

CONCISE SUMMARY RECORDING THE VIEWS PROVIDED BY THE PARTIES PURSUANT TO SECTION 33 OF THE GREATER CHRISTCHURCH REGENERATION ACT 2016.

SECTION 29 PARTY	SUMMARY OF VIEWS
Ōtākaro Limited	<p>The proposed medium-density residential development may compete with residential development in the central city (given proximity of greenfield land to central city, proposed housing typology, timing of development and potential price range). Ōtākaro would welcome further assessment of this matter and the opportunity to discuss any potential impact with Council.</p>
Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu	<p>Commends the Council for engaging Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri to prepare a cultural impact statement, which provides an excellent foundation for consideration of the issues raised in the draft Plan.</p> <p>The Cultural Impact statement includes a comprehensive list of expectations from Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.<sup>1</sup></p> <p>Stormwater from the development discharging into Horseshoe Lake – an issue that remains unresolved. Strategic partners need to work together with upmost good faith - only part way achieved to date and partners must work harder.</p> <p>Te Rūnanga believes there must be a principle of net cultural improvement arising from the development. Plan does not provide that as it stands.</p> <p>Strategic partners urged to further explore together this issue before it enters the public process. Would welcome the opportunity to continue to work collaboratively to determine if it is possible to address the issue prior to notification.</p>
Regenerate Christchurch	<p>The draft Cranford Regeneration Plan is considered to be in general accordance with the Outline.</p> <p>That (the) vision be extended to include achieving exemplar urban design outcomes, diversity of housing typologies, avoidance of development in flood prone and overly challenging land areas and recognising the wider cultural and catchment issues. These should then be reflected in the Goals where they are not already captured</p> <p>Consideration needs to be given to steps that are to be taken to ensure development is initiated in a timely manner e.g. bonds, sunset clauses or other measures to incentivize development, including clear timeframes.</p> <p>The whole Cranford area should be subject to an outline development plan to control ad hoc development.</p> <p>Support areas 1, 2, and 3 on the ODP being zoned Residential New Neighbourhood (RNN).</p> <p>Question the appropriateness of enabling residential development in the RNN constrained areas and consideration should be given to setting that land aside for passive open space or absorbed into the Cranford Basin storm water facility.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to a higher density zone for Area B than the proposed Residential Suburban and exploring options for better urban design outcomes.</p> <p>Inclusion of more detail on why the GCRA is being used rather than standard processes, particularly the need to act now.</p>

---

<sup>1</sup> Cultural Impact Assessment for Cranford Basin – Proposed Rezoning for Urban Activities. Tipa & Associates on behalf of Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga pp5-8.

	<p>Make it more explicit as to how Goals 1 and 2 are to be implemented through the provisions. Include assessment matters and other provisions aimed at achieving Goal 2 relating to innovative architecture.</p> <p>Need for more certainty around the timing and funding for the completion of the storm water management area. Have this information but there are uncertainties</p> <p>Subject to the above comments, the Plan will deliver quality regeneration outcomes.</p>
<p>Environment Canterbury</p>	<p>Expresses concern that parts of the area proposed to be rezoned residential may not be suitable for residential purposes, and that further geo-hydrological investigations are required prior to development to determine the areas that are suitable, or not suitable, for residential development.</p> <p>Seeks assurance that exacerbation of flood hazard will be avoided.</p> <p>Offers advice and other assistance with the development of the scope for Geo-hydrological Management Plan. Wants the Geo-hydrological Management Plan to also cover Area B.</p> <p>Requests to be involved in any application for land use and subdivision in a support and advisory role.</p> <p>Suggests amendments and minor alterations to the draft Plan.</p> <p>Suggests changes to the text to better align the draft Plan with the policies of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Suggests amendments and minor alterations to the District Plan provisions in the draft Plan</p> <p>Requests that parts of Area B that are within the Flood Ponding Management Area and/or High Flood Hazard Management Area retain current Rural Urban Fringe zoning.</p> <p>Seeks that the part of Area B not excluded above be covered by the East Papanui Outline Development Plan and be identified as a Greenfield Priority Area on Map A in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>Seeks that all subdivision for residential development covered by the ODP be restricted discretionary activity status, not some controlled and some restricted discretionary.</p>
<p>DPMC</p>	<p>The detail required in the Plan is sufficient.</p> <p>The Council is expected to undertake the pre-notification public engagement opportunities outlined in section 4.4 of the Outline.</p> <p>A number of points are made that seek clarification or consistency within the Plan or make editorial improvements.</p> <p>Make the draft Plan more closely aligned to the Outline.</p> <p>Needs additional concise discussion to explain and support the links between proposals and regeneration objectives.</p> <p>Needs a clear section where readers see a simple description of what will happen if the Plan is approved.</p>