


99654

RECEPTION	INFO
EC - CHRCH	ION
FILE REF: SM 2007-88	
DOCUMENT NO: 31 OCT 2007	

# Submission on Proposed Change No.1 to the Regional Policy Statement



**Environment Canterbury**  
Your regional council

Form 5: Submissions on a Publicly Notified Proposed Policy Statement or Regional Plan under Clause 6 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991

NAME: L MCCARTON

- B**  Tick this box if you do not wish to be heard in support of your submission;
- Tick this box if you do wish to be heard in support of your submission; and,
- Tick this box if you would be prepared to consider presenting your submission in a joint case with others making a similar submission at any hearing.

Return your signed submission by 5pm, 31 October 2007 to:

Freeport 1201  
Change No.1, RPS  
Environment Canterbury  
P O Box 345  
Christchurch

**A**

Full Name: Ernst + Renate Frei Phone: 322 4960

Organisation\*: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Postal Address: 564 Cashmere Road Fax: 322 4961

Christchurch 8025 Date: 31 October 07

email: Ernst@HoonHayValley.co.nz

\* the organisation that this submission is made on behalf of.

Postal address for service of person making submission (if different from above): \_\_\_\_\_

Signature: [Signature]

(Signature of person making submission or person authorised to sign on behalf of person making the submission)

Please note:  
(1) all submissions must be in a hardcopy form that is signed.  
(2) all information contained in a submission under the Resource Management Act 1991, including names and addresses for service, becomes public information.

<p><b>C</b> (1) The specific provisions of the variation that my submission relates to are: (Specify page number and subsection numbering for each separate provision).</p>	<p>(2) My submission is that: (State concisely: the nature of your submission, and clearly indicate whether you support or oppose each separate provision being submitted on, or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)</p>	<p>(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: (Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)</p>
<p><b>SUBMISSION 1</b> Any part of the Variation (including maps) that refers to and outlines the urban limits (boundary between rural and urban Christchurch) in the area generally known as Henderson Basin.</p>	<p><b>SUBMISSION 1</b> Henderson Basin must not remain zoned rural. Most traditional rural activities are becoming less sustainable in the Basin. The basin is to 88% surrounded by existing urban areas or by planned and proposed Greenfield developments. Many of these developments (some of them even high density ones) can and should logically reach into the basin</p>	<p><b>SUBMISSION 1</b> That the whole of "Henderson Basin" be included within the urban limits in order to have the area be allowed to go through a proper planning process with the Christchurch City Council.</p>

<p>(1) The specific provisions of the variation that my submission relates to are: (Specify page number and subsection numbering for each separate provision).</p>	<p>(2) My submission is that: (State concisely: the nature of your submission, and clearly indicate whether you support or oppose each separate provision being submitted on, or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)</p>	<p>(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: (Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)</p>
	<p>in order to make sensible and economic use of existing services and infrastructure. (The use of arbitrary and illogical existing roads as planning boundaries does not seem to make sense.) Please refer also to the C.C.C. South West Christchurch Draft Concept.</p> <p>The balance of the area can and should be developed and used for storm water retention, parks and possibly tourist activities (Camper Parks, Holiday Villages) all of which would comply with urban activities. Any balance can be used for Rural Residential of no more than half or 1 hectare.</p> <p>This part of the Variation as it is currently proposed (rural zoning) flies in the face of the rest it tries to stand for (Urban consolidation, integration of land use and infrastructure).</p> <p>This part of the City is twice as close to the centre of the City than most proposed Greenfield Sites. It is very well served with existing amenities green space (including the Port Hills), with shopping and employment areas (Haiswell, Barrington and the proposed Henderson Centre). It is already well served with Bus routes and this will further improve with the development of the planned hill suburb immediately to south of the basin.</p> <p>Maintaining and reinforcing "Rural status" for the "Henderson Basin" simply translates to not dealing with the issues around the basin, arisen over the last 30 years and pushing it back into the "too hard basket" for another 40 years.</p>	
<p><b>SUBMISSION 2</b> Any part of the Variation that refers to "land required to protect the landscape character of the Port Hills" and "form part of the rural land required to maintain the open landscape character either between or surrounding the areas of urban activities within greater Christchurch."</p>	<p><b>SUBMISSION 2</b> The two paragraphs "land required to protect the landscape character of the Port Hills" and "form part of the rural land required to maintain the open landscape character either between or surrounding the areas of urban activities within greater Christchurch." Are used and referred to repeatedly throughout the variation. They</p>	<p><b>SUBMISSION 2</b> That the two paragraphs be omitted from wherever they appear in the document.</p>

**Add further pages as required.**

usually appear with other considerations in respect to identifying growth and intensification within greater Christchurch. All the other issues are concerned with clearly measurable, objective and rational considerations. However the two paragraphs in question are subjective and can in my view applied to stop every single development. They cannot be applied objectively and will always be fully open to individual interpretation and abuse.

<p>(1) The specific provisions of the variation that my submission relates to are: (Specify page number and subsection numbering for each separate provision).</p> <p><b>SUBMISSION 3</b> Any part of the Variation referring to: "Transport" and to "Towns" and "Key Activity Centres in greater Christchurch."</p>	<p>(2) My submission is that: (State concisely: the nature of your submission, and clearly indicate whether you support or oppose each separate provision being submitted on, or wish to have amendments made, giving reasons.)</p> <p><b>SUBMISSION 3</b> One of the greatest issue for the development of Greater Christchurch, apart from the need to intensify existing and future urban development and the spread of uncontrolled urban sprawl is then provision of (public) transport in particular for commuter travel (commuting from places of residence to places of employment) from and to outlying (satellite-) towns and Key Activity Centres. Alternative, efficient, cost effective and environmentally sustainable movement of large number of people in a short space of time (rush hours) can only ever be achieved by rail transport. Buses will generally have to compete for road space and are generally an unattractive alternative to private transport. The regional council needs to take leadership in planning, promoting and implementing a regional rail system that could best and most efficiently be done along the existing rail corridors. Christchurch still has (only just, since we have already given away a crucial link near the new Railway Station that uses to connect through from the Lyttelton to the Northern (Papanui) line) some very well placed rail corridors, which can be utilised very economically. Outside of Christchurch City, only existing towns, along with further new towns along these arteries must be promoted and allowed for substantial growth or being selected as Key Activity centres. These towns are:  <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Southern Rail Link: Templeton, Weedons, Rolleston, Burnham, Durandel and Rakai</li> <li>• Western Rail Link: Sandy Knolls, Aylesbury, Kirwee, Darfield, Shelfield and Springfield</li> <li>• Northern Rail Link: Kaiapoi, Rangiora, Ashly, Sefton, Balcairn, Amberly and Waipara</li> <li>• Eastern Rail Link: Lyttelton and Diamond Harbour (Fast Ferry Link)</li> </ul> </p>	<p>(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury: (Please give precise details for each provision. The more specific you can be the easier it will be for the Council to understand your concerns.)</p> <p><b>SUBMISSION 3</b> A) No town in the greater Christchurch area away from rail corridors should be allowed to expand. B) No towns or centres outside the Christchurch urban limits shall be allowed to proceed with any expansion until such time as the Canterbury Regional Council has firm plans in place for a rail system connecting these centres with Christchurch City and such plans are well under way to implementation.</p>
--	--	---

**Add further pages as required.**

All these towns can be efficiently linked to the Christchurch CBD with rail transport of less than 30 minutes. (This will be less than what it will probably take future residents of Pegasus Town to reach Christchurch over hopelessly congested and polluting motorways and roads.)

Expansion to towns like Lincoln, Prebbleton, Woodend/Pegasus, which are not in the vicinity of a rail corridor should be restricted or not allowed to go ahead.