

RNN 9

**SUBMISSION BY THE CROWN ON THE RESIDENTIAL NEW NEIGHBOURHOOD  
PROPOSAL (PART) FOR THE CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT DISTRICT PLAN  
NOTIFIED ON 28 SEPTEMBER 2015**

**To:** Christchurch City Council  
**Address:** 53 Hereford Street, Christchurch  
**Email:** dpreview@ccc.govt.nz



**Submitter details**

**Full name:** Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority for and on behalf of the Crown  
**Postal address:** Private Bag 4999, Christchurch 8140  
**Email address:** info@cera.govt.nz  
**Phone number:** 0800 746 423  
**Contact person:** Viv Smith, Manager Planning

**The Crown authorises the persons below to represent its submission:**

**Authorised agents:** Cedric Carranceja / Jenna Silcock  
**Firm:** Buddle Findlay  
**Email address:** cedric.carranceja@buddlefindlay.com / jenna.silcock@buddlefindlay.com  
**Phone number:** 03 379 1747

The Crown's preferred addresses for service are the three email addresses above.

**Trade competition**

The Crown cannot gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

**Previous submissions**

The Crown lodged submissions on the Stage 1, 2 and other Stage 3 Proposals and understands that Note 4 of the Stage 3 Submission Form Guidelines applies to its submission.

**Please specify the specific proposal that your submission relates to:**

The Residential New Neighbourhood Proposal (Part), being the Outline Development Plans and narrative for each of the following Residential New Neighbourhoods:

- North Halswell (Appendix 8.6.4)
- South Masham (Appendix 8.6.5)

**The submission points, reasons and decisions sought are set out in the attached document.**

P W N S I

**Hearing**

The Crown wishes to be heard in support of its submission.

If others make a similar submission, the Crown will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'B.A.', enclosed within a large, horizontal, hand-drawn oval.

**Bronwyn Arthur**

Chief Legal Advisor Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority

For and on behalf of the Crown

**Date:** 10 November 2015

**SUBMISSION BY THE CROWN ON THE STAGE 3 RESIDENTIAL NEW NEIGHBOURHOOD PROPOSAL (PART) FOR THE CHRISTCHURCH REPLACEMENT DISTRICT PLAN NOTIFIED ON 28 SEPTEMBER 2015**

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

GLOSSARY OF TERMS	4
1. BACKGROUND	5
PART A - GENERAL SUBMISSION	7
2. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK	7
3. KEY IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED	8
Alignment with Strategic Directions and RPS	8
Structure and usability	9
Problems with the section 32 analysis	9
Natural Hazards, environmental protection and other development constraints	9
4. PROVISIONS SUPPORTED	10
5. THE CROWN'S PRINCIPAL OUTCOMES	10
6. DECISIONS SOUGHT	12
PART B - SUBMISSION ON THE RESIDENTIAL NEW NEIGHBOURHOOD PROPOSAL	14
SPECIFIC SUBMISSION	15

## GLOSSARY OF TERMS

CCRP	Christchurch Central Recovery Plan – Te Mahere Maraka Ōtautahi
CER Act	Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011
CERA	Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority
Council	Christchurch City Council
LURP	Land Use Recovery Plan – Te Mahere Whakahaumanu Tāone
NZTA	New Zealand Transport Agency
ODP	Outline Development Plan
Order	Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order 2014
Recovery Strategy	Recovery Strategy for Greater Christchurch – Mahere Haumanutanga o Waitaha
Replacement Plan	Christchurch Replacement District Plan
RMA	Resource Management Act 1991 (as amended)
RPS	Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

## 1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1 This submission is made by the Crown, for and on behalf of each of the 23 individual Government Department and Crown Entities as listed in paragraph 1.7 below.
- 1.2 The submission is divided into two parts as follows:
- (a) Part A (General Submission) sets out the principal outcomes the Crown seeks to be better enabled and supported through the notified proposal and highlights the key areas of support, and concerns, for the proposal.
  - (b) Part B (Specific Submissions) contains submission points which relate to the Residential New Neighbourhood proposal.
- 1.3 Note that Part A and Part B should be read together and form the Crown's submission.
- 1.4 The Crown has considered the notified proposal from both the policy and operational positions of relevant Government Departments and Crown Entities. The Christchurch Replacement District Plan ("**Replacement Plan**") will have significant impacts on the recovery of greater Christchurch and on the Crown's investment in, and policy objectives for, the rebuild and recovery of Christchurch. Clearer and more concise objectives, policies and rules are needed to support the recovery of Christchurch and enable efficient and effective delivery of services by Government Departments and Crown Entities.
- 1.5 The purpose of the submission is to provide the hearings panel, and all other submitters, with a consistent and coherent statement from the Crown about those aspects of the proposal that it supports or opposes, and to offer suggestions for how the proposal can be further improved.
- 1.6 The Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority ("**CERA**"), for and on behalf of the Crown, will be leading and presenting a case at the hearings on this submission, along with individual Government Departments and Crown Entities.
- 1.7 This submission represents the collective view of 23 Government Departments and Crown Entities as follows:

1. Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment	2. Department of Internal Affairs	3. Earthquake Commission
4. Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority	5. Ministry of Justice	6. Education New Zealand
7. Department of Conservation	8. New Zealand Defence Force	9. GNS Science
10. Department of Corrections	11. New Zealand Police	12. Housing New Zealand Corporation
13. Ministry of Civil Defence & Emergency Management	14. Ministry of Social Development	15. New Zealand Fire Service Commission

16. Ministry of Education	17. State Services Commission	18. New Zealand Transport Agency
19. Ministry for the Environment	20. Te Puni Kōkiri	21. Ministry of Health
22. The Treasury	23. The Ministry of Culture and Heritage	

## **PART A - GENERAL SUBMISSION**

Part A (General Submission) sets out the key improvements that the Crown considers need to be made to the outline development plans ("ODPs") notified on 28 September 2015. Part A should be read with and forms part of the Crown's detailed submission points contained in Part B of this submission.

### **2. STATUTORY AND REGULATORY FRAMEWORK**

2.1 The Replacement Plan must be in accordance with the statutory and regulatory framework that applies to Christchurch post-earthquake, as follows:

- (a) be not inconsistent with the Recovery Strategy for Greater Christchurch Mahere Haumanutanga o Waitaha ("**Recovery Strategy**"), the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan Te Mahere Maraka Ōtautahi ("**CCRP**") or the Land Use Recovery Plan Te Mahere Whakahaumanu Tāone ("**LURP**") - refer sections 15 and 23 of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 ("**CER Act**"), and clause 14 of the Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order 2014 ("**Order**");
- (b) give effect to any national policy statement, the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement ("**NZCPS**") and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement ("**RPS**") - refer section 75(3) of the Resource Management Act 1991 ("**RMA**");
- (c) be not inconsistent with a regional plan - refer section 75(4)(b) of the RMA;
- (d) have particular regard to the Statement of Expectations set out in Schedule 4 of the Order - refer clause 14(1)(d) of the Order. The Crown's Stage 3 submission dated 4 September 2015 addresses the Statement of Expectations at paragraphs 2.3 to 2.8;
- (e) be supported by sound evidence and an appropriate level of analysis in accordance with section 32 of the RMA;
- (f) be consistent with the objectives in the Strategic Directions Decision dated 26 February 2015.

2.2 We note that the Strategic Directions Decision provides useful guidance as to the alignment with the statutory framework, in particular pages 14-16 of the decision.

2.3 The Crown is concerned the proposals do not appropriately give effect to the RPS. Specific examples of changes required to meet these statutory requirements are set out in Part B of the submission.

### 3. KEY IMPROVEMENTS REQUIRED

#### Alignment with Strategic Directions and RPS

- 3.1 The operative Strategic Directions chapter and Decision 1 from the hearings panel (Strategic Directions and Strategic Outcomes) provide clear guidance regarding the approach that should be taken to drafting of proposals that will make up the Replacement Plan.
- 3.2 Importantly, there are two Strategic Directions objectives that all other objectives and policies are to be consistent with, being objectives 3.3.1 - enabling recovery, and 3.3.2 - using clear, concise language and minimising costs and uncertainty for the consenting process. We consider that further improvements can be made to the notified proposal to ensure consistency with those two objectives in particular.
- 3.3 Policy 3.3.7 – “Urban growth, form and design” of the Strategic Directions chapter, together with the useful explanation of deliberations in Decision 1 from the hearings panel,<sup>1</sup> provides direction about how best to ‘give effect’ to Policy 6.3.2 of the RPS. Following evidence from the Crown,<sup>2</sup> the hearings panel emphasised two important qualifiers in Policy 6.3.2 of the RPS, one being that the urban design requirements only apply “to the extent appropriate to the context” and second that the policy is targeted at business development, residential development and the establishment of public space.<sup>3</sup>
- 3.4 While the Crown agrees that creating a sustainable and attractive city is critical to the success of the recovery and regeneration of Christchurch, the RPS and Strategic Directions chapter both make it clear that regulatory controls should only be used “to the extent appropriate to the context”. The Council has previously explained that strict urban design controls should be focussed on the central city, development of centres, and some categories of multi-unit development.<sup>4</sup>
- 3.5 The provisions as drafted in the notified proposal go beyond the requirements of Policy 6.3.2 of the RPS and the ODPs are unnecessarily prescriptive in respect to urban design matters.
- 3.6 This is not warranted given the attributes of the sites, particularly the lack of specific attributes at South Masham that may need to be preserved or enhanced through the subdivision and development process. Further, the ODPs also lack clarity about the critical intended outcomes for development of the sites and requirements or expectations from the Council. It is unclear what is a ‘nice to have’ versus a strict requirement to satisfy the ODP and administration of the Replacement Plan.
- 3.7 The specific suggested improvements to the Residential New Neighbourhood proposal are explained in Part B of the submission.

---

<sup>1</sup> Decision 1, found at <http://www.chchplan.ihp.govt.nz/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Strategic-Directions-and-Strategic-Outcomes-Decision.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Transcript, page 1226, lines 5-35. As repeated and referenced by the hearing panel in Decision 1 Strategic Directions at paragraph 205.

<sup>3</sup> Decision 1, paragraph 205 found at <http://www.chchplan.ihp.govt.nz/wp-content/uploads/2015/03/Strategic-Directions-and-Strategic-Outcomes-Decision.pdf>

<sup>4</sup> Transcript, page 1226, lines 5-35. As repeated and referenced by the hearing panel in Decision 1 Strategic Directions at paragraphs 205-207.



## **Structure and usability**

3.8 The Crown submission on the proposals notified in Stage 2 on 2 May 2015 raised concerns about the integration across proposals and the structure and usability of the Replacement Plan. Those concerns remain with regard to the notified ODPs. It appears that the intention is for those to be an Appendix to Proposal 8 – Subdivision, Development and Earthworks. The Crown acknowledges that a decision is pending on both Proposal 8 – Subdivision, Development and Earthworks, and Proposal 14 – Residential, and wishes to re-state its submission from Stage 2, that a consistent approach to the structure of each proposal is needed, including by:

- (a) relocating all ODP provisions to one location within the Replacement Plan, with appropriate cross references to specific rules. Currently some ODPs are included in Proposal 8 (in Appendix 8.6), while others are included in Proposal 14 (in Appendix 14.10, with some specific requirements set out in 14.6.4).

## **Problems with the section 32 analysis**

3.9 The notified proposal did not include a section 32 analysis to support or justify the proposed ODPs. Although this is a relatively short section of the Replacement Plan, and should be self-explanatory, it is not clear why some provisions are required and why they have been drafted in the manner they have. Some explanation would be useful to better understand the intentions of the proposal and outcomes expected by the Council.

3.10 Consistent with the Crown submission on other notified proposals, there are a number of particular topics that should be addressed in the section 32 analysis, including:

- (a) economic implications (costs and benefits) of regulations proposed to be imposed through the proposal;
- (b) use of non-regulatory methods;
- (c) explanation of other actions/strategies that sit outside the Replacement Plan.

## **Natural Hazards, environmental protection and other development constraints**

3.11 Our understanding is that the ODPs take into consideration relevant natural hazards that may be present on the sites in South Masham and North Halswell. We note that there is a requirement in RPS Policy 6.3.3 for ODPs to consider natural hazards and environmental protection, but that is not clearly addressed in the notified ODPs.

3.12 The Crown has not reviewed the natural hazards maps against the notified proposal, but it is obviously imperative that the ODPs and anticipated development align with the hearings panel's decision on Proposal 5 – Natural Hazards and any other subsequent decisions from the hearings panel. Natural Hazards should be clearly identified in the ODPs and cross referenced to the relevant sections of the Replacement Plan.

3.13 The key to the maps includes a different colour for "Residential Area with greater development constraints". However it is unclear what constraints this refers to, and what a developer or the wider community might expect to see built or not built in those locations.

## 4. PROVISIONS SUPPORTED

- 4.1 The Crown supports a number of provisions in the proposal, where these are consistent with and have particular regard to the statement of expectations and the statutory framework. The proposal is an improvement on earlier notifications, and goes some way to streamlining the requirements for the ODPs. In particular, we support the identified potential location for road access, and requirements regarding location and detail of transport routes and connections.

## 5. THE CROWN'S PRINCIPAL OUTCOMES

The principal outcomes that the Crown seeks from the Replacement Plan are summarised below. The specific outcomes that are particularly relevant to the Residential New Neighbourhood Proposal are outcomes 1, 2, 4, 5, 8 and 9.

### 1. Enable Recovery

In accordance with Strategic Directions Objective 3.3.1, enable recovery, and:

- Meet community needs;
- Foster investment certainty;
- Sustain important qualities and values of the natural environment.

### 2. Increase housing supply:

To enable an increase in the supply of housing and the development of a range of types of houses, by:

- providing greater opportunity for intensification;
- streamlining and simplifying consenting processes;
- supporting the building of a range of housing types including affordable housing;
- enabling redevelopment of existing urban areas;
- encouraging innovative design.

### 3. Enable economic prosperity:

To provide for commercial, industrial and business activities to prosper and support a thriving Central City, by:

- providing sufficient and suitable land for development;
- being supported by efficient use of infrastructure;
- providing businesses with an appropriate level of freedom to establish facilities that are suitable to their own requirements;
- permitting temporary activities to occur while the district recovers.

### 4. Use infrastructure efficiently and effectively:

The provision of infrastructure is a fundamental cornerstone of recovery and development. The efficient and effective use of existing infrastructure and provision of new infrastructure must be provided for, including by:

- ensuring that the distribution of housing and business land efficiently uses existing transport, horizontal and community infrastructure;
- recognising strategic infrastructure, in particular strategic transport networks, including for freight.

### 5. Support and revitalise communities:

Better support the social and cultural activities of the community, which also underpin wider environmental and economic benefit, by:

- enabling the establishment of facilities that meet the needs of the community;
- providing for co-location of facilities;
- permitting temporary activities during the recovery phase.

#### **6. Revitalise damaged areas:**

Better support the effective functioning of the city and the wider urban environment by providing for:

- utilisation of existing urban areas for redevelopment;
- appropriate distribution of land use and agglomeration of activities;
- a level of flexibility that actively encourages brownfield redevelopment.

#### **7. Respond to natural hazards:**

It is important that the Replacement Plan provides a clear direction to:

- identify the risks associated with natural hazards;
- avoid subdivision, use and development in areas where risk is unacceptable;
- in areas where risk is not unacceptable, provide a framework so that risks of natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure are appropriately mitigated.

#### **8. Maintain and enhance natural and cultural heritage values:**

Better support the natural and cultural environment by:

- providing better access to a high quality network of public open space and recreation opportunities;
- ensuring natural resources are appropriately identified and their recognised values are appropriately managed;
- ensuring objects, structures, places, water and activities of historic, cultural or spiritual importance to Ngāi Tahu Manawhenua are identified and appropriately managed.

#### **9. Reduce prescriptive regulations**

To support innovation, choice, reduce transaction costs and increase efficiency by:

- reducing prescriptiveness, consenting and notification requirements;
- increasing flexibility for those seeking to develop permanent and temporary activities.

#### **10. Improve usability, clarity and integration**

To improve usability and clarity, by:

- providing clear linkages between objectives and their implementing policies and rules;
- being consistent in format and content across all proposals;
- providing clear objective assessment matters and criteria that focus on relevant environmental effects that need to be addressed;
- providing individual proposals, that when combined, allow for a well-integrated and duplication-free, Replacement Plan that is easy to understand and use.

- 5.1 The above principal outcomes are consistent with those in the Crown's submission on the Stage 1, 2 and 3 proposals and address additional outcomes, to reflect the different focus and topics of the proposal notified on 28 September 2015.
- 5.2 This submission seeks decisions from the hearings panel as discussed further in Part B of this submission so as to achieve the principal outcomes above.
- 5.3 The Crown opposes in part the proposal to the extent it does not help to achieve the principal outcomes outlined above.
- 5.4 The reasons for the Crown's submission are contained throughout Part A and Part B of this submission.

## **6. DECISIONS SOUGHT**

The Crown seeks the following decisions:

### **6.1 For provisions supported:**

- (a) Retain those provisions that are supported and are sought to be retained in Part B of this submission;

### **6.2 To be in accordance with the statutory and regulatory framework;**

- (a) Make any necessary amendments to the proposal to ensure that it:
  - (i) is not inconsistent with the Recovery Strategy and the LURP;
  - (ii) gives effect to national policy statements, national environmental standards, and the RPS;
  - (iii) is not inconsistent with regional plans;
  - (iv) demonstrably has particular regard to the statement of expectations;
  - (v) is supported by sound evidence and an appropriate level of analysis in accordance with section 32 of the RMA; and
  - (vi) implements the objectives in the Strategic Directions Decision.

### **6.3 To achieve integration and avoid duplication in the Replacement Plan;**

- (a) Make any necessary amendments to the proposal to ensure that it:
  - (vii) is consistent with the hearings panel's prior decisions on the Replacement Plan; and
  - (viii) reduces repetition and regulation.

### **6.4 To improve the plan structure and usability of the Replacement Plan;**

- (a) Make any necessary amendments to the proposal to ensure that it:
  - (ix) reduces repetition;
  - (x) addresses mapping inaccuracies; and

- 6.5 Amend the proposal in accordance with the more detailed decisions sought in Part B of this submission;
- 6.6 Any additional or alternative relief that achieves the same or similar outcomes to the above;
- 6.7 Consequential or ancillary changes as a result of the above.

## **PART B - SUBMISSION ON THE RESIDENTIAL NEW NEIGHBOURHOOD PROPOSAL**

### **7. BROAD SUBMISSION**

7.1 The Crown supports the Council's intent to make the Residential New Neighbourhood Zone ODPs consistent in terms of content and the level of detail, and to ensure that they give effect to Policy 6.3.3 of the RPS. The form and content of the North Halswell and South Masham ODPs generally achieve this but the Crown requests some amendments to ensure the ODPs:

- (a) are clearly focused on the matters required by RPS Policy 6.3.3;
- (b) are easy for developers, the community and other plan users to interpret; and
- (c) clearly identify which aspects are firm requirements and which are principles to be generally followed.

7.2 Although most of the ODP content appropriately addresses the land use and infrastructural elements that are set out in RPS Policy 6.3.3, there is also a strong focus on achievement of some of the urban design principles described in RPS Policy 6.3.2. Policy 6.3.2 states that development is to give effect to the NZ Urban Design Protocol 2005, "to the extent appropriate to the context". In developing an ODP, Policy 6.3.3(2) requires ODPs to be prepared in accordance with the matters set out in Policy 6.3.2, to the extent that these are relevant in providing for the infrastructural and other matters in Policy 6.3.3(3), but that the requirement does not go further than this. Where the principles in Policy 6.3.2 can be effectively addressed as part of subdivision and land use assessment matters, there is no need to prescribe them in an ODP.

7.3 The Crown seeks the following decisions:

- (a) Amend the Residential New Neighbourhood Proposal to:
  - (i) delete narrative which is purely descriptive;
  - (ii) delete reference to urban design matters which are more appropriately addressed through subdivision and land use matters of discretion;
  - (iii) clearly distinguish between principles to be followed and firm development requirements; and
  - (iv) improve ease of interpretation.
- (b) such other relief necessary to give effect to the relief sought in Part A of this submission; and
- (c) any additional or alternative relief that achieves the same or similar outcomes to the above.

## SPECIFIC SUBMISSION

7.4 The Crown's specific submissions and the decisions sought for the Residential New Neighbourhood Proposal are as follows:

Replacement/Plan provision	The Crown's submission is that: Oppose/ Support	Reasons	Decisions sought:	Department/ Agency	GGC Reference
Appendix 8.6.4 North Halswell Outline Development Plan – plan	Support	NZTA supports the location of road access to SH 75 (Halswell Road) as identified on the ODP. The identified access points, including provision for a flexible access point in the vicinity of Aidanfield Drive, are consistent with evidence provided for the Crown in the Stage 1 Commercial hearing and will ensure that adverse effects on the transport network, particularly the strategic transport network, are appropriately avoided and/or mitigated.	Retain the access points to Halswell Road as shown in Appendix 8.6.4	NZTA	APP 8.6.4 - plan
Appendix 8.6.4 North Halswell Outline Development Plan – Development Context and Requirements (introductory section)	Oppose	The regulatory effect of the introductory section of the narrative (in italics) is unclear. Aspects that are intended to be development requirements are already included in the body of the narrative. The remaining text is merely descriptive and deletion of this would make it easier to interpret the ODP requirements.	Delete the introductory section of the narrative (i.e. the text in italics).	CERA	APP 8.6.4 - Development Context and Requirements
Appendix 8.6.4 North Halswell Outline Development Plan – Development Requirements	Support in part	Except as specified elsewhere in this submission, the development requirements set out in the ODP narrative are clear and will give effect to RPS Policy 6.3.3.  The first sentence of the introductory paragraph is	(a) Amend the introductory paragraph under the heading 'Development Requirements' as follows:  All development is to comply with the relevant Objectives, Policies and Rules of the District Plan. In addition, the site specific requirements which must be met are shown on the Outline Development Plan and/or described below. Means of achieving the less tangible requirements are demonstrated in the	CERA	APP 8.6.4 - Development Requirements

Replacement Plan provision	The Crown's submission is that: Oppose/ Support	Reasons	Decisions sought:	Department/ Agency	CCC Reference
		<p>unnecessary, as it duplicates requirements already stated in the relevant chapters of the Replacement Plan.</p> <p>The regulatory effect of reference to the New Neighbourhood Design Guide is unclear. It would be inappropriate to make compliance with the contents of a design guide outside the Replacement Plan determinant of activity status for subdivision.</p>	<p>Christchurch City Council's New-Neighbourhood-Design-Guide- (b) Retain the narrative under the heading 'Development Requirements' except as otherwise requested in this submission.</p>		
<p>Appendix 8.6.4 North Halswell Outline Development Plan – Requirements</p> <p>1. Sense of place (Turangawaewa)</p>	<p><b>Support in part</b></p>	<p>The language in this section does not make it clear whether the matters identified are requirements to be met or principles to be generally followed in subdivision design.</p> <p>The status of the narrative relating to retention of trees is particularly unclear, and this matter could be appropriately addressed through the matters of discretion for land use and subdivision rather than in the ODP.</p>	<p><b>Amend section 1 to:</b></p> <p>(a) distinguish between firm requirements and general principles to be followed, and</p> <p>(b) delete the final sentence or clarify the extent of any requirement to retain trees.</p>	<p>CERA</p>	<p>APP 8.6.4 - Development Requirements SECTION 1</p>
<p>Appendix 8.6.4 North Halswell Outline Development Plan – Requirements</p> <p>2. Integration</p>	<p><b>Support in part</b></p>	<p>The language does not always clearly describe the nature and extent of development requirements. For example:</p> <p>(a) The requirement that 'the neighbourhood is not to turn its back on the road' could conflict with the requirement that there be no direct vehicle access to Sparks Road and Halswell Road and it is</p>	<p><b>Amend section 2 to make the extent and nature of development requirements clear.</b></p> <p><b>Delete requirements that development should not 'turn its back' on main roads, where this could lead to unintended outcomes for future residents and design of the ODP.</b></p>	<p>CERA</p>	<p>APP 8.6.4 - Development Requirements SECTION 2a SECTION 2c SECTION 2d</p>

D4

D5

D6



Replacement Plan provision	The Crown's submission is that: Oppose/ Support	Reasons	Decisions sought:	Department/ Agency	CCC Reference
		<p>unclear what it would mean in practice.</p> <p>(b) Use of 'may be required' in 2(c) and a requirement for treatments 'such as ...' in 2(d) are vague.</p>			
<p>Appendix 8.6.4 North Halswell Outline Development Plan – Requirements</p> <p>5. Access and transport</p>	<p><b>Support</b></p>	<p>NZTA supports the requirements in regard to location and design of transport routes and connections, in particular, item 5(c), as this will ensure that adverse effects on the transport network, particularly the strategic transport network, are appropriately avoided and/or mitigated.</p>	<p>Retain Section 5 as notified.</p>	<p>NZTA</p>	<p>D7</p> <p>APP 8.6.4 - Development Requirements</p> <p>SECTION 5a</p> <p>SECTION 5b</p> <p>SECTION 5c</p> <p>SECTION 5d</p> <p>SECTION 5e</p> <p>SECTION 5f</p>
<p>Appendix 8.6.4 North Halswell Outline Development Plan – Requirements</p> <p>6. Stormwater</p>	<p><b>Support in part</b></p>	<p>The Crown supports the content of Section 6 but considers that its clarity could be improved by rewording some clauses and including subheadings to make the section easier to read.</p> <p>In addition, matters that can be adequately addressed through the subdivision matters for discretion, such as reference to urban design matters, do not need to be duplicated in the ODP.</p>	<p>Amend Section 6 as follows:</p> <p>(a) Include appropriate subheadings to aid navigation</p> <p>(b) Delete reference to matters that are adequately covered in subdivision matters for discretion, such as urban design.</p> <p>(c) Reword clauses (d), (e) and (f) as follows:</p> <p>d. There are known to be springs throughout the neighbourhood, these are to be identified and safeguarded.</p> <p>e. The indicative stormwater management area at the eastern corner of the Outline Development Plan Area is to be the primary treatment and detention area for the full development area <u>except as described in (f) below. This is the preferred option:</u></p> <p>f. As an alternative option which will to reduce the overall area of stormwater land required along Sparks Road...</p>	<p>CERA</p>	<p>D8</p> <p>APP 8.6.4 - Development Requirements</p> <p>SECTION 6</p> <p>SECTION 6d</p> <p>SECTION 6e</p> <p>SECTION 6f</p>

Replacement Plan provision	The Crown's submission is that:		Decisions sought	Department/ Agency	CCC Reference
	Oppose/ Support	Reasons			
Appendix 8.6.5 South Masham Outline Development Plan – plan	Support	NZTA supports the location of road as identified on the ODP as this will ensure that adverse effects on the transport network are appropriately avoided and/or mitigated.	Retain the road access points as shown in Appendix 8.6.5	NZTA	APP 8.6.5 - plan
Appendix 8.6.5 South Masham Outline Development Plan – Development Context and Requirements (introductory section)	Oppose	The regulatory effect of the introductory section of the narrative (in italics) is unclear. Aspects that are intended to be development requirements (for example any requirements to address reverse sensitivity effects, and the staging requirement related to the proposed quarrying activity) should be included in the body of the narrative. The remaining text is merely descriptive and deletion of this would make it easier to interpret the ODP requirements.	(a) Delete the introductory section of the narrative (i.e. the text in italics). (b) Include any specific development requirements from this section in the relevant places under the heading 'Development Requirements'.	CERA	APP 8.6.5 - Development Context and Requirements
Appendix 8.6.5 South Masham Outline Development Plan – Requirements	Support in part	Except as specified elsewhere in this submission, the development requirements set out in the ODP narrative are clear and will give effect to RPS Policy 6.3.3.  The first sentence of the introductory paragraph is unnecessary, as it duplicates requirements already stated in the relevant chapters of the Replacement Plan.  The regulatory effect of reference to the New Neighbourhood Design Guide is unclear. It would be inappropriate to make	(a) Amend the introductory paragraph under the heading 'Development Requirements' as follows:  All development is to comply with the relevant Objectives, Policies and Rules of the District Plan. In addition, the site specific requirements which must be met are shown on the Outline Development Plan and/or described below. Means of achieving the less-tangible requirements are demonstrated in the Christchurch City Council's New Neighbourhood Design Guide.  (b) Retain the narrative under the heading 'Development Requirements' except as otherwise requested in this submission.	CERA	APP 8.6.5 - Development Requirements

D9

D10

D11

Replacement Plan provision	The Crown's submission is that: Oppose/ Support	Reasons	Decisions sought:	Department/ Agency	CCC Reference
Appendix 8.6.5 South Masham Outline Development Plan – Development Requirements 1. Sense of place (Turangawaewae)	compliance with the contents of a design guide outside the Replacement Plan determinant of activity status for subdivision.	The matters identified in this section are all matters that can be adequately addressed through the matters of discretion for land use and subdivision. The ODP narrative does not clearly add anything to the assessment that would be undertaken in regard to those matters of discretion.	Delete Section 1.	CERA	APP 8.6.5 - Development Requirements SECTION 1
Appendix 8.6.5 South Masham Outline Development Plan – Development Requirements 3. Density	The RPS requires that a density of 15 households per hectare be met in residential greenfield priority areas.	The RPS requires that a density of 15 households per hectare be met in residential greenfield priority areas.	Amend Section 3 to read as follows: Across the neighbourhood a density of 15 hh's/ha is anticipated <u>must be achieved</u> ...	CERA	APP 8.6.5 - Development Requirements SECTION 3
Appendix 8.6.5 South Masham Outline Development Plan – Development Requirements 5. Access and transport	NZTA supports the requirements in regard to location and design of transport routes and connections, as this will ensure that adverse effects on the transport network are appropriately avoided and/or mitigated.	NZTA supports the requirements in regard to location and design of transport routes and connections, as this will ensure that adverse effects on the transport network are appropriately avoided and/or mitigated.	Retain Section 5 as notified.	NZTA	APP 8.6.5 - Development Requirements SECTION 5a SECTION 5b SECTION 5c SECTION 5d
ODP Maps	The key to the maps includes a different colour for "Residential Area with greater development constraints", however it is unclear	The key to the maps includes a different colour for "Residential Area with greater development constraints", however it is unclear	Amend the ODP maps and text to more clearly articulate the constraints to development and the anticipated development type in those areas.	CERA	Maps

D12

D13

D14

D15

Replacement Plan provision	The Crown's submission is that: Oppose/ Support	Reasons	Decisions sought:	Department/ Agency	CCC Reference
		what constraints this refers to and what a developer or the wider community might expect to see built or not built in those locations.			