

**SUBMISSION TO:** Environment Canterbury

**ON:** Land Use Recovery Plan Review (August 2015)

**BY:** Riccarton/Wigram Community Board

**CONTACT:** Mike Mora  
Chairperson  
027 4303132  
mike.mora@ccc.govt.nz

## 1. INTRODUCTION

As a deputation to the Submissions Panel of the Christchurch City Council, Mr Mora and Ms Broughton Chairperson and Deputy Chairperson representing the Riccarton/Wigram Community Board (the Board) were advised and invited to submit separately to the Christchurch City Council's submission on this matter.

The Board has a statutory role under section 52 of the Local Government Act 2002 to inter alia, *'represent, and act as an advocate for, the interests of its community'*. It is in this capacity that the Board provides this submission to Environment Canterbury on the review of the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP).

If the opportunity is available the Board wishes to speak in support of this comment.

## 2. BOARD SUBMISSION

### 2.1 Introduction

Under the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy and the Council's South West Area Plan, there is an acknowledgment that the Riccarton/Wigram ward is one of the leading growth areas in the city and will remain so for the next two decades.

Additionally, the Board notes that the intent and framework of both the LURP and the Proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan reflect a clear emphasis on intensification areas in the post-earthquake environment.

The Board provides the following comments on the review of the LURP and in doing so records that the points outlined here have also been separately raised through its submissions on the Proposed Christchurch Replacement District Plan.

## 2.2 Priority Greenfield Areas

Notwithstanding the rapid and intensive development happening now and projected to continue in the south west of Christchurch, the Board is wanting to see that a lesser emphasis is given to prioritising greenfield developments in South Halswell, South East Halswell, South West Halswell, Murphys Road East, Quaifes and Sabys Roads. **(Attachment 1)**.

In this regard, the Board restates its concerns as being:

- Land stability and its suitability for development
- Liquefaction risk
- Historic high ground-water tables
- The inability of the receiving land to absorb storm-water runoff
- The flooding pressures on Hendersons Basin
- The environmental pressures on impacts of increased storm-water runoff and discharge into the Cashmere Stream/Upper Heathcote River and Halswell River catchments, namely Knights Stream, Creamery Stream, Nottingham Stream, Halswell River and Lake Ellesmere/Te Waihora.

## 2.2 Luney's / Buchanans Road

The Board supports the Luney's/Buchanans Road LURP priority Greenfield development in favour of quarrying this land as proposed by Fulton Hogan Ltd.

## 2.3. Further Comments - Draft Recommendations (as outlined in LURP Review Consultation Pamphlet August 2015)

### 3.2 Position Statements:

3.2.1-3.2.9 The Board agrees with broad principles.

3.2.10 Should further LURP Review recommendations be required, they should be the subject of further consultation.

### Draft Recommendation 2:

The Board fully supports this recommendation.

Draft Recommendation 3:

- 3.3.4 Airport Noise Contour - The Board supports a review of the noise contours to be done through Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).
- 3.3.7 The Board strongly supports the original intent at the time of adopting the LURP and that its statutory purpose ends in 2016. There are a number of very concerned residents before the Independent Hearings Panel who are concerned at the effect on their community of the proposed district plan and have virtually no awareness of the statutory significance of the LURP. They have very little awareness of CRPS. Having two documents makes it virtually impossible for the layperson and very difficult even for elected members with some knowledge of planning.

Draft Recommendation 5:

The Board supports The Lincoln Innovation Hub. This concept is well overdue.

Other Comments

Intensification has caused a huge amount of upset in the community, particularly when currently zoned Living One areas are being considered for medium density zoning. It should be noted that medium density is more prescriptive than the current Living Three. Existing communities should not be destroyed/undermined through imposition of a planning theory. In fact the Regional Policy Statement states that "*intensification and consolidation of residential development need to protect areas of special amenity and historic heritage as they contribute to the area's identity and character.*"

The Board strongly urges that consultation with the community occur before further areas are considered for intensification.

Mike Mora

**Chairperson**

21 August 2015

***Attachment 1: Proposed District Plan Review Stage 3 Planning Maps 45, 49 and 50 (incl legend) and Land Use Recovery Plan Greenfield Priority Areas***