LAND USE RECOVERY PLAN REVIEW

TO

Canterbury Regional Council
P O Box 345
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

FROM

Bromac Lodge Limited
C/- RMG
PO Box 908
Christchurch Box Lobby
Christchurch 8140

Note. See the different address for service below.

SECOND COMMENTS ON THE LAND USE RECOVERY PLAN REVIEW (LURP)

Introduction

Bromac Lodge Ltd (Bromac) provides additional comments on the LURP review in response to the Draft Recommendations Consultation document and, in particular, draft Recommendations 2 and 3. We consider that the additional comments are required in order to provide clarity on the meaning of the draft Recommendations and to ensure a workable planning framework going forward.

Our additional comments should be considered alongside the original comments we made on the LURP review in May of this year, and also the submissions made on the LURP in 2013. By way of summary, the original comments sought the following outcomes:

LURP Figure 4 – Map A Greenfield Priority Areas
That properties in John Patterson Drive identified in the submission be included as a Greenfield Priority Area in Map A.

Appendix 1 – Amendments to Canterbury Regional Policy Statement
Chapter 6, Map A Greenfield Priority Areas
That properties in John Patterson Drive identified in the submission be included as a Greenfield Priority Area in Map A.

Canterbury Regional Policy Statement
An additional action point that requires Environment Canterbury to change Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement to allow District Councils to make minor amendments to zoning and development boundaries indicated by the urban limit boundary and priority areas contained in Map A.

Additional Comments

Draft Recommendations 2 and 3 are as follows:

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*

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

Draft recommendation 2 deals with "significant" change and recommendation 3 proposes to amend the LURP, but not the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS).

The strategy underpinning the recommendations appears to one of:

- relying on a review of the CRPS at some point in the future to deal with additional growth options; and
- amending the LURP to provide more flexibility for consent authorities when processing resource consent applications - this is the "have regard" test discussed in section 3.3.3 of the Draft Recommendations Consultation Pamphlet (the DRCP).

While the term "significant" as used in Recommendation 2 is not defined, it is generally accepted that there is some effectiveness in a policy approach that requires a comprehensive planning process to consider spatially extensive development proposals.

The recommendations do not, however, adequately address the ability for Councils to consider development proposals through plan change and review processes, where the more prescriptive *"give effect to"* test applies in terms of the CRPS provisions. There are situations where developments may be proposed outside of but immediately adjoining the boundary of the urban limits, where they are otherwise able to be fully supported on their merits, and are otherwise consistent with the CRPS provisions. However, strict adherence to the present greenfield priority area boundaries in the CRPS means that District Councils are effectively unable to consider them further. The John Patterson Drive proposal as outlined in the 2013 and May 2015 submissions on the LURP is one such example. The recommendations proposed in the DRCP do not assist in a meaningful consideration of the merits of such proposals and, as such do not go far enough.

The current situation facing us and other parties is that submissions lodged on Stage 2 of the Christchurch Replacement District Plan (the Replacement Plan) have sought rezoning for residential purposes. The Christchurch City Council has recently filed its evidence and while the evidence considers proposals have merits, a recommendation[1] to reject the submission is based on the constraints imposed by objective 3.3.7(c) of the Replacement Plan which links directly to Chapter 6 and Map A of the CRPS.

[1] Evidence of Sarah Oliver – attachment B page 48

The conclusion that we have drawn from this is that the City Council's position is that the submission cannot be supported as it would not "give effect" to the CRPS. While there is a discussion in Section 3.3.3 of the DRCP that the amendments proposed in Recommendation 3 will provide some flexibility in the decision making process, it does not adequately deal with minor development proposals being considered through Plan processes.

Further Changes Sought

Within this context amendments to the Recommendations are sought which will direct the Canterbury Regional Council to amend Policy 6.3.1 of Chapter 6 of the CRPS to allow for minor urban development proposals immediately adjoining, but outside of, the boundary of the urban limits as follows:

- *Insert new clause (7) in Policy 6.3.1*
  (7) Provide for small scale urban activities and extensions to urban zoning outside of the existing urban areas and identified greenfield priority areas as shown on Map A, where such activities and zonings would immediately adjoin the boundary of an urban area.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide additional comments on the LURP review.

Graham Taylor
Resource Management Group Limited

For Bromac Lodge Ltd
28th August 2015

Address for Service:
C/- Resource Management Group Limited
PO Box 908
Christchurch Box Lobby
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

Attention: Graham Taylor