

Further submission on publicly notified proposal for Christchurch Replacement District Plan – Memorial Business Park Plan Change

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order 2014

To Christchurch City Council

By email: dpreview@ccc.govt.nz

Name of submitter: Christchurch International Airport Limited (*CIAL*)

This is a further submission on the Christchurch Replacement District Plan (*proposed District Plan*) – proposed **Memorial Business Park Plan Change** (*proposed MBPPC*)

- 1 CIAL could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
- 2 CIAL has an interest in this matter greater than the interest that the general public has.
- 3 CIAL wishes to be heard in support of this further submission.
- 4 **Signed** for and on behalf of Christchurch International Airport Limited by its solicitors and authorised agents Chapman Tripp:



Jo Appleyard / Ben Williams
Partner / Senior Associate
2 March 2015

Address for service of submitter:

Christchurch International Airport Ltd
C/- Jo Appleyard / Ben Williams
Chapman Tripp
PO Box 2510
Upper Riccarton
Christchurch 8140

Phone: +64 3 353 4130

Fax: +64 3 365 4587

Email address: ben.williams@chapmantripp.com

SPECIFIC SUBMISSION POINTS

5 CIAL wishes to make a further submission on the following points:

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
<p>Rodger David Linton M03</p>	<p>Oppose designation of parking lots within the proposed CIAL REPA Zone.</p> <p>[Council ref: D5]</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>CIAL does not consider that the REPA has been or should be 'watered down' to suit this particular proposal. CIAL is concerned to ensure that adequate controls exist over the land in the REPA to ensure that the airport can operate safely and efficiently. To that end, CIAL sought that the red shaded area within the site is controlled through the existing rule provisions for the REPA, including Rule 6.2 and Rule 6.3.4.</p> <p>CIAL seeks consistency in terms of REPA management across all the REPA areas, and to that end has separately sought an extension of its designation over this area as part of the Christchurch District Plan review process.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that Mr Linton's submission be rejected. CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.</p>
<p>Rodger David Linton M03</p>	<p>Oppose built form standards 16.4.5.2.7 (landscaped areas)</p> <p>[Council ref: D10]</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>CIAL sought amendments to built form standard 16.4.5.2.7 to provide for appropriate bird management in the alternative that the main relief sought (inclusion of zone specific provisions within the proposed MPBBC) is not granted.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.</p>
<p>Rodger David Linton M03</p>	<p>Comments regarding traffic</p> <p>[para 9]</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>CIAL agrees with Mr Linton and has noted its concern that there is no indication of how the adverse traffic effects of development arising from the proposed MBPPC could be mitigated.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.</p>
<p>Avonhead Community</p>	<p>Defer the decision on MBPPC until phase 2 of</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>CIAL notes that in its minute of 18 February 2015 the Independent Hearings Panel ordered that the MAIL plan</p>	<p>N/a</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
Group Inc M04	the district plan review. [Council ref: D2]		change will not be heard before the close of submissions for stage 2 proposals.	
Avonhead Community Group Inc M04	Seeks that Russley Road is maintained as a demarcation permanently	Support	In its original submission CIAL raised a number of concerns with regard to traffic and pedestrians potentially crossing Russley Road. The use of Russley Road to demarcate airport activities versus non-airport activities is supported.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.
Avonhead Community Group Inc M04	Oppose the night-time outage method proposed by MAIL and CCC to deal with additional sewerage generated by the Industrial Business Park. Oppose the plan change until the sewerage system is upgraded as necessary [para 27]	Support in part	CIAL agrees that the issue of how wastewater is to be dealt with is a particular concern. CIAL sought relief in the form of either a stronger policy framework around when a non-complying activity such as subdivision might be appropriate, or that any activity not complying with Rule 16.4.5.2.9 be a prohibited activity.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.
Avonhead Community Group Inc M04	Opposed to the additional pressure proposed to be placed on the Avonhead Road stormwater system. [para 28]	Support in part	CIAL shares Avonhead Community Group’s concerns that the current provisions for surface water management are inadequate. CIAL sought consistency with the provisions being sought by CIAL regarding stormwater through the proposed District Plan review process.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
Avonhead Community Group Inc M04	Support the proposal to plant trees and landscape the site [para 30]	Oppose in part	CIAL seeks provisions in the MBPPC that ensures the management of all landscape features is such that they do not encourage bird species known to be a threat to a safe aircraft operation to visit or inhabit the site. Planting and landscaping should reflect the CIAL Area 2A Landscape Protocol.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.
Canterbury District Health Board M05	A temporary solution for the appropriate disposal of sewerage must be specified as a condition of the development. [Council ref: D4]	Oppose in part	CIAL agrees that the issue of how wastewater is to be dealt with is a particular concern. CIAL sought relief in the form of either a stronger policy framework around when a non-complying activity such as subdivision might be appropriate, or that any activity not complying with Rule 16.4.5.2.9 be a prohibited activity. There is no evidence of sewage (or other waste water) being able to be dealt with on a temporary basis – and it might well have currently unknown adverse effects.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.
Canterbury District Health Board M05	Standing water at the site is restricted in order to avoid not only attracting wildlife but also the creation of potential mosquito habitats. [Council ref: D5]	Support	CIAL shares Canterbury DHB’s concerns that the current provisions for surface water management are inadequate and that standing water should be avoided. CIAL sought inclusion of specific provisions to manage the risk of bird strike through stormwater rules either in a single consistent rule package or a set of rules inserted into every zone within 13km of the end of Christchurch International Airport runways.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.
Christchurch City Council M06	Amend 16.1.2.1 Policy 8 “(d) <u>Maintain the</u>	Support in part	CIAL seeks provisions in the MBPPC that ensures the management of all landscape features is such that they do not encourage bird species known to be a threat to a safe aircraft operation to visit or inhabit the site. Planting and	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
	<p><u>amenity values along Memorial Avenue and its function as a war memorial and visitor gateway through the provision of buildings of a high visual an aesthetic quality, limited signage, a large building setback and landscaping along the frontage of memorial avenue."</u></p> <p>[Council ref: D4]</p>		<p>landscaping should reflect the CIAL Area 2A Landscape Protocol.</p> <p>CIAL supports the intention of the Council's submission, provided that MBPPC also includes provisions to ensure that landscaping is managed with bird strike risk and management in mind, not just visual amenity considerations.</p>	is granted.
<p>Christchurch City Council M06</p>	<p>Delete Rule 16.4.5.1.1 P6 (retail activity) and consequential amendments</p> <p>[Council ref: D5]</p>	Support	<p>In its primary submission CIAL sought that Rule P6 be deleted and that the retail activities be made a discretionary activity consistent with other Industrial zones. CIAL would also be satisfied with the relief sought by the Christchurch City Council.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought by Christchurch City Council is granted.</p>
<p>Christchurch City Council M06</p>	<p>Amend Rule 16.4.5.2.9 by amending the wording under the heading "Permitted" to read as follows: <u>"Any activity that does not discharge to the Council's reticulated wastewater network</u></p>	Oppose in part	<p>Given the nature of development it is not clear as to whether there would be any circumstance where development could occur without the discharge of flows. Any 'temporary' activity that results in, for example, discharges to groundwater is opposed on the basis that it may lead to other adverse effects.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
	<p>uUntil the upgrade of the Upper Riccarton Interceptor Sewer there shall be no discharge of wastewater from the zone to the Council's reticulated wastewater network to provide capacity to accommodate additional wastewater flows."</p> <p>[Council ref: D8]</p>			
<p>Christchurch City Council M06</p>	<p>Amend the Options Design Report to:</p> <p>i. Remove "Stormwater facility associated with open space" from the area identified as "Key open space locations"; and</p> <p>ii. Identify proposed areas for stormwater management.</p> <p>[Council ref: D9]</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>For the proposed MBPPC, CIAL seeks the deletion of all stormwater basin rules and associated assessment matters from individual zone packages and the subdivision chapter and their replacement with a single consistent and effective rule package that covers all zones.</p> <p>As its secondary and less preferred relief, the proposed rule package outlined in CIAL's primary submission should be inserted into every zone rules framework within 13km of the runways at Christchurch international Airport Limited.</p> <p>If provision if made within the specific Memorial Business Park zone, the provisions would need to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> avoiding the creation of bird habitats that could lead to an increase in the populations of those bird species known to be a hazard to safe aircraft 	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
			<p>operation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensuring that the management of all landscape features is such that they do not encourage those species known to be threat to a safe aircraft operation to visit or inhabit the site (therefore, planting should reflect similar species to those included in the CIAL Area 2A Landscape Protocol should be used); a Bird Management Plan (BMP) being prepared in consultation with CIAL. At a minimum the Plan would ensure that the design and ongoing management of all landscape features associated with the stormwater disposal, planted amenity areas on the site, and general site management minimises the sites attractiveness to all bird species; <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> that an appropriate contact person onsite be appointed to be responsible and to oversee the BMP. 	
<p>CEO of Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority on behalf of The Crown M07</p>	<p>Amend Rule 16.4.5.1.1 P6 (retail activity) to only allow the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -yard based and trade based activities; -emergency services; -activities that 	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>In its primary submission CIAL sought that Rule P6 be deleted and that the retail activities covered by P6 be made a discretionary activity consistent with other Industrial zones. CIAL supports the intent of this submission so far as it seeks to restrict retail activities that may occur as permitted activities.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission is granted.</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
	<p>support the needs of workers and businesses in the zone; -activities that are ancillary to permitted activities in the industrial zone</p> <p>[Council ref: D3]</p>			
<p>CEO of Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority on behalf of The Crown M07</p>	<p>Amend rule 16.4.5.1.1 P11 (office development) to only allow office development that is ancillary to a permitted activity</p> <p>[Council ref: D4]</p>	<p>Support in part</p>	<p>CIAL agrees that the level of office activity currently provided for in MBPPC is inconsistent with the proposed Replacement District Plan (<i>pRDP</i>), the LURP and the RPS. CIAL seeks that the status of activities in the MBPPC is consistent with other industrial zones in the pRDP.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks in the first instance that the relief it sought in its primary submission be granted.</p> <p>Alternatively, CIAL would be satisfied with the relief sought by the Crown.</p>
<p>CEO of Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority on behalf of The Crown M07</p>	<p>Delete rule 16.4.5.1.1 P14 (guest accommodation)</p> <p>[Council ref: D5]</p>	<p>Support</p>	<p>CIAL agrees that, to the extent that guest accommodation is a sensitive activity, permitted activity status is not appropriate.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought by the Crown is granted.</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
CEO of Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority on behalf of The Crown M07	<p>New non-complying rule: <u>“development within the site should not commence prior to completion of the Western Corridor project from Harewood to Yaldhurst including the Memorial interchange and the southern airport access (Dakoda Park) being operational.”</u></p> <p>[Council ref: D12]</p>	Support	<p>CIAL agrees that it is important that the related traffic effects of the MBP development can be accommodated safely and efficiently and not compromise access to/from Christchurch International Airport.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought by the Crown is granted.</p>
CEO of Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority on behalf of The Crown M07	<p>Amend the outline development plan to identify the staging of development and subdivision.</p> <p>[Council ref: D15]</p>	Support	<p>CIAL agrees that the outline development plan lacks detail and does not give certainty that the site will be developed in an integrated manner.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought by the Crown is granted.</p>
Airways Corporation of New Zealand Ltd M08	Whole submission	Support	<p>CIAL supports Airways Corporation having input on the detailed lighting design that shall be permitted in the Memorial Business Park. CIAL supports MAIL liaising with Airways Corporation to ensure the detailed design of all lighting associated with the Business Park does not result in any adverse effects on Airways operations. CIAL agrees that MAIL should provide greater detail of the built form standards or key structuring elements for lighting provisions</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought by Airways Corporation be granted.</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
			within the Memorial Business Park.	
Anthony Thomas Gough M09	Oppose any development that would then be able to seek to restrict the hours of operation of Christchurch Airport. [page 2, para 4]	Support	CIAL supports the avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on the safe and efficient use, development and operation of the Airport.	CIAL seeks that Mr Gough’s submission is allowed.
Commodore Airport Hotel Ltd M12	Seeks that the stormwater retention swale be located partly within the proposed setback between the Commodore’s Residential land and the business park [para 25]	Oppose in part	CIAL sought specific relief with regards to stormwater management and seeks that this be granted. To the extent that Commodore Airport Hotel’s requested relief is inconsistent with that, CIAL seeks that it be declined.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission be granted.
Jared Murtha M15	“REPA was supposedly rejected a few years ago. It seems like a plan so the airport can gain more carparking.”	Oppose	The plan change is not intended to ‘expand’ operations. CIAL seeks consistency between the ongoing provision of the REPA and the provisions of the plan change.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission be granted.
Memorial Avenue Investment Limited	Change status of buildings within zone from permitted to	Support in part	CIAL supports requirements that the landowner obtain resource consent for any buildings in the zone. However, CIAL is concerned to ensure that buildings within the REPA	CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its primary submission

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
M18	controlled [Council ref: D2]		are prohibited. The operative City Plan prohibits buildings within the REPA area via Rule 6.2 contained in Part 9 of Volume 3. It is unclear at this stage whether a similar chapter will be incorporated into the pRDP. Therefore out of caution CIAL is seeking that this rule be incorporated into the proposal (emphasising that CIAL is seeking consistency in the approach to the REPA across the City Plan).	be granted.
Memorial Avenue Investment Limited M18	Providing for increased retail and office activities [Council ref: D6]	Oppose	This is inconsistent with the proposed provisions for many other industrial zones in the pRDP. CIAL seeks that non-ancillary offices and retail activities be made a discretionary activity consistent with other industrial zones.	CIAL seeks that the relief requested by MAIL be declined.
Memorial Avenue Investment Limited M18	Amend 16.4.5.1.1 by adding P6-Supermarket [Council ref: D7]	Oppose	CIAL seeks that the status of activities in the MBPPC is consistent with other industrial zones. In the Industrial Park Zone rules, the only food and beverage outlets permitted are those with a maximum gross floor area of 150m ² .	CIAL seeks that the relief requested by MAIL be declined
Memorial Avenue Investment Limited M18	Amendments to 16.4.5.1.1 deletion of built form standards P6 and P7 and new built form standard P7 for Retail Activity Not Otherwise Permitted [Council ref: D8, D9]	Oppose	As discussed above, CIAL seeks that the status of activities in the MBPPC is consistent with other industrial zones. The proposed status and scale of retail activities in the MBPPC is not consistent with other Industrial Park zoned areas in the pRDP.	CIAL seeks that the relief requested by MAIL be declined

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
	<p>and D10]</p> <p>And other consequential amendments</p>			
<p>Memorial Avenue Investment Limited</p> <p>M18</p>	<p>Amendments to 16.4.5.1.1 deletion of built form standards P11 and P12 and new built form standards P13-P15 for Office Activities.</p> <p>[Council ref: D15 – D18]</p> <p>And other consequential amendments</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>As discussed above, CIAL seeks that the status of activities in the MBPPC is consistent with other industrial zones. The proposed status and scale of office activities in the MBPPC is not consistent with other Industrial Park zoned areas in the pRDP. In the Industrial rules in the pRDP only ancillary office activity is permitted as of right and is limited to a gross floor area of 500m² or 30% of the gross floor area of all buildings on the same site, whichever is lesser.</p> <p>CIAL opposes provision for office activity for aviation related businesses (emphasising the comments elsewhere re the potential traffic and pedestrian effects regarding the ‘crossing’ of Russley Road), rural businesses, or professional offices as permitted activities. CIAL also opposes inclusion of provisions allowing for the gradual increase of gross leasable floor area for total tenancies in the zone through to beyond 2022 in P15.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief requested by MAIL be declined.</p>
<p>Memorial Avenue Investment Limited</p> <p>M18</p>	<p>Amend rule 16.4.5.1.1 new permitted activity P17 – Health care facility excluding care facilities incorporating onsite accommodation built form standard:</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>CIAL notes that health care facilities are ‘sensitive activities’ in relation to noise. This is consistent with the definition of ‘sensitive activities’ in the pRDP. Consequently, regardless of whether the health facility provides onsite accommodation, it is an activity that is susceptible to noise caused by airport operations and has the potential to generate reverse sensitivity effects that could adversely</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief requested by MAIL be declined.</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
	<p>Nil.</p> <p>Consequential amendment of rule 16.4.5.1.5 NC3</p> <p>[Council ref: D20 and D34]</p>		<p>affect the safe and efficient operation of the airport.</p> <p>It is critical that sensitive activities within the 50 Ldn dBA noise contour are avoided.</p>	
<p>Memorial Avenue Investment Limited</p> <p>M18</p>	<p>Amend rule 16.4.5.1.1 built form standard P18 Guest Accommodation</p> <p>"... e. any bedroom must be designed and constructed to achieve an external to internal noise reduction of not less than 35dB Dtr,2m,nTw +Ctr</p> <p>d. any ancillary retail activity shall occupy not more than 500m² or 25% of the gross floor area of all buildings on the site used for Guest Accommodation, whichever is the lesser</p> <p><u>e. Guest</u></p>	<p>Oppose in part</p>	<p>CIAL notes that guest accommodation is also a sensitive activity (at least some instances) for the purposes of Rule 16.4.5.1.5 NC3.</p> <p>CIAL also seeks that the nature of guest accommodation be defined such that it is only 'non-sensitive activity' guest accommodation (if any) that is provided for in P18. In the alternative, guest accommodation should be determined as a non-complying activity under NC3.</p> <p>CIAL supports provision being made for acoustic insulation provided it is consistent with that provided elsewhere in the final provisions of the proposed District Plan. However, CIAL seeks that acoustic insulation is required anywhere within the 50Ldn dBA noise contour, not just within 100m of Avonhead and Russley Roads.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought by MAIL be declined or only granted provided that the concerns raised by CIAL in this submission and its original submission are addressed.</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
	<p><u>accommodation shall meet "Indoor design Sound Levels" as contained in [appendix 1, Part 4 of the City Plan – reference to be update] within 100m of Memorial Avenue or Russley Road"</u></p>			
<p>Memorial Avenue Investment Limited M18</p>	<p>Amend rule 16.4.5.1.2 providing for new controlled activity: Erection of new buildings and additions to existing buildings.</p> <p>[Council ref: unclear. MAIL submission page 12]</p>	<p>Oppose in part</p>	<p>CIAL is strongly opposed to the erection of new buildings within the REPA. As noted in its original submission, CIAL is seeking that a rule prohibiting buildings within the REPA area be included in the MBPPC. Provided that rule is included, CIAL is not opposed to new buildings on other areas of the MAIL site being provided for as controlled activities.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought by MAIL be declined unless a new rule is also included prohibiting buildings within the REPA.</p>
<p>Memorial Avenue Investment Limited M18</p>	<p>Amend Landscaped areas built form standards table and delete advice note.</p> <p>[Council ref: D56 and D57]</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>CIAL sought detailed relief in its original submissions relating to the management of activities that constitute bird strike risk. This relief is inherently linked to stormwater management and landscape management. CIAL seeks to ensure that the management of all landscape and stormwater features and facilities is such that they do not encourage those species of bird known to be a threat to a safe aircraft operation to visit or inhabit the site. This is a significant public safety issue.</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought in its original submission is granted.</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
Memorial Avenue Investment Limited M18	Amend 16.4.6.3.5 to include office activities. [Council ref: D64 - D68]	Support in part	CIAL does not support a greater level and intensity of retail and office activities than is permitted to occur in other industrial zones. However, CIAL is supportive of this standard applying as a matter of discretion to both retail and office activities locating in the business park.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought by MAIL is granted.
G N McVicar No 1 Trust M19	Confirm the plan change subject to deletion of the proposed REPA on the ODP and deletion of permitted activity rule p15 (car parking in the REPA) [Council ref: D1]	Oppose	<p>The REPA exists for the purpose of risk reduction. The highest risk of an aircraft runway-related accident occurs during take-off and landing. This is when the aircraft is aligned with the extended runway centreline and relatively close to the end of the runway. In order to protect the public from the risk of an incident, many national airway authorities define a zone beyond the runway end. The REPA design requirements are based on the United States Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) runway protection zones standards.</p> <p>The operative City Plan regulates activities within the REPA in Part 9 of Volume 3. It is unclear at this stage whether a similar chapter will be incorporated into the pRDP. Therefore out of caution CIAL is seeking that this rule be incorporated into the proposal (emphasising that CIAL is seeking consistency in the approach to the REPA across the City Plan).</p> <p>As stated in its original submission, CIAL is seeking to designate a portion of the subject site, which is owned by a third party. This forms part of the separate request by CIAL to rollover the existing Christchurch International Airport designation, with modifications. The final provisions of the rolled over designation are intended to be consistent with</p>	CIAL seeks that the relief sought by the GN McVicar No 1 Trust be declined.

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
			<p>the final provisions sought/supported in this submission.</p> <p>It is important that the REPA remains identified on the ODP. CIAL is not opposed in principle to deletion of rule P15 and has made submissions on this rule in its original submission. However, CIAL is concerned to ensure that there is no inappropriate development or land use permitted in the REPA area that may compromise the safe and efficient operation of the airport.</p>	
<p>G N McVicar No 1 Trust M19</p>	<p>Request that the plan change be considered independently to CIAL’s request for designation rollover with modification (and therefore without reference to the REPA)</p> <p>[paras 4 and 5]</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>As this plan change forms part of the review of the City Plan and proposed Replacement District Plan process, and CIAL’s designation rollover application also forms part of that process, it is appropriate to consider this plan change in light of the designation rollover process and would be artificial to separate the two.</p> <p>CIAL also notes that the Independent Hearings Panel has ordered that the MAIL plan change will not be heard until stage 2 of the pRDP review. This means that a decision regarding CIAL’s designation rollover will already have been made and will be available at that time (and will form part of the ‘existing environment’ for assessing the effects of the MAIL plan change).</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that the relief sought by the GN McVicar No 1 Trust be declined.</p>
<p>Sheryn Carol Valmai Linton M24</p>	<p>Oppose parking lots within the proposed CIAL REPA.</p> <p>[Council ref: D5]</p>	<p>Oppose</p>	<p>CIAL does not consider that the REPA has been or should be ‘watered down’ to suit this particular proposal. CIAL is concerned to ensure that adequate controls exist over the land in the REPA to ensure that the airport can operate safely and efficiently. To that end, CIAL sought that the red shaded area within the site is controlled through the existing rule provisions for the REPA, including Rule 6.2 and Rule</p>	<p>CIAL seeks that Mrs Linton’s submission be rejected. CIAL seeks that the relief sought its primary submission is</p>

Name of Submitter	Submission Point	Support / Oppose	Discussion	Relief Sought
			6.3.4. CIAL seeks consistency in terms of REPA management across all the REPA areas, and to that end has sought an extension of its designation over this area as part of the Christchurch District Plan review process.	granted.
Sheryn Carol Valmai Linton M24	Oppose built form standards 16.4.5.2.7 (landscaped areas) [Council ref: D10]	Support in part	CIAL sought amendments to built form standard 16.4.5.2.7 to provide for appropriate bird management in the alternative that the main relief sought (inclusion of zone specific provisions within the proposed MPBBC) is not granted.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought its primary submission is granted.
Linton Family Trust M25	Oppose parking lots within the proposed CIAL REPA. [Council ref: D5]	Oppose	See CIAL's response above and with regards to Mr Linton's submission on this matter.	CIAL seeks that this submission be rejected. CIAL seeks that the relief sought its primary submission is granted.
Linton Family Trust M25	Oppose built form standards 16.4.5.2.7 (landscaped areas) [Council ref: D10]	Support in part	CIAL sought amendments to built form standard 16.4.5.2.7 to provide for appropriate bird management in the alternative that the main relief sought (inclusion of zone specific provisions within the proposed MPBBC) is not granted.	CIAL seeks that the relief sought its primary submission is granted.