan currently in process. Those plan changes have specifically addressed Policy 8 and the NPS-UD in full. Plan change proponents have produced evidence seeking to demonstrate why the particular development they are proposing satisfies the NPS-UD including the criteria for determining that their particular plan change can be treated for the purposes of implementing policy 8 as adding significantly to development capacity.
- 45 Those plan change proponents have also presented submissions and evidence seeking to establish approving the plan change contributes to a well-functioning urban environment. Essentially the proponents are endeavouring to demonstrate approving the plan change will be in accord with the objectives and policies of the NPS-UD.
- 46 So this demonstrates, we submit, it is feasible to develop and include objectives and policies within the PDP to give effect to the NPS-UD and in particular provide for significant development that is unanticipated or out of sequence. It also demonstrates that such an outcome will still result in appropriate consideration and assessment of applications for plan changes, which, in practice, could still only allow for development within the CRPS 'hard line'. However, this will rely on an evidential assessment, rather than strict adherence to the CRPS.
- 47 Having read Mr Baird's Right of Reply Report we agree with the approach he articulates in his paragraph 2.34 to 2.43 and in particular his recommended wording at paragraph 2.43 as to how the PDP can be drafted.

P G Rogers

Counsel for the Selwyn District Council