

Submn #	I / We	Comments - please be as specific as possible to help us understand your views	Council officers responses and recommended amendments
194	support the plan	<p>Great plan, like the walkways and wet areas. The nice big expanses will be a great asset to the community and Christchurch.</p> <p>One concern I have with this plan and the new motorway is the ability to get across Cranford Street as there will be a wire barrier down the middle stopping you from <b>accessing</b> both wetlands. If our kids and others want to cross Cranford Street they will have to go all the way down to Innes Road. So it would be great to have some sort of accessway over Cranford Street.</p> <p>This also means it is easier for kids on the east side of Cranford to get to the west side which the high schools are on.</p> <p>The danger is kids with bikes and on foot will attempt to get over the wire barrier</p>	<p><b>Transport</b> The current proposals for the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) involve making changes to Cranford Street, providing four traffic lanes as far south as its intersection with Innes Road.</p> <p>The CNC consented plans include a dedicated signaled pedestrian/cycle crossing of Cranford St just to the north of its intersection with McFaddens Road.</p> <p>However, Council acknowledge that the proposals for the CNC will result in greater volumes of traffic being on Cranford Street, and some further changes to the road network will be necessary. As a result, a condition was placed on consent granted for the CNC that required Council to employ an "Independent Expert" to further assess the local impacts of the CNC on the road network at the southern end of the route, and recommend a series of improvements to the road network (known as The "Downstream Effects Management Plan") which would seek to address any issues. These changes would be funded by CCC.</p> <p>The "Independent Expert" has been appointed, and some preliminary traffic modelling work has been undertaken. This will lead to recommendation on how to address the issues raised in this feedback regarding children's' road safety.</p>
193	do not support the plan	<p><b>Sewer</b> - During heavy rain events the sewer currently discharges into Dudley Creek and [REDACTED]. Sewer back up prevents use of our toilets and [REDACTED]. We see there are vague plans in the Cranford Regeneration Plan supporting document, to address sewer issues and provide sewer services for 420 additional houses. However, we do not trust that this will work effectively as we have heard about planned improvements previously, from Council drainage employees, yet the current sewer problems still occur.</p> <p>There is no mention in the supporting document about the springs that flow up the piles supporting the northern sewer line [REDACTED] (in the seepage area) thus causing water seepage into the sewer pipe making it less effective. Perhaps the Council <b>drainage</b> employee who told us this was not consulted during preparation of the supporting material, or this information was conveniently left out.</p> <p><b>Storm water and flooding</b> - [REDACTED]. From the supporting document investigations have highlighted the challenging nature of this land and the likelihood of ongoing subsidence. Piecemeal subdivision is likely to result in changes in groundwater conditions and emergence of new springs that are likely to cause adverse effects for third parties. Blockage of drainage outlets could affect spring or seepage areas and may cause springs to migrate and emerge in other areas which could result in flooding elsewhere.</p> <p>We are extremely concerned that if the land [REDACTED] is built up, and has ineffective drainage it will cause adverse flooding effects on the low-lying adjacent properties [REDACTED]. Even with planned drainage, springs are difficult to control. All we see in the supporting documents are vague statements about the challenges of certain areas in the proposed development. We do not believe that our interests will be adequately addressed by a Council who wants to rush this through and developers only focused on profit.</p> <p>How can houses be safely constructed on areas where seepage has been identified and for which no set back is planned. Even if these seepage areas are remediated the water will need to find somewhere else to go, this will be into neighbouring properties. There is virtually no mention of impact of this on neighbouring properties in the information provided.</p> <p><b>Pile driving noise</b> [REDACTED]. The noise of pile driving for 420 houses will significantly impact upon our quality of life for many years.</p> <p><b>Pile driving vibration</b> due to the peaty soil, [REDACTED]. Land remediation and pile driving in the proposed development will cause vibration to our house, which is both upsetting to live with and damaging. There is no consideration of issues such as this in any of the supporting documentation.</p> <p><b>Roading</b> - On the map provided of the Cranford Regeneration Plan, why are there not plans for roading shown for all parts of the proposed development?</p> <p><b>Soil contamination</b> - In addition to the possible reasons for soil contamination mentioned in the supporting documents, there has been fill illegally dumped on the land west of Cranford Street for a number of years. Eventually, the Council issued an abatement notice which significantly lessened the number of trucks dumping daily, but some dumping continues. Has the land been tested to determine what has been being dumped there?</p> <p><b>Future seismic events</b> EQC deemed [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] Damage to drainage and sewerage infrastructure will be highly likely in future seismic events.</p>	<p>This is a comprehensive submission which raises nearly all of the issues that a future development must address.</p> <p><b>Sewer</b> Council staff are aware of the wet weather overflow from the Northern Relief sewer to Dudley Creek referred to in this submission (known as the Grassmere overflow). However, substantial work on the wastewater network has been done by the Stronger Christchurch Infrastructure Rebuild Team (SCIRT) which includes increasing the capacity of the Northern Relief sewer, and this has reduced the frequency of this overflow to once every 1.5 years on average. This is compliant with the Council's wet weather overflow consent, which requires a frequency of no more than twice per year for any overflow location.</p> <p>The proposed 'smart' pressure sewer system for Cranford enables the Council to remotely monitor and control the pump on each and every property using "Iota OneBox" technology. This includes storm mode, which prevents pumps from pumping during a storm when the network is already at capacity, so that there would be no discharge to the Northern Relief from Cranford during a storm. This means that growth in Cranford can be accommodated without increasing the volume or frequency of the Grassmere overflow. For more details on this smart pressure sewer technology, please refer to O'Brien and Lenihan (2015) and O'Brien and Casey (2017) (can be provided upon request).</p> <p>Another benefit of a pressure sewer system is that it is the most resilient type of wastewater system to earthquakes. The pipes are welded polyethylene (PE) which is a robust and somewhat flexible material, able to accommodate a reasonable amount of land settlement. As it is a pressurised system, the pipes do not need to be laid on a particular grade (unlike a gravity wastewater system, or to a lesser extent a vacuum wastewater system) and so changes in pipe grade due to land settlement are not an issue either.</p> <p>Therefore, the wastewater issues identified in this submission do not preclude the proposed rezoning.</p> <p><b>Stormwater and Flooding</b> A resource consent is needed for both the subdivision (including earthworks) and land use together for Areas 1 – 4 south of Cranford Street. The control of stormwater from the development is one of the matters that requires management before consent will be granted. The Council will be able to decline any application that fails to demonstrate how these requirements will be met. The Plan requires that a geohydrological plan be prepared and lodged for the extent of Areas 1 – 4 and separately for Area 5, if not covered by an comprehensive management plan, as part of the first subdivision consent application. This plan must show how the development will maintain springs and seeps, not result in the lowering or raising of groundwater levels, achieve an integrated approach to managing effects on flooding and groundwater, while also addressing effects on artesian conditions.</p> <p><b>Construction effects</b> Construction noise and disturbance resulting from future development can be addressed through conditions on subdivision consents. Some amenity effect of development can be anticipated. The Council does, at its discretion, require the developer to undertake, before and after construction, condition surveys of properties most likely to be affected by construction so that any damage directly attributable to construction can be identified.</p> <p><b>Roading</b> The local road layout within the subdivision will be determined in more detail at the subdivision stage when further information on levels and other land conditions becomes available at a more refined scale.</p> <p><b>Soil contamination</b> Matters of land contamination will be required to be dealt with by any proponent of subdivision. Contaminated land will need to be managed or remediated to a residential standard as part of development.</p>

193 contd	<p>The swampy land in this area is prone to flooding and earthquake damage and houses like ours should never have been allowed to have been built. We cannot believe that the Council is proposing that 420 new households be exposed to this unstable land.</p>	<p><b>Future seismic events</b></p> <p>The Christchurch District Plan has a comprehensive rules package that is specifically designed to manage the effects of land use and subdivision activities (refer to Chapters 8 and 14 of the CDP). These rules are significantly more stringent than those of previous plans which the surrounding area was rezoned and developed under. They are specific to the issues confronting residential development in the proposed development area. In terms of any required new infrastructure, a standard condition of any resource consent requires that such infrastructure meet the Council's Infrastructure Design Standard (refer to <a href="https://www.ccc.govt.nz/consents-and-licences/construction-requirements/infrastructure-design-standards/download-the-ids">https://www.ccc.govt.nz/consents-and-licences/construction-requirements/infrastructure-design-standards/download-the-ids</a>).</p> <p>Prior to zoning the land for urban uses, the Council needs to be satisfied that there is are effective and feasible engineering solutions to support the land's development and that such solutions can address any potential adverse effects (such as displacement of water onto adjoining land areas).</p> <p>The preliminary technical investigations undertaken to assess the lands potential for housing state that engineering the land will be challenging, but there are design solutions available. The key technical assessments undertaken, available on the Council's website, include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geotechnical Report on Proposed 12.5-hectare Residential Subdivision, Grants Road, Papanui, Bell Geoconsulting Ltd [BGL] (April 2013)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Spring Identification, PDP (September 2013)</li> <li>• Desktop Geotechnical Review 340 Cranford Street, St Albans, Elliot Sinclair and Partners Ltd (April 2015)</li> <li>• Geotechnical Report for proposed Plan change 340 Cranford St and 60 Croziers road, St Albans, Elliot Sinclair and Partners (June 2015)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Geotechnical Desktop Report GHD (February 2015)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Geotechnical Investigation Report GHD (September 2015)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Rezoning –Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Beca (22 December 2016)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Rezoning-Review of Geotechnical, Hydrogeology and Stormwater Evidence, Beca (8 September 2016)</li> <li>• Spring Identification and Groundwater Management for potential rezoning at the Grassmere Block, Final, prepared for the Christchurch City Council, Beca (22 December 2016).</li> </ul> <p>The above reports acknowledge the occurrence of historical subsidence in the proposed development area and surrounding neighborhoods, and the risk to infrastructure during seismic events. The former has been generally accepted as part of the environment and, while not without cost to property owners, does not present serious property damage issues. The latter is a risk, but as with many other parts of the developing city, this risk can be mitigated (but not necessarily completely avoided), through ground treatment methods.</p> <p>Detailed engineering design is not required at the rezoning stage. Should the land be rezoned, significant additional and more detailed technical assessments and design work will be required to meet the extensive requirements of the District Plan, including those proposed within the East Papanui Outline Development Plan narrative. This includes a geohydrogeological plan to be prepared and lodged for the extent of Areas 1 – 4 and separately for Area 5, if not covered by a comprehensive management plan, as part of the first subdivision consent application. This plan must show how the development will maintain springs and seeps, not result in the lowering or raising of groundwater levels, achieve an integrated approach to managing effects on flooding and groundwater, while also addressing effects on artesian conditions. Further geotechnical work for foundation design is needed at the building consent stage.</p>
--------------	--	--

192	Conditionally support the plan	<p>Support conditional upon the engineering (Geotechnical &amp; Hydrotechnical) aspects being vigorously scrutinised by the CCC (the Local Authority) so that any risks to subsequent homeowner are mitigated.</p> <p>Respondents concerns can only be alleviated if a central body (the Local Authority) fulfils this role to protect the stakeholders (prospective homeowners and existing property owners) interests going forward.</p>	<p>The Christchurch District Plan has a comprehensive rules package that is specifically designed to manage the effects of land use and subdivision activities (refer to Chapters 8 and 14 of the CDP). These rules are significantly more stringent than those of previous plans under which the surrounding area was rezoned and developed and are specific to the issues confronting residential development in the proposed development area. In terms of any required new infrastructure, a standard condition of any resource consent requires that such infrastructure meet the Council's Infrastructure Design Standard (refer to <a href="https://www.ccc.govt.nz/consents-and-licences/construction-requirements/infrastructure-design-standards/download-the-ids">https://www.ccc.govt.nz/consents-and-licences/construction-requirements/infrastructure-design-standards/download-the-ids</a>).</p> <p>Prior to zoning the land for urban uses, the Council needs to be satisfied that there is are effective and feasible engineering solutions to support the land's development and that such solutions can address any potential adverse effects (such as displacement of water onto adjoining land areas).</p> <p>The Plan requires that a geohydrological plan be prepared and lodged for the extent of Areas 1 – 4 and separately for Area 5, if not covered by a comprehensive management plan, as a part of the first subdivision consent application. This plan must show how the development will maintain springs and seeps, not result in the lowering or raising of groundwater levels, achieve an integrated approach to managing effects on flooding and groundwater, while also addressing effects on artesian conditions. The preliminary technical investigations undertaken to assess the land's potential for housing state that engineering the land will be challenging but there are design solutions available. The key technical assessments undertaken, available on the Council's website, include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geotechnical Report on Proposed 12.5-hectare Residential Subdivision, Grants Road, Papanui, Bell Geoconsulting Ltd [BGL] (April 2013)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Spring Identification, PDP (September 2013)</li> <li>• Desktop Geotechnical Review 340 Cranford Street, St Albans, Elliot Sinclair and Partners Ltd (April 2015)</li> <li>• Geotechnical Report for proposed Plan change ,340 Cranford St and 60 Croziers road, St Albans, Elliot Sinclair and Partners (June 2015)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Geotechnical Desktop Report GHD (February 2015)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Geotechnical Investigation Report GHD (September 2015)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Rezoning –Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Beca 22 December 2016</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Rezoning-Review of Geotechnical, Hydrogeology and Stormwater Evidence, Beca (8 September 2016)</li> <li>• Spring Identification and Groundwater Management for potential rezoning at the Grassmere Block, Final, prepared for the Christchurch City Council, Beca 22 December 2016.</li> </ul> <p>The above reports acknowledge the occurrence of historical subsidence in the proposed development area and surrounding neighborhoods, and the risk to infrastructure during seismic events. The former has been generally accepted as part of the environment and, while not without cost to property owners, does not present serious property damage issues. The latter is a risk, but as with many other parts of the developing city, this risk can be mitigated (but not necessarily completely avoided, through ground treatment methods).</p> <p>Detailed engineering design is not required at the rezoning stage. Should the land be rezoned, significant additional and more detailed technical assessments and design work will be required to meet the extensive requirements of the District Plan, including those proposed within the East Papanui Outline Development Plan narrative. This includes a geohydrogeological plan to be prepared and lodged for the extent of Areas 1 – 4 and separately for Area 5, if not covered by a comprehensive management plan, as part of the first subdivision consent application. This plan must show how the development will maintain springs and seeps, not result in the lowering or raising of groundwater levels, achieve an integrated approach to managing effects on flooding and groundwater, while also addressing effects on artesian conditions. Further geotechnical work for foundation design is needed at the building consent stage.</p> <p>It is proposed that land use and subdivision activities are a restricted discretionary activity within Areas 1 – 4 (South of Cranford Street), therefore the Council will be able to decline any application that fails to demonstrate how these requirements will be met (principally by the engineering design).</p>
191	support the plan	Yes 'but' as I live in a townhouse on [REDACTED] hope hugely that our access - recess will not be considered as a public roadway maybe "public notices" will be needed at our both entrance-exit areas. This is a private concern for me as a resident and is most important to me. I hope that this concern will be addressed.	The concern raised relates to unwise parking close to the vehicle access/exit points associated with 95 Grants Road – the Ngaio Marsh Village. This is an operational issue which will be separately investigated. The East Papanui Outline Development Plan should not directly affect the parking in this area as new parking demand will be accommodated within the new residential areas.
190	Not indicated	No comments included.	No response needed.
189	support the plan	[REDACTED]	Noted
188	support the plan	Looking forward to having less traffic on Cranford Street. Will make my bus ride home a lot quicker	Noted
187	support the plan		Noted
186	support the plan		Noted

184	do not support the plan	<p>I am against peat soil being used to build on. The cost is huge to put foundations down.</p> <p>I don't believe market gardens are not viable in this area</p>	<p><b>Geotech</b> Building on organic rich soils including peat is regarded as a technical challenge. However, there are methods including engineering practice to manage effects,, primarily that of settlement and potential liquefaction, can be designed against. Costs are potentially higher than for standard foundation design.</p> <p><b>Viability of market gardening</b> While the soils, when drained, can support market gardening, the economies of scale and risks from flooding are such that this activity is at best marginal in today's market. Most of the land that was previously used for market gardening has now been incorporated into the Cranford Basin stormwater area. Even before the Council acquired most of the Basin, the principal market gardening enterprise was adversely affected by flooding, vandalism and complaints from neighbours about noise, odour and other effects.</p> <p>The report prepared by Market Economics concluded that rural activities in this particular location eg close to the Key Activity Centre of Northlands, were an inefficient use of the land resource, and using the land for housing was a better way of achieving regeneration outcomes for the City.</p>
183	support the plan	<p>Where Cranford Street and McFaddens Road cross I think there should be a set of lights after Cranford Street is upgraded to 4 lanes because without the lights all the traffic will be sent to the Innes Road lights that have no turning arrows (which is an issue now).</p> <p>This would also keep residents like myself using Cranford Street to get to places like Northlands Mall rather than having to go to Papanui Road, which is already way to busy.</p>	<p>The concern raised relates to the downstream effects of the Christchurch Northern Corridor and the 4-laning of Cranford Street rather than the East Papanui Outline Development Plan. The submission rightly identifies that some vehicle traffic to the east of Cranford Street will need to re-route from McFaddens Road to Innes Road to undertake a right turn movement onto Cranford Street. This will result in a detour of 400m in order to undertake a right turn movement onto Cranford Street. The signaled intersection of Cranford Street/Innes Road is to be upgraded with signal phasing arranged to improve turning opportunities and safety for all traffic movements.</p>
173	do not support the plan	<p>The ground is peaty and a swamp area, lame excuse that it is no longer viable for market gardens. That wouldn't have anything to do with the cost of the land paid to the farmer in comparison to the cost of produce paid by the supermarkets. From past/recent experience the council should know that a big shake will liquefy the area and sink everything in it. You are trying to fill housing developments in the inner city, do this before there is a glut of accommodation. Leave the green spaces alone.</p>	<p><b>Geotech</b> Building on organic rich soils including peat is regarded as a technical challenge. However, there are methods including engineering practice to manage effects, primarily settlement and potential liquefaction, can be designed against.</p> <p><b>Market gardening</b> Economic assessments undertaken for this project are quite clear that the viability of market gardening, even part time, in this area is low. The report prepared by Market Economics concluded that rural activities in this particular location was an inefficient use of the resource, and using the land for housing was a better way of achieving regeneration outcomes for the City.</p>
166	support the plan	<p>I support the plan because;</p> <p>a) it utilizes land close to existing services: shops, education, mall, health, etc.</p> <p>b) it does not lessen any recreational activities: walking, cycling, parks, etc.</p> <p>c) it will connect with existing utilities: power, water, sewage.</p> <p>d) it does not affect the inner city housing plans (Eastern Frame) as the design of dwellings will be different: city will be medium/high density pre-determined design whereas Cranford will be low/medium with opportunity for individual design input</p>	<p>Noted</p>

164		<p>I do not support the housing part of the plan, but I do support the foresting and waterways and walkways part.</p> <p>That scale of development in this area is short-sighted. The map shows access from Grassmere Street (for 400+ residences?), possibly also from Cranford St. Cranford St and Main North Road are heavily congested already - and not everyone will be using the new bypass when it's done. Grassmere St has been drastically narrowed already by the cycleway. This is not suitable for an increased traffic volumes! In addition, local residents have already endured years of roadworks - the latest is months of work (often at night) for the cycleway. The proposed scale of ground remediation followed by construction, would mean a huge increase in heavy vehicle and contractor traffic for quite some time. This, and the resultant increased residential traffic, would make pedestrian, cycle and motorised travel slower and more dangerous in the area, and lower the general quality of life for all local residents.</p> <p>As this is an area vital to flood control, it seems very questionable to build on it without providing extensive fallback somewhere else for future floodwaters, but there seems to be no information provided about this?</p> <p>On the other hand, the proposed podocarp forestry and waterways / walkways is an ideal use for this kind of land, and a great illustration of how this area probably looked a couple of hundred years ago. This would indeed be an asset to our city, and improve local environments.</p>	<p><b>Transport</b> The Transport assessments conclude that there shall be no access to Cranford Street until such time as the Northern Arterial Extension is operational. When it is, as a consequence of the CNC and the ODP road network, traffic will be reduced on Main North Road and the northern section of Cranford Street, thus providing additional capacity to enable the traffic associated with the East Papanui ODP area to be safely brought onto the key transport routes.</p> <p>In accordance with road design parameters set out in the District Plan, Grassmere Street has been narrowed from 14m (which can accommodate traffic associated with a minor arterial route) to 8 metres at its narrowest point which offers suitable width for a local road that accommodates two-way traffic with on-street parking on one side.</p> <p>Some widening of Grassmere Street on the north-east side will be required in the future to create a separation strip between vehicle access points to private residences and the Cycle route, to ensure adequate visibility.</p> <p>Should the proposed (and required) earthworks involve heavy construction traffic (which in this case is very likely), an earthworks consent may include a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) as a condition of the consent. Further, in regard to traffic effects, again any development of significant scale would be required to have a TMP, and prior to this a safety audit of the roading network will need to be undertaken. Any required safety upgrades would be decided at that stage. The safety audit would be revisited at detailed design stage and post construction.</p> <p><b>Stormwater management</b> The area proposed to be rezoned for residential use is elevated above the 50 year average recurrence interval flood level, which is the national minimum standard for protecting against inundation of land under the Building Act. The District Plan also identifies and uses 200 year flood events to set minimum floor levels. Therefore the East Papanui area does not have a flood control function</p>
162	support the plan	<p>Please add the third lane for the motorway and another bridge over Waimaik down off of Mcleans Rd to allow traffic to go directly to the airport from the north. When we purchased [REDACTED] there was only one other subdivision now there is like 10 traffic down the road will be awful let's preempt the crazy while we can save money now. We also need a safe cycle way over the bridge. The old main north bridge is ready to fall over. Let's build it before it becomes a crisis.</p>	<p>Discussions between the NZTA (who are responsible for building and funding the Northern Arterial Route) and CCC (who are responsible for funding the NAR extension from QEII) to Cranford Street are ongoing. CCC can support a third lane if it is designated for high- occupancy vehicle use only. Final decisions on a third lane have not yet been made.</p>
154	do not support the plan	<p>I feel that there are already enough sections available without the need to develop agricultural land. Please get the Central housing sorted first.</p> <p>This area is regularly saturated and will be a future red zone if houses are placed on top regardless of how advanced pile technology has come in recent times.</p>	<p><b>Geotech</b> Building on organic rich soils including peat is a technical challenge that needs to be carefully managed at both the subdivision and building stage but is not a major constraint.. However, there are methods including engineering practice to manage effects although there is likely to be on-going gradual settlement. Piles are only one potential solution to building on this type of ground. Others include treating the ground to consolidate the organic rich sediments. These solutions do add to the development costs which will be passed on to the future buyers.</p> <p><b>Planning</b> Christchurch does have a good supply of sections and land that is already zoned. However most of this is at the edge of the City whereas this land is well located - relatively close to but in a different housing submarket than the Central City. Economic reports indicate that agricultural use of the land outside of the stormwater basin is unlikely to be economically viable for full-time farming.</p>
148	support the plan	<p>I love the wetlands area with walkways and space happening so close.</p> <p>What I am wanting is a dog park in this area somewhere as I have to travel so far in my car to get to the dog parks so far away.</p> <p>In Travis Wetlands no dogs are aloud. I would like to enjoy walking with my dog through this new area on a lead of course.</p>	<p><b>Dog parks</b> Dog parks (i.e. off-lead parks dedicated for dogs) are ideally large in size, and they are also intentionally sparsely located throughout the city to ensure many dogs can congregate and socialize at the one location. This being the case, it is not best practice parks planning, and it is cost prohibitive, to provide several dog parks in close proximity.</p> <p>The Cranford regeneration site is not a strong candidate for a dog park as two of the cities dog parks (the Groynes and Styx Mill) are relatively close by (4 and 5 km's away respectively). Most other City residents have to travel further to visit just one dog park.</p>
147	support the plan		Noted

112	do not support the plan	<p>I disagree with the need to put housing into this area. If it is deemed unviable for agriculture, I am of the opinion it should all be regenerated into a wetland area with walking tracks to allow those living in the area (and beyond) to enjoy. The idea of 420 dwellings in this area is I believe an unreasonable number of dwellings. Most people will use the back roads of Grants, Rayburn etc as their main routes in and out of the subdivision. These roads are narrow, and as a local, I see many people struggling with the existing <b>traffic</b> already on these roads. There is a lot of school traffic, many kids cycling and scooting and I feel that an increase in traffic will make it even more unsafe than it already is. Traffic moving onto Cranford St will just add to that problem area as well.</p> <p>I also feel that further encroachment into the waterways around the area is foolhardy. Pollution and lack of maintenance in these <b>waterways</b> is already an issue. We have [REDACTED] that floods in heavy rain and I can't see that extra buildings on the area would improve that. The draft plan mentions the issues of high ground water levels and the peaty nature of the soils. Surely if this number of houses are deemed necessary by the Council, there are other easier areas to develop.</p> <p>I fail to see the benefits for anyone other than the developers who have already probably invested a lot of money into this development. I am surprised that such a large number of houses are being considered when recent data is showing a slowdown in the <b>demand</b> for properties.</p>	<p><b>Transport</b> The Transport Assessment undertaken identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Road will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some degree. However it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Northern Arterial Route, the volume increases associated with the full development of the East Papanui ODP area and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads. The long-term estimated increases in traffic along local roads are likely to be greatest along Grants Road. By 2031 the estimated traffic volumes along Grants Road will at least double to between 4000vpd-5000vpd, which is similar to the volumes currently using Phillpotts Road, Tomes Road and Rutland Street, the lower volume collector roads of today. Maintaining Grants Road as a Local Road will require a cap on the number of new households south of Cranford Street to 425, including the holiday park. There may be a need for some form of traffic management in this area at some time in the future, but this is not unique in the City. These effects would only be marginally reduced if a lower density residential development was implemented.</p> <p><b>Stormwater/Drainage</b> Stormwater runoff from the new residential development will be contained and treated within the development area before discharge to Council land adjoining the ODP area. This will not aggravate any flooding issues within the surrounding waterway network subject to attenuation of stormwater on-site.</p> <p><b>Soil productivity</b> While the soils, when drained, support market gardening, the economies of scale and risks from flooding are such that this activity is at best marginal in today's market. Most of the land that was previously used for market gardening has now been incorporated into the Cranford Basin stormwater area. Even before the Council acquired most of the Basin the principal market gardening enterprise was adversely affected by flooding, vandalism and complaints from neighbours about noise, odour and other effects.</p> <p>The report prepared by Market Economics concluded that rural activities in this particular location were an inefficient use of the resource, and using the land for housing was a better way of achieving regeneration outcomes for the City.</p> <p><b>Rezoning</b> It is true that some landowners have been seeking rezoning of their land for some time and there have been infrastructure constraints (wastewater, transport, storm water management) which have prevented this. Now that these constraints are being dealt with, there are no planning reasons to prevent residential development. Potential effects on the local transport network, and some challenging subsoil conditions can be managed based on the assessments undertaken by the Council. However, there will be gradual changes in amenity to some extent in some streets as a result of increased traffic over time.</p> <p><b>Land availability</b> At a City wide scale, there is no evidence of a shortage of housing land in either Greenfields areas or within the existing urban area. However this area is well located, compared to other existing and potential housing areas and will provide further choice in a slightly different location. If development only proceeds slowly then traffic effects etc are likely to be more easily managed.</p>
101	do not support the plan	<p>I live [REDACTED] from this area and am strongly against having the land use restrictions changed to allow for more houses to be built.</p> <p>This is a natural wetland and the original restrictions on allowing buildings in this area were put in place for a reason. Sounds to me like this plan is being driven by a desire of a few to make money rather than it being in the interests of the public.</p> <p>The area I live in is already wet and muddy during even brief rainfall periods, who is to say that building these houses and altering the land isn't going to displace water and cause the issue to worsen. I have no trust in the council or local geo-technicians being able to manage this correctly as there are too many unknown variables.</p> <p>On top of this, Cranford street is already too busy a road. Adding another 450 houses and all the traffic that will bring is madness. Christchurch isn't a city short on land. Why on earth would you want to build houses on a swamp on one of the busier roads in the city?</p> <p>If this land is no longer able to be used for market gardens then it should be turned into a natural wetland (as the land obviously naturally wants to be) with bike and walking tracks for the public to enjoy.</p>	<p><b>Planning</b> The main reasons for the original restrictions were to do with lack of access, flood risks, and insufficient sewer capacity. These issues have been and are being resolved through infrastructure improvements and the purchase of most of the 'wetland' area for stormwater management. There are however additional opportunities for Council to consider acquiring supplementary areas of land that are affected by springs and seeps and other issues at the subdivision stage.</p> <p><b>Groundwater/wetness</b> It is acknowledged that lawns and gardens in some existing parts of the area do not dry to the extent they do in other parts of the City, particularly when the groundwater levels are high. However, this is a tradeoff future buyers will make in deciding whether they want to live in this location.</p> <p><b>Transport</b> The Transport Assessment identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Road will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some degree. However it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Christchurch Northern Corridor, the traffic volume increases associated with development of the Outline Development Plan area and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads. The effects on the local road network including levels of service at intersections are described as modest. The long-term estimated increases in traffic along local roads are likely to be greatest along Grants Road. By 2031 the estimated traffic volumes along Grants Road will at least double to between 4000vpd-5000vpd which is similar to the volumes of traffic currently on Phillpotts Road, Tomes Road and Rutland Street, the lower volume collector roads of today. Maintaining Grants Road as a Local Road will require a cap on the number of households south of Cranford Street to 425, including the holiday park.</p>

101 contd			<p><b>Land supply</b> Christchurch has a good supply of sections and land that is already zoned. However most of this is at the edge of the City whereas this land is well located within relatively close proximity to the Central City.</p> <p>The demand for neighbourhood parks (playground equipment, seating and landscape planting) for future and adjacent residents has been considered with this plan, as well as a network of shared cycles/pedestrian paths (on drainage land) that link parks with streets and adjacent stormwater/drainage areas. The draft regeneration plan also proposes one centrally located neighbourhood park.</p>
400	support the plan	It would be good to build some more homes for people who are still wanting on a home to live in	Noted
399	do not support the plan	This is a ridiculous plan. There is already too much traffic around Northlands and Cranford St.	<p>The Integrated Transport Assessment identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Road will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some degree. However it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the CNC, the volume increases associated with the ODP and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads. The effects on the local road network including levels of service at intersections are described as modest.</p> <p>These effects are estimated to be marginally reduced where a lower density residential development is implemented</p>
398	do not support the plan	<p>I have lived in this area for 58 years and we were always told that because of the peat and marshy conditions the Cranford St extension was not viable for housing, and market gardening is so fabulous in the ground conditions.</p> <p>I am aware that building codes and conditions have changed but am very, very sceptical about homes in this area - Surely people count? and safeness for individual persons is paramount.</p> <p>What is to happen to the wild-life? Pukeko, moor hens, sky larks and duck produce their future off-spring in this area - In fact, every year, ducks walk their babies through Esperance St / Frome Place from Dudley Stream to the stream which crosses Cranford Street - times change - I will move on - but the lives of people and birds should not be endangered.</p> <p>Are these people who live in the subdivision not going to eat vegetables?</p> <p>How is ChCh meant to feed their population if the market gardening areas become housing?</p>	<p>This observation is generally correct for the proposed stormwater basin and the proposed housing area has peaty soils. However, even before Council purchased the land for the Cranford Basin for stormwater retention, the economics and practicality of market gardening had become marginal. The area now remaining in private ownership is relatively small and fragmented, making it very difficult to use for commercial market gardening.</p> <p>The proposed new wetland and forest areas will provide significant benefits for wildlife by creation of quality habitat. Council adopts a 6 values multi-benefits approach to waterway design and management, which includes consideration of biodiversity values. This will support quality planting and good connections through the area and promote both terrestrial and stream ecological as well as ecosystem restoration generally.</p> <p>The Building Code requires that structures to be built do not pose a risk to occupants.</p>
397	support the plan	Major concern is impact of increased traffic volumes in Grants Road especially as Ngiao Marsh and St Josephs congest this road.	<p>The Integrated Transport Assessment identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Road will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some extent. The degree of increase in traffic on Grants Road is likely to be considered by some residents to be significant. However the Assessment notes that due to the traffic relief created by the CNC and ODP road linkages the volume increases associated with the ODP and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads.</p> <p>These effects are estimated to be marginally reduced where a lower density residential development is implemented.</p>
396	do not support the plan	<p>There seems to be very little forward planning on this proposed plan.</p> <p>The road has been significantly narrowed and made one way and now you are going to place another road out on to this narrow road (Grassmere Street). This will increase the traffic majorly through all these very small side streets around the area. The only way out on to Main North Road now is along a very narrow Mary St and with the increased housing this is going to be a recipe for danger!</p> <p>NOT HAPPY</p>	<p>The Integrated Transport Assessment identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Road will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some extent. The degree of increase in traffic on Grants road is likely to be considered by some residents to be significant. However the Assessment notes that due to the traffic relief created by the CNC and ODP road linkages, the traffic volume increases associated with the ODP and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads.</p> <p>In accordance with road design parameters set out in the District Plan, Grassmere Street has been narrowed from 14m (which can accommodate traffic associated with a minor arterial route) to 8 meters at its narrowest point which offers suitable width for a local road that accommodates two-way traffic with on-street parking on one side.</p> <p>Widening of some sections of Grassmere Street on the North-east side will be required in the future to create a separation strip between vehicle access points to private residences and the Cycle route, to ensure adequate visibility. It is intended that the land required for widening be secured by condition of subdivision consent.</p>

395	support the plan	<p>Good idea, will help improve ones with new houses in this location.</p> <p>A shame Grasmere Street has been ruined for access with a bike lane and narrowed entrance - needs to be widened and controlled if anything</p>	<p>In accordance with road design parameters as set out in the District Plan, Grasmere Street has been narrowed from 14m (which can accommodate traffic associated with a minor arterial route) to 8 metres at its narrowest point which offers suitable width for a local road that accommodates two-way traffic with on-street parking along one side.</p> <p>Widening of some sections of Grasmere Street on the North-east side will be required in the future to create a separation strip between vehicle access points to private residences and the Cycle route, to ensure adequate visibility. It is intended that the land required for widening be secured by condition of subdivision consent.</p> <p>Signal control of the of Grasmere Street/ Main North Road intersection is currently being considered as part of the changes to Main North Road to accommodate Bus Priority.</p>
388	do not support the plan	<p>It is bad land -- marshy and no good in a quake -- in an area of the city already overwhelmed with traffic and congestion which will only get much worse with this new highway ending in the middle of a residential area.</p> <p>Keep it as a green area like the city council once had before you ignored the greenbelt plan around the city post-quake.</p>	<p><b>Geotech</b> The Council accepts that some of the proposed development land has some challenging geotechnical hurdles to overcome. This is why it has undertaken several investigations into geotechnical conditions in this area, and had them peer reviewed. There are safeguards in the District Plan that will ensure that proper consideration is given to ground conditions before consent to subdivide can be granted. The Building Code requires that structures that are built do not pose a risk to occupants. This includes risks to property and occupants from natural hazards and poor ground conditions.</p> <p><b>Transport</b> The Transport Analysis concludes that once the CNC projects are implemented, the transport effects of development proposed in the ODP area will be adequately mitigated. Where the potential for adverse effects does exist, it is likely that these effects will generally be of a minor or less than minor scale through a combination of a lower scale residential development, and careful design of the road network and its interface with existing roads.</p> <p><b>Green Belt</b> Because of the large area of land acquired by the Council for wetlands and stormwater management, most of the area will remain open space.</p>
354	do not support the plan	<p>This area should be used for a sports field.</p> <p>If you need are to build houses use the east where houses once were</p>	<p>Recreation planning now indicates that large sports parks (e.g. 30ha) are the way forward for reasons of efficiency, resource use and cost savings. Large sports parks avoid the need to duplicate facilities at multiple sites, such as changing rooms, car parking and flood-lighting.</p> <p>Council Recreation Planners, in consultation with sporting clubs, are focusing on planning for larger 'sports hubs' strategically located around the City (e.g. Ouruhia Domain, Hagley Park).It is not considered that the Cranford Regeneration site is suitable for Sports Park land.</p> <p>Options for the future development of the 'residential red zone' are being worked on now and the development potential for that area has still to be determined.</p>
353	do not support the plan	<p>Yes. I don't think it's a good idea. This is swamp land and damp underneath for housing and parks no matter what you do.</p> <p>Not only that - Where is you care and consideration for the people on the east side of Christchurch. Why aren't you helping them if you have money to throw away on something so unimportant as to tote up a swamp land on Cranford St. Get priorities in order. Care about the poor and the people who really need your help.</p>	<p><b>Geotech</b> The geotechnical investigations that have been undertaken acknowledge that the land around the Cranford Basin being proposed for housing presents challenges. Suitability for housing varies and the engineering and building costs of development in overcoming the concerns raised will potentially be significantly higher than Christchurch's average. Nevertheless the conclusions from the investigations are that some housing is feasible and marketable in this locality.</p> <p><b>Planning</b> It is usual practice for local authorities to allocate funding to investigate and assess development potential anywhere in their district as part of its future planning. Costs of developing the land however are mostly borne by the private sector. The Council is very aware of the situation facing many people, and their environment, in eastern parts of the City and significant amounts of public money has, and will continue to be allocated to addressing those issues.</p>
352	support the plan		Noted
351	support the plan	<p>I am fully supporting the plan due to the shortage of housing development in Christchurch as well as the increasing cost due to the demand. As one of prospective buyer, it is an opportunity for us to have our own house if the project will push through.</p> <p>But the planner should take in consideration the environmental impact such as flooding within and nearby area, wastewater discharge, stormwater intake / catchments that will significantly will be reduced due to that development.</p>	<p>The Christchurch District Plan has a comprehensive rules package that is specifically designed to manage the effects of land use and subdivision activities, including risks from flooding. The rules contained within the District Plan, are significantly more stringent than those of previous plans under which the surrounding area was rezoned and developed.</p>



351 contd		<p>Traffic might also become problem in the future.</p> <p>Recommend to put the price of the housing to be fair and not only rich can afford</p>	<p>Notwithstanding this, technical assessments undertaken to date, advise that there are effective and feasible engineering solutions to support the land's development and address flood management issues. Further and more detailed information and supporting assessments can be found under the Draft Supporting Document for the Draft Cranford Regeneration Plan, dated March 2017.</p> <p>The Council does not set prices of housing but expects that development costs and the favourable location of the land will make new housing relatively expensive.</p>
347	do not support the plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This is economic madness. The soil type of this land is "Waimairi Peaty Loam", which is a very soft and weak soil type, so foundations will be horrendously expensive, which means the buildings will be expensive.</li> <li>2. This is close to a new major arterial route, which will constrain values because of high traffic volumes, and aid congestion too.</li> <li>3. It is contrary to the Council goal of inner city development.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Building costs</b> It is acknowledged that Waimairi Peaty Loam is considered to have a low bearing strength, commonly due to wetness, which may result in soil compaction. The additional building requirements could add to land development costs. However, as evidenced by the demand for housing on similar soils in the vicinity (eg Grassmere Street and Lewisham Crescent) there is a market in this area for housing.</p> <p>The Building Code requires that structures are built so as not to pose a risk to occupants. This includes risks to property and occupants from natural hazards and poor ground conditions.</p> <p><b>Traffic</b> Traffic is predicted to increase over time on parts of the local network, but people considering purchasing in the area are likely to trade this off against advantages of the location.</p> <p><b>Inner City development policies</b> Council has a range of policy objectives with regards to the provision of housing. The overriding objective for the future growth of Christchurch is to reduce the amount of development going into locations at the edge of the urban area, and to consolidate and intensify growth within the existing urban area. An important part of these objectives is to encourage development near key centres such as Northlands/Papanui, as well as the central city and older inner suburbs. The area being proposed for housing is consistent with these objectives.</p>
343	support the plan	<p>I support the plan for regeneration of the Cranford Basin. As a local resident I think the development of a wetland area with walkway connections to Cranford street would be a fantastic use of the land and a nice way to integrate the motorway into the local area.</p> <p>One area of concern for me is the Orbiter Bus Route that current runs along Philpotts Road. As your report outlines, the land there is quite peaty and "soft". As a result, my neighbours and myself in the area [REDACTED] find that the orbiter buses shake our homes quite violently when they pass. They often pass at speed too due to the fact that they have just passed through from an 80km speed limit. I support the suggestion in your plan to relocate the orbiter bus route to Cranford street. I actually [REDACTED] and am surprised that the bus has not already been routed down Cranford from Papanui and then onto Innes road as there are lots of businesses operating on Cranford street. It would seem more practical and profitable for the bus route to navigate Cranford street as opposed to having it run along a motorway and largely rural area where it cannot pick up any passengers.</p> <p>If you cannot relocate the Orbiter bus route, could you look to see what could be done on Philpotts road to reduce the negative impact of the busses? (It is specifically busses and not cars or standard trucks that cause this violent shaking). for example could you put in place some features to slow the speed of the busses or improve the state of the road (it currently has a "spine" which may be causing this problem)?</p> <p>I really think, as someone working on Cranford Street, that the best option is to re-route down that road. I have used the orbiter myself and can appreciate it's convenience as a resident at being situated on Philpotts road but would prefer if it provided access to the workplace for my colleagues or offered access to the other restaurants and businesses on Cranford street which is beneficial to more people.</p> <p>I would also love to see Cycle lanes and nice pedestrian routes. The Qe2 motorway is regularly used as a cycling and running circuit (by commuters and recreational exercisers alike) and I would love to see them have a safe and accessible avenue.</p> <p>Finally, at present the end of Philpotts Road where it meets the QE2 motorway is often littered and used as a dumping ground. It's very sad. I'd love to see some measures which reduce this. At present I suspect it is because it isn't maintained well (the pavements, grass verges and trees there are unkempt) which I think promotes littering and dumping. If you could consider ways to reduce this it would be much appreciated.</p> <p>Very happy overall with the plan and look forward to living in a beautiful Christchurch.</p>	<p>With regard to the current vibration from buses travelling along Philpotts Road, while the routing of bus services lies with Environment Canterbury, it is understood that NZTA wish to amend the intersection of QEII with Philpotts Road to a left-in-left-out, which will remove the service from Philpotts Road.</p> <p>The other issue within control of Council relates to littering around the intersection of Philpotts Road/QEII. This is a Council enforcement matter, which is unrelated to the impacts of development of the East-Papanui ODP area, and should be addressed through contacting Council's Customer Services section.</p>
312	do not support the plan	<p>I do not support this plan because:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Where there is swamp water it brings mosquitoes, midges, to water rats to surrounding homes.</li> <li>2. The water table is already high in this area (as your technical investigations have shown) when you drain water from Dudley Creek, Styx River, Avon River and storm water run-off it will all add up to the area being flooded. It should remain a green belt for market gardens.</li> </ol>	<p>Mosquitos and rats can be an issue from time to time with waterways but property owners in their vicinity can reduce the likelihood of these problems occurring through good property management practices.</p> <p><b>Water Table</b> The Cranford Basin storage capacity is adequate to ensure that water in the basin will not spill onto the surrounding land in a 50 year average recurrence interval storm, taking into account the Council's estimate of climate change rainfall increase. Basin capacity includes a safety margin which could accommodate a larger storm or other eventualities such as future zoning changes.</p>

312 contd		With four lane traffic ending at Innes Rd, and then going to two lanes, it will cause a bottle neck of traffic. Maybe two lanes would be the best!!!	<p><b>Market gardening</b> While the soils, when drained, support market gardening, the economies of scale and risks from flooding are such that this activity in this location is at best marginal in today's market. Most of the land that was previously used for market gardening has now been incorporated into the Cranford Basin stormwater area. Even before the Council acquired, most of the Basin the principal market gardening enterprise was adversely affected by flooding, vandalism and complaints from neighbours about noise, odour and other effects.</p> <p><b>Traffic</b> The design of the Northern Corridor and its connection to Cranford Street has already been consented. A "Downstream Effects Management Plan" is to be undertaken that seeks to address the traffic issues downstream of the 4-laning and will include a community engagement/consultation process.</p>
311	support the plan	It's a great plan.	Noted
310	Support the plan	At last!! How nice to think after all these years this "eyesore" is going to disappear.  I have lived i [REDACTED] and have driven or walked past it almost daily.  The plan looks great and the "forests" or whatever will break it up beautifully.  Best of luck at 88 yr old I probably will not see it but I hope it all goes well	Noted
309	support the plan	1) I support the plan based on premise that the northern arterial extension will remove substantial traffic from Main North Road and from Cranford Street North of the Cranford Street/Northern Arterial Junction.  2) I cannot see planned local roads in the vicinity of Paparua Street School that would service the residential development block in that area.  3) Is some linkage planned for strategic local cycleways and pedestrian routes e.g. linking those off Philpotts Road with those north of the Northern Arterial extension (may need cycle/pedestrian underpass?)	While Cranford Street would service the block from the north, the block would also be serviced by local roads including Grassmere Street, Shearer Avenue, Grants Road and other roads leading from Grants Road.  The CNC does not include a pedestrian/cycle underpass in the area of the Cranford Regeneration Plan However the CNC will see the construction of a shared path on the west side of the corridor which will cross Cranford Street via a set of pedestrian/cycle signals to link with a shared off-road path in the south-west side of Cranford Street.
308		I don't have any comments on the plan. I will be 89 years old in June, but with the population growing it might be a very good idea. Although there was always a lot of water in those paddocks on Cranford Street.  Good luck whatever they are going to do.	
284		I certainly wouldn't like a house there as it is so wet during winter - it doesn't matter how little rain we get there always water is lying.	Drainage improvements will lead to less water lying around properties but in times when the water table is high, water will not soak into the ground as fast as in other parts of Christchurch.
283	do not support the plan		Noted

274	do not support the plan	<p>My concern is that this plan is very general and doesn't contain sufficient information to make a definitive submission on support or reject. Therefore, in my view, I have to register lack of support until the Council is able to provide better information.</p> <p>Let me be specific.</p> <p>I contacted the Council for clarification specifically as to the roading plan because the consultation document shows an 'indicative collector road' that only intersects with Grassmere Road and not Cranford Street. Similarly the 'indicative local roads' do not connect to Cranford Street and feed off of Grassmere Street only.</p> <p>The Papanui residential area south of Main North Road is already suffering severe traffic congestion. If one wants to turn left from Grassmere Street onto Main North Road, one is often waiting for ages because a car is usually signalling right and cannot get into the flow of traffic. There are numerous traffic lights in the stretch of road from the Harewood/Papanui Road intersection to Langdons Road, a new light forthcoming at the bus exchange in front of the Mall, another traffic light at Halliwell Avenue and then another at Sawyers Arms Road. I can get across town in about 15-20 minutes and easily spend another 15-20 minutes trying to get to the Halliwell Avenue intersection (the only way I can get to my home.)</p> <p>Ivan Thomson of the Council phoned me and said he would follow up our conversation with an email. That email has never came. However, he told me that 'oh, that's just a concept plan and there will be an intersection with Cranford Street.' 'However, no one has made a decision about the northern arterial road yet and whether or not there will be a right turn from that arterial onto Cranford Street. The location of an intersection with the new residential area could only be determined once that is known.' In short, 'No one at the Council can answer your question.'</p> <p>Is it fair to ask for support (or not) from area residents when such details are not available?</p> <p>I also question whether the sizing of the proposed stormwater management area is sufficient particularly in the face of climate change when larger storms can be expected (although the long-term projection is for the east coast to become drier, larger and more severe storms can also be anticipated).</p> <p>A good example of the lack of quality stormwater engineering is found at the Fitzgerald Avenue intersection north of Durham Street. When this road was re-built, the Council adopted a design that regularly sees the road flooding during severe weather events. How can we have confidence that the proposed stormwater area is sufficient when things like the Northern Arterial Road haven't been built yet?</p> <p>My solution to this issue is to adopt a 2-stage plan for the Cranford Basin. Proceed with the establishment of the stormwater management areas in the first instance. Reserve the remainder of the area marked for residential development as community gardening land. This would honor the history of the area and allow time for the impact of the Northern Arterial Road and the stormwater management area to be tested.</p> <p>In the interim, the community will get green space in which to encourage gardening skills and the growing of food in a sustainable way - which are values that the Council says it supports.</p> <p>Then, after a period of 5-10 years, the Council could consider re-zoning for residential development according to the aspirations in this concept plan - provided that the traffic management and stormwater management are working properly.</p> <p>At present, the Christchurch region has many areas that are zoned for residential development that are not being fully used. There is no immediate need to open this land for development along the lines proposed.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <p>a) I don't support the plan</p> <p>b) I believe that stormwater management should be the only priority for the near term; traffic management can only be considered (and consulted on) once the impact of the northern arterial road and any exchanges are known</p> <p>c) in the interim, the area proposed for development should be set aside for community gardens</p>	<p><b>Transport</b></p> <p>The East-Papanui Outline Development Plan indicates a collector road through the residential development block connecting Cranford Street to Grassmere Street.</p> <p>The impact of the Northern Arterial on the local network has been modelled and potential effects have been assessed. The Transport Assessment identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Road will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some extent.</p> <p>The degree of increase in traffic on Grants Road is likely to be considered by some residents to be significant. However the assessment notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Christchurch Northern Corridor and the ODP road linkages, the volume increases associated with development of the Outline Development Plan area and general growth in the area, will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads. These effects would be marginally reduced if a lower density residential development was implemented.</p> <p>The potential for a third lane on the Waimakariri Bridge still needs be investigated and a decision made. The outcome of investigations will in turn influence the final design of the intersection of the Northern Arterial Extension and Cranford Street. The design of the Northern Arterial extension/Cranford Street intersection does not change the conclusions of the Integrated Transport Assessment, which recommends an intersection with the ODP spine road and Cranford Street which is located to the north of the Northern Arterial/Cranford Street intersection.</p> <p>Council's minimum infrastructure design standards require the developers to allow for and contain on site any stormwater runoff in excess of what currently exists, up to a 50 year return period storm. In a very large storm smaller amounts of water may spill, causing flooding of land but not flooding for any house with the required minimum floor levels. Provided that the rules are followed the proposed development will have a minor effect.</p> <p><b>Planning - staging</b></p> <p>A two stage process along the lines suggested is a valid option and was considered in the Supporting Document. The Council accepts the view that there is a sufficient supply of housing land for now and the foreseeable future but the location of this land is, in terms of planning policy, superior to some other planned areas of the City and therefore should be made available. It is a relatively small development that is unlikely to have any material impact on the rate of development in those other planned areas.</p> <p>The landowners themselves cannot be compelled to make their land available for community gardens or other public amenities, even as an interim step. They would be unlikely to be able to make a viable market gardening use from the land and it is likely the Council would need to purchase their properties to make any community garden happen.</p> <p><b>Stormwater management</b></p> <p>The function of Cranford Basin as a flood storage area has been planned taking into account the existing catchment, the Northern Arterial Extension and provision for flood relief for Flockton Basin. Basin capacity is adequate so that the basin will not spill onto the surrounding land in a 50 year average recurrence interval storm, taking into account the Council's estimate of climate change rainfall increase. Basin capacity includes a 'safety margin' which could accommodate a larger storm or other eventualities such as future zoning changes.</p> <p><b>Parks, community gardens</b></p> <p>The demand for different types of park land has been assessed. A neighbourhood park (playground equipment/seating and landscape planting) for future and adjacent residents is proposed, as well as shared cycles/pedestrian paths (on drainage land) that link the park with streets and adjacent stormwater/drainage areas. Council will consider the establishment of a community garden in the future, if there is demand from the new local community. History has shown that an established and willing group of volunteers is required for community gardens to operate successfully.</p>
262	support the plan (conditional)	<p>Cranford Basin: I would like to see more commitment towards planting native flora which will attract more native fauna. There is street planting guidance in the Infrastructure Design Standards which are referred to by the Council's landscape architects when subdivisions are lodged. In preparing street planting plans, the Council will have regard to broad range of matters to do with the local context but there are strong policies in the district plan aimed at increasing biodiversity.</p> <p>Residential Development: I would like to see more commitment from the council that the residential area will be a green area with lots of trees on the road and playgrounds. I have no insight in the sections but I suggest that the council will make allowance for car parks on residential terrain or a shared car park so less parking issues will appear that could conflict with the cycle ways.</p>	<p>The large wetland area will certainly make a significant contribution to what this submission is seeking.</p> <p>The District Plan requires a certain amount of off street parking to be provided in new residential areas, and the Council is well aware of the potential conflicts that can arise between the provision of on-street parking and cycle ways. The overall roading design will take this into account.</p>

253	do not support the plan		
229	do not support the plan	<p>I don't believe it is the right time to be progressing with opening up more land as there are too many uncertainties in the market.</p> <p>Current house price stability suggests that there is potentially going to be an oversupply of land in the city, so this land is likely to not be developed for a period of time because of the likely low return on development.</p> <p>There is also uncertainty of the rebuild of the city. If the city doesn't reach a tipping point soon, the rebuild could drag on for years and CHCH will not be an attractive place to be - population growth will stagnate and so this is another reason why there will be little demand for this land.</p> <p>Also, what will happen with the Red Zone is still unknown. Some of this land could be zoned for residential development, and so this will put even further land on the market - also dampening demand. Associated with this, if Cranford is approved then a decision to develop some of the Red Zone may in itself be restricted by the land developed in Cranford. This would reduce the options for the Red Zone.</p> <p>Market gardens close to the city have environmental and economic benefits, and should be retained.</p> <p>I suggest that the decision to develop Cranford is delayed until more is known about: the plans for the Residential Red Zone; the progress of the Central City rebuild; and, housing demand.</p>	<p>While there are signs of a potential over supply of land in general, there are house and land price variances across the City. This area has a history of strong demand such that in combination with other factors, it is not considered inappropriate to provide for a relatively small amount of additional supply.</p> <p>The matters raised concerning the Residential Red Zone are noted, and will be considered further as that Plan is progressed.</p> <p>Given the relatively small number of houses being proposed, and the different location, the market effects of this development are unlikely to be felt around the Residential Red Zone area, for example certainly not as much as for the Prestons development. The Council does not consider it necessary to prevent new residential zoning in a location which is relatively close to the CBD, whereas it might take a different view if further significant residential zoning was promoted in more peripheral parts of Greater Christchurch.</p> <p>Similarly with regard to developing the Central City residential areas (which is a priority for the Council) in the Council's view, and based on market information, any competition with housing development in the Central City is likely to be very limited and of very minor effect.</p>
207	support the plan	<p>Why has this taken so long?</p> <p>Should have been done immediately after earthquakes</p>	Noted
206	support the plan	<p>Housing - yes</p> <p>Forest &amp; Cycleway - yes</p> <p>Proposed Northern Arterial Extension - x?</p>	Noted
91	support the plan	<p>I think it's a brilliant idea. The land is sitting there doing nothing, and can't be used for anything, so it may as well be developed. I think high density, in some places and a some lower density in others with a nice mix, to have a lovely upmarket group of property with the access to the city, and the new cycleway etc.</p> <p>As well as Northlands etc, infrastructure with buses, so is ideal. A waste sitting there at the moment. There may be some idiots object for objecting, But I have lived in the area for 53 Years, and 18 right in the heart of what is proposed, and no matter what anyone says, the water can be managed as I have proven that,, and with the earthquake nothing sunk on this land, and I have some buildings that were just sitting on the ground right next to ponds with no major piles and they haven't moved. SO what has been done on my property proves all the negative people WRONG</p>	Noted
86	do not support the plan	<p>I do not support this plan. The plan does not sufficiently address the traffic issues such a development will give rise to in the neighbourhood.</p> <p>Grants Road is already a constrained access route. Parking along the road outside the rest home is restricted to one lane only during the day as a result of parked cars associated with the rest home.</p> <p>With the inclusion of the cycleway along Grassmere St this road has been also become more restricted with a significant narrowing of the access point onto Main North Road which will lead to significant traffic constraint should any vehicles attempt to turn right on to Main North Road. This will inevitably mean that, at the least, right turning traffic but more realistically the majority of all traffic using Grants Road in order to exit from the area.</p> <p>Grants Road is not unable to accommodate the additional traffic that would result from another 420 houses in the area. This is simply infeasible and the consideration given to this issue in the draft planning material is insufficient and does not address the issue.</p> <p>It should further be noted that as the access into and out of Grants Road on to Papanui Road is also restricted that the traffic congestion and flow would impact other surroundings roads many of which are themselves narrow.</p> <p>As a resident of this area we have recently experienced over 6 months of very limited traffic access to our street while Grants Road was closed and at the same time the Council in its wisdom also decided to proceed with the construction of the cycleway meaning that access along Grassmere St was also severely restricted. This created significant delays for those living in the area and added significantly to the commute time involved in getting my children to school, particularly having to join the heavy traffic flows on Main North Road between Grassmere St and Blighs Road.</p> <p>There would be a significant impact on all residents in this area as a result of this proposal and it would have a significant impact on the nature of the neighbourhood- turning a relatively quiet suburban street into a significant thoroughfare.</p> <p>The traffic associated with 420 houses in a relatively confined space would be significant.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Road will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity. The degree of increase in Grants road is likely to be considered by some residents to be significant. However it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the CNC, the volume increases associated with the ODP and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads.</p> <p>These effects are reduced but not to a significant degree where a residential development that accords with a lower density scenario is implemented.</p> <p>Grants Road is heavily parked outside the rest home. However, the road is 9 metres in width which offers suitable width for a local road that allows two-way traffic to pass cautiously while accommodating on-street parking on both sides. CCC has the ability to restrict parking to one side thus creating a wider road, however this needs to be balanced against the potential for higher traffic speeds which is not consistent with other sections along Grants Road</p> <p>Various intersection layouts have been tested for the Main North Road/ Grassmere Road intersection. While a restricted movement arrangement has a notable effect by reducing traffic volumes on Grassmere Street, changes to the form of the intersection would have relatively little effect on projected traffic volumes on Grants Road. Changes to the intersection may therefore be governed more by safety, accessibility and amenity rather than impacts on the surrounding local road network.</p> <p>Only four additional road accesses onto Grassmere Street from the new development will however be permitted, to reduce intersection conflicts.</p> <p>Widening of Grassmere Street on the north-east side will be required to create a separation strip between the vehicles access points and the cycle route, so that adequate visibility is established. It is intended that the land required for widening be secured by condition of subdivision consent.</p>

86 contd		<p>The plan focuses overly on the regeneration aspects of this development and not on the practical elements of it.</p> <p>I also note that this volume of traffic using Grassmere St would significantly undermine the safety of the new cycleway that has just been built in the street.</p> <p>I do not support the planned development of this area.</p> <p>Should this proposal go ahead any traffic associated with the development should be restricted from exiting the area via Grassmere St and should be required to exit onto Cranford St which is a road more able to accommodate additional traffic (particularly once the arterial extension is completed) and where there is a reduced impact on the residential neighbourhood given that the corresponding area of Cranford St is predominantly commercial/light industrial usage.</p>	<p>Access only onto Cranford Street would increase traffic demand on Main North Road and Papanui Road and while the local streets to the south of the ODP area would have lower levels of traffic than with a Grassmere St through route, there would be longer delays at the intersections with Main North Road and Papanui Road. The limited access option also increases pressure on Shearer Avenue which has direct access between the development block and Main North Road</p>
85	support the plan	<p>Plan looks great and hope the open space and stormwater management area is planted in podocarp forest and NZ natives with walkways as proposed. A native haven among intensified housing is certainly a fair tradeoff.</p> <p>Please keep it as green as practical.</p>	Noted
81	do not support the plan	<p>I support the proposed developments to the waste water and wetland and forested areas with the addition of proposed walkways, but I do not support the housing development.</p> <p>I don't believe that when there are a surplus of rental properties and current housing development projects with empty properties that an additional 420 houses is currently required by the city.</p> <p>My biggest issue with the proposed housing development is that the majority of the designated area falls into the Paparoa Street school zone. This school currently has role of ~600 students and those numbers have grown over the years. The school prides itself on the close knit community culture it creates which is virtually impossible to maintain if the role was to expand. Also if the infrastructure of the school was unable to handle an increasing role then they would likely be forced to change their current zone boundaries which would mean homes currently in the zone would no longer be in zone, thus negatively affecting those who live there if they have school aged children but also causing depreciation or reduced capital growth in the value of their home which in any city is greatly influenced by being in a desirable school zone (such as the Paparoa Street zone).</p>	<p>Paparoa and Papanui Primary Schools and MOE have both been consulted on this Plan. No objections have been raised by either party.</p> <p>Papanui Primary School's submission considered that the development would contribute to that school maintaining a steady roll, but not have a significant impact on its roll. That school considered that both Papanui and Paparoa could be destination schools. The school zones appear to overlap in part of the east Papanui area, so that there would be a choice of schools for children in that area.</p>
689	support the plan		
673	support the plan	<p>Dense native bush &amp; wetland plantings similar to Travis and Halswell Quarry are needed to create a good buffer between the high density housing and the wetland character of Cranford Basin.</p> <p>Lower density housing (lifestyle blocks) for areas prone to springs and subsidence.</p> <p>Protection of known springs from sudden changes to water table during construction and provision of rain gardens and treatment basins around their catchments to minimise pollution to these springs.</p> <p>Small areas of high density housing overlooking the wetlands can assist in passive surveillance of these areas as vegetation thickens up.</p> <p>I have issue with the roading layout in this development as there is potential for motorists to "rat-run" through to avoid traffic lights on Cranford, Papanui and Main North Roads -traffic calming measures and alignments will be needed.</p> <p>There is good connectivity with existing transport links, but there must be extra provision for bus/cycle links to the Northern Corridor and Papanui /Main Nth Rd built preferably from the start of development!</p>	<p>The suggestions put forward in the submission are noted. The Outline Development Plan encourages those urban design principles being put forward.</p> <p>Council's minimum infrastructure design standards and proposed rules require developers to maintain separation from springs and keep stormwater separate from stormwater flows. Provided that this happens the proposed development should have a minor effect.</p> <p><b>Roading Layout</b> A through road will attract vehicles through the site and through the local road network, however this would be balanced by the benefits of lower peak direction travel times on Main North Road, supporting public transport services. A through route at Grassmere Street also places less pressure on the Shearer Avenue through route and offers higher accessibility to the road network to and from the surrounding area. The through road could include future traffic calming measures to create a balance between the wider network advantages listed above and the need to manage the level of rat running and its impacts on these local streets.</p>
632	do not support the plan	<p>I think it's crazy to be even considering building 420 houses on this land. It is wet, boggy and low lying (it's a storm water basin for a reason). With all the hard stand &amp; paved / asphalted areas in Papanui and St Albans the storm water needs to run off somewhere. If you put houses here the water will run off somewhere else &amp; perhaps we'll see another Flockton situation. What happens when we have the next earthquake? Sinking foundations, liquefaction? Leave the land as it is - put in some walking and cycle paths and plant some fruit trees. Create little reserves for families to enjoy. I agree we need more space for residential development but I don't believe this is a good (or the right) location due to the ground conditions.</p>	<p>The key point is that there are no proposals to build within the Cranford Stormwater Basin itself. That basin has been set aside to respond to the environmental risks of concern to this and other submitters, and to create the environment sought at the end of the submission.</p> <p>Building on organic rich soils on the edge of the Basin including peat is technically challenging. However, there are methods including engineering practice to manage effects, primarily that of settlement and potential liquefaction. Piles are only one potential solution to building on this type of ground. Others include surcharging the ground with additional fill to reduce secondary settlement and to consolidate the organic rich sediments.</p> <p>The Building Code requires structures to be built to not pose a risk to occupants. This includes risks to property and occupants from natural hazards and poor ground conditions.</p> <p>The suggestions around fruit trees, reserves etc are unlikely to eventuate under current private ownership, but could be created within the residential development if it goes ahead eg within the proposed local park.</p>

619	support the plan	<p>I support the plan, but do have concern's that need to be addressed,</p> <p><b>1, Traffic leaving the CNC.</b> That the traffic leaving the CNC traveling south to what will be the inevitable bottle neck at Innes road will attempt to drive north on Cranford Street, enter and cut through the Cranford Basin to Grassmere Street and on to Grants Road to get to Papanui Road as an alternative to get in to the CBD. If this is allowed to happen this will have a very negative effect of the residents of the Papanui Cluster and defeat one of the objectives of the creation of the Papanui Cluster some Ten years ago, which was to reduces traffic flow in the suburb and direct it to the main arterials.</p> <p><b>2, Traffic flow.</b> That the creation of some 420 homes will increase the traffic flow in the Papanui Cluster which has already increased substantially in the last few years, I find the Papanui Cluster easy to turn into but frustratingly slow to get out of, specifically Grants Road onto Papanui Road and Mary Street to Main North Road. Surely Cranford Basin Residents will need Traffic lights at Grassmere Street to allow them to get out onto Main North Road?</p> <p><b>3, Paparoa Street School</b> There is no doubt the Cranford Basin will be popular with Families and that the roll at Paparoa Street School will increase. Where will the Extra classrooms go? I hope the extra class rooms will not be at the detriment of the valuable resource that is the grassed areas of the School grounds. Building on current car parking space and relocating the car parks could be an alternative.</p> <p><b>4, Paparoa Street School car parking</b> Including the Rutland Reserve, there are five entrances to Paparoa Street School, with only one of these having any car parking for child drop off/pick up and only a few car parks at that. With the imminent increase in the roll at Paparoa Street School, what plan is there to ensure Safe drop off/pick for children? Could land in Area 4, adjacent to Rutland Reserve to be set aside for Paparoa Street School Car parking and drop off/pick up Turnstile?</p> <p><b>5, Grassmere Street/Grants Road-Cycle way intersection,</b> What is the plan for this intersection?</p> <p>At present the only place for children to Cross the road as they leave the Cycle way (on their way home from School) is at the apex of the Grassmere Street/Grants road corner, this is a blind corner to the right to Grassmere Street and not safe for Children and the Elderly to use (Ngaio Marsh Retirement village is on this intersection)</p> <p>The obvious solution is to install a foot path on the south side of Grants Road from the cycle way to the Erica Play Ground with zebra crossings installed. This affects our family and I would appreciate some feedback on this.</p> <p><b>6, Rutland reserve development.</b> With the increase in population, recreational facilities in the area will be required. What plan if any is for the Rutland reserve? I Examples could be Skate park, Pump track, and additional age specific play equipment.</p> <p><b>7, Heavy vehicle traffic on Grants Road,</b> With RAC Contracting being based at the end of Grants Road there has been an unwanted increase in heavy vehicle traffic down Grants road, especially when there were hundreds of trucks dumping clean fill on site some months ago when every truck passing shook our house. During construction of the Cranford Basin will heavy vehicles be restricted to using Cranford street as an entry/exit point to keep these vehicles away from Grassmere Street and the Papanui cluster?</p> <p>Thank you for taking my submission into consideration. I look forward to your reply.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Council acknowledge that the proposals for the CNC will result in greater volumes of traffic being on Cranford Street to the south of Innes Road, and some further changes to the road network will be necessary. As a result, a condition was placed on consent granted for the CNC that required Council to employ an "Independent Expert" to assess the impacts of the CNC on the road network at the southern end of the route, and recommend a series of improvements to the road network (known as The " Downstream Effects Management Plan") which would seek to address any issues. These changes would be funded by CCC.</li> <li>2. A through road would attract vehicles through the site and through the local road network, however this would be balanced with the benefits of lower peak direction travel times on Main North Road, which will support better public transport services.  A through route at Grassmere Street would also place less pressure on Shearer Avenue relative to Shearer Avenue being the only through route, and offers higher accessibility to the road network to and from the surrounding area. The through road could include future traffic calming measures to create a balance between the wider network advantages listed above, and the need to manage the level of rat running and its impacts on these local streets.  Modelling suggests that signalised Grassmere Street/Main North Road would offer wider road network advantages, however a limited movement arrangement delivers higher travel time savings for the Public Transport corridor of Main North Road and lower flows on Grassmere Street and Grants Road.</li> <li>3. Decisions regarding the layout and development of school property at Paparoa Street School rest with the Ministry of Education. MOE and Paparoa Primary School were both consulted on the proposal and did not raise any issues with regard to the ability of the school to cope with any increase in school roll.</li> <li>4. Traffic impacts associated with an increased school roll have not been addressed in this assessment of the impacts of development of the East Papanui ODP. However a school travel plan could be implemented with assistance from CCC to minimise the impact of school traffic and parking demands on Paparoa Street, Rutland Street, Tomes Road and surrounding streets.</li> <li>5. Improvements to the Grassmere Street/Main North Road intersection are currently being explored as part of the Public transport corridor improvements along Main North Road. Various "treatments" have been explored including a fully signalised arrangement as well as a restricted movement arrangement. Modelling suggests that a signalised Grassmere Street/Main North Road would offer wider road network advantages, however a limited movement arrangement delivers higher travel time savings for the public transport corridor of Main North Road. Final decisions have yet to be made.  A potential additional crossing facility near the corner of Grants Road/Grassmere Street has not been investigated as part of the East-Papanui Outline Development Plan. However the suggested extension of the footpath on the southern side of Grants Road accompanied by a crossing feature does have merit and could be considered as part of the Major Cycle Route project.</li> <li>6. The demand for additional park land within the Regeneration site has been assessed. It was decided not to increase the size of facilities at Rutland Reserve or Shearer Park, but rather include a completely new park, centrally sited for future and adjacent residents. A neighbourhood park can contain playground equipment/pump track, etc as well as seating and landscape planting. Exact park layout and facilities provided are typically finalised at a later date with community input. Also proposed are shared cycles/pedestrian paths (on drainage land) that link the park with streets and adjacent stormwater/drainage areas.</li> <li>7. Should the proposed (and required) earthworks involve heavy construction traffic), an earthworks consent may include a Traffic Management Plan (TMP) as a condition of the consent. Further, in regard to traffic effects, again any development of significant scale would be required to have a TMP, and prior to this a broad safety audit of the roading network would be undertaken. Any required safety upgrades would be determined at that stage. The safety audit is also revisited at the detailed design also.</li> </ol>
618	do not support the plan	<p>Don't want housing. Why build somewhere fraught with land issues...another disaster waiting to happen. This land should be developed as park space/native planting/recreational only.</p>	<p>Building on organic rich soils including peat is technically challenging. However, there are methods, including engineering practice to manage effects, primarily that of settlement and potential liquefaction. Piles are only one potential solution to building on this type of ground. Others include surcharging the ground with additional fill to reduce secondary settlement and consolidate the organic rich sediments. Costs are potentially higher than standard foundation design.</p> <p>The conclusions from the geotechnical investigations are that some housing is feasible and marketable in this location. The Building Code clearly requires that structures do not pose a risk to occupants. This includes risks to property and occupants from natural hazards and poor ground conditions.</p> <p>It is unlikely that the landowners would allow their land to be used for parks in the first instance and their properties or parts of them would need to be acquired by the Council for this to happen. Residential subdivision will however provide the means to create some reserves.</p>

618 contd			The demand and need for park space has been fully assessed. Two adjacent parks exist (Shearer and Rutland). One additional neighbourhood park is proposed, in a central location, to be as accessible as possible to many of the future residents. In addition, a network of shared cycles/pedestrian paths are proposed (on drainage land), which link park areas with streets and adjacent stormwater/drainage areas.
614	support the plan		
612	do not support the plan	It's a wetlands! I don't understand how we have red zones huge amounts of land that has issues after the earthquakes yet you would let people build a new subdivision on crap land! Have we learnt nothing?!	<p>The Council and other local authorities have learned much from the Canterbury Earthquakes, particularly on how not to build in these particular ground conditions. Planning and building standards are much more stringent now that they have been historically.</p> <p>The conclusions from the geotechnical and other investigations are that housing is feasible and marketable in this location provided appropriate ground preparation and foundation designs are implemented. Building on organic rich soils including peat is a technical challenge but it can however be done with standard engineering practice. The effects, primarily that of settlement and potential liquefaction, can be designed against. Piles are only one potential solution to building on this type of ground. Others include surcharging the ground with additional fill to reduce secondary settlement and consolidate the organic rich sediments.</p> <p>The Building Code clearly requires that structures not pose a risk to occupants. This includes risks to property and occupants from natural hazards and poor ground conditions.</p>
609	support the plan	It's an excellent use of land which is more or less redundant.	Noted
602	support the plan	<p>I am supportive of the Regeneration plan. The possibility of the development of the empty land adjacent to Rutland reserve and Paparoa Street School for residential housing would help to reinvigorate the suburb and allow for needed housing.</p> <p>The expansion of reserve and tree planting and creation of a wetland is a conservation project that would be amazing. Especially in the return of native bird, fish and insect species to a residential area within the city. These species could then spread to outside reserve areas. Provides an area not just for the enjoyment of locals and other citizens but for education and science purposes too</p>	Noted
601	support the plan		
547	do not support the plan	<p><b>DRAINAGE</b> - Having witnessed twice daily for more than 30 years, the accumulation of water either side of Cranford Street, I'm concerned that the heavily compacted land under and around the Northern Arterial Extension, will force that water into a much smaller area, which appears to have been put aside for residential development. The smaller area would mean that standing water - calculated according to land area - would be twice as deep and probably twice as difficult to clear.</p> <p><b>CYCLE, PEDESTRIAN WAYS</b> - Stopping the proposed Cranford Street cycle/walk path halfway, seems to be a negative move. Currently, it is *theoretically possible to cycle/walk from the Main North Road to Placemakers. The new scheme cuts that route along the southern side of Cranford in half. *I've used the word 'theoretically' deliberately, as cyclists and walkers are often forced to manoeuvre around scores of parked cars and various hawkers straddling the path with their wares: which include a Punta-seller, a permanently-parked van advertising a nearby restaurant, used car sellers and a flower-peddler. This means walkers and bikes often have lurch into some of the busiest traffic lanes in the city.</p> <p><b>CRANFORD-GRASSMERE COLLECTOR ROAD</b> - This appears to be designed to connect the two streets in something of a rat-run starting from opposite the Cranford Commercial area, which is already a bottleneck from as early as 7:00am most days. For the proposal to work, it will need traffic lights at least to help with safe traffic flow.</p>	<p>The Cranford Basin storage function has been planned taking into account the existing catchment and the Northern Arterial Extension and provision for flood relief for Flockton Basin. Basin capacity is adequate to ensure that the basin will not spill onto the surrounding land in a 50 year average recurrence interval storm, taking into account Council's estimate of climate change rainfall increase. Basin capacity also includes a safety margin which could accommodate a larger storm or other eventualities such as future zoning changes.</p> <p><b>Cycle and pedestrian ways</b> This comment appears to relate to the projected CNC, and in particular the design of the CNC and its connection to Cranford Street. This has already been consented and does not form part of this Regeneration Plan area. However the issues highlighted in the submission concerning obstructions to pedestrians and cyclists have been noted.</p> <p><b>Cranford-Grassmere collector road</b> The Cranford Street/ collector road intersection is to be upgraded to signals, or a roundabout, at the point at which the average delay for right turning vehicles from the collector road onto Cranford Street during peak hour exceeds 35 seconds. 'Peak hour' is defined as those hours between 3pm and 7pm on a weekday.</p>
517	support the plan	Don't see any issues. Well done!!	
501	support the plan	<p>IT all seems like a good idea.</p> <p>We find it very difficult driving to Main North Road and turning right over two lanes of busy traffic.</p> <p>If this development goes ahead we will have no problem getting through to Cranford Street.</p>	The ODP shows a road connection with Meadow Street thus it is possible to access Cranford Street through this connecting Road. In addition, with the ODP collector road in place and the CNC projects completed, access into Main North Road from Meadow Street should be easier with traffic volumes taken off Main North Road.
435	support the plan	Not at this time. We would welcome the extension to our street as we desperately need another entrance and exit with the addition of bikes at the very, very busy Main Rd/Sawyers Arms Rd corner.	The ODP shows a road connection with Shearer Street thus it is possible to access Cranford Street through this connecting Road. In addition, with the ODP collector road in place and the CNC projects completed, access into Main North Road from Meadow Street should be easier with traffic volumes taken off Main North Road
433	do not support the plan	<p>After the earthquakes (Feb &amp; Sept) there was significant water/liquefaction on both sides of Cranford St up to where the tents are for sale. To build ANYTHING on that land is asking for another Bexley.</p> <p>I fail to see why you want 4 lanes to Innes Rd. It would be a much better plan to have 4 lanes to where the Northern Arterial extension meets Cranford St then 2 lanes. Lights to control traffic flow.</p> <p>Building by Paparoa St/Grassmere is fine, as there was little to no liquefaction there. You need to think about what we have been through to build the future. What lessons have been learned or ignored?</p>	<p>Building on organic rich soils including peat is technically challenging. However, there are methods, including engineering practice, to manage effects, primarily that of settlement and potential liquefaction. Piles are only one potential solution to building on this type of ground. Others include surcharging the ground with additional fill to reduce secondary settlement and consolidate the organic rich sediments.</p> <p>The design of the CNC and its connection to Cranford Street has already been consented. A "Downstream Effects Management Plan" is to be undertaken that seeks to address the traffic issues downstream of the 4-laning and will include a community engagement/consultation process.</p>

433 contd			The Building Code clearly requires that structures to be built do not pose a risk to occupants. This includes risks to property and occupants from natural hazards and poor ground conditions. Lessons have certainly been learnt within the geotechnical and building profession since the earthquakes on how best to build in these conditions to ensure 'another Bexley' does not occur.
431	support the plan	Generally pleased with the planning but concerned that remediation of the land to acceptable height to avoid flooding should be completed before development is completed. I am sure that the Council is well experienced by the sectors floods to avoid a repetition	The District Plan and Building Code both require minimum floor levels which seek to reduce the risk of flooding. These floor levels will be required to be achieved as part of the building and resource consent processes.
417	do not support the plan	<p>You have outlined a range of options.</p> <p><b>Traffic:</b> Unfortunately, these plans still do not address the traffic effects around the developments. As Cranford St south is still not sorted in terms of dealing with the massive projected increase in south bound traffic (and may never be), much of it will seek any ability to head south and west - i.e. potentially straight thru this development, thru the easy access feeder road onto Grassmere St and Grants Rd. Having just spent countless 1000s on a new parallel Papanui cycleway, you adroitly point out you will need to mitigate effects on traffic crossing this cycleway. Why would I send my kids down there if I know up to 7000 extra vehicles per day may cruise down/across this dedicated cycleway?!</p> <p>Grants Rd is currently single lane during weekdays with a large number of staff parked on both sides of the east end for Ngaio Marsh - no mention of how this will be accommodated.</p> <p>No mention of how traffic access would actually be managed onto Papanui or Main Nth Roads - just these points need to be assessed - what, again? - CCC just spent our money on reworking Main North Rd/Grants Rd intersection to make it narrow and more difficult to access - what for? - some garden space and cycleway protection?!! Now you are proposing you will have to readdress it to cope with up to 7000 vpd (assuming some commercial development) in this area. We will be gridlocked trying to get north or west.</p> <p><b>Schools</b> - can the mentioned schools actually cope with the expected number of children (of which I saw no mention of any figures). I will assume 2.4 kids per unit, so up to 1500. Unlikely all residents will be families, but. Can the schools cope? Do have any estimates of numbers on rolls? Do they have any money to upgrade facilities/classroom numbers?</p> <p><b>Earthworks:</b> no discussion of cost it takes a developer to PROPERLY remediate the suboptimal land. Having done it to our own section, it is not cheap. Given current, let alone future building costs in Christchurch, I wonder who's going to be able to afford these small "medium density" sections. The developers will want a return on all this high cost land repair - rafts, piling and the like and the small sections won't appeal to many who can actually afford them. That's why the larger 1B sections (with much less local amenity and environmental impact you allude to) attract a higher value and actually get developed/sold.</p> <p>Sorry, but I haven't seen anything to reassure me the land/roading/schooling will cope with medium density plans up to 30h/ha. The only beneficiaries are the developers (I know one who is rubbing hands in expectation), the losers are those who buy, those in the surrounds and of course the Council who will spend eternity dealing with the infrastructure failure, thus ratepayers.</p> <p>No-one wants to prevent development, but Council needs to choose the much lower density, sustainable option with green spaces that enhances the current local subdivisions and their accessways, not overload them. Then you will truly regenerate Papanui.</p>	<p><b>Traffic</b> It is correct to assume that the ODP collector road will attract vehicles through the site and through the local road network. However this would be balanced by the benefits of lower peak direction travel times on Main North Road, thereby supporting public transport services. A through route via Grassmere Street would result in less pressure on the Shearer Avenue through route than if the latter were the only through route. A through route from Grassmere Street to Cranford Street offers higher accessibility to the road network to and from the surrounding area. This through route could include future traffic calming measures to create a balance between the wider network advantages listed above, and the need to manage the level of rat running and its impacts on these local streets.</p> <p>Various development scenarios that include different degrees of development, development years, different "treatments" ie improvements to the Grassmere Street/Main North Road intersection and alternative ODP road network layouts have been modelled.</p> <p>The modelled scenarios that include either the signalling of a full movement intersection or restricting of permitted turning movements, suggest that changes in traffic volumes along most of Grassmere Street will still result in traffic levels which are below levels that might be expected for most local roads. The most significant traffic increases on Grassmere Street will occur for the short section between the ODP collector Road and Grants road. The estimated volume of traffic on this short section of the cycle route is unlikely to create safety issues or discourage the use of the facility.</p> <p>Grants Road is heavily parked outside the rest home. However, the road is 9 metres in width which offers suitable width for a local road that allows two-way traffic to pass cautiously while accommodating on-street parking on both sides. CCC has the ability to restrict parking to one side thus creating a wider road however this needs to be balanced against the potential for higher traffic speeds which would not be consistent with other narrowed sections along Grants Road.</p> <p>Reference to 7000vpd on Grants road was associated with a development scenario comprising an Industrial plus residential development, which created trips higher than a residential scenario of 1500 households. This development scenario is not being pursued. The most recent analysis focuses on the effects of development ranging from 200 households to 370 households. The latter, together with general growth in the area, is likely to generate 3000-3500 additional vehicle trips per day once the land has been fully developed, which could take at least ten years.</p> <p>Analysis concluded that the CNC projects in addition to the ODP collector road provide traffic relief to Main North Road and Papanui Road.</p> <p><b>Earthworks (cost)</b> There will be a significant cost in ground remediation to ensure that the provisions of the Building Code are adhered to. It is acknowledged that build costs are likely to be high in this area. This was similarly identified by the Commissioners in its Decision on Plan Change 1 to the RPS when they said:</p> <p><i>'The question of cost, and the willingness to absorb that cost, is a decision for the market place to make, and it may of course lead to a more extended period of construction and an extended period of marketing before final development is achieved. It is likely also, from other stormwater engineering evidence, that over time the levels of development that can be achieved overall at Cranford will of necessity be less than is required for standard Greenfields developments, if we conclude that development should be allowed to occur. That would be because of the stormwater retention areas required, but is also potentially if ground conditions prove that some areas cannot be economically developed at all.'</i></p> <p><b>Density</b> The comment relating to the L1B –type densities in the previous City Plan is valid in that such low densities would have less environmental effects overall. On the other hand, both regional and district planning policies are to encourage more people to live near major centres (including the central City) and public transport routes, to densify in selected areas and to provide greater choice of travel modes. So there is a balance to be struck between implementing this policy and managing traffic and geotechnical effects, all within infrastructure capacities.</p> <p><b>Schools</b> Paparua and Papanui Primary schools are supportive of the Plan.</p>



417 contd			<p>Papanui Primary School's submission of the Board of Trustees considers that the development would contribute to the school maintaining a steady roll, but that the development would not impact on the school roll significantly as both Papanui and Paparoa could be destination schools, since their school zones overlap in part of the ODP area.</p> <p>MOE has been consulted and did not raise any issues with the proposal. MOE has not indicated what pupil yield the development might have, but based on other subdivisions in the City, it would likely be in the vicinity of 180 students (years 0-8). It is noted that there are 2 state primary schools (Papanui Primary and Paparoa Primary) along with 2 state-integrated primary schools (Christchurch Adventist and St Josephs Primary) in close proximity to the proposed housing area.</p> <p>The potential effects of additional housing on the safety of children getting to and from school is an issue around any school and such situations need to be continuously monitored.</p>
1170	support the plan	<p><b>Please see submission attached separately.</b></p> <p>In summary, proposed development of the Case/Crozier land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Recognises that Case/Crozier land is not able to be efficiently or effectively used;</li> <li>- Will facilitate urban consolidation what will result in urban renewal and development of this area and improve the environmental, economic, social and cultural wellbeing of the local community. This will expedite the regeneration process, thus giving effect to an important purpose of the Act.</li> <li>- Case family land is ideally positioned to support the holistic and integrated land use planning of the surrounding Cranford area with which it is inextricably linked by its water environment and landscape values as well as enabling access for the surrounding community to the heart of the multipurpose naturalized stormwater wetland area;</li> <li>- The inclusion of the Case/Crozier land will enable comprehensive development to be properly considered and implement with a view to the establishment of housing of a high standard with attractive variation which will represent a positive contribution to urban renewal and development.</li> <li>- Proposed development of the Case/Crozier land will enable a focused and expedited regeneration process which will be greatly to the advantage of the community as a whole.</li> </ul> <p>In short, and importantly, the Case family is willing and able to develop its land in accordance with the draft Plan.</p> <p>It is considered that the vision and goals of the draft Plan would be better achieved through the RNN Zone for the reasons which follow.</p> <p><b>[refer to full submission for detail]</b></p> <p>Suggested amendments to the draft rules are set out in Appendix 2 (refer to original submission).</p> <p><b>Amendments:</b></p> <p>It is noted that in the stated purposes of the Act, emphasis is placed upon "...enabling a focused and expedited regeneration process".</p> <p>It follows that every effort should be made to avoid the imposition of steps or processes which will slow down the process of expediting regeneration. In particular, unduly burdensome requirements relating to development form and design should be avoided, because of the propensity of such measures to slow down the regeneration process, which should be expedited to fulfill the vision and goals of the draft Plan.</p> <p>It is noted that in Decision 10 of the IHP, the Panel took issue with the appropriateness of introducing the Homestar and Lifemark provisions into the CRDP. The Panel expressed reservations that the additional costs of such provisions would represent a higher proportion of construction costs for the lower value market segments with associated implications on the affordability of houses. The Panel determined the most appropriate method was to promote best practice in this area through non-regulatory methods including incentives. We note that the draft Plan also identifies that Council officers will proactively engage with designers and developers on non-regulatory methods to achieve the desired design outcomes and this is supported.</p> <p>In addition, it is noted that a purpose of the Act is to facilitate the ongoing regeneration of greater Christchurch and the definition of regeneration includes improving the environmental, economic, social and cultural wellbeing and the resilient of communities through....</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Urban renewal and development; and</li> <li>(ii) Restoration and enhancement.</li> </ul> <p>The Case family maintains that the provisions of the RNN Zone will facilitate and enable a high quality of urban design. As to this:</p>	<p>The proposed Residential Suburban Transition Zone has been reassessed and found less than ideal for this site because it does not work well with the Outline Development Plan approach. The principal alternatives are Residential Suburban and Residential New Neighbourhood. The latter is preferred because it enables a greater choice of housing typologies. A potential disadvantage is that a <i>minimum</i> net density of 15 hh/ha is required which can lead to 'cramming' unless there are design related criteria that need to be met. The RNN Zone has these criteria, but the small narrow nature of the site provides limited design and layout flexibility.</p> <p><b>Homestar &amp; Lifemark</b></p> <p>The submission is correct in terms of the decision of the IHP and reasons for it. Policy 14.1.4.8 states</p> <p>a. Promote new residential buildings that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. provide for occupants' health, changing physical needs, and life stages; and</li> <li>ii. are energy and water efficient;</li> </ul> <p>through non-regulatory methods including incentives.</p> <p>However, while requiring an expedited regeneration process, the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act, is significantly different from the RMA, which is the legislation the IHP was required to act within. Regeneration and renewal have specific meanings that give the Act a different slant, particularly around improving and enhancing.</p> <p>Without the 'exemplar' provisions it would be difficult to see how this development justifies an expedited process under the GCRA – it would simply be another development that could be processed under the RMA using normal Schedule 1 processes.</p> <p>There are pragmatic ways in which the Regeneration Plan/ District Plan can encourage best practice without affecting costs and slowing down the consenting process.</p> <p>RNN does not have an upper limit on the number of households and was introduced into the proposed District Plan primarily to provide flexibility for a variety of housing types in large greenfields areas. The purpose of the upper limit of 50 household units in the draft Regeneration Plan was to limit the number of sections a Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone would probably yield. However this number of household units may not be sufficient to deliver the required minimum density of 15 hh per hectare (net). Assuming a net area of 4 ha (ie subtracting the first flush treatment areas, the Case /Crozier block will be required to deliver 60 units (if the existing dwelling was removed and the FPMA and FMA area filled). This has the potential to cause significant adverse effects on the amenity of existing residents unless restrictions are considered. It is therefore proposed that any houses in Area 5 have a height limit of 8 metres.</p>

1170 contd		<p>(i) the rules which are contained in the Draft Plan, with the suggested amendments which follow, are suggested as providing flexibility that will better enable development to be achieved in the immediate future;</p> <p>(ii) a potential benefit of the approach taken is affordability. The Case family argues that the exemplar standards which the Council promoting in the draft Plan, whilst understandable, may put the brakes on development because of excessive cost.</p> <p>(iii) There is a compelling case for the suggested amendments which will still provide a high quality urban design but are more likely to result in an expedited development process being implemented.</p> <p>In short, it is suggested that the ability to develop quickly is a significant feature of the compelling case for re-zoning to take place.</p> <p><b>Specific amendments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Amendments suggested to enable development to take place in accordance with the subdivision and residential requirements for the RNN Zone.</li> <li>- Amendments are suggested to the ODP to enable yield to be determined by the zone requirements for the RNN Zone and following site specific investigations which are best enabled at the time of subdivision to ensure that the most appropriate scale and form of development is not unduly hindered by an arbitrary number of households having been identified.</li> <li>- Minor amendments and clarifications which are found throughout Appendix 2.</li> </ul> <p><b>Conclusion:</b></p> <p>██████████ reiterates its support for the general thrust of the draft Plan and are pleased to be able to support the regeneration of the Cranford area being an inextricable part of the Case family land and to fulfill the purpose of the Act, as noted above.</p>	
1169		<p>INTRODUCTION</p> <p>1. This feedback is made by Orion New Zealand Limited (Orion) on the Christchurch City Council Cranford Regeneration Plan (DCRP).</p> <p>STATEMENT OF INTEREST AND BACKGROUND</p> <p>2. Orion own and operate the electrical distribution network between the Waimakariri and Rakaia Rivers and supply line services to over 190,000 customers within Christchurch City and the Selwyn District. Orions core purpose is to consistently deliver a safe, secure and cost-effective supply of electricity.</p> <p>3. Broadly, the electricity network comprises underground cables, overhead lines, substations/transformers/kiosks, electricity structures (poles/pylons, earth rods and associated buildings) and access tracks. Orion is responsible for the installation, maintenance, repair and upgrade of the electricity network.</p> <p>FEEDBACK ON THE DRAFT CRANFORD REGENERATION PLAN</p> <p>4. The DRCP includes consideration of Councils water, wastewater and stormwater infrastructure which will be required to service future subdivision within the East Papanui Outline Development Plan area. The DRCP is, however, silent on other infrastructure which will be required, such as electricity distribution provided by Orion. Furthermore, Orion has not been consulted with on the DCRP.</p> <p>5. The DCRP covers ground which is known to consist of shallow peats and silts. These pose a potential hazard to infrastructure, including Orions distribution network. The DCRP acknowledges the potential effects of subsoil liquefaction. It states, however, that geotechnical issues will be addressed at the subdivision consent stage.</p> <p>6. While it is accepted that the subdivision consent stage is the appropriate time to consider such hazards, Orion has concerns in relation to impacts on the design, cost and resilience of its distribution network which will be required to service the subdivision. Geotechnical and natural hazard constraints could result in a more costly installation of electricity infrastructure, with the additional costs being borne by the developer or Orion. Furthermore, Orion has concerns on how its infrastructure would be impacted in an earthwork event, given the known peat conditions underlying the land. It is important that Orions electricity distribution network is as resilient as possible.</p> <p>7. Given the above, Orion seeks to ensure that the Christchurch District Plan contains rules or assessment matters which ensure that matters relating to installation of electricity infrastructure are considered at the time of the design phase of subdivision within the ODP area. The subdivision rules, as they relate to the Residential New Neighbourhood Zone and Residential Suburban Density Transition Zone, include the following assessment matters which are relevant to the construction of electricity infrastructure:</p> <p>8.4.4.2 Hazard constraints</p> <p>b. The extent to which any hazard or geotechnical constraints exist on the land and the appropriateness of measures to reduce risk, including liquefaction, flooding, rockfall, cliff collapse and other matters addressed in Chapter 5 (Natural Hazards).</p>	Subdivision officers will engage with Orion when assessing the subdivision consent.

1169 contd	<p>8.4.4.3 Servicing and infrastructure</p> <p>a. Whether each allotment has appropriate servicing and connections to water supply, wastewater disposal, stormwater management systems and other services; whether it is necessary to provide or upgrade services or utilities to enable the site to be serviced, and whether the design, location, capacity, type and construction of services and infrastructure, including the suitability of the proposed water supply for fire-fighting purposes, and any required infrastructure upgrades, are acceptable to the Council.</p> <p>8.5.7 Servicing</p> <p>g. Whether there is the ability for allotments to appropriately connect to an electrical supply system and a telecommunications network.</p> <p>8. Orion considers that the above assessment matters aid in ensuring that the provision of electricity within the ODP area will be appropriately considered at the time of the subdivision consent process. Orion would, however, appreciate early engagement from the Council and subdivision developers at subdivision consent stage to ensure the electricity network in the subdivision remains resilient.</p>	
1156	<p>[summary only – REFER TO FULL ORIGINAL SUBMISSION FOR DETAIL]</p> <p>2.2 [REDACTED] are fully supportive of the CBRP but would set out some suggestions which might better achieve the outcomes sought by the CBRP, both in terms of the overall goal of the plan and the ability of the Crozier/Case land to deliver those outcomes.</p> <p>...PC1 <b>BACKGROUND...</b></p> <p>3. [REDACTED] have been involved in developing parts of the land adjacent to Area 5 and have also participated in the processes initiated by PC1 to the RPS, the LURP and the new Christchurch District Plan. More recently, we have consulted with various units of the City Council regarding matters of stormwater and transport management and the best rules or controls to address the future use of the Crozier/case land. Part of the Crozier land has been acquired to facilitate stormwater management of the area. The outcome of the above history, acquisition and consultation is that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The areas of the Crozier/Case land have been acquired for stormwater management in a manner which will allow the balance land to be used for urban regeneration.</li> <li>(ii) The Crozier land (along with the Case land) is now a small anomalous area of rural land with no ability to be used for any productive rural purpose.</li> <li>(iii) That utilization of the Crozier land (in conjunction with the Case land) will support the objective of urban consolidation and give effect to the purpose of the CBRP;</li> <li>(iv) That the Crozier/Case land can be developed in a comprehensive way to achieve the outcomes of the Regeneration Plan and the relevant objectives, policies and rules of the RDP; and</li> <li>(v) Development of that land can proceed with minimum impediments in terms of transport, infrastructure and stormwater management.</li> </ul> <p>It is the submitters view that the land can be developed (Area 5) in accordance with the objectives of the CBRP.</p> <p><b>4. FUTURE ZONING</b></p> <p>[REDACTED] have consulted with the City Council as to the best zoning outcome for the land. It is the submitters understanding that the most appropriate outcome would be to replace the suggested RSDT Zone with the RNN Zone of the RDP.</p> <p>The reasons for the change in zoning have been discussed with and in part initiated by the CCC being:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The RNN Zone is focussed on a high standard built/living environment providing for a range of densities and addresses the anticipated level of development (i.e. density) in a more logical and sustainable manner.</li> <li>(ii) The Crozier/Case land can be developed jointly to better achieve that outcome given that the RNN Zone provides for a broad range of house sizes and by definition affordable housing, and as such better achieves the purpose of the CBRP; and</li> <li>(iii) That the RNN Zone provisions will better support the ODP particularly by reference to the Creating New Neighborhoods Design Guide (part of the ODP).</li> </ul> <p><b>5. AMENDMENTS TO ASSIST THE CRBP</b></p> <p>Following on from the above, a number of amendments are suggested with the purpose of improving the outcomes and better meeting the objectives of the CBRP. These are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) To replace the provisions of the RSDT with those of the RNN Zone. <i>[These amendments have been considered in consultation with the Case family and are attached to and part of the Case family submission].</i></li> <li>(ii) To replace the provisions in relation to the Homestar and Lifemark stds as referenced in the assessment matters (Rule 8.7.4(ds) with the provisions of Appendix 8.6.31 (East Papanui Outline Development Plan) and</li> </ul>	<p><b>Appropriate Zoning</b></p> <p>The proposed Residential Suburban Transition Zone has been reassessed and found wanting for this site because of the complex set of processes and rules it would create with the ODP. The principal alternatives are Residential Suburban and Residential New Neighbourhood. The latter is preferred because it enable a greater choice of housing typologies. A potential disadvantage is that a <i>minimum</i> net density of 15 hh/ha is required which can lead to ‘cramming’ unless there are design related criteria that need to be met. The RNN Zone has these, but the small narrow nature of the site provides limited design and layout flexibility. Implications of this are discussed below regarding a limit on the number of households.</p> <p>The submission is correct in terms of the decision of the IHP and reasons for it. However, while requiring an expedited regeneration process, the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act, is significantly different from the RMA, which is the legislation the IHP was required to act within. Regeneration and renewal have specific meanings that give the Act a different slant, particularly around improving and enhancing.</p> <p>Without these provisions it would be difficult to see how this development justifies an expedited process under the GCRA – it would simply be another development that could be processed using normal Schedule 1 processes under the RMA.</p> <p>RNN does not have an upper limit on development and was introduced to the proposed District Plan primarily to provide flexibility for a variety of housing types in large greenfields areas.</p> <p>The purpose of the upper limit of 50 household units in the draft Plan was to maintain to openness of the site. However this figure may not be sufficient to deliver the required minimum density of 15 hh per hectare (net). Assuming a net area of 4 ha (ie taking account of the first flush treatment areas, the Case Crozier block will be required to deliver 60 units (if the existing dwelling was removed and the FMA and FPMA filled). This has the potential to cause adverse effects on the amenity of existing residents unless restrictions are considered. It is therefore proposed that any houses in Area 5 have a height limit of 8 metres.</p> <p>The zoning map and ODP boundaries will be amended to insert the correct boundaries.</p>

1156 contd		<p>in particular clauses 8.6.31A (Context) B (Guidance) C (Development Form and Design) and D (Development Requirements)</p> <p>(iii) Amend Planning Map 25 to identify the Crozier/Case land as RNN Zone, and</p> <p>(iv) To amend the zoning map to reflect the final boundaries of the Crozier land subsequent to purchase the 10m strip for the bund by the Council from the Crozier property (see planning map attached).</p> <p>In any event ██████████ support the purpose and outcomes sought by the CBRP and are committed to deliver an outcome IN ASSOCIATION WITH THE Case land which will ensure a diversity of housing typologies and affordability.</p> <p><b>ATTACHMENT 1 – PLANNING MAP 25</b></p>	
1155	support the plan	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>██████████</p> <p>The parties strongly support the identification of Areas 1-4 as Greenfield Priority Areas in Map A of the RPS and the associated 'ODP' (subject to minor amendments) and rezoning to Residential New Neighbourhood Zone that is to be included in the District Plan. In summary it is considered that there is no valid environmental, social or economic reasoning for excluding this land from the Greenfield Priority Areas and that regardless of the density of development that might be achieved, the use of this land for urban purposes represents a more efficient and sustainable use of the land resource, is consistent with the policy framework of the RPS, is entirely appropriate in terms of achieving a consolidated urban form, is able to be efficiently serviced, and most crucially provides land for residential development in a central location in close proximity to a Key Activity Centre in a manner that will assist with both the Christchurch earthquake recovery and the regeneration of the Cranford area.</p> <p><b>Background</b> [refer to original submission]</p> <p><b>Relief sought:</b></p> <p>The parties support and seek that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The land shown as Areas 1-4 be identified on Map A of Chapter 6 of the RPS as Greenfield Priority Areas;</li> <li>2) The land shown as Areas 1-4 be rezoned in the District Plan to Residential New Neighbourhood Zone;</li> <li>3) The ODP proposed in the District Plan be adopted, subject to minor amendments discussed below;</li> <li>4) The proposed District Plan rule package be adopted, subject to several amendments discussed below.</li> </ol> <p><b>Reasoning and information</b></p> <p>[Note this is summarized – please refer to full original submission]</p> <p><b>Urban form</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Will support the strategic aim of Objective 6.2.2 of the CRPS for an urban form that achieves urban consolidation and intensification of urban areas. This is to be achieved by intensifying, in particular residential development in and around KACS which are the focal points for services, employment, social interaction and transport.</li> <li>- Proximity to local schools</li> <li>- Well serviced by public transport.</li> <li>- The Grassmere Street site is located in a more strategic position within close proximity to the Central City and with access to major transport routes than any other Greenfield Priority Area identified on Map A of the RPS. The proximity to an established KAC with existing commercial and community facilities and services also makes it a very sustainable option for growth when compared with other locations.</li> </ul> <p><b>Cranford Basin designation</b></p> <p>The City Council and NZTA have both confirmed designations for much of the Cranford Basin. The parties' land borders but is outside of these designations and will therefore be left as an isolated island of rural land if not identified as a Greenfield Priority Area.</p> <p><b>Transportation</b></p> <p>Grassmere Street is a local road carrying approximately 1400 vehicles per day. It has good access to the surrounding road network including directly onto the Main North Road (opposite Northlands) or to the west and south via Grants Road to Papanui Road. Meanwhile Cranford Street provides direct access to the City Centre. This existing road network could accommodate the additional development while the ODP should bring a number of localised transport benefits in terms of improved connectivity in this part of the community. Grassmere Street has footpaths along both</p>	<p><b>Neighbourhood Park</b></p> <p>It is noted that springs have unique values that are not necessarily consistent with the values of a Neighbourhood Park.</p> <p>The location and siting of the new neighbourhood park was carefully chosen, and meets the needs of the community and city. Its location, outlook, water-table/drainage and street frontage were all strong factors.</p> <p>The Council does not wish to accept land for parks which has significant physical limitations, unsuitable shape and size or in unsuitable locations, purely because developers encounter challenges with lot layout. The submitters statement is not supported that ... "Given the inability to develop around the springs it would be more efficient to amend the ODP so as to co-locate the park with the area with the highest concentration of springs..."</p> <p><b>Outline Development Plan and Springs</b></p> <p>The roads shown on the ODP are marked as indicative to provide the flexibility to amend road alignment. This flexibility can be used to address required setback from springs etc.</p> <p><b>Upper Limit on number of households.</b></p> <p>The Council considers that an upper limit can be justified as part of the balance of enabling a variety of housing typologies (including residential medium density), recognizing the variable and mostly challenging ground conditions (the precise nature which will become known in more detail at the subdivision consent stage) and the potential effects of development on the local road network, which is one of the major concerns raised in submissions.</p> <p>Traffic modelling indicates that traffic volumes associated with households significantly above the 370 mark are likely to trigger a change on Grants Road from 'local' road to 'collector road, with consequential increases in functions and improvements eg cycle lanes, and intersection improvements at Papanui Road. As traffic volumes increase there will also be more potential conflict with the cycle way along Grassmere Street.</p> <p>Calculating an appropriate number of households that will eventuate from this development is difficult to predict until the detailed subdivision design stage, but particular regard has been had to the estimated net area available for development after removing areas to be excluded for geotechnical reasons and stormwater basins.</p> <p>Policy 6.3.7 (3) requires a net density of 15 hh/ha averaged across the ODP area. This equates to at least 500 hh for the Grassmere block. However, in terms of net density (taking out geotechnically constrained areas and stormwater basins (approx. 16 ha) the CRPS requirement is 255hh. Any development in the RMD and "constrained" area is a 'bonus' in terms of the RPS.</p> <p>The point about flexibility is acknowledged. This has been provided for by removing the 30hh/ha minimum from Area 2 thus allowing more flexible housing and density mix. There is also flexibility in how the constrained areas could be developed</p> <p>The preferred configuration will therefore be: Areas 1 and 2 around 240 hh assuming land is set aside for existing dwellings; 105 hh for around the current camping ground area; and 70 - 120 households approximately for the constrained area. Depending on the results of detailed engineering and subdivision design, the final yield could be anywhere up to the 425 households limit.</p> <p>The planning provisions will need to consider how to ensure the future residential development rights of the Top Ten Holiday Park are protected, preserved, and provision made for higher net density to take into account the potential 105 households.</p> <p>The approach taken is to limit the number of households for Areas 1, 2 and 3 to 320 households, recognising the additional potential of Area 4. In the longer term, development of Area 4 will have a lesser effect on Grassmere Street and Grants Road so that, in effect, the overall impact on these roads will be the same or less than for the 370 households provided for in the Draft plan.</p> <p><b>Joint subdivision and land use consents</b></p> <p>Council's experience in securing the exemplar design outcomes through separate subdivision and land use processes has been problematic. Once subdivision consent is obtained and sections sold, securing well designed neighborhoods and housing diversity is difficult, resulting in poor urban outcomes.</p>

<p>1155 contd</p>	<p>sides (formed section) to a point some 260m south east of Main North Road while beyond this is a single footpath linked to Grants Road.</p> <p>Development of the Grassmere Street area would allow for the upgrading of Grassmere Street itself south of Grants Road. This would not only provide access to the development but also significantly improve pedestrian access to and from the Rutland Reserve and Paparoa Street School and enable improved pedestrian access between Grassmere Street and Rutland Street alongside the cycle access currently being developed.</p> <p><b>Landscape</b> The landscape character of the area taken as a whole is as much dominated by residential activity, including a very large retirement complex, urban parks and urban traffic as it is by rural activity. What rural activity exists in the immediate vicinity of the area has increasingly limited productive potential due to the encroachment of urban uses and the impact of stormwater. Further, in the future, as discussed above, this land will be developed for roading and stormwater purposes.</p> <p>Development of this area could be designed to maintain a level of landscape amenity equal to, or better than, the existing moderate level of rural amenity. Further, the communities surrounding the area have limited access to open space with some reserves (ie Rutland) not having particularly good access for the immediate surrounding community. There is also a significant lack of connectivity within the area, all of which could be enhanced by the proposed development.</p> <p><b>Ground Conditions</b> Both the parties and the Council have commissioned ground condition reports. What is apparent from these reports is that development of the area is clearly possible, but that there may be higher costs involved. In this regard it is no worse, and indeed in some cases it is better, than other Greenfield Priority Areas.</p> <p><b>Amendments sought</b> [refer to original submission] - Amendments sought to <b>density and housing number cap</b> to address apparently inconsistency</p> <p>A solution to the internal inconsistency established in the rule framework would be to increase the overall cap, given the site's excellent location and proximity to services. An alternative solution would be to retain the cap and provide some flexibility with the minimum density required to be achieved across all of Areas 1-4, noting the constraints imposed by the retention of existing good quality low density houses, the presence of springs and the need to avoid development near these, and the RPS recognition that the standard 15 hh/ha may not be able to be achieved in all greenfield areas where site-specific constraints are present.</p> <p>- <b>Joint subdivision and land use consenting requirement</b></p> <p>There is a proposed requirement for subdivision and landuse consents to be processed together (rule 8.5.1.3) i.e. developers will have to design the subdivision and the buildings concurrently. This is fundamentally different to standard Residential New Neighbourhood subdivisions (outside of medium density/ comprehensive areas) where the land developer creates the roads, infrastructure, and lots and then on-sells to house building companies. The proposed co-consenting requirement significantly limits future development/ sell-down options as the future developer/ purchaser has to be willing to design both the subdivision and the subsequent dwellings. In Christchurch there is a very shallow pool of companies that do both, and therefore the proposed rule presents a considerable impediment to the timely regeneration of the area.</p> <p>The parties have been unable to find any corresponding rule in the residential chapter that requires landuse consent i.e. it's unclear what you actually need landuse consent for. The proposed subdivision rule references the need for future development to comply with the built form standards in Rules 14.12.2.1-17, however this numbering is not a built form standard and does not relate to any standard RNN zone provisions.</p> <p>More fundamentally the parties do not consider there to be any clear rationale as to the need to process both subdivision and landuse together and in particular why this block needs to be differentiated from all the other Residential New Neighbourhood zones. The only other site where there is a joint subdivision and landuse approach is the Spreydon lodge block in Halswell where this approach was driven by the land developer who wanted to control both aspects. At most any co-consenting should be limited to the medium density Areas 1 and 2 although even here a more efficient and effective solution would be to simply identify larger lots at subdivision and then require development of these larger lots to be subject to a future landuse consent to ensure acceptable design outcomes are achieved.</p> <p>- <b>Springs and waterways</b> No earthworks, building, and subdivision development, fencing or paving is to occur within 30m of an existing spring or 10m of a watercourse (8.6.31D.6(a)). 30m circles from the springs have been imposed on the ODP below.</p> <p>The 30m circles take in indicative roads shown on the ODP. This means that future subdivision cannot be both in accordance with the ODP and remain 30m away from springs. Either the proposed road alignment shown on the ODP needs to be modified, or the subdivision rules need to be amended to enable roading within 30m of springs (noting that such works require consent through the restricted discretionary subdivision rule, thereby enabling appropriate conditions to be in place).</p>	<p>It has resulted in small single unit houses crowded onto small sections, leaving little room for private open space, and little variance in housing typologies. Council officers have carefully examined the options and have concluded that, for the Grassmere Block, a joint approach is more likely to deliver exemplar, high quality design outcomes. Furthermore the Grassmere block is a geotechnically complex site and a comprehensive approach to development is not only desirable but required.</p> <p>Provided that developers work collaboratively with Council officers the consenting process should be as, if not more efficient. If there are additional costs, these need to be weighed up against the benefits of the expedited planning process that the Council has undertaken.</p> <p>With a collaborative approach between landowners and between developers and the Council, there is no reason why the joint consenting approach should not be quicker and more cost effective in the long run.</p> <p><b>Homestar &amp; Lifemark</b> The submission is correct in terms of the decision of the IHP and reasons for it. However, while requiring an expedited regeneration process, the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act, is significantly different from the RMA, which is the legislation the IHP was required to act within. Regeneration and renewal have specific meanings that give the Act a different slant, particularly around improving and enhancing.</p> <p>Without these Homestar and Lifemark provisions it would be more difficult to see how this development justifies an expedited process under the GCRA – it would simply be another development that could be processed using normal Schedule 1 processes under the RMA. The Council will not be requiring detailed building plans as part of the resource consent process but rather an indication that the Homestar &amp; Lifemark standards will be applied at the building consent stage.</p> <p>Nor is the Council requiring a standard higher than the building code. What is being required is a level of certification from the New Zealand Building Council to be submitted with the resource consent.</p>
-----------------------	---	--

1155 contd	<p>Clause (d) of rule 8.6.31D requires waterways to be naturalised as part of subdivision development. It is unclear how waterways are to be naturalised if earthworks adjacent to them are prevented. The rules therefore need amending to enable earthworks where necessary for naturalisation.</p> <p>- <b>Neighbourhood Park</b> A new neighbourhood park of 3-4,000m<sup>2</sup> is required (8.6.31D.3(b)). This is shown in the ODP. Given the inability to develop around the springs it would be more efficient to amend the ODP so as to co-locate the park with the area with the highest concentration of springs e.g. the cluster of springs in the Area 4 block between Areas 1 and 2. There should still be room to locate playground equipment etc in an attractive setting where the springs are an amenity asset as currently occurs in long-established neighbourhood parks in several suburbs along the base of the Port Hills. This location is a little less central, however it is only 150m south of the proposed location/ 1 minute walk so the material change in usability is minimal.</p> <p>- <b>Greenstar and Lifemark requirements</b> The matters of discretion include whether proposed dwellings will achieve Lifemark 3 as a minimum standard, and Homestar 6 as a minimum standard. Lifemark is focused on the internal design of dwellings being suitable for people with mobility impairments. Homestar has more of a focus on energy and water efficiency/ sustainable design. Both are valid voluntary tools if housebuilders see value in such certification. They are not however appropriate as a District Plan requirement. This is particularly the case where in order to achieve those standards a very detailed design of dwellings is required e.g the height of light switches, the type of door handles, height of bench tops etc.</p> <p>The Council looked to include these requirements in the recent District Plan Review process. By the time these matters progressed to hearing the Council was unable to find any planners who were willing to support such provisions in evidence. These provisions were heavily criticised by the Independent Hearings Panel as being counter to recovery outcomes and largely unworkable as District Plan rules. Given that the inclusion of such provisions was carefully considered and comprehensively rejected by an experienced and independent hearings panel, it is surprising that they are proposed in the Regeneration Plan when they were found to be directly contrary to recovery outcomes in IHP Decisions 10 and 17. It is therefore considered that these requirements should be removed as being counter to Regeneration and more importantly unworkable within a District Plan compliance and consenting framework.</p> <p><b>Conclusion</b></p> <p>The ability to erect houses in this central, well serviced location, can make a useful contribution towards the recovery of Christchurch and the regeneration of the Cranford area.</p> <p>The urbanisation of this Grassmere/Cranford Street site is logical from an urban form perspective in that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it is more akin to consolidation rather than urban expansion;</li> <li>• it meets the intent of the objectives and policies associated with the RPS;</li> <li>• is an efficient and effective method of promoting urban growth.</li> </ul> <p>The area's proximity to the Central City and a major KAC with all the associated services would mean reduced travel distances, enhanced walking and cycling opportunities and convenience compared with other locations. Further, the area has access to a wide range of recreation, social and community facilities and sits in a prime location to take advantage of the existing public transport system, rather than having to extend that system.</p> <p>It also has the potential to improve community interaction and connectivity in this part of the City. The issues surrounding flooding, soil conditions and infrastructure are able to be resolved. Finally, without the proposed rezoning the site is likely to become isolated as a rural area due to roading and stormwater proposals.</p> <p>In conclusion, it is also worth noting the following paragraphs from the Commissioners decision on PC1 which said:</p> <p><i>"The outcome of allowing the Cranford Basin development against that background would be to convert what is at present virtually a waste area with little or no productive future at the centre of the northern part of the city interrupting connectivity and affecting consolidation, into a potentially desirable locality close to the city centre. It appears physically capable of development at a cost in a way that will mitigate very beneficially the current stormwater management problems that exist for over 1100 hectares of area of the northern part of the city. It would be quite wrong in our view to not allow development given that setting. That requires therefore that the Cranford Basin come within the Urban Limits."<sup>1</sup></i></p> <p><i><u><b>Ironically when one takes into account the overall approach in Greater Christchurch taken by the Regional Council and the City and District Councils to the importance of maximising the utilisation of built infrastructure, one could not envisage a clearer example than having a necessary major infrastructure upgrade utilised to service a significant additional area of land immediately adjacent. The same point can be made in terms of both the inefficiency of use of the present major road passing through this area, and the efficiencies related to the very costly roading upgrades about to be undertaken again either in or immediately nearby the Basin area. That very</b></u></i></p>
------------	--

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 647 of PC 1 Decision

1155 contd		<p><u>principle of consolidation to achieve efficiency of use of built infrastructure has been repetitively and vigorously urged upon us in an overall context by the regional and territorial authorities. But at Cranford Basin this principle appears to have been overlooked.</u>[emphasis added]  <i>In summary then for all those reasons we have included the Cranford Basin within the Urban Limits, subject to specific provisions in new Policy 12, an ODP, and residential density expectations.”<sup>2</sup></i></p> <p>In conclusion parties are willing to meet with the Council's Regeneration Plan team to discuss these comments further and are able to provide more detailed information if so required.</p> <p><b>Appendix 1 – Cranford Basin – Timeline for Grassmere Street Residents participation in Cranford Basin Rezoning</b></p>	
1154	support the plan	<p>I support the plan.</p> <p>████████████████████</p> <p>████████████████████</p> <p>My submission is consistent and additional to that.</p> <p>1. Density</p> <p>The plan is internally inconsistent in its present form. It has a maximum of 370 units on █████ 33 hectares yet requires, area by area, densities to be met that are in excess of this. My preference is for the maximum (370) to be retained, but for flexibility within the designated areas.</p> <p>2. Rooding</p> <p>The plan requires a maximum of 4 indicative local roads onto Grassmere St. I suggest that be reduced to three by the removal of the most northerly of those on Grassmere St. With direct property access (Max. 16m width) for those properties fronting Grassmere St. and the balance being serviced from the Shearer Ave extension I see no need for that in the plan.</p> <p>3. Greenfield Land</p> <p>The plan suggests there is no shortage of greenfield land in the city. That maybe the case but much of it is subject to developer delays (eg Highfield) and will not be coming to market any time soon. Conversely █████ land is adjacent to all major infrastructural services including ultra fast broadband and is within 100 metres of a KAC in Northlands.</p> <p>4. Wasteland</p> <p>When I first moved █████ it was a lovely rural area with some horticulture, cropping and animals. It is now a wasteland surrounded on three sides by residential properties. No longer can we farm the land, attract contractors to the area, run livestock (sheep) for fear of mauling, and we are exposed to all the reverse sensitivities that go with growing urbanisation around us. Not to mention the additional costs of maintaining the land for no return, and the added CCC imposition of Residential rates on Rural land.</p> <p>5. Timing</p> <p>The plan comments that if this opportunity is not taken it might be 2025 or 2030, or even longer before the land can be further developed. We have been going down this path with the Council for 15 years now. Another 10 to 15 years would be incomprehensible and intolerable.</p> <p>6. Opportunity</p> <p>With the Northern Arterial and Stormwater requirements now resolved, we have a golden opportunity for a measured and balanced resolution to this land - an ideal mixture of increased urbanisation on the land suitable for that, and on the unsuitable land, a multi-purpose forested wetland with enhanced waterways and passive recreation areas that will benefit ecosystems and the surrounding community.</p> <p>7. Exciting.</p>	<p><b>Density</b></p> <p>The intent of the cap is to strike a balance between being consistent with the policy of encouraging residential development near the Key Activity Centre, minimising effects on the local road network and ground conditions, and making efficient use of the land. The 370 figure for the Grassmere block was derived from transport modelling and met in the draft Plan by applying very conservative assumptions around yields and has been reviewed. The potential yield from development of the ODP area would be closer to 530 applying the net density definition to its full potential, which includes a 10 ha RMD overlay at a minimum of 30 hh/ha.</p> <p>In view of the traffic modelling and local concerns around traffic safety and congestion, officers consider that a) a cap on households is necessary because there is no upper limit under the RNN zone and a potential of over 530 households would create very significant traffic adverse effects; and b) the cap should not be much in excess in the general vicinity of 370 as notified.</p> <p>The minimum number of households required to comply with the District Plan is approximately 255 (which excludes the RNN constrained). It is difficult to estimate the yield of the RNN constrained land but it could be somewhere between 80 - 100. These figures generate a total yield of 370, but do not provide for any development at RMD densities.</p> <p>In view of the potential conflict between the proposed cap and requirements of the District Plan and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, and to make the Plan workable, a more flexible approach is necessary which will increase the upper limit. The preferred approach is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace the RMD in Area 2 with RNN. This reduces the required minimum density to 15hh/ha or approximately 70 households, instead of the current 140. Assuming that some medium density will be provided, the likely yield is likely to be around 100.</li> <li>- Retain the RMD overlay for Area 1 but recognise that the existing two houses can retain 2000m<sup>2</sup> sections. This leaves 4.7 Ha yielding 140hh minimum.</li> <li>- Area 3, mainly occupied by the Top 10 Holiday Park has the long term potential of yielding 105 hh minimum.</li> <li>- Assuming 30 per cent of Area 4 cannot be developed because of springs and other geotechnical issues, Area 4 is likely to yield up to 80 hh assuming 10 hh/ha over the net 8ha.</li> </ul> <p>This adds up to 320 hh in the foreseeable future with a potential of a further 105 when or if the camping ground gets developed. Because this area has direct access options to Cranford and Meadow Streets, the traffic impact of development of Area 3 on the Grassmere and Grants Road area is likely to be less than that from Areas 1, 2 and 4.</p> <p>Taking these matters into account, and the points made in the submission, the cap for areas 1, 2 and 4 will be set at 320, with provision for a further 105 households on Area 3 in the ODP.</p> <p><b>2. Rooding</b></p> <p>In the transport evidence presented to the hearings panel for the District Plan, the transport expert for Council stated that he considered such road connections as illustrated on the ODP necessary in order to minimise network impacts and provide good accessibility. All analysis has been modelled on the basis of the roading network as proposed. The removal of the northern Grassmere access as suggested is likely to result in poorer outcomes for access to and from the ODP area.</p>
1153	do not support the plan	<p>████████████████████</p> <p>No provision for the 4 laning of Cranford St from Main North Rd all the way to Bealey Ave plus no provision for the extension of Grassmere St to Rutland St so that homeowners in the major Residential Development block can have left turns into a feeder street to say Innes Rd on their way to the CBD etc</p> <p>Right turning off the Indicative collector road in to Cranford St will be dangerous with increased traffic volumes especially facing the existing commercial area access</p>	<p>The current proposals for the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) involve making changes to Cranford Street, providing four traffic lanes as far south as its intersection with Innes Road.</p> <p>However, Council acknowledge that the proposals for the CNC will result in greater volumes of traffic being on Cranford Street to the south of Innes Road, and some further changes to the road network will be necessary. As a result, a condition was placed on consent granted for the CNC that required Council to employ an "Independent Expert" to assess the impacts of the CNC on the road network at the southern end of the route, and recommend a series of improvements to the road network (known as The " Downstream Effects Management Plan") which would seek to address any issues. These changes would be funded by CCC.</p>

<sup>2</sup> Paragraphs 657 and 658 of PC 1 Decision

1153 contd			<p>The "Independent Expert" has been appointed, and some preliminary traffic modelling work has been undertaken. However, this has been temporarily put "on hold" while a decision is made on whether a third southbound lane will be added to the Waimakariri River bridge (which could have some effect on traffic flows on Cranford Street). Once these deliberations are complete, work on the "Downstream Effects Management Plan" can continue, and a critical part of this process will be a community engagement/consultation process.</p> <p>The intersection of Cranford Street and the ODP collector road will be suitably designed to safely accommodate right turns out of the ODP area.</p>
1152	support the plan		Noted
1115	support the plan	<p>1. I think it is a positive thing to offer land for new residential development within the urban area, close to a major activity centre (Papanui &amp; Northlands) and also close to transport links including cycleways.</p> <p>2. I'm also happy to see the concept for the wetland areas, which will be a great and accessible natural space.</p>	Noted
1108	support the plan	<p>I support the rezoning, however, suggest some of the rules require amendment with regard to maximum dwelling numbers, in summary:</p> <p><b>Relief Sought</b></p> <p>The parties support and seek that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The land shown as Areas 1-4 be identified on Map A of Chapter 6 of the RPS as Greenfield Priority Areas;</li> <li>2) The land shown as Areas 1-4 be rezoned in the District Plan to Residential New Neighbourhood Zone;</li> <li>3) The ODP proposed in the District Plan be adopted, subject to minor amendments discussed below;</li> <li>4) The proposed District Plan rule package be adopted, subject to several amendments discussed below.</li> </ol> <p><b>Amendments sought to the proposed Regeneration Plan</b></p> <p>Whilst being very supportive of the overall intent and direction of the proposed Regeneration Plan for the reasons set out above, the parties do have several concerns with the detail of the proposed District Plan provisions. These concerns are set out below:</p> <p><b>Density and housing number cap</b></p> <p>The proposed Plan sets the following approach to managing density:</p> <p>Grassmere St block = 33 ha. Croziers Rd block = 4.7 ha;</p> <p>Total yield is limited to 420 households (8.6.31D.2(e)) across all blocks. This limit appears to be transport-related;</p> <p>Croziers Rd/ Area 5 is limited to a maximum of 50 households (just over 10hh/ ha) clause (d); This leaves 370 households for Grassmere Areas 1-4;</p> <p>Requirement that Areas 1 &amp; 2 achieve 30hh/ha (clause a). Areas 1 and 2 are approximately 12.5ha in size so are required to deliver 375 units. Note this rule requirement is not a minimum density but rather an exact 30/ha.</p> <p>Requirement that Area 3 achieves 15/ha (clause b). Area 3 is approximately 7 hectares and therefore must deliver 105 households. Again this is not a minimum density, but rather an exact 15hh/ha .</p> <p>Areas 1 and 2 are the priority development areas and as such Areas 3 and 4 cannot be of a scale and intensity that would preclude the ability to develop Areas 1 and 2 to the minimum 30/ha required within the overall 420 household cap (8.6.31D.8(a)).</p> <p>So some 375 households must go into Area 1 and 2, leaving no household allocation for the remaining 23 ha of Areas 3 and 4.</p> <p>The proposed rule package therefore appears to be internally inconsistent whereby any comprehensive subdivision application for the area will either exceed the 420 household cap; or alternatively will comply with the overall cap but in so doing will not hit the required area-specific densities in Areas 1-4. The parties are comfortable with the principle of Areas 1 and 2 being identified for medium density housing, given their close proximity to the Northlands KAC. A solution to the internal inconsistency established in the rule framework would be to increase the overall cap, given the sites excellent location and proximity to services. An alternative solution would be to retain the cap and provide some flexibility with the minimum density required to be achieved across all of Areas 1-4, noting the constraints imposed by the retention of existing good quality low density houses, the presence of springs and the need to avoid</p>	<p><b>Refer also to response to submission # 1155</b></p> <p><b>Density and Housing</b></p> <p>The intent of the cap is to strike a balance between being consistent with the policy of encouraging residential development near the KAC, mimimising effects on the local road network and ground conditions, and making efficient use of the land. The 370 figure for the Grassmere block was derived from transport modelling and met in the draft Plan by applying very conservative assumptions around yields and has been reviewed. The potential yield from development of the ODP area would be closer to 530 applying the net density definition to its full potential, which includes a 10 ha RMD overlay at a minimum of 30 hh/ha.</p> <p>In view of the traffic modelling and local concerns around traffic safety and congestion, officers consider that a) a cap on households is necessary because there is no upper limit under the RNN zone and a potential of over 530 households would create very significant traffic adverse effects; and b) the cap should not be much in excess in the general vicinity of 370 as notified.</p> <p>The minimum number of households required to comply with the District Plan is approximately 255 (which excludes the RNN constrained). It is difficult to estimate the yield of the RNN constrained land but it could be somewhere between 80-100. These figures generate a total yield of 370, but do not provide for any development at RMD densities.</p> <p>In view of the potential conflict between the proposed cap and requirements of the District Plan and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, and to make the Plan workable, a more flexible approach is necessary which will increase the upper limit. The preferred approach is as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Replace the RMD in Area 2 with RNN. This reduces the required minimum density to 15hh/ha or approximately 70 households, instead of the current 140. Assuming that some medium density will be provided, the likely yield is likely to be around 100.</li> <li>- Retain the RMD overlay for Area 1 but recognise that the existing two houses can retain 2000m2 sections. This leaves 4.7 Ha yielding 140hh minimum.</li> <li>- Area 3, mainly occupied by the Top 10 Holiday Park has the long term potential of yielding 105 hh minimum.</li> <li>- Assuming 30 per cent of Area 4 cannot be developed because of springs and other geotechnical issues, Area 4 is likely to yield up to 80 hh assuming 10 hh/ha over the net 8ha.</li> </ul> <p>This adds up to 320 hh in the foreseeable future with a potential of a further 105 when or if the camping ground gets developed. Because this area has direct access options to Cranford and Meadow Streets, the traffic impact of development of Area 3 on the Grassmere and Grants Road area is likely to be less than that from Areas 1, 2 and 4.</p> <p>Taking these matters into account, and the points made in the submission, the cap for areas 1, 2 and 4 will be set at 320, with provision for a further 105 households on Area 3 in the ODP.</p> <p><b>Joint Subdivision and land use consenting requirement</b></p> <p>Council's experience in securing the exemplar design outcomes through separate subdivision and land use processes has been problematic. Once subdivision consent is obtained and sections sold, securing well designed neighborhoods and housing diversity is difficult, resulting in poor urban outcomes.</p> <p>It has resulted in small single unit houses crowed onto small sections, leaving little room for private open space, and little variance in housing typologies. Council officers have carefully examined the options and have concluded that, for the Grassmere Block, a joint approach is more likely to deliver exemplar, high quality design outcomes. Furthermore the Grassmere block is a geotechnically complex site and a comprehensive approach to development is not only desirable but required.</p> <p>Provided that developers work collaboratively with Council officers the consenting process should be as, if not more efficient. If there are additional costs these need to be weighed up against the benefits of the expedited planning process that the Council has undertaken.</p>



1108 contd		<p>development near these, and the RPS recognition that the standard 15 hh/ha may not be able to be achieved in all greenfield areas where site-specific constraints are present.</p> <p><b>Joint Subdivision and land use consenting requirement</b> There is a proposed requirement for subdivision and land use consents to be processed together (rule 8.5.1.3) i.e. developers will have to design the subdivision and the buildings concurrently. This is fundamentally different to standard Residential New Neighbourhood subdivisions (outside of medium density/ comprehensive areas) where the land developer creates the roads, infrastructure, and lots and then on-sells to house building companies. The proposed co-consenting requirement significantly limits future development/ sell-down options as the future developer/ purchaser has to be willing to design both the subdivision and the subsequent dwellings. In Christchurch there is a very shallow pool of companies that do both, and therefore the proposed rule presents a considerable impediment to the timely regeneration of the area.</p> <p>The parties have been unable to find any corresponding rule in the residential chapter that requires land use consent i.e. it's unclear what you actually need land use consent for. The proposed subdivision rule references the need for future development to comply with the built form standards in Rules 14.12.2.1-17, however this numbering is not a built form standard and does not relate to any standard RNN zone provisions.</p> <p>More fundamentally the parties do not consider there to be any clear rationale as to the need to process both subdivision and land use together and in particular why this block needs to be differentiated from all the other Residential New Neighbourhood zones. The only other site where there is a joint subdivision and land use approach is the Spreydon lodge block in Halswell where this approach was driven by the land developer who wanted to control both aspects. At most any co-consenting should be limited to the medium density Areas 1 and 2 although even here a more efficient and effective solution would be to simply identify larger lots at subdivision and then require development of these larger lots to be subject to a future land use consent to ensure acceptable design outcomes are achieved.</p> <p><b>Springs and waterways</b> No earthworks, building, and subdivision development, fencing or paving is to occur within 30m of an existing spring or 10m of a watercourse (8.6.31D.6(a)). 30m circles from the springs have been imposed on the ODP below.</p> <p>The 30m circles take in indicative roads shown on the ODP. This means that future subdivision cannot be both in accordance with the ODP and remain 30m away from springs. Either the proposed road alignment shown on the ODP needs to be modified, or the subdivision rules need to be amended to enable roading within 30m of springs (noting that such works require consent through the restricted discretionary subdivision rule, thereby enabling appropriate conditions to be in place).</p> <p>Clause (d) of rule 8.6.31D requires waterways to be naturalised as part of subdivision development. It is unclear how waterways are to be naturalised if earthworks adjacent to them are prevented. The rules therefore need amending to enable earthworks where necessary for naturalization.</p> <p>A new neighbourhood park of 3-4,000m<sup>2</sup> is required (8.6.31D.3(b)). This is shown in the ODP. Given the inability to develop around the springs it would be more efficient to amend the ODP so as to co-locate the park with the area with the highest concentration of springs e.g. the cluster of springs in the Area 4 block between Areas 1 and 2. There should still be room to locate playground equipment etc in an attractive setting where the springs are an amenity asset as currently occurs in long-established neighbourhood parks in several suburbs along the base of the Port Hills. This location is a little less central, however it is only 150m south of the proposed location/ 1 minute walk so the material change in usability is minimal.</p> <p><b>Green Star and Lifemark requirements</b> The matters of discretion include whether proposed dwellings will achieve Lifemark 3 as a minimum standard, and Homestar 6 as a minimum standard. Lifemark is focused on the internal design of dwellings being suitable for people with mobility impairments. Homestar has more of a focus on energy and water efficiency/ sustainable design. Both are valid voluntary tools if housebuilders see value in such certification. They are not however appropriate as a District Plan requirement. This is particularly the case where in order to achieve those standards a very detailed design of dwellings is required e.g. the height of light switches, the type of door handles, height of bench tops etc.</p> <p>The Council looked to include these requirements in the recent District Plan Review process. By the time these matters progressed to hearing the Council was unable to find any planners who were willing to support such provisions in evidence. These provisions were heavily criticized by the Independent Hearings Panel as being counter to recovery outcomes and largely unworkable as District Plan rules. Given that the inclusion of such provisions was carefully considered and comprehensively rejected by an experienced and independent hearings panel, it is surprising that they are proposed in the Regeneration Plan when they were found to be directly contrary to recovery outcomes in IHP Decisions 10 and 17. It is therefore considered that these requirements should be removed as being counter to Regeneration and more importantly unworkable within a District Plan compliance and consenting framework.</p>	<p>With a collaborative approach between landowners and between developers and the Council, there is no reason why the joint consenting approach should not be quicker and more cost effective in the long run.</p> <p><b>Springs and waterways</b> The roads shown on the ODP are marked as indicative to provide the flexibility to amend road alignment. This flexibility can be used to address required setback from springs etc.</p> <p><b>Parks</b> It is noted that springs have unique values that are not necessarily consistent with the values of a Neighbourhood Park. The location and siting of the new neighbourhood park was carefully planned, and will meet the needs of the community in this area. Its location, outlook, water-table/drainage and street frontage are all strong factors in its favour.</p> <p>As with all development proposals/sites, if challenges are encountered with lot layout, this is not a reason to swap with park land. Council does not wish to accept land for parks which has significant physical limitations, or is of unsuitable shape and size or in unsuitable locations.</p> <p>The submitters statement is not supported that ... "Given the inability to develop around the springs it would be more efficient to amend the ODP so as to co-locate the park with the area with the highest concentration of springs..."</p> <p><b>Home Star and Lifemark requirements</b> The submission is correct in terms of the decision of the IHP and reasons for it. However, while requiring an expedited regeneration process, the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Act, is significantly different from the RMA, which is the legislation the IHP was required to act within. Regeneration and renewal have specific meanings that give the Act a different slant, particularly around improving and enhancing. Without these Homestar and Lifemark provisions, it would be more difficult to see how this development justifies an expedited process under the GCRA – it would simply be another development that could be processed using normal Schedule 1 processes under the RMA. The Council will not be requiring detailed building plans as part of the resource consent process but rather an indication that the Homestar &amp; Lifemark standards will be applied at the building consent stage.</p>
1089	do not support the plan	- The CDHB does not agree that challenges with the ground conditions can be addressed with careful management at the time of development as the Plan asserts.	The Christchurch District Plan has a comprehensive rules package which is specifically designed to manage the effects of land use and subdivision activities, including risks from flooding. The rules contained within the District

1089 contd		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The CDHB note from the Geotechnical Hydrological and Stormwater technical expert evidence that there are potential issues with the underlying ground conditions within Cranford basin.</li> <li>- Flooding in the Flockton Basin in recent years has highlighted the impact that inadequate stormwater management can have. Flooding can lead to water damaged property and insanitary housing conditions and also increase the risk of pathogen contaminated water and water borne disease likelihood. It is unclear from the expert evidence whether the flooding in the Cranford Basin can be effectively mitigated.</li> <li>- The proposal appears inconsistent with the CRDP Objective 3.3.6 which related to natural hazards. The evidence suggests that rezoning the entire area (western portion) proposed for residential rezoning is not appropriate and that site by site investigations will still be required for each dwelling.</li> <li>- The CDHB supports the concerns raised by ECAN in the Summary of Views of Section 29 parties 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. They also 'seek assurance that exacerbation of flood hazard will be avoided'.</li> <li>- The Cranford Basin Rezoning review of Geotechnical, Hydrology and Stormwater document as attached to the application recommend that further work is required to determine the suitability of the land for residential purposes. The CDHB is concerned that residential development in the area as outlined in the proposal may not sufficiently mitigate against the negative health impacts on purchasing and surrounding residents. Therefore CDHB does not support the existing proposal as it stands.</li> </ul>	<p>Plan, are significantly more stringent than those of previous plans under which the surrounding area was rezoned and developed.</p> <p>Additional rules are also proposed within the East Papanui Outline Development Plan "narrative" (refer to Appendix 2 of the Draft Cranford Regeneration Plan document, dated 30 March 2017). It is proposed that land use and subdivision activities are a restricted discretionary activity in Areas 1 - 4, therefore the Council will be able to decline any application that fails to demonstrate how these requirements will be met (principally by the engineering design).</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, technical assessments undertaken to date, advise that there are effective and feasible engineering solutions to support development of the land development and address flood management issues. Further and more detailed information and supporting assessments can be found under the Draft Supporting Document for the Draft Cranford Regeneration Plan, dated March 2017.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geotechnical Report on Proposed 12.5-hectare Residential Subdivision, Grants Road, Papanui, Bell Geoconsulting Ltd [BGL] (April 2013)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Spring Identification, PDP (September 2013)</li> <li>• Desktop Geotechnical Review 340 Cranford Street, St Albans, Elliot Sinclair and Partners Ltd (April 2015)</li> <li>• Geotechnical Report for proposed Plan change,,340 Cranford St and 60 Croziers road, St Albans, Elliot Sinclair and Partners (June 2015)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Geotechnical Desktop Report GHD (February 2015)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Geotechnical Investigation Report GHD (September 2015)</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Rezoning –Preliminary Geotechnical Assessment Beca 22 December 2016</li> <li>• Cranford Basin Rezoning-Review of Geotechnical, Hydrogeology and Stormwater Evidence, Beca (8 September 2016)</li> <li>• Spring Identification and Groundwater Management for potential rezoning at the Grassmere Block, Final, prepared for the Christchurch City Council, Beca 22 December 2016.</li> </ul> <p>The above reports acknowledge the occurrence of historical subsidence in the proposed development area and surrounding neighbourhoods, and the risk to infrastructure during seismic events. The former has been generally accepted as part of the environment and, while not without cost to property owners, does not present serious property damage issues. The latter is a risk, but as with many other parts of the developing city, this risk can be mitigated (but not necessarily completely avoided), through ground treatment methods.</p> <p>Staff at the CHDB are more comfortable with the Plan following a meeting on 19 May during which more detail was provided on flood mitigation.</p>
1087		<p>In regards to re zoning our property, would the necessary infrastructure i.e. Sewer main etc be put in place to support the change?</p> <p>And what impact would it have changing from rural to anything else?</p> <p>We are also concerned with the extra demands on the Cranford basin and surrounding stormwater infrastructure with the re zoning of surrounding land for housing development.</p>	<p>Trunk sewer, water supply and drainage system capacity would need to be in place before rezoning. Wastewater, water supply and stormwater infrastructure all have capacity within their respective networks to service the proposed development.</p> <p>At a broad level, the character of the area will change and there is likely to be additional traffic. Detailed design of the ODP roading network and its interface with existing roads has yet to be undertaken.</p> <p>The Cranford Basin storage function has been planned, taking into account the existing catchment. The Northern Arterial Extension and provision for flood relief for Flockton Basin. Basin capacity is sufficient that the basin will not spill onto the surrounding land in a 50 year average recurrence interval storm, taking into account the Council's estimate of climate change rainfall increase. Basin capacity includes a safety margin which could accommodate a larger storm or other eventualities such as future zoning changes.</p>
1086	do not support the plan	<p>We do not support the plan due to the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the area was originally zoned rural for the main reason being the land was suitable for this and not housing due to the type of soil in the area, we are concerned at the potential future problems with the land as are very aware of the problems already in the neighbourhood with land type</li> <li>- an area around Papanui Road/Northlands Mall has recently been rezoned to accommodate higher density residential housing and allows for any further development in the area so not sure why there is requirement for further zoning change when this has only recently occurred</li> <li>- the local school is not designed to cater for the extra amount of children that the new proposed housing would provide for, with the amount of housing proposed this would put further extreme pressure on the school with future rolls, resources, facilities etc and this has not been planned for or taken into account</li> <li>- the new cycleway going down Grassmere Street would become very dangerous due to the increased traffic(cars, trucks and bikes), this cycleway has been designed and implemented at a large cost to allow for people to utilize safely, if more traffic come through or over the cycleway this will put people off using this new facility and particularly make it dangerous for children</li> <li>- the City has a large amount of vacant space and land to develop and needs to have housing developed in the Four</li> </ul>	<p><b>Suitability of land for housing</b></p> <p>The Christchurch District Plan has within it a number of rules that are specifically designed to manage the effects of land use and subdivision activities, including risks from flooding. The rules contained within the District Plan, are significantly more stringent than those of previous plans under which the surrounding area was rezoned and developed. Additional rules and guidance are also proposed for the District Plan as set out within the East Papanui Outline Development Plan narrative (refer to Appendix 2 of the Draft Cranford Regeneration Plan document, dated 30 March 2017).</p> <p>It is proposed that land use and subdivision activities within Areas 1- 4 are a restricted discretionary activity, therefore the Council will be able to decline any application that fails to demonstrate how these requirements will be meet (principally by the engineering design).</p> <p><b>Schools</b></p> <p>Paparoa and Papanui Primary schools are supportive of the Plan.</p> <p>Papanui Primary School's submission of the Board of Trustees considers that the development would contribute to the school maintaining a steady roll and that the development would not impact on the school roll significantly. This is because both Papanui and Paparoa could be the destination schools, depending on the location of the particular household</p>

1086 contd		<p>aves to ensure we as Christchurch City become a proper liveable city; not further in the suburbs as this will provide further competition to what the city is trying to achieve, we already have plenty of urban sprawl and if we want a city with thriving business this has to have people living in the core of the city. With the East frame trying to be developed currently this type of proposed development will only make the job hard for the CBD and Chch city as a whole.</p> <p>- the traffic access to the site is a concern, with Grassmere Street being narrowed at the Main North Road intersection to allow the cycleway to be implemented and with Grants Road being a slower road with number of children on bikes and walking and the Ngaio Marsh rest home with elderly residents about and currently this is the only access to the proposed development this will cause a major traffic problem in and out of the area - I do not see why we are creating this problem when we have just built a major cycleway and trying to get people away from cars</p> <p>- the development of the site would provide the local mall with further demand and further traffic around the Northlands Mall, again this will take business away from the CBD and make it harder for business to survive in the city, which is already difficult for many business owners, we have a number of large malls in Chch, many more per head of population than most cities, this type of development will only increase the job of Chch CBD to once again become an exciting and progressive CBD.</p>	<p>MOE has been consulted and has not raised any issues with the proposal. MOE has not indicated what pupil yield the development may have, but based on other subdivisions in the City, it would likely be in the vicinity of 180 students (years 0-8). It is noted that there are 2 state primary schools (Papanui Primary and Paparua Primary) along with 2 state-integrated primary schools (Christchurch Adventist and St Josephs) in close proximity to the proposed housing area.</p> <p><b>New cycleway on Grassmere Road</b> The modelled scenarios that include either the signalling of Grassmere/Main North Road or restricting some permitted turning movements at that intersection suggest that traffic volumes along Grassmere Street in the section immediately to the south of Main North Road would increase to no more than 700-1100 vehicles per day, which is a volume that might be expected for local roads. The most significant traffic increases on Grassmere Street would occur for the short section between the ODP collector Road and Grants road. The estimated volume of traffic on this short section of the whole route is unlikely to create significant safety issues or discourage the use of the cycleway facility.</p> <p>Some widening of Grassmere Street on the North-east side will be required in the future to create a separation strip between vehicle access points to private residences and the Cycle route, to ensure adequate visibility. It is intended that the land required for widening be secured by condition of subdivision consent.</p> <p><b>Appropriate location for housing</b> It is not agreed that development of this area represents urban sprawl, since it is entirely surrounded by urban development. It would also seem unrealistic to postpone any further development in an area that contributes to a consolidated urban form until other areas are developed.</p> <p><b>Traffic access</b> The Outline Development Plan identifies several points of vehicle access to the site. In accordance with road design parameters as set out in the District Plan, Grassmere Street has been narrowed from 14m (which can accommodate traffic associated with a minor arterial route) to 8 metres at its narrowest point, which is a suitable width for a local road that accommodates two-way traffic with on-street parking provided along one side.</p> <p><b>Economic impact on the central city</b> The Central City has a different and wider role than the district centres like Northlands. It is considered that it will benefit from additional residential development close to the central city, together with its offer of cultural, social, recreational and commercial opportunities. There is no evidence to suggest that the Central City would suffer as a result of an additional 420 houses in this location.</p> <p>Further, future residents may be relocating from various areas of the City and from outside of the City and therefore these residents would not be diverting existing trade from the Central City to suburban locations.</p> <p>It is a Strategic Objective of the Christchurch District Plan and the Regional Policy Statement to encourage more intensive residential development within and around Key Activity Centres such as Northlands due to very good accessibility by foot, cycle and public transport to a range of shops, services and transport linkages. The proposal is therefore consistent with these objectives.</p>
1085	support the plan		Noted
1084	support the plan		Noted
1081	support the plan	<p>I am all for this plan to go ahead.</p> <p>Having had family live on Grassmere Street I have seen so much development go on around this street except on the eastern side of Grassmere Street. This land held up extremely well during the earthquakes/floods and I've found it strange that this land has not been developed earlier.</p> <p>With the cycle networks going in and the close proximity to so many schools and facilities this land is perfect for rezoning residential. With the City centre slowing coming back to life we are seeing good demand for housing back close to the CBD. (Easy access directly into town on my electric bike on the new cycle way!) There's no piece of land quite like it available for housing so close to the city centre.</p> <p>It will provide so many families great opportunities. I hope we see this land rezoned in the near future.</p>	Noted
1079	support the plan	<p>Having lived on [REDACTED] for a number of years I think that the planned proposal for this land would be hugely beneficial to the local area.</p> <p>Although the housing market is slowing down in CHCH this is mainly due to the large amount of spec homes being built from investors or building companies on the large subdivisions on the outskirts of CHCH. There is still good demand for land close to the CBD and this would provide a great opportunity for many young families wanting to provide a new home for their family so close to many schools and facilities.</p>	Noted

1079 contd		<p>With the city centre slowing becoming active again, we are starting to see people looking for housing back close to the city centre. There is no piece of land so close to the CBD like this is CHCH and it would be crazy not to rezone this land for residential purposes for future use.</p> <p>Having a young family myself i know of many people who would be interested in building in this fantastic location in Christchurch and look forward to hopefully having this opportunity one day.</p>	
1078	support the plan	<p>My family have lived on this street for almost 30 years. In that time it has changed from a notably rural area to an up and coming suburb of Christchurch. I use to horse ride in the paddocks where Ngaio Marsh now stands. My husband and I have just returned to Christchurch with our young daughter after ten years away. I see this area as being ideally situated for young families with easy access to the city and good schools. It would be a shame to see such good land continue to remain vacant and under utilised when it is so central. I whole heartedly support the plan - aside from the roading proposals which need to be reassessed.</p>	Noted
1065	support the plan	<p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>[REDACTED]</p> <p>It is a very different Street and environment today with all surrounding land now residential including a Big Rest Home with associated Villas; substantial cycleway just completed linking us to the CBD; Key Activity centre (Northland shopping centre with two Supermarkets) just a five minute walk away and all other amenities residential areas have.</p> <p>Our home which is piled, suffered little damage in the two Christchurch Earthquakes proving with properly designed Groundworks and Foundations, it is ground which can be safely built on.</p> <p>This is a unique opportunity to develop the last few acres in this special pocket of central land for residential housing. Please support the Final Stage of all the work done by the Christchurch City Council Staff and us, a group of adjacent neighbours who are all working together trying to change the zoning and face of my Street and area. We totally support this Regeneration plan and with ongoing discussion and work, particularly around suggested Roading in the redevelopment and suggested Housing designs and numbers across the total area feel that by working together, we can re-design an area, which is currently waste land; into a fantastic residential area with public open spaces which we can all feel immensely proud of.</p>	Noted
1027	do not support the plan	<p>We purchased our first family home (as a lot of families have on our street) as it was quiet, had a park, large sections and had a dead end. It is a safe street. Children are able to go to the park by themselves without parents needing to worry about being run over.</p> <p>Your proposal is to open the end of the street which is unnecessary. The road that is being planned to join to ours can stop short of our street without having any major impact on your plan. (You could put a walkway there instead and encourage people to walk and bike to the mall), now that's thinking!!</p> <p>There is the proposed collector road going through the middle and another local road which both exit out onto Grassmere Street and there is no benefit to having Shearer Ave opened up as the traffic will end up on the same road (Main Nth Rd). The traffic there is already so busy and if there is another set of lights going in at Grassmere St then it will become even more backed up.</p> <p>Please reassess your proposal and put yourselves in our position.</p>	<p>There are advantages and disadvantages of this proposal for Shearer Avenue residents.</p> <p>As a connecting road to the East Papanui ODP area, traffic volumes may increase along Shearer Avenue. However detailed traffic analysis shows that with the ODP collector road that connects Cranford Street to Grassmere Street, the traffic volume changes on Shearer Avenue would be of a minor nature. On the other hand there will be greater connectivity for Shearer Avenue residents to Cranford Street and towards the CBD.</p>
1025	support the plan	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit on the Cranford Regeneration Plan. We have lived in [REDACTED] [REDACTED] When we came the area was rural. There were horses grazing over the road where Ngaio Marsh now stands. Trucks and machinery could easily access the site and contractors came every year and cut the hay. These days' trucks and trailers cannot access the street without driving over the footpath or on the wrong side of the road.</p> <p>The country lane has become a very busy street as service vehicles come and go to Ngai Marsh and the many new families in the street go about their busy lives. Fiber Optic Cable has been installed and we are fortunate to be right on the city's new cycle network for quick access to the city by bicycle. Grassmere street is no longer rural and while we acknowledge that the land must be developed carefully and within its obvious constraints it is important that we maximize the infrastructure to the area by allowing people to live here.</p> <p>We built our house 20 years ago, it had very little damage in the earthquake, peat doesn't liquefy and the foundations have held firm. We have raised our family here with Northlands just down the road, buses, schools and services all within a short walk. Getting to this point in the planning process has been a long journey for local residents, please support the final stage so that the last few acres of land in Grassmere street can be made available for residential use.</p>	Noted
1015	do not support the plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The flood plain is for water drainage not building on.</li> <li>2. More houses means more pressure on local infrastructure and lowers the quality of life of people.</li> <li>3. The New road project through the basin already disrupts water flows and takes a large area of drain.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area proposed to be rezoned for residential use is elevated above the 50 year average recurrence interval flood level, which is the national standard for protecting land against inundation. Building floor levels would be required to be higher than that (above 200 year levels) under the District Plan. Because of existing ground levels, the areas proposed for housing do not have an important flood control function.</li> </ol> <p>Building on organic rich soils including peat is regarded as a technical challenge. However, there are methods including engineering practice to manage effects primarily that of settlement and potential liquefaction, can be designed against. Piles are only one potential solution to building on this type of ground. Other potential</p>

1015 contd			<p>solutions include surcharging the ground with additional fill to reduce secondary settlement and consolidate the organic rich sediments.</p> <p>The conclusions from the geotechnical investigations are that some housing is feasible and marketable in this location.</p> <p>2. There is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that, other than traffic, that wastewater, water supply and stormwater infrastructure all have capacity within their respective networks to service the proposed development. There is no evidence to suggest that there would be any significant decrease in the quality of life for local people.</p> <p>3. The Cranford Basin storage function has been planned taking into account the existing catchment, the Northern Arterial Extension and provision for flood relief for Flockton Basin. Basin capacity is sufficient that the basin will not spill onto the surrounding land in a 50 year average recurrence interval storm, taking into account the Council's estimate of climate change rainfall increase. Basin capacity includes a safety margin which could accommodate a larger storm or other eventualities such as future zoning changes.</p>
1008	do not support the plan	<p>I do not support the part of the plan that includes housing on my northern boundary. I bought my property in [REDACTED] because of its rural outlook, and do not want to lose this. The value of my property will drop with the addition of infill housing.</p> <p>I also note that the schematic vision map allows only for strategic and local cycle way; pedestrian route as the extension to the north of Croziers Road. This will preclude vehicular access to the proposed housing development. Traffic on the northern arterial extension will add to the congestion at the McFaddens Rd/Cranford St intersection, so this would need to be traffic light controlled.</p>	<p><b>Rural outlook/property values</b> There will be a change to the rural outlook, but house owners cannot expect owners of rural property, where there is a sound case for development, to forego benefits to provide amenity for and sustain the land values of others. To minimise the effects of this change, a development requirement proposed will restrict the height of buildings to 8m.</p> <p><b>Transport</b> Vehicle access to the Croziers Block will be from Croziers Road</p> <p>The intersection of McFaddens Road/Cranford Street is to be restricted to a left-in-left-out arrangement as part of the Christchurch Northern Corridor project. This will result in a detour of 400m in order to undertake a right turn movement onto Cranford Street. The signaled intersection of Cranford Street/Innes Road is to be upgraded with signal phasing, arranged to provide safe turning opportunities for all traffic movements including across Cranford Street from McFadden's.</p>
1000	support the plan	<p>I represent the owner of a property on Cranford Street close to the area of the Regeneration Plan and fully support it. It has been well thought out and will provide</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A significant recreational area of in excess of 80 hectares with walkways and forest proposed</li> <li>2. Flood management benefits for the local area and city</li> <li>3. Better utilization of the rural land by zoning a significant area for residential housing. In addition to the obvious benefits of increased housing the rezoning will benefit the Northlands/Papanui commercial area along with the Cranford Business Park and other business adjacent to it by creating an increased customer base.</li> </ol> <p>Furthermore I cannot see how the residential rezoning will have a detrimental effect on the Central City Regeneration as recently reported in the Christchurch Press. Homeowners looking to live in the suburbs are looking for a different environment and lifestyle to those seeking inner city living.</p> <p>The plan should proceed as proposed and without delay.</p>	Noted
956	do not support the plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 If house are built in this area it could add to traffic congestion (which is already a problem)</li> <li>2 the previous use of market gardens means there could be soil contamination when the land is disturbed.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Transport</b> The Transport Assessment undertaken identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Avenue will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some extent. However, it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Northern Arterial Route, the volume increases associated with development of the ODP area and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads.</p> <p>The long-term likely increases in traffic along local roads are likely to be greatest along Grants Road with the estimated future traffic volumes for this road changing it from a local road to a lower volume collector road in function.</p> <p>By 2031 estimated traffic volumes along Grants Road will be similar to those that are currently found on Phillipotts Road, Tomes Road and Rutland Street.</p> <p>These effects are estimated to be marginally reduced if a lower density residential development is implemented</p> <p><b>Soil contamination</b> All development of sites known or suspected to be contaminated is subject to the requirements of the National Environment Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health. This ensures that land affected by contaminants in soil is appropriately identified and assessed before it is developed and if necessary the land is remediated of contaminants to make the land safe for human use. This assessment is required at the time of subdivision consent.</p>
955	do not support the plan	My main concern is that the amount of Traffic coming onto already congested Road. If this issue was addressed properly then it would be O.K.	The Transport Assessment undertaken identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Avenue will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some extent. However it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Northern Arterial Route,

955 contd		Like the open spaces Planned	<p>the volume increases associated with development of the ODP area and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads.</p> <p>The long-term estimated increases in traffic along local roads are likely to be most acute along Grants Road with the estimated traffic volumes for this road being similar to those typically found on the lower volume collector roads of today. By 2031, estimated traffic volumes along Grants Road can be compared to those that are currently found on Phillipotts Road, Tomes Road and Rutland Street.</p> <p>These effects are estimated to be marginally reduced if a lower density residential development is implemented.</p>
869	do not support the plan	Underlying land geography doesn't appear conducive to residential redevelopment. Would be supportive of low impact / land usage regeneration (recreation) rather than residential.	A network of shared cycle/pedestrian paths (on drainage land) is proposed throughout the site.
814	support the plan	<p>I appreciate the cycle ways. I particularly enjoy cycling through the Rutland St Park (though the path is a little narrow) and along to Grassmere St with the open area there. The path will be quite shady if houses are built right next to it; could become icy.</p> <p>Also I see that housing is planned in the areas North (or Northwest) of my property. I have appreciated the open space along that boundary. I am concerned that houses built the minimum required distance from the boundary will cause considerable shade over a large portion of my section. Personally I do not want housed there but as the housing is likely to proceed I request that there be an increased distance from the boundary that buildings may be erected. Maybe an access way could be over my fence then the houses.</p> <p>I understand that there will be lights for pedestrians &amp; cyclists to cross Cranford St at McFaddens Road. This is really important.</p> <p>I think the potential urban area should remain rural. We need to be cautious &amp; not build on unsuitable land needed for water run-off. Also to learn from what happened at Kaiapoi along the Courtney Drive Subdivision.</p>	<p>The District Plan contains recession plane and height rules as well as setbacks from streets which will minimise the shading effects of new houses.</p> <p>To minimise the effects of development in Area 5 on the adjoining residential area, a maximum height limit of 8m is proposed.</p> <p>Leaving the land as rural at the present time is appropriate until more detailed geotechnical work is undertaken to determine what level of housing intensity is sustainable. The findings may conclude that a very low density form of development is the best option.</p>
798	do not support the plan	<p>That land is the home of many pukeko.</p> <p>Impact on uptake of central city housing developments.</p> <p>Ability for stormwater local streams and infrastructure to handle the development</p>	<p><b>Pukeko</b> The proposed new wetland and forest areas will provide significant benefits for wildlife by creation of quality habitat. Council adopts a 6 values multi-benefits approach to waterway design and management which includes consideration of biodiversity values. This will support quality planting and good connections through the area, so will be of benefit to local wildlife.</p> <p><b>Central City housing</b> Council has a range of policy objectives with regards to the provision of housing. The overriding objective for the future growth of Christchurch is to reduce the amount of development going into areas at the edge of the urban area and consolidate and intensify growth within the existing urban area (for example Objectives 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement). An important part of these objectives is to encourage development near key centres such as Northlands/Papanui, as well as the central city and older inner suburbs. The area being proposed for housing is consistent with these objectives. Council is of the view that those looking to live in the suburbs are a different market sector and looking for a different environment and lifestyle to those seeking inner city living.</p> <p>Otākaro Limited is now satisfied that the proposed housing around the outskirts of the Cranford Basin would not adversely affect the take-up of residential land in the East Frame.</p> <p><b>Stormwater infrastructure capacity</b> Stormwater effects from the proposed new residential development will be contained and treated within the development area before discharge to Council land adjoining the ODP area. This will not aggravate any flooding issues within the surrounding waterway network, subject to attenuation of stormwater on-site..</p> <p>The Cranford Basin storage function has been planned taking into account the existing catchment and the Northern Arterial Extension and provision for flood relief for Flockton Basin. Basin capacity is adequate to ensure that the basin will not spill onto the surrounding land in a 50 year average recurrence interval storm, taking into account our estimate of climate change rainfall increase. Basin capacity includes a safety margin, which could accommodate a larger storm or other eventualities such as future zoning changes.</p>
796	support the plan	<p>Q1 There is a line of poplars currently bordering the waterway adjacent to the Papanui School heading through to Cranford St, can you please tell us what will happen to these? They effectively will be your South border of the residential development block.</p> <p>Q2 What will happen to the trees bordering the West boundary of Cranford St? Behind this will be your open space and stormwater management area.</p> <p>Q3 Will there be access to get onto the Northern arterial road from the Cranford St area heading North?</p>	<p><b>Trees</b> Consideration will be given to the future of existing trees at the stage of subdivision. They will be assessed in terms of their health, whether they will create shading issues, and whether they fit within any overall planting scheme, including for the proposed wetland. None of these trees are scheduled for protection in the District Plan.</p> <p><b>Access</b> The consented Northern Arterial Route provides for access from the Cranford Street area via a new collector road.</p>
786	support the plan	<p>Forested stormwater basement and Walkways need to be prioritized at the start and not let as an afterthought (ie the 10 years suggested)</p> <p>Commercial Area; on Cranford Street need safe access &amp; egress thoughts. The collector road comes in here. Traffic lights or other??</p> <p>Rutland Reserve, and other green space areas should not be built on.</p>	<p><b>Timing</b> Work has already started with trialling certain species, but realistically, the walkways and forested areas cannot be developed until after the ponding basins have been constructed. The pace of the forest/recreation work over the next five years will have to be put in the mix with other Council expenditure priorities.</p>

786 contd		<p>Noise Barriers need considering at the Cranford St/CNC interchange. Mitigation or noise will improve useability of wetlands walkways.</p> <p>Generally I support developments. Close to the city of densification (eg. Papanui Subdivision, Eastern frame) But do not support Satellite cities; such as Rolleston, Pegasus etc.</p> <p>These cause traffic issues and make public transport less feasible as the city expands at a rapid pace. We need people to live close to the city center.</p>	<p><b>Cranford Street junction</b> The Cranford Street/ ODP collector road intersection is to be upgraded to signals, or a roundabout, once the average delay for right turning vehicles from the collector road onto Cranford Street during peak hour exceeds 35 seconds. 'Peak hour' is defined as those hours between 3pm and 7pm on a weekday.</p> <p><b>Parks</b> There are no plans to build on existing parks, such as Shearer Park and Rutland Reserve. These two parks, in addition to a new proposed Neighbourhood park, are proposed to be incorporated into the Regeneration Plan.</p> <p><b>Noise barriers</b> This comment relates to the Christchurch Northern Corridor project which has already been separately considered. It is unlikely however that acoustic attenuation eg noise barriers, will be provided for passive recreation activities because the benefits would probably not exceed the costs. Noise barriers are usually only used for protecting residential buildings and their occupants..</p>
785	support the plan	<p>1 Get on with it!</p> <p>2 Make sure the Papanui stream walkway is linked to this area and Rutland Reserve and Lewisham Reserves are linked.</p> <p>3 Ensure large, deciduous trees; Poplars/Oak are planted on edges and corners of proposed Basin to provide vertical scale, landmarks and colour (there are some great Poplars already in area)</p>	<p>A network of shared cycle/pedestrian paths (on drainage land) is proposed, which is very likely to link up with existing greenspace.</p> <p>A planting plan is likely to be prepared as part of detailed planning for the Basin and is likely to be consulted on. That would be the appropriate time to raise this issue again</p>
784	do not support the plan	<p>We do NOT support development of Cranford Basin for reasons:</p> <p>1) Congestion. There is already too much traffic in this area. Partly due to the increasing development to the North i.e. Rangiora etc/Northwood etc as well as the increasing encroachment of the Northlands commercial area e.g. Mitre 10 Mega there is increased vehicular movement with resultant safety issues for cyclists &amp; pedestrians.</p> <p>2 Lack of green area in the Papanui Northlands area. Having lived in this area since 1990 we have noticed decreasing green space with little other than Erica Reserve to use as park areas. Increased high density housing/infill has worsened the recreational accessibility to this.</p>	<p>1. The Transport Assessment undertaken identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Avenue will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some extent. However the assessment notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Northern Arterial Route, the volume increases associated with the ODP and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads.</p> <p>The long-term estimated increases in traffic along local roads are likely to be most acute along Grants Road with the estimated traffic volumes for this road typically being similar those found on the lower volume collector roads of today. By 2031, estimated traffic volumes along Grants Road would be comparable with those that are currently found on Phillipotts Road, Tomes Road and Rutland Street.</p> <p>These effects are estimated to be marginally reduced if a lower density residential development is implemented.</p> <p>2. There are no plans to build on existing parks, such as Shearer Park and Rutland Reserve. These two parks, in addition to a new proposed neighbourhood park, is proposed to be incorporated into the Regeneration Plan for future and adjacent residents to use. Shared cycle/pedestrian paths (on drainage land) will also be provided between parks, streets and adjacent areas.</p>
778	support the plan	<p>* Love the native planting - especially if the plants are genetically related to Riccarton Bush.</p> <p>*Love the catchment areas for water and overfill from the Dudley Creek.</p> <p>*Believe it will be OK to build where you have outlined IF the rest of the area is reserved for wetlands.</p> <p>*Our part of McFaddens Road still floods too much-so am hopeful the new overflows will take some of the excess.</p>	<p>These comments relate mostly to the stormwater management facility planned for east of Cranford Street which is starting to get underway with trial planting.</p> <p>McFaddens Road drainage is not expected to be affected by the proposed rezoning or any other work. No new overflows are planned, other than storm flow bypasses in the lower Dudley Creek to the east of Hills Road, which will not advantage McFaddens Road. McFaddens Road may drain slowly or poorly due to a flat gradient or stormwater inlets blocked by leaves. The submitter is encouraged to bring these problems to the attention of the CCC Customer Call Centre ph 941 8999.</p>
776	support the plan		Noted
775	support the plan		Noted
774	support the plan		Noted
773	support the plan	<p>All looks very good on paper but I do have concern of four lanes of traffic blending into 2 lanes at Innes Road.</p> <p>Water ponds being so close to housing.</p>	<p>The current proposals for the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) involve making changes to Cranford Street, providing four traffic lanes as far south as its intersection with Innes Road.</p> <p>However, Council acknowledge that the proposals for the CNC will result in greater volumes of traffic being on Cranford Street to the south of Innes Road, and some further changes to the road network will be necessary. As a result, a condition was placed on consent granted for the CNC that required Council to employ an "Independent Expert" to assess the impacts of the CNC on the road network at the southern end of the route, and recommend a series of improvements to the road network (known as The " Downstream Effects Management Plan"), which would seek to address any issues. These changes would be funded by CCC.</p> <p>The "Independent Expert" has been appointed, and some preliminary traffic modelling work has been undertaken. However, this has been temporarily put "on hold" while a decision is made on whether a third southbound lane will be added to the Waimakariri River bridge (which could have some effect on traffic flows on Cranford Street). Once this decision is made, work on the "Downstream Effects Management Plan" can continue, and a critical part of this process will be a community engagement/consultation process.</p>

773 contd			<p>A dedicated signaled pedestrian/cycle crossing of Cranford Street just to the north of its intersection with McFaddens Road is included within the CNC consented plans. The changes to the road network required by the Downstream Effects Management Plan will be undertaken, when necessary, to coincide with the opening of the CNC.</p> <p>It is not clear what the concern is about water ponds being so close to housing. Flood risks, mosquitos etc have been addressed for other submissions.</p>
771	support the plan		Noted
1196	do not support the plan	<p>In my position as Chair of the Board of Trustees for Papanui Adventist School, we are concerned that this Residential Development's associated collector road has the potential to create a "cut through" traffic pathway from Cranford Street to Papanui Road that would go right past our school. Obviously this concerns us on a number of different levels.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Grants Road has already been narrowed to slow traffic around the school. Any further traffic load would make Grants Road a bottleneck</li> <li>• As we are an area school and have small children in the area, any increase in traffic would increase the risk to our pupils.</li> </ul> <p>For these reasons we do not support the Residential Development as indicated in the plan.</p>	<p>The Transport Assessment undertaken identifies that projected increases in traffic particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Avenue will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some extent. However, it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Northern Arterial Route, the volume increases associated with the ODP and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads.</p> <p>The ODP collector road will attract vehicles through the site and through the local road network. However this is balanced against the benefits of lower peak direction travel times on Main North Road which supports public transport services. A through route also places less pressure on Shearer Avenue and offers higher accessibility to the road network to and from the surrounding area. The through road could include future traffic calming measures to create a balance between the wider network advantages listed above with the need to manage the level of rat running and its impacts on these local streets.</p> <p>There are traffic management options to maintain safety for school children eg school travel plans, traffic calming, and these will be considered on an on-going basis as traffic gradually increases along Grants Road.</p>
1197	Do not support the plan	<p>Contacting you this time in my capacity as a resident at [REDACTED] I have 2 concerns, obviously from a personal level the street we live in will become a through road, greatly increasing the traffic flow. Having 3 children this is obviously a concern.</p> <p>Secondly the "Black Map" of 1856 shows this area as Swamp, Raupo and Tussock making me very sceptical as to the commercial viability of true level of engineering required to make any structures built in this area to be earthquake resilient.</p>	<p>As a connecting road to the East Papanui ODP area, traffic volumes may increase along Shearer Avenue. However, with the through road included in the ODP that connects Cranford Street to Grassmere Street, this is likely to take most of the increases in traffic and the traffic volume changes on Shearer Avenue are predicted to be minor.</p> <p>Building on organic rich soils including peat is technically challenging. It can however be done with standard engineering practice and the effects, primarily that of settlement and potential liquefaction can be designed against. Piles are only one potential solution to building on this type of ground. Others possible solution include surcharging the ground with additional fill to reduce secondary settlement and consolidate the organic rich sediments.</p> <p>Waimairi Peaty Loam is considered to have a low bearing strength, commonly due to wetness, which may result in soil compaction. Modification adds significantly to land development costs. However, as evidenced by the demand for housing on similar soils in the vicinity (eg Grassmere Street and Lewisham Crescent) there is a market in this area for housing and the market appears to be able to bear these increased land development costs.</p>
1227	Not specified	<p><b>Introduction</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Board wishes to note that this submission is based on limited feedback from the community. This is because the plan is currently out for consultation and the Board will receive feedback in due course from the consultation.</li> <li>2. The Board recognises that the land is well located for houses because of its proximity to a Key Activity Centre (Papanui/Northlands), public transport links, main roads and services infrastructure. However it is important to ensure that the developments do not have negative effects on the soil and natural conditions in the local area. In addition, future-proof planning must be undertaken to ensure that there are no adverse effects on local traffic.</li> <li>3. In summary the Board considers that the plan contains some positive community aspects however there is potential for negative impact related to some aspects of the development.</li> </ol> <p><b>Submission details</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The Board submits that the title of the plan could be misleading to some citizens as the wetlands area and the housing development projects could be confused. The Board notes that the use of the word 'basin' is misleading as it is the 'rim' that is being proposed for development, not the basin.</li> <li>2. The hydro-geology of the area is of concern to the Board. The land contains complex areas with some parts very challenging to build upon which has been identified by the experts.</li> <li>3. Drainage and in particular storm water outflow are of concern to the Board specifically due to cultural considerations of the outflow into Horseshoe Lake.</li> <li>4. The impact of 350 additional houses in the area could result in an increase in traffic volume of up to 700 vehicles. This is of further concern given the development of the northern corridor and the increased volume of traffic moving into and through the vicinity of the planned development area around Cranford Street. The Board would like to see further detailed analysis of the impact of this increase on traffic flow.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Regeneration Plan title</b></p> <p>At the early stages of plan development it was becoming apparent through public reaction to media reports that people thought the Council was promoting development in the Basin proper, where the proposed stormwater management area is. The Plan seeks to make it clear that the proposed housing development area is outside of the Basin.</p> <p>The entire area is being brought into the urban area (as defined in the Regional Policy Statement) for the purposes of integrated resource management and regeneration. Although the changes to the District Plan being sought relate to facilitating urban development, the area being regenerated is both the Cranford Basin and its immediate surrounds.</p> <p><b>Land conditions</b></p> <p>Building on organic rich soils including peat is regarded as a technical challenge. However, there are methods including engineering practice to manage effects, primarily that of settlement for liquefiable sediments. Piles are only one potential solution to building on this type of ground. Others include surcharging the ground with additional fill to reduce secondary settlement and consolidate the organic rich sediments. Costs are potentially higher than standard foundation design.</p> <p>The conclusions from the geotechnical investigations are that some housing is feasible and marketable in this location.</p> <p><b>Cultural considerations</b></p> <p>Council officers are in contact with Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga who are opposed to stormwater discharges from Cranford entering Horseshoe Lake, and are aware of the concerns and of the cultural significance of that water body.</p> <p><b>Traffic</b></p> <p>The Transport Assessments undertaken identify that projected increases in traffic, particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Avenue, will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity. However, it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Northern Arterial Route, the volume</p>



1227 contd		<p>5. The Board is concerned about the increase in Opex costs created as a result of this development and in particular the increased costs related to managing and maintaining the roads within the area of the plan. The Board also has Opex concerns around the future potential for the need for more pumps.</p> <p>6. The Board would also like to raise concerns about whether or not schools in the area have sufficient capacity to cater for the increased number of children living in this area. Consultation with the Ministry of Education is strongly recommended.</p>	<p>increases associated with the ODP and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads.</p> <p>The long-term estimated increases in traffic along local roads are likely to be most acute along Grants Road with the estimated traffic volumes for this road being similar to the lower volume collector roads of today. By 2031, estimated traffic volumes along Grants road can be compared to those that are currently found on roads such as Phillpotts Road, Tomes Road and Rutland Street.</p> <p>These effects are estimated to be only marginally reduced further where a residential development that accords with a lower density development is implemented.</p> <p><b>OPEX Costs</b> It is possible that the Opex costs, in this area eg for kerb and channel could be higher due to gradual subsidence. However, these costs would not be of such magnitude, compared to many other parts of Christchurch, that they would justify no development in the area.</p> <p><b>Schools</b> MOE has been consulted and has not raised any issues with the proposal.</p> <p>Paparoa and Papanui Primary schools are supportive of the Plan.</p> <p>Papanui Primary School's submission of the Board of Trustees considers that the development would contribute to the school maintaining a steady roll and that the development would not impact on the school roll significantly as both Papanui and Paparoa could be destination schools, depending on where the children come from within the area.</p> <p>The Adventist School made a submission but did not raise any issues about capacity to accommodate growth.</p>
1252	Support the plan	<p>Comment Papanui Primary School Board of Trustees</p> <p>Goal 1 Residential development .... This would contribute to the school maintaining a steady roll - the proposed residential development will not impact significantly upon the school roll, as both Papanui and Paparoa could be destination schools depending on the respective school zones.</p> <p>Goal 3 Integration of infrastructure .... walking/cycling... We would expect that safe walking/cycling and scootering access (crossing Cranford Street) to the school from the new residential would be a feature of future detailed planning - including a lowering of the current 60kmph speed limit to 50kmph.</p> <p>The current intersection at Cranford Street and Main North Road has been an ongoing concern for the school and the school community with regard to pedestrian safety. The Northern Arterial Route will change traffic volumes and behaviour therefore consultation over a 'safe routes to school' plan would be our expectation moving forward</p> <p>Goal 5 ... enhances ecological values ... The school is excited by the educational and recreational opportunities these areas would provide for our children to enhance their learning experiences. We would encourage the CCC to 'Think Big' with these areas. The school would loved to be involved in the planning, planting and caring for stages.</p> <p>One important consideration we'd like to put forward is regarding the Industrial General Zone(s) at the edge of the Cranford Regeneration area but which is outside the scope of the current plan.</p> <p>Our feeling is that this Industrial General Zoning is incompatible with the school, the existing residential areas and the proposed residential areas. A lot of the existing activity in this area could still be maintained under a Commercial Zoning. However there is some activity that could be better relocated given the possible impact of their operations upon residents and given the geotechnical and water table issues in the area</p> <p>Our suggestion would be that the Industrial General be rezoned to a mix of Residential and Commercial.</p> <p>This option aligns with the CCC's assessments as evidenced by the following extract from the consultation document.</p> <p><i>"... residential development on land outside of the Cranford Basin stormwater facility will provide economic and social regeneration benefits to the city compared to other urban uses such as retailing or industry."</i> Page 3 Draft Cranford Regeneration Plan, CCC, 2017</p> <p>If this suggestion cannot be considered as part of this process we would strongly recommend that CCC start looking at this with some urgency.</p>	<p><b>Traffic</b> These points have been noted. There will be a need to address the issues raised as traffic builds up, if not before, including the idea of a safe routes to school plan.</p> <p>Crossing facilities associated with the East Papanui ODP will be included within the Cranford Street/ODP arterial road intersection.</p> <p><b>Industrial General Zoning adjoining school</b> The Industrial General Zoning at the edge of the Cranford Regeneration Plan area boundary has recently been reviewed and confirmed through the District Plan Review. Specifically, the IHP considered a submission seeking a rezoning of this land from industrial to commercial. This was rejected by the Panel, and there is no scope to reconsider this matter at the present time. However the situation can be monitored and depending on land ownership changes and possible land use changes in the Winters Road vicinity in the medium term (5-10 years), there could be opportunities to improve the amenity around the south and eastern parts of the school's immediate environment.</p>

1279	Do not support the plan	All rivers/ponds/flood basin have lateral spread of water due to close proximity of [REDACTED] I feel you are increasing of flooding risk.	The Cranford Basin stormwater works and storage function have been planned taking into account the existing catchment, the Northern Arterial Extension and provision for flood relief for Flockton Basin. Basin capacity is adequate to ensure that the basin will not spill onto the surrounding land in a 50 year average recurrence interval storm, taking into account Council's estimate of climate change rainfall increase. There will be an embankment around the perimeter of the basin which will mean there is no lateral dispersion ie loss of water out of the basin in the design standard flood. All this means that flooding risk is not increasing.
1282	UNSURE	<p>1. Will we have problems with midges and mosquitos from wetlands?</p> <p>2. Because of high water table in area, will flooding from heavy rainfall extend towards and affect our property? Cranford basin has been reduced from arterial extension. If more storm water is being diverted to area will this be a problem?</p> <p>3. We would be upset if our on street parking was done away with in the future, or we were unable to get our caravan out and into our property.</p> <p>We bought this property in 1973</p>	<p>The Council periodically receives complaints from residents living near waterways concerning mosquitos and other insects. It appears that this issue is often, but not always, associated with lower water levels (i.e. more standing pools), lack of flushing water flow and high water/air temperatures which encourage the breeding of mosquitos. House owners can reduce the risk of mosquitos by eliminating potential habitat on their own sections and there are numerous actions that can be taken, particularly where water collects.</p> <p>The area proposed to be rezoned for residential use will be elevated above the 50 year average recurrence interval flood level, which is the national standard for protection of land against inundation. The District Plan also has rules to ensure new houses are elevated above the 1:200 flood event.</p> <p>The Cranford Basin storage function has been planned taking into account the existing catchment, the Northern Arterial Extension and provision for flood relief for Flockton Basin. Basin capacity is adequate so that the basin will not spill onto the surrounding land in a 50 year average recurrence interval storm, taking into account Council's estimate of climate change rainfall increase. Basin capacity includes a safety margin which could accommodate a larger storm or other eventualities such as future zoning changes.</p> <p>Parking on Cranford Street will be considered as part of the "Downstream Effects Management Plan", which will recommend a series of improvements to the road network at the southern end of the route, to address outstanding issues as a result of the construction of the Northern Arterial and Extension. A critical part of this process will be community engagement/consultation.</p>
1283	Do not support the plan		Noted
1284	Support the plan		Noted
1286	Do not support the plan	<p>Tena koe, thanks for sharing the draft plan with us. Our main concern is the removing of the vista along the bike path at the end of Grassmere Street for new housing. This area of town really lacks for good parks and open spaces - it's totally dominated by suburban streets and this plan only adds to that. We appreciate the plan to include lots of open spaces still but feel it's in the wrong area - over by the motorway, removed from the inhabitants of the major block between Main North Road - Papanui Road - Innes Road - Cranford Street. Can the green space not be by the bike path/Papanui School?</p> <p>We're also interested to know the style of suburban development to take place - will it be thoughtfully designed, like Auckland's new Hobsonville Point development or more bland sprawl from unimaginative and cost-saving development companies, like we're seeing elsewhere in Christchurch?</p> <p>We're open to the project, but hope these points will be carefully considered.</p>	<p>The demand and location for park land has been assessed. A new Neighbourhood Park (playground equipment/seating and landscape planting etc) is proposed to be sited in a central location to be accessible to as many future residents as possible. This will complement the adjacent existing Shearer and Rutland Parks. In addition, a number of shared cycles/pedestrian paths (on drainage land) will provide linkages to streets and adjacent stormwater/drainage areas.</p> <p>The Council is aware of the design issues raised in the submission, and is doing what it can to improve the quality of new developments. There are assessment matters to be met as part of obtaining consent, and these include design related matters. However, whilst the Council regulates aspect of residential design such as height and setback limits, recession plane angles, open space around the house etc, the detailed architectural design of housing will ultimately be determined by the developer. Since land development costs may be relatively high, it can be expected that development will be of good quality.</p>
1340	Do not support the plan	<p>According to 'homes.co.nz' in The Press 29.4.17, there are 4966 available sections in Christchurch (cf Auck - 5145, Wgtn 977, Q'Town 1721, Hamilton 761).</p> <p>We don't need to carve up any more greenspace in the city!!!</p> <p>This is in the best interests of greedy developers NOT citizens of ChCh.</p> <p>Adding new roads and more traffic on to Grassmere St, which is already in the target of being markedly narrowed &amp; containing a new bike lane, is potentially dangerous, not to mention ruining the character of a quiet semi-rural street</p>	<p>It is correct that at a City wide scale, there is no evidence of a shortage of housing land in either Greenfields areas or within the existing urban area. However, most of these sections are in large development areas at the edge of the City, not in areas such as this which has existing services and is easily accessible.</p> <p>This area is well located, compared to other existing and potential housing areas. The total number of houses being proposed is not significant in terms of the overall quantum of housing that the City needs over the next ten – twenty years.</p> <p>The Transport Assessment identifies that projected increases in traffic, particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Road will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some extent. However it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Christchurch Northern Corridor, the volume increases associated with the ODP and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads and that the effects on the local road network are described as modest.</p> <p>These effects will only be reduced slightly where a lower density residential development is implemented.</p>
1341	Do not support the plan		
1472		<p>Hi,</p> <p>I realise that I am a few days late in getting this in but I only found out about the public consultation period for the Cranford basin regeneration plan this evening after purposefully searching for it.</p> <p>I have two comments to make.</p>	The Council acknowledges that a sizeable portion of the proposed development block is affected by springs and seeps and has been identified as such on the Outline Development Plan. Residential development will be required to be undertaken in such a way as to maintain separation between buildings and springs, which either means very low density development, or clustering of houses to ensure that springs are not disturbed.

1472 contd		<p>1. I wholeheartedly support the transformation of the Cranford basin into a forested wetland and hope that this proceeds as soon as possible.</p> <p>2. I have concerns about residential development in the Grassmere street block due to the swampy spring fed land in this area and the potential for degradation of the waterways as well as problems in the future due to natural hazards. I feel this Grassmere street block, in particular the southern end of this block, should be included as part of the forested wetland.</p> <p>I hope my comments can still be included in the public submissions.</p>	The development rules require existing drains to be 'naturalised', which will enhance water quality and ecological values. There could also be opportunities at the time of subdivision to add to the forested wetland or at least provide further public access into that part of the plan area.
1568	Supports the plan		Noted
1591	Neither support nor not support	<p><b>1. INTRODUCTION</b></p> <p>1.1 The NZ Transport Agency's mandate is set out under the Land Transport Management Act 2003. It has a statutory responsibility to undertake its functions in a way that contributes to an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system in the public interest.<sup>3</sup> It is also responsible for managing funding of the land transport system<sup>4</sup> to give effect to the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding.</p> <p>1.2 The designations and resource consents for the Northern Arterial and Northern Arterial Extension/Cranford Street Upgrade (NAE and CSU) were approved through a Resource Management Act process. This established the general layout and a specimen design for the whole northern corridor between the Christchurch Northern Motorway and the Cranford Street/Innes Road intersection. This work is to be delivered through the Christchurch Northern Corridor (CNC) Alliance. There was significant traffic modelling input into the specimen design developed for the consenting phase of the project which was based on landuse forecast assumptions. As the design has been developed further the traffic modelling and landuse assumptions have been updated. These would not include more recent proposals such as the Cranford Regeneration Plan and proposals to increase the capacity of the northern access (e.g. third southbound lane on the Waimakariri Bridge). Changes like this to the wider landuse and transport context can compromise the design choices and investment decisions made by both the Transport Agency and Christchurch City Council.</p> <p>1.3 The CNC represents a significant strategic infrastructure investment from both the Transport Agency and Christchurch City Council in the order of \$240M. On this basis the Transport Agency needs to ensure that new proposals, such as the Cranford Regeneration Plan, do not compromise the benefits of this significant infrastructure investment. This could be in terms of compromise to the capacity or safety of the option being developed, and as a consequence bringing forward the need to reconsider the design of key components.</p> <p>1.4 The key intersections at the southern end of the CNC that could be affected are the roundabout at the intersection of Cranford Street and the Northern Arterial Extension, and the intersection of Cranford Street and Innes Road.</p> <p><b>2.0 REASONS FOR SUBMISSION</b></p> <p>2.1 The traffic modelling analysis undertaken to date on the NAE and CSU has used a combination of modelling tools. SIDRA intersection models have been based on those provided by the Christchurch City Council. These models have been updated to include the latest intersection layouts and the latest forecast demand volumes based on the Christchurch Assignment and Simulation Traffic (CAST) model. The CAST model is itself fed by demands from the Christchurch Transport Model (CTM) which has demographic inputs (population, households, employment levels etc) and relatively coarse traffic demand outputs. The CAST model used for the analysis is version 09 which includes the 2026/2036/2046 land use forecasts made at the beginning of 2016.</p> <p>2.2 With the land use forecasts for the development of the Cranford Basin progressing significantly over the last six months, it is considered prudent to establish whether these forecasts (and the associated planned infrastructure) are significantly different from those currently assumed in CTM and CAST. If either the quantum of development or transport network connectivity have changed significantly since CAST version 09 was developed then this will have a knock on effect to traffic demands that are input into the SIDRA models. If proposed development levels have increased, or been brought forward, then it is likely that higher traffic volumes will be experienced on Cranford Street at an earlier year. These may impact the operation of the intersections and could potentially affect intersection performance in terms of capacity and safety.</p> <p>2.3 The impact of additional development as proposed under the Regeneration Plan would require assessment against the existing and currently planned infrastructure which is under construction. This may result in additional infrastructure being required or a redesign or modification of the proposed infrastructure. The assessment and associated costs of any redesign or upgrade to mitigate traffic impacts should be the responsibility of the developer.</p> <p>2.4 It is acknowledged that a Transport Assessment of the development proposal has been completed which concludes that although there is potential for adverse transport effects these are generally of a minor scale. Although, given the scale of development proposed, the increase in traffic volumes along Cranford Street are</p>	<p>The latest modelling focuses on a development scenario of 200 - 370 households with increases above this scale of development being capped to 425 households.</p> <p>Based on the modelling of the 200-370 hh scenarios, there can be expected to be minimal difference in traffic volume changes on the local road network with demands and delays for the most part marginally improved despite additional generation from the Outline Development Plan. The drop in demands from Cranford Street to the Cranford/NAR extension are as a result of the accessibility provided by the ODP road network that connects between Cranford Street and Grassmere Street.</p> <p>As such, there will be no adverse traffic effects on the downstream Christchurch Northern Corridor road network that can be attributed specifically to the Cranford Regeneration Plan.</p>

<sup>3</sup> LTMA 2003 section 94

<sup>4</sup> LTMA 2003 section 95(e)

1591 contd		<p>likely to be limited compared to the other traffic flows there are some concerns with how these increase may affect the downstream intersections on the CNC.</p> <p>2.5 The layout proposed for the Cranford Street/NAE roundabout is considered adequate from a capacity perspective given the significant reduction in traffic volumes using Cranford Street North following the completion of the CNC.</p> <p>2.6 From a safety perspective the design is considered to be more sensitive to changes in the traffic volumes. The layout was amended to remove the right-turn movement southbound from the NAE to Cranford Street North based on input from the independent safety audit. Also of concern was the offside merge of the traffic from Cranford Street North heading south into the City. Despite the concern this movement was still provided to retain the connectivity. This safety aspect does not appear to have been covered in any detail in the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>2.7 Further downstream of this intersection the design of the Cranford/Innes intersection is also sensitive to changes in traffic volumes and particularly turning demands. It is not clear whether the additional traffic from the development of the Regeneration Plan area in parallel with other potential changes to the traffic volumes along the CNC will compromise the design of this intersection in terms of capacity as well as safety.</p> <p>2.8 The Transport Agency would welcome further assessment of the potential impacts of the increased traffic volumes on the downstream components of the CNC design. The Transport Agency is currently developing a Paramics micro-simulation model which covers the whole of the CNC, including the critical intersections at the southern end of the route. This will provide an opportunity for a more refined view of the operation of these intersections and an ability to fully appraise the impacts of additional development as is being proposed. It may be prudent for the City Council to assist or contribute to this modelling process to better understand any potential transport impacts.</p> <p><b>3.0 CONCLUSIONS</b></p> <p>3.1 It is acknowledged that the scale of the development proposed under the Cranford Regeneration Plan and the connectivity included through the site to the adjoining networks will serve to distribute transport effects from the site. Despite this there is potential for the traffic generated from the development of the site to impact on the operation of downstream intersections.</p> <p>3.2 This has the potential to compromise the transport benefits to be achieved through the significant infrastructure investment in the CNC.</p> <p>3.2 Further assessment of the potential impacts on the safety and capacity of the consented intersection designs is required. If adverse effects are identified then mitigation options for any modification or redesign of the infrastructure would be required.</p>	
1706	Do not support the plan	<p>I do not support the Residential development section of the plan.</p> <p>The area being re-zoned for housing will have a direct impact on traffic flow and volume into the exiting residential street network especially now with the cycle way reducing traffic flow and on street parking in the area around Main North Rd Grassmere St.</p> <p>Also the land is of poor quality for building (peat) and prone to flooding and during winter has significant ponding.</p> <p>Where is the runoff from the new residential area to be collected and what is to stop it moving into existing residential areas if land is built up. Proposed S/water marginal area is already wet can it take more!</p>	<p><b>Geotechnical</b> Building on organic rich soils including peat is technically challenging. However, there are methods including engineering practice to manage effects, primarily that of settlement and potential liquefaction. Piles are only one potential solution to building on this type of ground. Other potential solutions include surcharging the ground with additional fill to reduce secondary settlement and consolidate the organic rich sediments. Costs are potentially higher than standard foundation design.</p> <p>The conclusions from the geotechnical and economic investigations are that some housing is feasible and marketable in this location.</p> <p><b>Transport</b> Grassmere Street has been narrowed from 14m (which can accommodate traffic associated with a minor arterial route) to 8 metres at its narrowest point, which offers suitable width for a local road that accommodates two-way traffic with on-street parking provided along one side.</p> <p>Widening of some sections of Grassmere Street on the North-east side will be required in the future to create a separation strip between vehicle access points to private residences and the Cycle route, to ensure adequate visibility. This could be taken as part of subdivision.</p> <p>The Integrated Transport Assessment identifies that projected increases in traffic, particularly on Grassmere Road, Grants Road and to a lesser extent Blighs Road will be noticeable to some residents and will impact on their amenity to some extent. However, it notes that due to the traffic relief created by the Christchurch Northern Corridor, the volume increases associated with the Outline Development Plan and general growth in the area will still remain within the carrying capacity of these roads and that the effects on the local road network are described as modest.</p> <p><b>Flooding/Runoff</b> Managing stormwater and groundwater levels will be technically challenging. New development is required to attenuate and treat stormwater runoff and this is will be achieved by directing it into stormwater basins on private land before it gets released into the Cranford Basin stormwater management facility. A comprehensive geohydrological plan is required from the developers as part of the first subdivision consent application to ensure effects on groundwater and springs are managed.</p>

