

OFFICE USE ONLY

## COMMENT FORM

### Land Use Recovery Plan Review: Draft Recommendations

Comments can be emailed to:

[lurp@ecan.govt.nz](mailto:lurp@ecan.govt.nz) or posted to:

Comments on Land Use Recovery

Plan Review Environment

Canterbury

P O Box 345

Christchurch 8140

SUBMITTER ID:

FILE NO: LAND/LURP/PLAN/1

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

Full Name: **Slava Meyn**

Phone:

Organisation\*: **Canterbury Sports Limited**

\*The organisation that this submission is made on behalf of

Postal Address:

Postcode:

Email:

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

**Attention: Ewan Chapman**

**c/- Duncan Cotterill.**

**PO Box 5**

**Christchurch 8140**

Signature: Ewan Chapman

Date: **28 August 2015**

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

**Please note: All information contained in comments provided, becomes public information.**

## Background

Canterbury Sports Limited (CSL) owns the site at 466 – 482 Yaldhurst Road, Christchurch. Mr Slava Meyn is the Director and principle shareholder of CSL.

The site is being progressively rezoned as a recreational (fotball) facility, known as the Christchurch Football Academy. However, the ultimate goal of CSL is to establish a multi-sports facility that would be capable of hosting national and international events. This could include a gymnasium, and Olympic size swimming pool, along with the currently consented football fields and associated development.

## Comments

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

**Canterbury Sports Limited (CSL) strongly agrees with Point 8, which relates to the need to amend certain aspects of the LURP to enable consideration of matters under the RMA. This is addressed further in the submission.**

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.

**While CSL agrees that it is desirable for planning decisions to be undertaken through more traditional statutory mechanisms, it considers there are fundamental problems with the LURP that should be addressed as quickly as possible (such as through this review) rather than having to be resolved through traditional methods. One such issue is the absolute bar the LURP currently acts as against development outside the urban limits, even when this development is most appropriate to be situated in this area. The proposed LURP review does address this issue.**

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

**No comment.**

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.

**CSL consider the Minister needs to make these amendments as quickly as possible. Christchurch is in a stage of recovery, and there are projects which will benefit the entire city, such as the development proposed by CSL, which have to be put on hold indefinitely until the LURP is updated to reflect the new position.**

**CSL also consider that a process needs to commence at the same time, to update the CRPS. The amendment to the LURP will not resolve the issue of Map A still being included in CRPS. Under draft recommendation 3 it is recognised that s60(2) permits a review of the CRPS to be instigated by a Minister of the Crown. CSL considers this approach should be taken to align the changes to the LURP with the CRPS.**

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.'

**No views.**

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

**No views**

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

**Only as outlined above – that the CRPS should be changed in conjunction with the LURP. It is not sensible to go through this process of changing the LURP, if the necessary changes are not made at the same time to the CRPS.**

**The Proposed LURP Review Recommendations considers that the CRPS could be reviewed at the same time as a district plan. Christchurch district plan is currently undergoing a complete review – and so this is surely the right time to align the CRPS with the LURP.**

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

**Currently, the LURP and the CRPS act as a 'technical knock-out' for any development not taking place in an identified greenfield priority area, and outside the 'urban limits'. This is inappropriate, and was not the approach that was intended by the Crown when the LURP was introduced.**

**CSL strongly supports the view that these applications outside greenfield priority areas should be addressed on a case-by-case basis.**

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?

**No views**

Any other comments:



Ewan Chapman  
Signed on behalf of Slava Meyn and Canterbury Sports Limited.

28 August 2015