

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: Graeme Charles Walsh

Phone: 0274 340 491

Organisation*:

*The organisation that this submission is made on behalf of
Graeme Charles Walsh and Graeme Charles Walsh Ltd

Postal Address:
470 Cranford Street,
Redwood

Postcode: 8051

Email: walshag@xtra.co.nz

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

Signature:



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

Date: 26 August 2015

Comments

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

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.

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 intensification initiatives in strategic infrastructure

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.

I support draft recommendation 3, that Figure 23 should be indicative only. That is because if the CCC are stuck with having to adhere to a hard and fast urban boundary then it prevents sensible rezoning.

As it is my properties (approx 4 ha in total) at 468 and 470 are Zoned Rural. However I am bordered (overlooked) by commercial activities on 3 boundaries and Cranford Street on a fourth. Additionally, the new Northern Extension is to run a long a fifth boundary. Given these circumstances and given that the land area is small, it is devoid of any economic use under its current rural zoning. My view is that my properties should be rezoned 'Industrial General' to bring them into alignment with the neighbouring properties.

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.'

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

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

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

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?

Any other comments: