

COMMENT FORM

Land Use Recovery Plan Review: Draft Recommendations

Comments can be emailed to:
lurp@ecan.govt.nz or posted to:
Comments on Land Use Recovery
Plan Review Environment

Canterbury
P O Box 345
Christchurch 8140

All comments to be received by 5pm, Friday 28 August 2015

SUBMITTER ID:
FILE NO: LAND/LURP/PLAN/1

Full Name: Warren Richard Lewis

Phone: 366-4320 (Business)

Organisation*: Cashmere Fields

*The organisation that this submission is made on behalf of

Postal Address: PO Box 13-282, Christchurch

Postcode: 8141

Email: warren@lewisandbarrow.co.nz

Contact name and postal address for service of person making comment (if different from above):

Signature:



Date: 25 August 2015

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

Comments

Position statements on section 3.2: Do you agree with these? Yes

Draft Recommendation 1: The LURP Review should principally identify any areas for further consideration through more traditional statutory mechanisms rather than attempt to resolve them directly by recommending changes to the LURP.

There needs to be more flexibility in Map A in Chapter 6 to allow sensible changes so that Greenfield land can be subdivided and not blocked from subdivision, to allow completion of areas to be greenfield land by extension of Greenfield boundaries where sensible. To limit this each Local Authority may only increase urban areas by 1 or 2%.

Draft Recommendation 2: Any consideration of significant change is best undertaken through a more comprehensive future spatial planning process or in the review of the Regional Policy Statement including:

- any consideration of additional greenfield land
- any consideration of further intensification initiatives
- any consideration of further significant investment in strategic infrastructure

This should be done now so that the Independent Hearing Panel for the Christchurch Replacement District Plan can be given a little bit of flexibility in handling requests for changes in Greenfield boundaries.

Draft Recommendation 3: The Minister amend the LURP to show Figure 4 on page 23 of the LURP as being 'indicative' only, and remove Appendix 1 relating to Chapter 6.

Agreed. However this flexibility should also be given to Map A in Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement by the Minister directing the Canterbury Regional Council to change Map A of Chapter 6 of the CRPS to have a Note: The boundaries of Greenfield Areas shown are to be amended where terrain, land ownership, and completion of development etc require some flexibility. This flexibility for each Local Authority must only result in a maximum increase in Urban Area of 2%.

Draft recommendation 4: The Minister direct Waimakariri District Council to amend Policy 14.5.1.1 as set out in the District Plan as follows: 'To avoid new residential and rural residential activities and development outside of existing urban areas and priority areas within the area identified in Map A in Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement; rural residential development areas identified in the Rural Residential Development Plan; and MR 873.'

Agree.

Draft recommendation 5: The Minister add an additional sub-action to LURP Action 27 to read: 'vii. zoning that defines the Lincoln Innovation Hub'.

Agree.

Do you have comments on matters where the LURP Review is not recommending change?

The Lurp should be directing Local Authorities to simplify their District Schemes, reduce the number of zones, and make District Schemes understandable by the rate payers.

Re section 3.3.3: Development outside Greenfield priority areas: Do you have views on the conclusion reached?

When a District Scheme is reviewed Chapter 6 of the CRPS should be flexible enough to allow changes to the District Scheme. Sensible changes should not have to wait, and not have to cost people a Resource Consent when they could submit to a New District Scheme Hearing. Without flexibility Hearing Panels have their hands tied when otherwise they could make sensible amendments to the District Plan thereby enhancing its value.

Re paragraph 3.3.6: Greenfield Priority Areas for Business in NW Christchurch: Do you have views on the approach to the Greenfield priority areas for business in north-west Christchurch?

More flexibility is needed to get more use of land in industrial areas in the weekends, i.e. there should be more reserves, recreation facilities, gyms, residences etc so that there are people present during weekends. Otherwise large expanses of industrial areas become targets for boy racers and vandals.

Any other comments:

The increased supply of Urban Land is slowly reining in the mismatch of supply and demand and section prices have plateaued and are dropping a little. It worries me that in 10 year's time we will be back to demand exceeding supply if the Lurp and particularly Map A of the CRPS Chapter 6 are not altered or given flexibility to expand the section supply to keep well ahead of the demand. Christchurch is in a position to show Auckland that increased section supply does have a direct effect on affordability of sections and housing. However, if this is to happen the Christchurch Replacement District Plan and the present Independent Hearing Panel need to have the flexibility to increase the supply of sections in each area by at least 1% per annum.