

was that in the event that an alternative facility was made available, there was the potential for the Kart Club to simply operate from both the existing and new tracks i.e. the creation of a new track does not automatically mean that the existing track must close.

The second amendment concerned the introduction of a rule and timeframe requiring the Council to develop Owaka Road into the proposed 'waka trail' cycling and walking route, with the road closed to heavy vehicles. As part of such works the access to Owaka Pit would need to connect more directly with the motorway rather than the current access from Owaka Road.

The ownership of the Awatea area appears to be fragmented relative to most of the other Living G areas. There was consistent feedback from landowners that where ownership is fragmented, Council needs to adopt a much more proactive approach at establishing the key network infrastructure and greenspace to enable development to occur as it is unrealistic to expect a single developer to buy out multiple adjacent property owners. The current 'hands off' approach by Council was seen as being contrary to the stated aims of the Council (and CERA) to facilitate housing to address current housing supply constraints.

9.7 Halswell West

The owners of 68 Whincops Road sought that the ODP be amended to reflect a revised access route into their landholding from the adjacent 'Longhurst' development.

The developers of Longhurst also sought that the ODP and Zoning be aligned to reflect recent zone boundary adjustments that have recently been agreed with Council.

10.0 Chapter 14 Landuse Provisions

In general, feedback was focussed on the subdivision rather than residential chapters. This prioritisation reflected the interest of the majority of respondents as land developers/ subdividers rather than house builders. Several respondents considered that the rules controlling non-residential activities, especially community facilities such as health and day care, and small corner shops/ dairies were too restrictive for a greenfield context and that the provisions could be relaxed in order to facilitate the establishment of such facilities in greenfield neighbourhoods as a key component in creating high quality neighbourhoods. In particular the building size and hours of operation controls were felt to be overly restrictive.

The other consistent feedback was that the bulk and location controls were overly prescriptive, especially concerning the location of front doors and windows, ground floor habitable rooms, garaging, fencing and landscaping (14.6.3.8- 14.6.3.14). It was noted that many of the medium density typologies that Council was requiring through the 'Housing Choices' guide would not comply with these provisions, with the effect that comprehensive subdivision applications would be non-complying. There was consistent feedback that these rules were not necessary for achieving good design outcomes and that they conversely prevented perfectly acceptable design solutions from being implemented. These rules were therefore sought to be deleted.

In particular, if the 'comprehensive' route was followed, it was felt that this approach could be exempt from a greater number of provisions as the house and site 'package' for adjacent sites would be assessed as a single bundle and therefore the issues that

the prescriptive rule package was trying to address would be considered through the comprehensive framework.

11.0 Conclusion

- 1) There was a consistent desire for the Council to provide adequate timeframes for the proposed changes to be robustly considered by affected landowners. There was a view that it would be far preferable to take a bit longer and develop an effective package than proceed with haste on a package that was seen as benefiting from considerable revision.
- 2) There was a consistent preference to retain the existing Living G package, especially for blocks that were partially developed or where subdivision consents had been granted for part of the block.
- 3) Where blocks have been completely built out there was general acceptance of these areas shifting to a similar zone package to the suburban balance of the City, noting specific issues with aligning the suburban rule package with mixed density contexts.
- 4) There was very little interest in pursuing the proposed Comprehensive Development route, however there was general acceptance of having this route as an option.
- 5) The activity and notification status of both the Comprehensive and Subdivision-only routes was seen as being well in excess of what was justifiable in terms of a robust s.32 assessment, with the proposed rule package shifting the majority of subdivision plans from being controlled at present to non-complying. Given the perceived absence of significant resource management issues with the current City Plan approach to land development, and the fact that Living G areas had all been carefully considered through plan change processes and had reasonably detailed ODPs, the current activity status of controlled was sought to be retained. The proposed rule package was seen as being directly contrary to the stated aims of the District Plan Review of simplifying and streamlining.
- 6) The prescriptive rules under section 8.2 were seen as being excessive, ambiguous (in some cases) and unnecessary for achieving good design outcomes. These matters were all seen as being capable of being addressed through the normal controlled activity process with appropriate assessment matters.
- 7) The mandatory requirement to pepper-pot density for subdivision-only applications was seen as being contrary to good urban design practice and would result in outcomes that were contrary to many of the operative ODPs, as was the requirement for every subdivision stage to in itself achieve 15 households/ hectare.
- 8) For areas with a large number of landowners, the key development constraint was the difficulty in establishing coordinated network infrastructure. The proposed rule package did not address this issue, and Council was seen as needing to play a much more proactive role in facilitating the delivery of this infrastructure to enable the coherent development of smaller adjacent landholdings.
- 9) The prescriptive land-use rules in Chapter 14 were seen as being excessive and unnecessary for achieving good quality built outcomes, with the rules in some cases directly working against medium density typologies.
- 10) The Chapter 14 rules for non-residential activities were seen as being excessive for a greenfield context, especially for community facilities such as healthcare, day

care, and small scale corner shops. Enabling such facilities to easily establish was seen as a key method for developing high quality neighbourhoods.

Appendix 1: Consultation Summary

1. Greg Dewe, Fulton Hogan - (Longhurst & Knights Stream) – e-mailed 18/3 and 24/3 and phoned 24/3
2. Darryl Millar, RMG - Ngai Tahu (Prestons & Wigram) -phoned & e-mailed 18/3. Talked to Jason Jones, RMG 27/3 and e-mailed feedback received 31/3.
3. Shane Dixon, Harrison Grierson - East Belfast & part of Highfield – phoned & e-mailed 19/3
4. Bruce Sinclair, Elliot Sinclair - Enterprise Homes (Masham), Ngai Tahu (Wigram), other clients in Awatea and Highfield – (phoned & e-mailed 18/3). Met 25/3 with Bruce Sinclair, Trudi Burney, and planning team.
5. Kim Seaton, Novo Group & Hamish Wheelans, Gilman Wheelans – phoned & e-mailed 18/3; meeting 21/3.
6. Patricia Harte, Davie Lovell-Smith - phoned & e-mailed 19/3; e-mailed feedback received 27/3.
7. Rachel McClung, Davis Ogilvie - clients in part of Highfield - phoned & e-mailed 19/3.
8. John Fergerson, Baseline Planning – clients in part of Prestons (as surveyor) - phoned & e-mailed 19/3)
9. Janette Dovey, Bellbird Consulting - clients in part of Highfield - phoned & e-mailed 19/3; phoned 1/4
10. Nicola Rykers, Boffa Miskell – no known clients -phoned & e-mailed 19/3.
11. Kim McCracken - clients in Yaldhurst and Belfast -phoned 21/3.
12. Clive Dawe, 396 Wigram Rd (2.2ha block behind Carrs Rd Speedway) – telephoned 21/3 – questions around whether CCC would be designating a stormwater corridor shown under pylons on his land (as shown on the existing ODP)
13. Peter Lewys, 62 Whincops Rd (one of a narrow suburban strip of houses fronting Whincops adjacent to Longhurst subdivision) – telephoned 21/3
14. Gill Newman, 44 Carrs Rd – 6 acres – telephoned 21/3

15. Peter Hide, 19 Cashmere Rd (but owning 502 Halswell Rd – suburban sized section) – telephoned 21/3
16. Deborah Lynch, 2479a West Coast Rd – 2 acre block behind McKenzie Residential School in Masham – telephone 21/3
17. Julie Silcock – 47 Pensicola Cres (Masham), but owns a 1.5 acre block in Halswell/Whincops area
18. Amanda Foster – 396- 400 Prestons – 1.6ha total. In Prestons ‘village commercial’ ODP area. Called 24/3
19. Kay Styler, Awatea Residential Association – phoned 24/3 and 31/3.
20. Andre Cargill – 302 Wigram Rd – 800m² residential section - phoned and e-mailed 24/3
21. Graham Riddel – 140 Awatea Rd (8ha in two titles) – phoned 24/3
22. Charlotte Gibbon – Devondale Estate, NW Belfast – phoned and e-mail 24/3
23. Mark Hutching, 366 Halswell Junction Rd – e-mail feedback received 24/3
24. Mark Henare, Pegasus Health – phoned 25/3
25. Jeffrey & Susan Gibson, 479A Yaldhurst Rd –e-mail feedback received 24/3
26. David Shepherd, 82 Whincops Rd (suburban size section) – e-mail and phoned 25/3
27. Kevin Smith, practice manager for Halswell Health. E-mailed and phoned 25/3.
28. Foodstuffs SI Ltd – C/- Sarah Eveleigh, Anderson Lloyd – amend Prestons ODP to remove secondary road adjacent to the consented supermarket. E-mail feedback 25/3
29. Colin Stokes, 475c Yaldhurst Rd –E-mail feedback 25/3
30. Jenny Howard, 68 Whincops Rd – approx. 6ha adjacent to Fulton Hogan. Would like to amend the ODP as it relates to her block and will e-mail changes through. Would also like densities of around 750-800m² size. phoned 26/3.

31. Greg Smith, 477D Yaldhurst Rd – e-mailed feedback 25/3.

32. David Wilson, Justin Prain, (developers) and Kate McKenzie, Richard Graham (Cardno) – north west Yaldhurst and northwest Belfast – e-mail 21/3, meeting on 31 March