

7 May 2021

Selwyn District Council
Freepost 104 653,
PO Box 90
ROLLESTON 7643

Email: submissions@selwyn.govt.nz

Christchurch City Council's Further Submissions on the proposed Selwyn District Plan

Introduction

1. Christchurch City Council (the Council) thanks Selwyn District Council (SDC) for the opportunity to make further submissions on the proposed Selwyn District Plan (the plan). The Council's further submissions in support or opposition to primary submissions lodged on the plan are attached as Attachment 1.

Summary

2. Our further submissions focus on the following topics:
 - a. Strategic Directions;
 - b. Coastal Environment;
 - c. Natural Features and Landscapes
 - d. Mineral Extraction;
 - e. Urban Growth; and
 - f. Requests for re-zonings;

Strategic Directions and Urban Growth

3. The Council's further submissions on strategic directions and urban growth **oppose** submissions that do not ensure that there is sufficient development capacity or that are likely to hinder the development of a well functioning urban environment, including the wider Greater Christchurch urban environment. Achieving a well functioning urban environment is likely to have implications on the location and form of residential, commercial and other business development in some circumstances. The National Policy Statement on Urban Development directs the achievement of both of these outcomes. The further submissions also **oppose** submissions that do not give effect to the Greater Christchurch urban growth strategy in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which provides for a well function urban environment. The proposed District Plan is required to give effect to both of these higher order Resource Management Act documents.
4. The Council **supports** the submissions that seek to provide:

- a. Greater protection of versatile soils from urban development, unless it is the most appropriate option;
- b. Enhanced health and wellbeing outcomes; and
- c. Efficient and well functioning urban environments.

Coastal Environment

5. The Council's further submissions on the Coastal Environment provisions **oppose** submissions that seek a more lenient rule framework for plantation forestry in the coastal environment identified in the plan. The Council and SDC's territorial boundary both include areas identified in a coastal environment overlay. The notified framework in the plan is consistent with the Council's framework for plantation forestry in the coastal environment, meaning consistent outcomes should be achieved. Therefore, the Council seeks retention of the notified framework in the plan with regard to plantation forestry in the coastal environment.

Natural Features and Landscapes

6. The Council's further submissions on the Natural Features and Landscapes **oppose** submissions that:
 - a. Seek to alter (make more lenient) or remove provisions relating to Visual Amenity Landscapes (VALs). The Council and SDC's territorial boundary includes Banks Peninsula as a VAL under the plan, and as a Rural Amenity Landscape (RAL) under the Council's plan. The notified VAL framework in the plan is largely consistent with the framework for RAL's in the Council's plan, meaning consistent outcomes for these landscapes should be achieved. Therefore, the Council seeks retention of the notified framework in the plan with regard to VAL's.
 - b. Seek a more lenient rule framework for plantation forestry and mineral extraction in Outstanding Natural Landscapes (ONL's). The Council and SDC's territorial boundary both include the Banks Peninsula and Te Waihora / Lake Ellesmere as identified ONL's. The notified ONL framework in the plan is largely consistent with the framework for ONL's in the Council's plan, meaning consistent outcomes for these landscapes should be achieved. Therefore, the Council seeks retention of the notified framework in the plan with regard to ONL's.

Mineral Extraction

7. The Council's further submissions on the mineral extraction provisions in the General Rural Zone **oppose** submissions that seek a more lenient rule framework and/or more enabling provisions than currently proposed in the plan to provide for quarrying. The notified framework should mean that quarrying activities are consistently managed, particularly as cross boundary effects may arise.

Requests for Re-Zonings

8. The Council's further submissions on requests for re-zonings oppose submissions that seek an increase in the amount of residential land or density and/or an increase in the amount of land zoned for industrial purposes on the basis that:


- a. The re-zoning requests are located outside Greenfield Priority Areas and projected infrastructure boundary identified in Map A of Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS), and the Future Development Areas proposed in Change 1 to CRPS or the requests are outside the Urban Growth Overlay identified in the plan;
- b. The Greenfield Priority Areas in the CRPS, and the Future Development Areas proposed in Change 1 to the CRPS, provide for sufficient residential land capacity in Selwyn District to meet demand for at least the next 30 years, as required by the NPS-UD, so there is no need for additional residential land to be provided. Any additional land that is zoned for residential above what is currently proposed in the plan is surplus and will undermine the infrastructure that has already been provided for the existing zoned areas and will not be an efficient use of land.
- c. Urban development is not anticipated in these areas in the CRPS and granting these requests will result in the plan not giving full effect to the CRPS;
- d. The National Policy Statement for Urban Development (NPS-UD) requires that a well-functioning urban environment supports reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. It is unclear how additional urban growth in these areas will support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;
- e. The increase in urban development in these areas is likely to have increased transport effects on Christchurch City as a result of commuting from these areas;
- f. It is unclear what density (households / hectare) will be achieved in allowing the re-zoning requests. The Council has previously sought a minimum density requirement of 15 households per hectare in the Selwyn District to represent a more efficient use of land;
- g. With regard to industrial, there is already sufficient land zoned for Industrial purposes in the Greater Christchurch Area to meet demand for at least the next 30 years, as required by the NPS-UD. Any additional land that is zoned for industrial purposes above what is currently proposed in the plan is surplus and will undermine the infrastructure that has already been provided for the existing zoned areas and will not be an efficient use of land;
- h. The re-zonings would generally encompass reduction in highly productive land;

Relief Sought

9. That relief sought in respect of the primary submissions of submitters is indicated in Attachment 1.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide this submission. For any clarification on points within this submission please contact David Falconer David.Falconer@ccc.govt.nz

Yours faithfully



Carolyn Gallagher

Acting General Manager - Infrastructure, Planning and Regulatory Services

Attachment A: Christchurch City Council's Further Submissions on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan

Acronyms Used:

VAL	Visual Amenity Landscape
CDP	Christchurch District Plan
pSDP	Proposed Selwyn District Plan
ONL	Outstanding Natural Landscape
RAL	Rural Amenity Landscape
NES-PF	National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry
RPS	Canterbury Regional Policy Statement
NPS-UD	National Policy Statement – Urban Development
SD	Strategic Directions

(1) Name of person who made primary submission that is supported or opposed	(2) The particular parts of the primary submission supported or opposed			(3) Primary Submission Point Summary	(4) Support / Oppose	(5) Reasons for support or opposition of the primary submission	(6) Decision Sought
	Submitter ID	Submission Point (#)	Proposed Selwyn District Plan Provision				
Strategic Directions (SD)							
Foster Commercial	DPR-0126	001	SD-DI-O6	Remove hierarchy of activity centres.	Oppose	The hierarchy of activity centres is important not just for recognising and	Retain the objective as currently worded.

						distinguishing the different roles of centres and their integration with infrastructure and facilities within Selwyn District, but also how those centres fit within that for the wider Greater Christchurch area, providing certainty to inform decisions. This includes centres within Christchurch City, particularly the Central City and Key Activity Centres. Removing the hierarchy of centres would be inconsistent with the RPS and could present a risk of development/ investment in one centre impacting on the function of another centre.	
Lynn & Malcolm Stewart, Lynn & Carol Townsend & Rick Fraser	DPR-0136	002	SD-UFD-O2	Amend the provision for sufficient feasible development capacity for housing	Oppose in part	It is appropriate to provide, as a minimum, sufficient development	Amend the objective as follows;

Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	DPR-0137	002		and business, to “as a minimum, ample” development capacity, or variations thereof.		capacity for anticipated future demand, but that should include some buffer to provide for the possibility that future demand exceeds that predicted. However, providing for excessive development capacity can result in inefficiencies, poor integration with infrastructure provision, and not achieve a well-functioning urban environment. The NPS-UD already requires a buffer to be included in the calculation of the required development capacity, but also seeks provision of “at least sufficient development capacity”. Wording along those lines	“There is at least sufficient feasible development capacity ...”
Kevin & Bonnie Williams	DPR-0157	002					
Brent Macaulay & Becky Reid	DPR-0176	002					
Carey Manson	DPR-0178	002					
Peter & Christine Bond	DPR-0180	003					

						would be more appropriate.	
New Zealand Pork Industry Board (NZ Pork)	DPR-0142	076	New	Include protection of versatile rural land	Support	Versatile land deserves protection because of its significance for rural production and for resilience, and to recognize the finite nature of such land.	Insert a new objective that productive and versatile rural land is protected for primary production.
Horticulture New Zealand	DPR-0353	084					
Canterbury District Health Board	DPR-0343	011	SD-DI-01	That the objective specifically identify health as an outcome of development, to reflect the National Policy Statements of both Freshwater Management (2020) and Urban Development (2020).	Support	The enhancement of health outcomes is an important strategic objective, both in terms of the form of urban development, including potential transport emissions, and in the impact of activities on freshwater.	Include the enhancement of health outcomes in the objective.
Canterbury District Health Board	DPR-0343	013	SD-UFD-03	That the objective seek the creation of environments that protect or improve prospects for long-term health and wellbeing.	Support	Agree with the submitter that well-designed environments can contribute to lifelong health and wellbeing by encouraging the use of active transport and interaction with other community	Add to the objective that it seek the creation of environments that improve prospects for long-term health and wellbeing.

						members. It also accords with the purpose of the Act to manage the use, development and protection of resources in a way that enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being.	
Rolleston West Residential Limited (RWRL)	DPR-0358	068	SD-UFD-01	That urban growth is “primarily”, rather than “only”, located in or around existing townships	Opposed	Requiring urban growth to be located in and around existing townships will enhance the achievement of efficient and well-functioning urban environments, integration with infrastructure, and compliance with the direction in the RPS and NPS –UD.	Retain the objective as currently worded.
Import Rolleston Holdings Limited (IRHL)	DPR-0363	067					
Rolleston West Residential Limited (RWRL)	DPR-0358	059	SD-Overview	Seeks to clarify that relevant Strategic Directions objectives can be considered in resource consent applications.	Support	There have been Environment Court decisions that have indicated that the SD in the Christchurch District Plan are not relevant in the	Make it clear that, where relevant, SD objectives be considered in assessing resource consent applications. There
	DPR-0363	058					

<p>Ipport Holdings (IRHL) Rolleston Limited</p>						<p>consideration of resource consent applications. This appears to be on the basis that those directions will have been implemented in the objectives and policies of subsequent chapters (which are required to be consistent with the Strategic Directions chapter). However, in some cases SD objectives can be so specific that it is not possible for the direction in subsequent chapters to be any more specific. In such cases reference to the relevant SD objectives would be essential to adequately assess resource consents against the objectives and policies of the Plan. In doing so, proposals can be assessed against the</p>	<p>are other methods for achieving the same outcome. For example, by stating in each relevant subsequent chapter which SD objectives are also objectives for that chapter, although this may make the Plan very repetitive.</p>
---	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

						broader outcomes sought by the plan rather than being limited to zone specific objectives that may not adequately reflect the wider context.	
Christchurch International Airport Limited	DPR-0371	019	SD-UFD-02	Seeks sufficient urban development capacity “in appropriate locations” and to “promote well-functioning urban environments”.	Support	The achievement of a well-functioning urban form is an important objective in addition to providing sufficient development capacity, and both are directed by the NPS-UD. It involves more than just integration with infrastructure provision as covered by proposed Objective 3. It also includes matters relating to the form of urban development to achieve such things as efficiency and accessibility, including access to public transport	Amend the objective to include that the provision for development capacity also promotes well-functioning urban environments.

						services and reducing the need to rely on private motor vehicles, particularly in the context of Greater Christchurch.	
Urban Growth (UG)							
Lynn & Malcolm Stewart, Lynn & Carol Townsend & Rick Fraser Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd Kevin & Bonnie Williams	DPR-0136 DPR-0137 DPR-0157 DPR-0178 DPR-0180 DPR-0192 DPR-0209 DPR-0298 DPR-0355 DPR-0358	003, 004 006, 007 003, 004, 006 003, 006 002, 007 004 003, 004, 011, 014 003 322, 323	UG- Overview, UG-P3, UG- P7.3	That there be “ample” or “plentiful” urban development capacity instead of “enough”. That urban growth on land outside of the township boundaries should not need to go through a Sch. 1 zoning process. Delete UG-P3 that directs that rezoning of land for urban growth outside of Urban Growth Overlays be avoided. Remove sub-clause .3 of Policy 7 that requires that the	Support in part, otherwise oppose	It is appropriate to provide, as a minimum, sufficient development capacity for anticipated future demand, but that should include some buffer to provide for the possibility that future demand exceeds that predicted. However, providing for excessive development capacity can result in inefficiencies, poor integration with infrastructure provision, and not achieve a well-functioning urban environment. The	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.

				<p>natural features, physical forms, opportunities, and constraints be addressed.</p>	<p>NPS-UD already requires a buffer to be included in the calculation of the required development capacity, but also seeks provision of “at least sufficient development capacity”. Wording along those lines would be more appropriate.</p> <p>In terms of land outside the township boundaries needing to go through a Sch. 1 zoning process, that would be the minimum necessary as such land would be outside the greenfield priority areas, which the RPS limits urban growth to, as well as outside the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in the RPS. Such land should be subject to the</p>
--	--	--	--	---	--

						<p>assessment required under the Schedule 1 process, both in terms of the appropriateness of the location for urban growth generally and in terms of the detailed zone provisions. This would include addressing the natural features, physical forms, opportunities, and constraints as required in sub-clause 3. of Policy 7.</p> <p>Urban growth outside of Urban Growth Overlays would also be outside the greenfield priority areas, which the RPS limits urban growth to, as well as outside the Projected Infrastructure Boundary in the RPS.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Lynn & Malcolm Stewart, Lynn & Carol Townsend & Rick Fraser Kevin & Bonnie Williams Carey Manson Manmeet Singh Horticulture New Zealand	DPR-0136	007	UG-P9	Amend Policy 9 from “Recognise and provide for” versatile soils when rezoning land to extend townships ...”, to “Have particular regard to versatile soils when ...”; OR amend to “protect highly productive land and versatile soil, to the extent reasonably possible, when ...”.	Support in part	Versatile land deserves greater protection because of its significance for rural production, for resilience, and to recognize the finite nature of such land. However, in some situations it may be the most appropriate location for urban growth, as recognized by the proposed NPS for Highly Productive Land.	Amend the policy to the following; <u>“Only use versatile soils</u> to extend township boundaries to establish new urban areas <u>when it is the most appropriate location for urban growth.</u> ”
	DPR-0157	007					
	DPR-0178 DPR-0209 DPR-0353	005 008 224, 225					
Lynn & Malcolm Stewart, Lynn & Carol Townsend & Rick Fraser Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd Kevin & Bonnie Williams West Melton Three Ltd	DPR-0136	003, 010, 011	UG, UG-Overview, UG-P13, UG-P15	That permitted rural residential densities be increased from up to 2 households per hectare to 5 hh/ha. The specific policy direction in the District Plan on urban growth in the Greater Christchurch area be able to be overridden	Oppose	In terms of the increase in densities permitted for rural-residential development to 5 hh/ha., this would effectively allow houses on sections of 2,000m2 outside the urban areas that urban development is limited to under	Retain the existing wording of the policy.
	DPR-0137	003, 007					
	DPR-0157	004, 008					
	DPR-0160	002					
	DPR-0363	311					

<p>Ipport Rolleston Holdings Limited (IRHL) Foodstuffs South Island Limited & Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited</p>	<p>DPR- 0373</p>	<p>009</p>		<p>by reference to NPS - UD.</p> <p>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.</p>		<p>the RPS for Greater Christchurch. The RPS only allows residential activities outside those urban limits where the density is no greater than 2 hh/ha.</p> <p>In terms of the urban growth policy direction being able to be overridden by reference back to the NPS-UD, a District Plan is to indicate how an NPS is to be given effect to. The proposed District Plan largely does that and reflects the more specific direction on urban growth in the RPS that it must also give effect to. The NPS-UD provides a specific process allowing for consideration of particular types of unplanned urban growth proposals if certain criteria are</p>	
--	------------------	------------	--	--	--	---	--

					<p>meet. That provision within the NPS should apply to unplanned development, rather than provisions in the District Plan itself.</p> <p>For the same reasons amendments to the UG-Overview relating to the NPS-UD are inappropriate.</p> <p>The above comments are also relevant to submission DPR-0373, which seeks to enhance commercial development capacity and to give effect to the NPS-UD. The NPS does not just seek to provide development capacity. It also seeks to achieve well-functioning urban environments. Achieving the latter outcome may involve some limitations on development.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Manmeet Singh Trices Road Re- zoning Group	DPR-0209 DPR-0298	005 008	UG-O3	That development capacity be provided in each township	Oppose	Providing for the continual growth of all townships is not necessarily appropriate in all circumstances.	Retain the existing wording of the objective.
Rolleston West Residential Limited (RWRL) Four Stars Development Ltd & Gould Developments Ltd Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited (IRHL)	DPR-0358 DPR-0344 DPR-0363	330 011 319	UG-P4	Amend the policy as follows: 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.	Oppose	This amendment would mean that urban growth within Greater Christchurch could be provided for where not anticipated in the RPS, so would not give effect to the RPS, as is required. That could have significant implications for the achievement of the urban growth strategy for Greater Christchurch.	Retain the existing wording of the policy.
Rolleston West Residential Limited (RWRL) Iport Rolleston Holdings Limited (IRHL)	DPR-0358 DPR-0363	339, 340, 341, 342 328, 329, 330, 331	UG-P13, UG- P14, UG-P15, UG-P16	Delete Policy 13 – Residential growth – Greater Christchurch area and apply Policy 14 throughout Selwyn. Delete Policy 15 – Business growth – Greater Christchurch area and apply Policy	Oppose	Policies 13 and 15 are essential to give effect to many of the directions in the RPS relating to Greater Christchurch. Deleting them and amending Policies 14 and 16 as sought could have significant implications for the	Retain the existing wording of the policies.

				16 throughout Selwyn.		achievement of the urban growth strategy for Greater Christchurch.	
Foodstuffs South Island Limited & Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited	DPR-0373	007, 008	UG-03, UG-P15	Amend UG-03 and UG-P15 to provide for supermarkets outside of the Town Centre Zones.	Oppose	<p>It would be inappropriate for the objective and policy to provide for supermarkets in all areas that are not Town Centre Zones. There will be locations that are not suitable and that would be inconsistent with the RPS direction that commercial activities are primarily directed to centres. It could also impact on the functions of centres if supermarkets are enabled outside these areas.</p> <p>Supermarkets are a specific form of urban development, whereas the objective and policy relate to providing for commercial and</p>	Retain the existing wording of the objective and policy.

						industrial growth generally. The location of supermarkets would be more appropriately dealt with under the objectives and policies relating to commercial and mixed use zones in particular.	
Rolleston Industrial Holdings Limited (RIHL)	DPR-0374	006, 317, 318, 323, 324.	Urban Growth Overlay, UG-Overview, UG-P2, UG-P3, UG-R1	<p>Delete the Urban Growth Overlay as notified.</p> <p>Alternatively, the Urban Growth Overlay should only be identified and referred to as a priority area for urban zoning and development, rather than as an area to which urban zoning and development is generally confined.</p> <p>Amend the UG-Overview removing references to the</p>	Oppose	<p>In terms of confining urban zoning and development, it is incorrect to say that the NPS – UD removes the ability to prescribe the location of urban development. The NPS does not seek to just provide development capacity. It also seeks to achieve well-functioning urban environments. Achieving the latter outcome may involve some limitations on development. It is appropriate that the</p>	<p>Retain the Urban Growth Overlay or include alternative provisions that give direction as to the location of urban development.</p> <p>Retain the existing wording of the overview, Policies 3 and 4, UG-R1 and UG-MAT1.</p>

				<p>Urban Growth Overlay.</p> <p>Delete Policies UG-P3 and UG-P4, and rule UG-R1 and UG-MAT1</p>		<p>proposed District Plan gives direction on how both outcomes are to be achieved. The proposed District Plan largely reflects the more specific direction on urban growth in the RPS, which it must also give effect to.</p> <p>It is noted that the NPS-UD provides a specific process for allowing consideration of particular types of unplanned urban growth proposals if certain criteria are met. That process provides flexibility, but does not remove the need for the District Plan to provide direction on the location of urban development.</p>	
Kāinga Ora - Homes & Communities	DPR-0414	162, 163	UG-P13, UG-P14	That, in respect of new residential growth areas, sub	Oppose	It is important and appropriate that the District Plan include	

				clauses 1 and 4 of UG-P13 and sub-clause 3 of UD-P14 are deleted as submitter opposes setting out density and dwelling numbers/targets in policies.		direction on the specific dwelling targets and minimum net densities to ensure that sufficient development capacity is provided. This will ensure that it is provided in a form that achieves a well-functioning urban environment, including the wider Greater Christchurch urban environment. This is consistent with the NPS-UD and the RPS, which the District Plan is required to give effect to.	
Coastal Environment (CE)							
Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Incorporated	DPR-0212	089	CE-R2	Delete CE-R2 as notified	Oppose	CE-R2 classifies Plantation Forestry (as defined in the NES-PF) as a restricted discretionary activity in the coastal environment of the Selwyn District.	Retain CE-R2 as notified

						The CDP also includes default consenting requirements for planation forestry in its coastal environment overlay which adjoins that of the Selwyn District. To ensure consistency across boundary, it is important that both plans have similar outcomes.	
Federated Farmers of New Zealand North Canterbury	DPR-0422	221	CE-R2	Delete CE-R2 as notified	Oppose	As above	Retain CE-R2 as notified
Natural Features and Landscapes (NFL)							
Federated Farmers of New Zealand North Canterbury	DPR-0422	001	NFL-SCHED2	Delete NFL-SCHED2 (Visual Amenity Landscape Areas (VALs))	Oppose	Proposed NFL-SCHED2 includes the Te Pātaka o Rākaihautū/Banks Peninsula VAL. This overlay borders the Banks Peninsula RAL in the CDP, which serves a similar purpose and has	Retain NFL-SCHED2 as notified

						similar outcomes to those proposed in the pSDP. This overlay in the Christchurch District is necessary to protect amenity values associated with Banks Peninsula. To protect the overall integrity of those values as a whole, it is important that both plans have similar protections in place.	
Upper Waimakariri / Rakaia Group (UWRG)	DPR- 0301	030	NFL – O2	Amend NFL – O2 to remove “visual amenity” from the landscapes to be maintained, and where possible, enhanced, to <u>“significant natural landscapes”</u>	Oppose	The CDP includes equivalent “visual amenity landscapes” as “rural amenity landscape” overlays that adjoin those in the pSDP (Banks Peninsula RAL). The CDP includes outcomes at an objective and policy level of maintaining these values. Therefore, to avoid cross-boundary inconsistencies, the outcomes at an	Retain NFL-O2 as notified

						objective level should be consistent.	
Federated Farmers New Zealand – North Canterbury	DPR-0422	161	NFL-O2	Delete as notified	Oppose	As above	Retain NFL-O2 as notified
Lukas Travnicek	DPR-0104	004	NFL-R1	Delete as notified	Oppose	<p>NFL-R1 provides a permitted activity pathway for building and structures subject to compliance with built form standards to protect ONL values. This submission seeks more permissive built form standards than that proposed.</p> <p>Both the pSDP and the CDP include overlays for parts of Banks Peninsula as an ONL that adjoin. Therefore, similar built form standards</p>	Retain NFL-R1 as notified

						should apply to manage the effects of built form on these values across both districts to protect the overall integrity of those landscapes as a whole.	
Dairy Holdings Limited	DPR-0372	080	NFL-R3	Delete NFL-R3 in its entirety	Oppose	<p>NFL-R3 classifies plantation forestry in the Banks Peninsula and Te Waihora ONLs as a non-complying activity, and a discretionary activity in all VALs.</p> <p>These activity statuses are consistent with those in the CDP for these ONL and RAL areas where they border cross boundary.</p> <p>These rule classifications are necessary to protect the values in the ONLs, VALs and RALs and should be consistent between both districts to</p>	Retain NFL-R3 as notified

						protect the overall values with these landscapes.	
Craigmore Farming Services Limited	DPR-0388	0411	NFL-R3	Delete NFL-R3 in its entirety	Oppose	As above	Retain NFL-R3 as notified
Federated Farmers of New Zealand North Canterbury	DPR-0422	168	NFL-R4	Change mineral extraction to discretionary activity in ONLs	Oppose	NFL-R4 classifies quarrying / mineral extraction as a non-complying activity in ONLs. This is consistent with the approach in the CDP in the Banks Peninsula ONL which is shared with the Selwyn District. Therefore, to protect the overall integrity of this ONL, non-complying activity status should be consistent across both districts.	Retain NFL-R4 as notified
Ellesmere Sustainable Agriculture Incorporated	DPR-0212	060	NFL-R5	Change non-complying activity status for Plantation Forestry in the Te Waihora / Lake Ellesmere ONL to	Oppose	NFL-R5 classifies plantation forestry as a non-complying activity in all ONLs in the Selwyn District.	Retain NFL-R5 as notified

				restricted discretionary		This is consistent with the approach in the CDP in the Banks Peninsula ONL which is shared with the Selwyn District. Therefore, to protect the overall integrity of this ONL, non-complying activity status should be consistent across both districts.	
Federated Farmers of New Zealand North Canterbury	DPR-0422	169	NFL-R5	Opposes all provisions that apply to VALs	Oppose	Consistent management of the Selwyn District's VALs with the Christchurch District's RALs is required where these intersect to protect the overall integrity of these landscapes.	Retain NFL-R5 as notified
Canterbury Regional Council	DPR-0260	119	NFL-R5	Retain as notified	Support	In accordance with CCC's primary submission	Retain NFL-R5 as notified
Dairy Holdings Limited	DPR-0372	083	NFL-REQ2	Amend the footprints for buildings for ONLs and VALs 300 m2 to 500m2.	Oppose	NFL-REQ2 comprise built form standards that buildings must comply with in ONLs to be a permitted activity.	Amend NFL-REQ2 consistent with CCC's primary submission

						Both the pSDP and the CDP include overlays for parts of Banks Peninsula as an ONL that adjoin. Therefore, similar built form standards should apply to manage the effects of built form on these values across both districts as outlined in our primary submission and to protect the overall integrity of those values.	
Craigmore Farming Services Limited	DPR-0372	043	NFL-REQ2	Amend the footprints for buildings for ONLs and VALs 300 m2 to 500m2.	Oppose	NFL-R1 provides a permitted activity pathway for building and structures subject to compliance with built form standards to protect ONL values. Both the pSDP and the CDP include overlays for parts of	Amend NFL-REQ2 consistent with CCC's primary submission

							Banks Peninsula as an ONL that adjoin. Therefore, similar built form standards should apply to manage the effects of built form on these values across both districts as outlined in our primary submission and to protect the overall integrity of those values.	
General Rural Zone - Quarrying								
Fulton Limited	Hogan	DPR-0415	009	GRUZ-P8	Amend Policy GRUZ-P8 from “provide for mineral extraction” to “enable mining and quarrying activities...”	Oppose	GRUZ-P8 implements GRUZ-O1 which sets the outcomes for the rural zones prioritising primary production (which includes mineral extraction) over other activities in the rural environment. GRUZ P8 is specific to mineral and aggregate production which seeks to provide for those activities while	Retain GRUZ-P8 as notified

		017				managing adverse effects. A restricted discretionary and discretionary activity rule framework implements GRUZ P8. The effects of quarrying should be managed through consenting process that enables effects to be appropriately managed (an effects based regime). “Enabling suggests the use of either permitted or controlled activity pathways.	
			GRUZ-21	Support exclusion of dust from matters of discretion under Rule GRUZ-21.	Oppose	As outlined in CCC’s primary submission, the effects of dust nuisance effects should be considered as part of the matters of discretion.	Retain GRUZ-21 as notified
Winstone Aggregates	DPR-0215	061	GRUZ-R21	Amend restricted discretionary activity status for mineral and aggregate extraction to controlled	Oppose	GRUZ-R21 classifies quarrying as a restricted discretionary activity subject to a number	Retain GRUZ-21 as notified

						<p>of standards and terms being met. Where one or more is not met, a discretionary activity status applies.</p> <p>To manage potential cross boundary effects, the notified activity statuses in the pSDP should remain.</p>	
Canterbury Regional Council	DPR-0260	173	GRUZ-R21	Amend GRUZ-21 to include consideration of dust in the matters of discretion	Support	As outlined in CCC's primary submission, the effects of dust nuisance effects should be considered as part of the matters of discretion.	That GRUZ-R21 is amended in accordance with CCC's primary submission.
Road Metals Co Ltd	DPR-0057	001, 002	New	Include buffers and zones to provide for existing quarries	Oppose	CCC opposes this where the inclusion of such zoning and buffers would have adverse effects on sensitive activities.	

Rezoning Requests

Name of person who made primary submission that is opposed	Submitter ID	Submission Point (#)
Roger & Gwenda Smithies	20	1
M R & K M Davenport	34	1
Peter, Bonny, Scott & Corde Rhodes	38	1
Xiaojiang Chen	44	1
Trudy & Mark Saunders	53	1
Julie Stafford	74	1
Ballantrae Residents Group	134	1
Lynn & Malcolm Stewart, Lynn & Carol Townsend & Rick Fraser	136	1
Pinedale Enterprises Ltd & Kintyre Pacific Holdings Ltd	137	1
GN & LG Burgess	143	1
Barry Moir	150	1
Bernie Breen	153	1
Kevin & Bonnie Williams	157	1
Kerry Millar - Millar's Machinery Limited	162	2
Mikyung Jang	163	1
Inwha Jung	164	1
GM & J Drinnan	174	1
Brent Macaulay & Becky Reid	176	1, 11, 12
Carey Manson	178	1, 8
Alastair King	191	1
Merf Ag Services Ltd & Matthew Reed	192	1, 2, 3, 8
T & K Hopper, B & R Jacques, B & F Mckeich, R & S Silcock, D & K Perrott, T Richardson & H Carmichael	202	1

M Springer	203	1
Urban Holdings Limited, Suburban Estates Limited & Cairnbrae Developments Limited	206	2
Manmeet Singh	209	1,2
Lester & Dina Curry	219	2
Roger Howard & Jillian Rosemary Marshall	243	1
Craig Robertson	246	1
Michele & Regan Beight	248	2
Robert Wilson Purchas & Wendy Ann Almond	253	1
Treacey Clode	263	1
Derek Hann	273	1
E Salins	275	1
Trices Road Re-zoning Group	298	1,2,3
Alison Smith, David Boyd & John Blanchard	302	1
William John & Helen Mary Bishop	307	1
Four Stars Development Ltd & Gould Developments Ltd	344	2
Rolleston West Residential Limited (RWRL)	358	1,2
Rolleston West Residential Limited (RWRL)	358	1
Rupert Jack Wright & Catherine Elizabeth Wright	361	2
John Ferguson	362	5
B.A. Freeman Family Trust	364	3,4,5
MB Property Holdings (2002) Ltd & Mitchell Bros Sawmillers Ltd	366	1
Holly Farm	369	1
Fox & Associates	376	1
Rolleston Industrial Developments Limited (RIDL)	384	8, 9
CSI Property Limited	392	1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10
McMillan Civil Limited	394	4

Gulf Central Properties Ltd & Apton Developments Ltd	399	1
Franco Farms Limited	405	2
Urban Estates No. 21 Limited	408	2
Hughes Developments Limited	411	8
Blakes Road Kingcraft Group	413	2
Alistair John Dugald Cameron	416	1
Jenny Fisher, Graham & Racquel Drayton, John & Fiona Kipping, David & Elizabeth Whiten	417	1
Survus Consultants Ltd	426	1, 2
Terrence Richard Waghorn	430	1
Lance Roper	431	1
Birchs Village Limited	432	1
Daire Limited, Alistair King	435	1
P.B and J.C Nahkies	436	2
Robert Barker	438	1
GW Wilfield Ltd	443	2,3
Bealey Developments Ltd	449	1
Lance Roper	450	1
Kirwee Central Properties Limited	451	1
Matthew Keen	452	2
Marama Te Wai Ltd	460	1
Pandora Trust	462	2
Murray Boyes	476	1
Kelvin and Sue McIntyre	487	1
Paul and Sue Robinson	491	1
Gallina Nominees Ltd & Heinz-Wattie Ltd Pension Plan	493	1