

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

DOCUMENT NO. 2455/58
99176 30 OCT 2007
 ACTION
 INFO



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

A

Full Name: JANET REEVES Phone: 3251120

Organisation*: CONTEXT URBAN DESIGN Phone: 3251120

Postal Address: P.O. BOX 45, LITTLE RIVER Fax: 3251120

Date: 27.10.07

email: jreeves@clear.net.nz

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

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

Signature: J.H. REEVES

(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.

C (1) The specific provisions of the variation that my submission relates to are: (Specify page number and subsection numbering for each separate provision).

(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.)

(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.)

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

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:

Freepost 1201

Change No.1, RPS

Environment Canterbury

P O Box 345

Christchurch

(1) The specific provisions of the variation that my submission relates to are:	(2) My submission is that:	(3) I seek the following decisions from Environment Canterbury:
Page 14 Policy 6. Urban form, infrastructure and sequencing within identified urban limits	The introduction of sequencing is essential not only to ensure efficient use of land and resources but also to enable communities to develop in a timely manner. Dispensing development around many subdivisions means that residents must wait longer for neighbourhoods to form and for sufficient thresholds to be reached for local facilities and services to be viable. This provision is supported .	Retain this policy and add into the explanation that sequencing supports earlier development of communities.
16 Policy 7. Development Form and Design	Urban design best practice needs to be championed and supported through statutory documents such as this. This policy will help to give it the status it needs to be recognised by the development sector and the Environment Court as a legitimate resource management requirement. This provision is supported .	Retain this policy in its entirety
17 Policy 8. Outline Development Plans and Changes of Zoning in District Plans. Clause (c)	Outline development plans are useful for establishing the framework for future development. Some aspects of a development site are fixed, such as existing trees, watercourses, landforms, views, access points. These will not change and can be shown on a land use plan which is embodied in a District Plan. It would however be unwise to show other aspects such as the location, size and shape of land to be set aside for business activities, community facilities, schools, the route of walkways, cycleways and bus routes through the site and the distribution of different residential densities, on a land use plan. Such a practice leads to inflexible subdivision layouts which are liable to change once the design details are developed. Both the Northwood and the Aidanfield subdivisions had land use patterns embodied in the Christchurch City Plan which proved problematic at the implementation stage. Inflexible outline development plans can be a hindrance to good urban design. This provision is opposed .	Amend this clause so that it requires only the aspects which are fixed to be drawn on the land use plan. An additional clause will be needed to require other essential matters to be included in the outline development plan as requirements/design criteria, e.g. a site for local shops will be required in a central position, within 15 minutes walk of all residents. The requirements will need to be met by the scheme plan at the time of subdivision.