

Christchurch City Council – Private Plan Change 18 Hendersons Residential - Summary of Decisions Requested and Submissions

Submitter Number	Submitter Name	Point Number	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought
1	Robert Fletcher	1.1	Support	The submitter is supportive of the plan change as they consider it to represent a practical and sustainable way to grow Christchurch's housing supply.	Approve the private plan change.
1	Robert Fletcher	1.2	Support	The submitter states that there is clear demand for developable land in this part of Christchurch.	Approve the private plan change.
1	Robert Fletcher	1.3	Support	The submitter states the broader community benefits of increased housing capacity and diversity far outweigh the costs of losing what is currently underutilized rural fringe land.	Approve the private plan change.
1	Robert Fletcher	1.4	Support	The submitter highlights site proximity to active and public transport options.	Approve the private plan change.
1	Robert Fletcher	1.5	Support	The submitter is satisfied that the technical assessments provide a solid framework for managing factors like stormwater and flood risk, and the environmental mitigations could increase biodiversity.	Approve the private plan change.
2	Lori Smith on behalf of Lori and Richard Smith	2.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, as they consider that proposal would contribute to overpopulation pressures, result in the continued loss of valuable farmland, and place unsustainable demands on already stretched infrastructure, schools and roading networks.	Decline the private plan change.
2	Lori Smith on behalf of Lori and Richard Smith	2.2	Oppose	The submitter considers there to be sufficient housing capacity within the locality of the site and that the proposal is not needed.	Decline the private plan change.
3	Andrew Carr	3.1	Oppose	The submitter did not provide further detail.	Decline the private plan change.
4	Wayne Taggart	4.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, as they consider that the proposal will increase traffic volumes and decrease the safety of the area.	Decline the private plan change.
4	Wayne Taggart	4.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, as they consider that the proposal will increase traffic volumes and decrease the safety of the area.	Turn Rydal Street into a full cul-de-sac, to keep the traffic flow away from the two primary schools and the parent drop-off zones on Rydal Street.
5	Matthew Pfahlert	5.1	Neutral	The submitter is concerned the proposal will result in adverse effects on existing residents, including increased traffic volumes and decreased driver and cyclist safety.	Use development contributions resulting from the proposal to resolve any issues that may be caused or arise from the proposal.
5	Matthew Pfahlert	5.2	Neutral	The submitter is concerned about potential impacts on existing water supply, wastewater, stormwater infrastructure, and flood risk.	Use development contributions resulting from the proposal to resolve any issues that may be caused or arise from the proposal.

6	Lily Miller	6.1	Neutral	The submitter is concerned that the proposal will result in increased traffic and decreased roading network safety.	Make improvements made to the Leistrella Road/Hoon Hay Road intersection to ensure it is safe for extra traffic.
6	Lily Miller	6.2	Neutral	The submitter is concerned that the proposal will result in increased traffic and decreased roading network safety.	Provide traffic deterring measures on Rollesby Street, such as speed bumps, to encourage the traffic to use Northaw and Leistrella road instead.
7	Laura Revell	7.1	Neutral	The submitter is concerned about the safety of children crossing the roads due to the increased traffic volume from the proposal.	Implement safe crossing points at the intersection of Northaw Street and Rydal Street, and on Leistrella Road between Rydal Street and Hoon Hay Road.
8	Marita Courtney	8.1	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about potential flooding impacts on existing properties and taller housing in proximity to existing properties.	Decline the private plan change.
9	Volker Nock	9.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, as they are concerned about the removal of stormwater ponding areas, loss of greenspace and pervious surfaces area, and associated downstream effects.	Decline the private plan change.
9	Volker Nock	9.2	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the proposal will increase vehicle traffic and decrease pedestrian and cyclist safety on Leistrella Road/Rydal Street.	Delay the granting of the proposal until pedestrian and cyclist safety improvements to Leistrella Road and its intersections with Rydal St and Hoon Hay Rd have been completed.
10	Dena O'Brien	10.1	Neutral	The submitter comments that the proposal will create safer route for to access Sparks Road infrastructure, current cycling infrastructure at Kaiwara Reserve is incomplete, there is lack of cycle connectivity between Kaiwara Street and Hoon Hay Road, and Kaiwara Reserve playground is outdated.	Require the integration of safe, continuous, and clearly designated walking and cycling connections between the new subdivision, Kaiwara Reserve, Kaiwara Street, Sparks Road, and Hoon Hay Road.
10	Dena O'Brien	10.2	Neutral	The submitter comments that the proposal will create safer route for to access Sparks Road infrastructure, current cycling infrastructure at Kaiwara Reserve is incomplete, there is lack of cycle connectivity between Kaiwara Street and Hoon Hay Road, and Kaiwara Reserve playground is outdated.	Upgrade and extend the existing Kaiwara Reserve pathway so that it provides a safe and direct connection to Kaiwara Street.
10	Dena O'Brien	10.3	Neutral	The submitter comments that the proposal will create safer route for to access Sparks Road infrastructure, current cycling infrastructure at Kaiwara Reserve is incomplete, there is lack of cycle connectivity between Kaiwara Street and Hoon Hay Road, and Kaiwara Reserve playground is outdated.	Assess and improve cycling infrastructure along connecting streets, including Sparks Road and Kaiwara Street.

10	Dena O'Brien	10.4	Neutral	The submitter comments that the proposal will create safer route for to access Sparks Road infrastructure, current cycling infrastructure at Kaiwara Reserve is incomplete, there is lack of cycle connectivity between Kaiwara Street and Hoon Hay Road, and Kaiwara Reserve playground is outdated.	Upgrade the Kaiwara Reserve playground and amenities to ensure it meets the needs of a larger community.
11	Penny Wells	11.1	Neutral	The submitter is concerned about increased crash rates, and increased traffic congestion at the Cashmere Road/Penruddock Rise intersection.	Upgrade the Cashmere Road/Penruddock Rise intersection plans from a round-about to a traffic light-controlled intersection, with full cycle lane protections on both sides of Cashmere Road.
12	Damien Aspros	12.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, questioning how new dwellings will be serviced with Primary and High Schooling.	Decline the proposal until school infrastructure is in place to accommodate additional dwellings.
13	David Fox	13.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, stating the area is already prone to flooding, and that increased traffic will worsen existing poor roading conditions and roading congestion.	Decline the private plan change.
14	Gordon Macfarlane	14.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, stating that residents in this area are facing growth without adequate roading and footpath upgrades, citing issues of congestion, poor public transport provision, a lack of active mode infrastructure provision, and poor roading conditions.	Decline the private plan change.
14	Gordon Macfarlane	14.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, stating that residents in this area are facing growing communities without adequate roading and footpath upgrades, citing issues of congestion, poor public transport provision, a lack of active mode infrastructure provision, and poor roading conditions.	Invest in roading and public transportation within this area.
15	Grant Magrath	15.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, as they consider Cashmere Road to be already exceeding its capacity, and that traffic management needs to be upgraded before increase traffic volumes.	Decline the private plan change, until such time that Cashmere Road and the Hoon Hay Road intersection can accommodate existing traffic before adding more.
16	Hilary Jones	16.1	Oppose	The submitter states that most residents moved to the area for its semi-rural feel.	Decline the private plan change.
16	Hilary Jones	16.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, and states that there is too much strain on the schools and roading in the area, with little to no infrastructure.	Stop building in swamp land and overpopulating an under resourced area.
17	Claire Sullivan	17.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, as they concerned that the risk of flooding has not been appropriately addressed.	Decline the private plan change.
17	Claire Sullivan	17.2	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that effects regarding school zoning and associated flow on effects for families have not been considered.	Decline the private plan change.

17	Claire Sullivan	17.3	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that traffic effects, such as congestion and its effects on residents, increased traffic volumes, and a lack of cycling infrastructure have not been appropriately addressed.	Decline the private plan change.
18	Janet Albertson	18.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, as they are concerned about increased traffic volumes, associated congestion, and increased roadworks.	Decline the private plan change.
18	Janet Albertson	18.2	Oppose	The submitter states new schools would be required to accommodate an increased population and that there is not sufficient land for schooling.	Decline the private plan change.
18	Janet Albertson	18.3	Oppose	The submitter states that existing flooding in the area is significant, with Hendersons Road inaccessible due to flooding.	Decline the private plan change.
18	Janet Albertson	18.4	Oppose	The submitter states that existing flooding in the area is significant, with Hendersons Road inaccessible due to flooding.	Turn the site into a wetland.
19	Susan Reynolds	19.1	Support	The submitter supports the plan change, but is concerned about increased traffic volumes, due to existing congestion.	Approve the private plan change, on the basis that a separate cycleway is constructed along Hendersons and Cashmere Roads and the frequency of service for the Westmorland bus route (Route 44) is increased.
19	Susan Reynolds	19.2	Support	The submitter also states that the proposal does not provide a cycleway or improved Public Transport.	Approve the private plan change, on the basis that a separate cycleway is constructed along Hendersons and Cashmere Roads and the frequency of service for the Westmorland bus route (Route 44) is increased.
20	Peter John Coleman	20.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, as there will be a significant increase in traffic on Leistrella Road.	Require the proposal to have direct access to Sparks Road and no access to the original Leistrella Road.
21	Grant Davies	21.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, concerned about the intensification of an area that does not have sufficient existing stormwater infrastructure and experiences flooding.	Commit to fixing the drainage in the area before approving any more additional development.
21	Grant Davies	21.2	Oppose	The submitter is also concerned about downstream flooding effects.	Commit to fixing the drainage in the area before approving any more additional development.

22	Sue Walker on behalf of Individual and collective group of Sparks Road residents	22.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, stating that there is enough recently constructed and planned for subdivisions in the area.	Repeat the traffic projections to include recently constructed and planned for subdivisions in the area.
22	Sue Walker on behalf of Individual and collective group of Sparks Road residents	22.2	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about increased traffic volumes and that many recently constructed and planned for subdivisions have not been accounted for in traffic projections.	Repeat the traffic projections to include recently constructed and planned for subdivisions in the area.
22	Sue Walker on behalf of Individual and collective group of Sparks Road residents	22.3	Oppose	The submitter is concerned stormwater modelling has not considered planned for subdivisions, that flooding will worsen, and that waterway health will reduce.	Enforce design changes (e.g. relocating or expanding wetland/swale buffer areas) and provide assurances that stormwater will be appropriately managed to protect wetland function and avoid increasing flood risk to neighbouring properties.
22	Sue Walker on behalf of Individual and collective group of Sparks Road residents	22.4	Oppose	The submitter references District Plan policy on not transferring natural hazard risk, suggesting the proposal may increase flood risk to existing properties.	Enforce design changes (e.g. relocating or expanding wetland/swale buffer areas) and provide assurances that stormwater will be appropriately managed to protect wetland function and avoid increasing flood risk to neighbouring properties.
22	Sue Walker on behalf of Individual and collective group of Sparks Road residents	22.5	Oppose	The submitter also concerned about increased impervious surfaces reducing groundwater recharge and affecting nearby wetlands and drains.	Enforce design changes (e.g. relocating or expanding wetland/swale buffer areas) and provide assurances that stormwater will be appropriately managed to protect wetland function and avoid increasing flood risk to neighbouring properties.
22	Sue Walker on behalf of Individual and collective group of Sparks Road residents	22.6	Oppose	The submitter identifies factual inaccuracies in the Section 32 report, noting that an additional recently constructed dwelling at 126 Sparks Road has not been acknowledged. They state that this dwelling, built with elevated foundations due to high flood hazard and groundwater conditions, sets a precedent for future development on the site.	Enforce that reports and investigations used to inform foundation information are redone.
22	Sue Walker on behalf of Individual and collective group of Sparks Road residents	22.7	Oppose	The submitter also questions the reliability and currency of technical reports and assessments supporting the PPC, suggesting they are outdated or not reflective of current site conditions.	Enforce that reports and investigations used to inform foundation information are redone.
22	Sue Walker on behalf of Individual and collective group of Sparks Road residents	22.8	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that proposed housing along the northern boundary will require similarly elevated foundations, resulting in visually dominant and imposing buildings when viewed from existing properties. Concerns are raised about amenity effects, including loss of privacy, proximity of development, and potential vibration effects from foundation works on nearby homes (particularly given prior earthquake damage).	Reconsider the proposal, with particular attention to potential effects on Sparks Road residents.
22	Sue Walker on behalf of Individual and collective group of Sparks Road residents	22.9	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about a reduction in water pressure.	Reconsider the proposal, with particular attention to potential effects on Sparks Road residents.

23	Aaron Swann	23.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, citing concerns relating to stormwater runoff from new development, building height and proximity to existing properties, and overall housing density. Additional concerns include boundary treatments, wildlife welfare, social and visual impacts, loss of privacy and potential effects on property values, as well as the alteration of a significant water catchment area.	Meet with the submitter and other residents to clarify these concerns.
24	Anna Kokje	24.1	Support	The submitter is supportive of the plan change, and raises some concerns about active mode infrastructure to and from the proposed subdivision, noting that: - There is no clear path through Kaiwara Reserve. - Existing cycle lanes on Blakiston Street, Hoon Hay Road, and Cashmere Road are narrow, lack physical separation, and are unsafe at peak traffic times, especially for turning movements. - Increased cycling from the new development could heighten the risk of accidents, which the proposal does not adequately address. The submitter also raises traffic concerns, questioning the traffic report's conclusion that an additional three hundred dwellings will have minimal impact, citing existing congestion along Cashmere Road and peak-hour detours through Kaiwara Street and Blakiston Street.	Improve cyclist safety along Cashmere and Hoon Hay Road.
24	Anna Kokje	24.2	Support	The submitter states that trees on the site have visual, environmental, and canopy value, and expresses scepticism that the developer will retain them without explicit safeguards.	Protect some of the trees on the site.
25	Graham Trost	25.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form, while acknowledging that they are not opposed to development in principle. Their primary concern is that the proposal does not provide sufficient information or certainty to demonstrate that development can occur without adverse effects on neighbouring properties, particularly those along Sparks Road. The submitter is concerned about infrastructure and servicing, especially the adequacy and condition of existing community laterals, and the roading network. The submitter is concerned that there is insufficient publicly available information about these systems, including their condition, capacity, invert levels, and grades.	Provide detailed information on existing community laterals, including their location, condition, capacity, invert levels, and grades.
25	Graham Trost	25.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change in its current form, while acknowledging that they are not opposed to development in principle. Their primary concern is that the proposal does not provide sufficient information or certainty to demonstrate that development can occur without adverse effects on neighbouring properties, particularly those along Sparks Road. The submitter is concerned about infrastructure and servicing, especially the adequacy and condition of existing community laterals, and the roading network. The submitter is concerned that there is insufficient publicly available information about these systems, including their condition, capacity, invert levels, and grades.	Demonstrate that existing infrastructure is sufficient to service the development without adverse effects on neighbouring properties.
25	Graham Trost	25.3	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns about lack of transparency and supporting technical information, noting that site-specific investigations do not appear to have been fully undertaken or disclosed.	Undertake and disclose comprehensive site investigations of infrastructure connections and servicing arrangements.

25	Graham Trost	25.4	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns about lack of transparency and supporting technical information, noting that site-specific investigations do not appear to have been fully undertaken or disclosed.	Make all relevant technical information publicly available to affected property owners.
25	Graham Trost	25.5	Oppose	The submitter highlights the relevance of previous objections made to earlier applications by the same developer, suggesting that these concerns may still apply and have not been adequately resolved or reassessed in the context of the current plan change.	Revisit and assess previous objections raised in earlier applications by the same developer.
25	Graham Trost	25.6	Oppose	The submitter highlights the relevance of previous objections made to earlier applications by the same developer, suggesting that these concerns may still apply and have not been adequately resolved or reassessed in the context of the current plan change.	Confirm that any previously identified issues have been appropriately addressed or resolved.
25	Graham Trost	25.7	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about the social impacts of development on existing residents, including effects on wellbeing, day-to-day living, and how people interact within the community as density increases.	Ensure the proposed private plan change appropriately considers resident well-being.
25	Graham Trost	25.8	Oppose	The submitter highlights the importance of greenspace, open space, and environmental quality, expressing concern that these may not be sufficiently protected or integrated, potentially reducing amenity and the environmental character of the area.	Ensure the proposed private plan change appropriately considers environmental impacts.
25	Graham Trost	25.9	Oppose	The submitter emphasises a strong connection to place (particularly along Sparks Road) and is concerned that the proposal may not adequately respect or respond to the existing character, identity, and lived experience of the area.	Ensure the proposed private plan change appropriately considers social impacts.
25	Graham Trost	25.10	Oppose	The submitter notes the importance of property as a financial asset and raises concerns that the development could lead to a reduction in property values.	Ensure the proposed private plan change appropriately considers social impacts.
26	Justin Avi	26.1	Support	The submitter supports the plan change but would like to see a greater density of homes than the proposed three hundred, with varying housing typologies and some mixed use.	Require increased density to fit more than 300 homes on the site, and to include some low to mid rise apartments.
26	Justin Avi	26.2	Support	The submitter suggests the requirement for some houses in the proposed development to be affordable and/or for first home buyers.	Require some houses in the proposed development to be affordable and/or for first home buyers.
26	Justin Avi	26.3	Support	The submitter suggests encouraging Environment Canterbury to create a new bus route that goes from city to Halswell via Sparks Road, and potentially some express service extension beyond to Lincoln/Rolleston via Tai Tapu.	Create a new bus route that goes from city to Halswell via Sparks Road, and potentially some express service extension beyond to Lincoln/Rolleston via Tai Tapu.
26	Justin Avi	26.4	Support	The submitter suggests encouraging Central Government to provide a new High School within the area.	Provide a new High School within the area.
27	Hannah Squire	27.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, stating that infrastructure around the area is not keeping up with the rapid growth and needs significant more work before more development is added.	Decline the private plan change.

28	Leah Williams	28.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, stating that there is not enough infrastructure to support this in this area such as schools and roading, and that the building of houses should be stopped.	Decline the private plan change.
28	Leah Williams	28.2	Oppose	The submitter states that the area is prone to flooding and development result in increased pressure on water drainage.	Decline the private plan change.
29	Zac Porter	29.1	Oppose	The submitter did not provide further details.	Decline the private plan change.
30	Fiona Niles	30.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, stating the growth in the area is too fast without the appropriate level of roading and provisions.	That the roading within the area be to an appropriate standard before adding more dwellings.
30	Fiona Niles	30.2	Oppose	The submitter states that infrastructure is not ready for an increase of 300 dwellings, with numerous developments already underway.	Ensuring roading, schooling, and commercial offerings are of a suitable level to service the population before adding more dwellings.
31	Danielle Millar	31.1	Neutral	The submitter supports the need for additional housing but raises concerns that growth in Halswell has not been matched by supporting infrastructure, particularly incomplete and disconnected footpath networks.	If the proposal is approved, look at providing a direct bus service that links the new subdivisions around the quarry area, including the Miln's Road retirement village, directly to central city.
31	Danielle Millar	31.2	Neutral	The submitter supports the need for additional housing but raises concerns that growth in Halswell has not been matched by supporting infrastructure, particularly incomplete and disconnected footpath networks.	Reserve a large portion of land in the area for a secondary school.
31	Danielle Millar	31.3	Neutral	The submitter supports the need for additional housing but raises concerns that growth in Halswell has not been matched by supporting infrastructure, particularly incomplete and disconnected footpath networks.	Approve the private plan change, on the basis that developer pays for logical infrastructure, including linking footpaths to the wider footpath network.
32	David Clarke	32.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, concerned about the size of the development, its impacts on traffic volumes, flood risk and associated property damage, and a lack of high school capacity.	Reduce the number of planned houses or increase minimum sections size.
32	David Clarke	32.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, concerned about the size of the development, its impacts on traffic volumes, flood risk and associated property damage, and a lack of high school capacity.	Amend the proposal to include business developments such as cafes, restaurants and dairies.
32	David Clarke	32.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, concerned about the size of the development, its impacts on traffic volumes, flood risk and associated property damage, and a lack of high school capacity.	Plan for a school to support new housing developments.

33	Danni Chen	33.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, the submitter raises concerns about traffic congestion and ongoing roadworks, noting that it is already difficult to travel in and out of Halswell.	Delay further expansion of the Halswell area.
33	Danni Chen	33.2	Oppose	The submitter consider that existing infrastructure upgrades should be completed and assessed before further increasing housing density, and question whether current improvements will be sufficient to meet future demand.	Finish undertaking existing infrastructure upgrades and then assess if there is sufficient capacity for additional dwellings and residents before rezoning the site.
33	Danni Chen	33.3	Oppose	The submitter consider that existing infrastructure upgrades should be completed and assessed before further increasing housing density, and question whether current improvements will be sufficient to meet future demand.	Provide community infrastructure, including parks, early childhood facilities, and primary and secondary schools, ahead of or alongside further residential development.
34	Kezia Rodden	34.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, due to their being insufficient infrastructure in the wider area, and a lack of schooling options and long-term plan to accommodate an increase in high school children.	Provide more infrastructure around the wider area and properly address roading issues.
35	Laura McClure	35.1	Support	The submitter supports the plan change, considering it a sensible approach to accommodating city growth and promoting residential development close to the CBD. The submitter highlights the benefits of intensification near the city centre.	Approve the private plan change.
35	Laura McClure	35.2	Support	While acknowledging some existing infrastructure constraints, the submitter considers the area capable of accommodating additional housing provided infrastructure is appropriately upgraded.	Approve the private plan change.
36	Rachel Lockwood	36.1	Neutral	The submitter acknowledges need for housing but considers the area to be in significant need of a new secondary school to accommodate population growth.	Provide a new secondary school within the area.
37	Sylvia Nissen	37.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, insufficient supporting infrastructure to accommodate an additional 300 dwellings, particularly given recent large-scale growth in the area. The submitter states there is a significant shortfall in education provision.	In considering the proposed plan change, ensure adequate land is set aside for new primary and secondary schools.
37	Sylvia Nissen	37.2	Oppose	The submitter expresses concerns regarding access to essential services, including healthcare and early childhood education. The submitter also highlights a lack of recreational infrastructure, particularly sports fields.	In considering the proposed plan change, ensure adequate land is set aside for sports grounds, parks with playgrounds, early childhood education providers, and doctors.
37	Sylvia Nissen	37.3	Oppose	The submitter expresses concerns about the poor condition and performance of Cashmere Road, noting flooding issues and stormwater infrastructure capacity, ongoing maintenance needs, and a lack of safe cycling and pedestrian infrastructure. The submitter considers that further development will exacerbate transport and safety issues.	In considering the proposed plan change, ensure Cashmere Road is upgraded so that it does not regularly flood and that footpath and cycling infrastructure is adequate and cohesive.

37	Sylvia Nissen	37.4	Oppose	The submitter notes a pattern of rapid development in the wider area without adequate infrastructure upgrades.	In considering the proposed plan change, ensure development contributions are sufficient and use to support infrastructure development in the area.
38	Rachel Kirk	38.1	Oppose	Thesubmitter opposes the plan change, expressing concern regarding the proposal being within a flood management area, and the potential transfer of flood risk to existing properties.	Require detailed, site-specific stormwater and flood modelling for the northern boundary, demonstrating no transfer of flood risk and clear integration of runoff into wetland systems.
38	Rachel Kirk	38.2	Oppose	The submitter states wetland design must genuinely enhance ecological values rather than function solely as engineered detention. The submitter expresses concerns about the removal of trees and habitats, and associated impacts on wildlife.	Require the wetland and swale systems to be positioned and designed so that runoff from the northern boundary contributes positively to wetland function rather than being diverted away from it.
38	Rachel Kirk	38.3	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the elevated foundations required by flood and seismic conditions, and the proposed 10 houses along the northern boundary may cause overlooking, shading, and visual dominance on existing properties. The submitter states that Proposed densities of 15–20 households/ha (up to 440 dwellings) represent significant intensification adjacent to low-density properties, requiring mitigation. The submitter states the proposal provides no clear details on setbacks, fencing, or planting buffers along northern properties.	Impose specific boundary interface controls along Sparks Road, including height limits or single-storey restrictions along the northern boundary, maximum finished floor level controls relative to existing ground levels, increased setbacks, mandatory landscape buffers or shelter planting and clear fencing provisions.
38	Rachel Kirk	38.4	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the elevated foundations required by flood and seismic conditions, and the proposed 10 houses along the northern boundary may cause overlooking, shading, and visual dominance on existing properties. The submitter states that Proposed densities of 15–20 households/ha (up to 440 dwellings) represent significant intensification adjacent to low-density properties, requiring mitigation. The submitter states the proposal provides no clear details on setbacks, fencing, or planting buffers along northern properties.	Ensure that amenity, privacy, shading, and visual dominance effects on existing residents are specifically assessed and mitigated through enforceable ODP provisions.
38	Rachel Kirk	38.5	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that the elevated foundations required by flood and seismic conditions, and the proposed 10 houses along the northern boundary may cause overlooking, shading, and visual dominance on existing properties. The submitter states that Proposed densities of 15–20 households/ha (up to 440 dwellings) represent significant intensification adjacent to low-density properties, requiring mitigation. The submitter states the proposal provides no clear details on setbacks, fencing, or planting buffers along northern properties.	Consider extending the Rural Urban Fringe (RuFU) zoning to the full northern boundary (Sparks Road interface) for a more appropriate transitional edge between existing properties and higher-density residential development.
38	Rachel Kirk	38.6	Oppose	The submitter expresses concerns about water supply capacity and domestic pressure due to increased demand.	Require clear infrastructure modelling (including water supply capacity) that demonstrates no reduction in service levels for existing residents.

38	Rachel Kirk	38.7	Oppose	The submitter states the site is not a priority growth area and that development may reduce property enjoyment, value, and insurance considerations.	Ensure the northern boundary be treated fairly, that risks are not transferred, and that meaningful mitigation is built into the plan change, not deferred to later stages.
39	Michael Simek	39.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, expressing concern regarding infrastructure capacity, roading safety, congestions, and a lack of active mode infrastructure. States that development in the area has reduced the safety of commuters including school children.	Decline the private plan change, until such time that there is sufficient infrastructure provision to accommodate the development.
40	Margaret Winter	40.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, expressing concerned that the proposed development could redirect floodwaters along roads, increasing the risk of flooding to their home.	Decline the private plan change.
40	Margaret Winter	40.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes intensifying housing in flood-prone areas and considers that the development does not adequately account for future flood risks, and states that housing should not be in Flood Management Areas given these uncertainties.	Decline the private plan change.
41	Andrew Evans	41.1	Support	The submitter strongly supports the plan change, arguing that growth should occur near the city rather than in outlying areas like Selwyn, Lincoln, or Rangiora to avoid congestion and inefficient sprawl.	Approve the private plan change.
41	Andrew Evans	41.2	Support	The submitter considers concerns about rural character secondary to the benefits of urban development and proximity to the city.	Approve the private plan change.
41	Andrew Evans	41.3	Support	The submitter does not support mandating minimum housing densities, preferring that market demand guide development.	Approve the private plan change.
42	Alex Gabites	42.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, the submitter raises concerns about existing stormwater and wastewater capacity issues, noting current ponding, sewer overflows, and drainage problems during heavy rainfall events. The submitter is concerned that additional development would exacerbate flooding and infrastructure pressures.	Decline the private plan change.
42	Alex Gabites	42.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, the submitter raises concerns about existing stormwater and wastewater capacity issues, noting current ponding, sewer overflows, and drainage problems during heavy rainfall events. The submitter is concerned that additional development would exacerbate flooding and infrastructure pressures.	Where development in the area does proceed, limit it to low-density housing consistent with the existing neighbourhood to reduce pressure on stormwater and wastewater systems,
42	Alex Gabites	42.3	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, the submitter raises concerns about existing stormwater and wastewater capacity issues, noting current ponding, sewer overflows, and drainage problems during heavy rainfall events. The submitter is concerned that additional development would exacerbate flooding and infrastructure pressures.	Where development in the area does proceed, Stilwell Drain North be widened and naturalised to improve stormwater capacity.

42	Alex Gabites	42.4	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, the submitter raises concerns about existing stormwater and wastewater capacity issues, noting current ponding, sewer overflows, and drainage problems during heavy rainfall events. The submitter is concerned that additional development would exacerbate flooding and infrastructure pressures.	Upgrade existing infrastructure, particularly the wastewater and stormwater networks, to ensure they can accommodate additional development without worsening flooding or servicing issues.
43	Mathew Lee on behalf of Mathew Lee & Family Trust	43.1	Oppose	The submitter requests that properties to the west of the subject site be included in the proposed plan change for rezoning.	Consult all the rural landowners within the area, to undertake future development of residential housing and greenspace.
44	Tricia McNaughton	44.1	Neutral	The submitter is concerned regarding lack of infrastructure, particularly schools, and a lack of footpaths along Hendersons Road.	Increase the capacity of the schools in the area.
44	Tricia McNaughton	44.2	Neutral	The submitter is concerned regarding lack of infrastructure, particularly schools, and a lack of footpaths along Hendersons Road.	Provide footpaths along Hendersons Road.
44	Tricia McNaughton	44.3	Neutral	The submitter is pleased with addition of wetlands and reserves.	No resolution sought.
45	John Haylock	45.1	Neutral	The submitter is neutral on the application overall, noting some benefits such as improved walkability, and acknowledges the value of existing green spaces and amenities.	No resolution sought.
45	John Haylock	45.2	Neutral	The submitter raises broader concerns about urban sprawl and low-density development in New Zealand, advocating for more compact and higher-density housing forms similar to those in Europe and Asia. The submitter highlights the inefficiency of large individual land parcels, including land consumption and energy use, and supports more consolidated living patterns. The submitter notes that while inner-city intensification is progressing, developments should still provide adequate storage and parking.	Stop the fragmentation of productive land for housing.
46	Robin Berthault	46.1	Neutral	The submitter raises concerns about floodplains, groundwater conditions, and wetland loss, noting that existing wet areas between Henderson, Cashmere, and Sparks Roads are being encroached upon by development.	Increase infrastructure to accommodate increased users as a result of developments.
46	Robin Berthault	46.2	Neutral	The submitter expresses concern about stormwater and flood resilience, stating that wetland removal could reduce local flood protection.	Retain or increase protected wetland areas in proportion to development forecasts.
46	Robin Berthault	46.3	Neutral	The submitter raises transport safety concerns on Cashmere Road, including high traffic volumes, near-misses involving cyclists and pedestrians, and driver frustration during peak periods.	Create safe pedestrian and cycle ways with crossings along the entirety of Cashmere Road and Hendersons Road.

47	Sharon Marquet	47.1	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns about stormwater drainage capacity behind their property, noting existing backflow and localised flooding during heavy rain events.	Provide clarity on how stormwater will be managed if development occurs, and whether changes in land levels or drainage could increase flood risk to nearby properties.
47	Sharon Marquet	47.2	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns about potential traffic effects, particularly on Northaw Street and Sparks Road, noting existing congestion and safety issues during school drop-off and events.	No resolution sought.
48	John & Karen Walker	48.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, raising concerns about increased traffic and safety issues, noting reduced visibility, parked vehicles, and existing congestion near schools and the CBD route.	Decline the private plan change.
48	John & Karen Walker	48.2	Oppose	The submitter express significant concern about stormwater and flooding risk.	Decline the private plan change.
48	John & Karen Walker	48.3	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about loss of amenity, including reduced views, privacy, and increased noise from potential boundary fencing and neighbouring development.	Decline the private plan change.
48	John & Karen Walker	48.4	Oppose	The submitter anticipates construction and operational impacts, including noise, dust, fumes, and disruption from earthworks and housing construction activities over an extended period.	Decline the private plan change.
48	John & Karen Walker	48.5	Oppose	The submitter opposes the loss of productive rural land, stating it is inconsistent with government policy.	Require the site to be used for productive use.
49	Karl Swart	49.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, stating the proposal would result in a significant loss of greenspace.	Decline the private plan change.
50	Astrid Saville	50.1	Not stated	The submitter raises concerns about increased traffic generation from the proposed residential development, particularly impacts on Leistrella Road. The submitter notes that Leistrella Road already experiences constrained capacity and visibility issues due to on-street parking, effectively limiting two-way traffic flow.	Undertake road widening or parking controls on Leistrella Road heading towards Hoon Hay Road.
50	Astrid Saville	50.2	Not stated	The submitter highlights limited alternative access routes, stating that residents must use Leistrella Road to reach Hoon Hay Road due to restricted movements at the Rydal Street/Sparks Road intersection.	Undertake intersection upgrades at Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road.
50	Astrid Saville	50.3	Not stated	The submitter anticipates peak-hour congestion and queuing at the Hoon Hay Road/Leistrella Road intersection, resulting in a traffic bottleneck.	Undertake coordination of traffic management improvements at the Rose Street and Hoon Hay Road

					intersection in conjunction with the intersection with Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road.
51	Angela Clothier	51.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, concerned about the impact of land directly behind their property, and increased water run-off risk.	Decline the private plan change.
52	Jaimita and Alvaro de Jongh and Lo-Fo-Wong	52.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, raising significant traffic safety concerns, citing congestion, unsafe cycling and pedestrian conditions, and increased risk from additional vehicle movements associated with the proposed subdivision. The submitter is concerned that development would discourage active transport to nearby schools and worsen already unsafe road conditions.	Decline the private plan change.
52	Jaimita and Alvaro de Jongh and Lo-Fo-Wong	52.2	Oppose	The submitter considers the land to be highly productive (LUC Class 2) and oppose rezoning for residential development under national policy direction.	Decline the private plan change.
52	Jaimita and Alvaro de Jongh and Lo-Fo-Wong	52.3	Oppose	The submitter raises extensive stormwater and flooding concerns. The submitter is concerned about future insurability and financial risk for residents in flood-prone areas, citing examples of insurance cost increases and market withdrawal from similar locations.	Retain the area for flood mitigation, potentially through public acquisition.
53	Michelle Burns	53.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, raising concerns about existing surface flooding and inadequate stormwater drainage in the area, noting that gutters already fill after minor rainfall due to a high-water table and low-lying land.	Decline the private plan change.
53	Michelle Burns	53.2	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, raising concerns about existing surface flooding and inadequate stormwater drainage in the area, noting that gutters already fill after minor rainfall due to a high-water table and low-lying land.	Undertake prioritise development on land that is more suitable for urban development.
53	Michelle Burns	53.3	Oppose	The submitter considers that further housing and increased impervious surfaces will worsen stormwater issues.	Address the area's existing stormwater issues before adding more housing.
54	Mark Lee on behalf of M O Lee Family Trust	54.1	Oppose	The submitter seeks for their property to be rezoned to residential zoning.	Consult all the rural landowners within the area, to undertake future development of residential housing.
55	Marianne Lewis	55.1	Support	The submitter is supportive of the plan change, supporting increased housing in the Christchurch area, noting a general need for additional supply.	Approve the private plan change.
55	Marianne Lewis	55.2	Support	The submitter considers the site's current Rural zoning to be inappropriate, given its proximity to the city and existing urban development.	Approve the private plan change.
55	Marianne Lewis	55.3	Support	The submitter highlights that the area has existing infrastructure capacity and would improve connectivity, including road links and cycle/walkway connections between Westmorland, schools, and community facilities.	Approve the private plan change.

55	Marianne Lewis	55.4	Support	The submitter notes good public transport accessibility, being close to Orbiter bus routes.	Approve the private plan change.
56	Lynn Lewis	56.1	Support	The submitter supports residential development, particularly Medium Density Residential Zone (MDRZ) housing, alongside the inclusion of additional natural areas and green space.	Approve the private plan change with Medium Density Residential Zoning.
56	Lynn Lewis	56.2	Support	The submitter notes that existing infrastructure is largely in place, with opportunities for improved transport connections, including cycleways and public transport routes.	Approve the private plan change with Medium Density Residential Zoning.
56	Lynn Lewis	56.3	Support	The submitter emphasises the importance of maintaining a mix of housing types, arguing that not all development should be high-density.	Approve the private plan change with Medium Density Residential Zoning.
56	Lynn Lewis	56.4	Support	The submitter highlights the value of natural areas for community use, education, and wildlife, particularly for schools and public recreation.	Approve the private plan change with Medium Density Residential Zoning.
56	Lynn Lewis	56.5	Support	The submitter supports completing the area in a consistent urban design style that integrates with existing development, improving urban form and avoiding abrupt edges.	Approve the private plan change with Medium Density Residential Zoning.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.1	Support	The submitter, owner of 150 Sparks Road (adjoining the PC18 area), questions whether the PC18 flood modelling and compensatory storage calculations rely on assumed flood storage capacity on 150 Sparks Road, potentially without the landowner's knowledge or consent.	Confirm through the s42A report or through provisions in the ODP text, that the PC18 flood modelling does not rely on any assumption on that 150 Sparks Road will remain undeveloped or will provide flood storage for the PC18 development.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.2	Support	The submitter, owner of 150 Sparks Road (adjoining the PC18 area), questions whether the PC18 flood modelling and compensatory storage calculations rely on assumed flood storage capacity on 150 Sparks Road, potentially without the landowner's knowledge or consent.	Confirm through the s42A report or through provisions in the ODP text, that the compensatory storage calculations for PC18 are self-contained within the PC18 land and do not depend on flood storage capacity outside the PC18 boundary, including on 150 Sparks Road.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.3	Support	The submitter, owner of 150 Sparks Road (adjoining the PC18 area), questions whether the PC18 flood modelling and compensatory storage calculations rely on assumed flood storage capacity on 150 Sparks Road, potentially without the landowner's knowledge or consent.	The decision sought by the submitter is that Council confirm through the s42A report or through provisions in the ODP text, that if the modelling does make any such assumption on, the applicant is required to identify this explicitly and demonstrate that the assumption is lawfully secured or that the PC18 proposal can achieve flood neutrality without reliance on 150 Sparks Road.

57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.4	Support	The submitter is concerned that earthworks, filling, and stormwater works associated with PC18 could alter flood paths, increase flood levels, or redirect stormwater onto 150 Sparks Road, which is lower-lying and therefore particularly vulnerable to even small changes in flooding behaviour.	Provide a provision in the ODP text requiring that the PC18 development shall not increase flood levels, flood extents, or flood duration on any neighbouring property, including 150 Sparks Road, for the 2% AEP (50-year) and 0.5% AEP (200-year) events, including allowance for climate change.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.5	Support	The submitter is concerned that earthworks, filling, and stormwater works associated with PC18 could alter flood paths, increase flood levels, or redirect stormwater onto 150 Sparks Road, which is lower-lying and therefore particularly vulnerable to even small changes in flooding behaviour.	Provide a requirement in the ODP text for ongoing monitoring of flood effects during and after development, with a requirement to remedy any identify adverse effects on neighbouring properties.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.6	Support	The submitter is concerned the PC18 stormwater management system may direct treated or untreated runoff toward or across 150 Sparks Road.	Require confirmation on that no stormwater from the PC18 development will be discharged onto or directed toward 150 Sparks Road, either directly or via overland flow paths, without the prior written consent of the submitter.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.7	Support	The submitter is concerned the PC18 stormwater management system may direct treated or untreated runoff toward or across 150 Sparks Road.	Require that if any stormwater infrastructure is proposed that would affect flow paths to or across 150 Sparks Road, the submitter seeks to be a directly affected party with approval rights.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.8	Support	The submitter is concerned that PC18 and any updated flood modelling or overlays could unnecessarily constrain the future residential development potential of the northern part of 150 Sparks Road, which they consider suitable for around 20 sections.	Ensure that the PC18 decision and any associated flood modelling updates do not result in any new or more restrictive flood overlays being applied to 150 Sparks Road as a consequence of the PC18 development.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.9	Support	The submitter states this area is a logical extension of nearby residential development and note that existing flood hazard overlays may be based on outdated modelling.	Ensure that the DHI flood modelling undertaken for PC18 explicitly reports on pre-development and post-development flood levels at the northern boundary of 150 Sparks Road (adjacent to Sparks Road), so that there is a clear and current evidence base available regarding actual flood risk on the higher ground of the submitter's property.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.10	Support	The submitter points to PC18 modelling suggesting potential flood level reductions in the wider basin, arguing this could improve flood conditions on their land and should be reflected in updated overlays.	Ensure that if the flood modelling confirms that the PC18 stormwater infrastructure reduces flood levels on the northern portion on of 150 Sparks Road, this should be acknowledged in the s42A report and in any recommendations regarding flood overlay mapping for the area.

57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.11	Support	The submitter considers PC18 an opportunity to ensure more accurate flood modelling and planning outcomes that recognise future development potential of their property.	Ensure that the Outline Development Plan or equivalent planning framework for PC18 expressly acknowledges that 150 Sparks Road is not part of the PC18 area and that the plan change does not determine or constrain the future land use of 150 Sparks Road.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.12	Support	The submitter considers PC18 an opportunity to ensure more accurate flood modelling and planning outcomes that recognise future development potential of their property.	If it is proposed to use any part of 150 Sparks Road for flood storage or stormwater management purposes in connection on with PC18, this must be the subject of a separate agreement with the submitter on fair and reasonable terms.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.13	Support	The submitter is concerned that 150 Sparks Road has limited access to areas suitable for future development, and that the PC18 subdivision will introduce new roads but may not provide future connectivity to their land.	Provide an amendment to the PC18 Outline Development Plan and roading layout to include provision for a future road connection on (or road stub) to the boundary of 150 Sparks Road at a location that provides practical access to the submitter's potential residential envelope. The connection on point should be agreed with the submitter or, failing agreement, determined by Council.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.14	Support	The submitter states that without such provision, the remaining land could become constrained or effectively landlocked, reducing its development potential.	If a direct road connection to the boundary of 150 Sparks Road is not feasible, Council provide a provision in the ODP requiring that the PC18 development does not preclude future access to 150 Sparks Road from the PC18 roading network, including by reserving a suitable corridor or easement strip along the shared boundary.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.15	Support	The submitter considers that good planning practice requires new subdivisions to include road connections to adjoining land where future development is likely.	Ensure the submitter be consulted on the PC18 roading layout before it is finalised, to ensure that connectivity to 150 Sparks Road is properly considered as part of the Outline Development Plan.

57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.16	Support	The submitter acknowledges that the Council may consider 150 Sparks Road important for wider catchment flood management and supports integrated stormwater planning.	If the hearing panel considers that the wider catchment stormwater management solution requires the use of land at 150 Sparks Road, the submitter seeks a direction or recommendation on that Council must negotiate in good faith with the submitter for the acquisition on of any required land, on terms that reflect the strategic infrastructure value of the land, not merely its rural or flood-affected value.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.17	Support	The submitter is concerned that assumptions made through PC18 could pre-empt or undermine a proper, transparent process for any future acquisition or use of their land for infrastructure purposes.	Ensure any assumption on about the availability of 150 Sparks Road for flood storage must be understood as contingent on a separate, properly compensated arrangement with the landowner.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.18	Support	The submitter does not oppose urban development in principle but seeks assurance that PC18 will not increase flood risk to 150 Sparks Road, which is lower-lying and within the same catchment. The submitter states that the current flood modelling contains significant gaps and uncertainties, including missing climate change scenarios, limited storm duration assumptions, incomplete infrastructure modelling, unresolved model issues, and lack of cumulative effects assessment. The submitter considers that these deficiencies mean the effects on their property cannot be confidently assessed at this stage. The submitter states under national policy on natural hazards, decisions must be based on the best available information, and that the current modelling does not meet this standard.	An independent peer review of the flood modelling be required as a condition on of the plan change becoming operative, with focus on the effects on lower-lying land adjoining the PC18 site to the west, including 150 Sparks Road, and with the submitter having the right to participate in that process and to raise the matters identified in this submission. This peer review should address, as a minimum: That the peer review address, as a minimum: climate change scenarios consistent with CCC and Ministry for the Environment guidance; the use of the 48-hour critical storm duration (or longer if found to be more critical) for assessing off-site effects on land within Henderson's Basin; the unresolved model instability near Valley and Cashmere Roads; confirmation that the March 2025 pond design performs as assumed; and cumulative effects of foreseeable future development within the catchment.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.19	Support	The submitter does not oppose urban development in principle but seeks assurance that PC18 will not increase flood risk to 150 Sparks Road, which is lower-lying and within the same catchment. The submitter states that the current flood modelling contains significant gaps and uncertainties, including missing climate change scenarios, limited storm duration assumptions, incomplete infrastructure modelling, unresolved model issues, and lack of cumulative effects assessment. The submitter considers that these deficiencies mean the effects on their property cannot be confidently assessed at this stage. The submitter states under national policy on	Ensure that the plan change not become operative until the peer review has been completed and the submitter has had the opportunity to review its findings.

				natural hazards, decisions must be based on the best available information, and that the current modelling does not meet this standard.	
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.20	Support	The submitter is concerned that the proposed wastewater network is designed only for the PC18 development, with no provision for future extension to adjoining land, including 150 Sparks Road. The submitter states this could preclude future wastewater connection from nearby land and is inconsistent with the proposal's stated intent of integrated urban development.	Ensure there is a provision in the ODP text requiring that the PC18 wastewater network be designed with sufficient capacity and connection on points to allow future extension to adjoining land, including 150 Sparks Road, consistent with the applicant's argument that the area is a logical and integrated urban extension.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.21	Support	The submitter is concerned that the proposed wastewater network is designed only for the PC18 development, with no provision for future extension to adjoining land, including 150 Sparks Road. The submitter states this could preclude future wastewater connection from nearby land and is inconsistent with the proposal's stated intent of integrated urban development.	Ensure that the ODP require infrastructure corridors and wastewater connection on stubs at the boundary with 150 Sparks Road, so that future development is not precluded or made unreasonably expensive by the need to construct independent parallel infrastructure.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.22	Support	The submitter notes that the wastewater modelling is preliminary and incomplete, with unassessed factors such as air valves and odour, which may affect its reliability.	Ensure that the wastewater hydraulic modelling be updated to assess the capacity of the network to accommodate future connections from adjoining land, and the results inform the final network design.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.23	Support	The submitter is concerned that significant earthworks and filling required for PC18 will raise ground levels, thereby reducing existing flood storage capacity within Henderson's Basin.	Ensure that the applicant be required to quantify the total volume of fill to be placed within the Henderson's Basin flood management area and to demonstrate, through modelling (not assumptions), that the compensatory storage provided within the stormwater management areas fully offsets the loss of flood storage from filling.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.24	Support	The submitter states that the volume of fill and compensatory storage has not been fully quantified, and that stormwater mitigation design is still preliminary and uncertain. The submitter is concerned that loss of flood storage could increase flood risk to lower-lying neighbouring land, including 150 Sparks Road, by displacing water that currently ponds on the site during storm events.	Ensure that the ODP include a provision requiring compensatory storage to be provided at a ratio greater than 1:1 to account for uncertainty in the preliminary sizing, high groundwater constraints on basin depth, and climate change effects on flood volumes.

57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.25	Support	The submitter notes that the applicant's report acknowledges Stormwater Management Areas may need to integrate with adjacent land in the future, including 150 Sparks Road. The submitter is concerned that the plan does not require the infrastructure to be designed to enable this integration. The submitter states without such provisions, future coordinated stormwater management could be made impossible or significantly more costly, potentially leaving adjoining land with limited or unworkable drainage options.	Ensure that the ODP text require SMAs 1 and 2 to be designed and constructed with provision for future connect on to stormwater management facilities on adjoining western land, including 150 Sparks Road, consistent with the applicant 's own engineers' expectation on that these facilities will combine in the future.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.26	Support	The submitter notes that the applicant's report acknowledges Stormwater Management Areas may need to integrate with adjacent land in the future, including 150 Sparks Road. The submitter is concerned that the plan does not require the infrastructure to be designed to enable this integration. The submitter states that without such provisions, future coordinated stormwater management could be made impossible or significantly more costly, potentially leaving adjoining land with limited or unworkable drainage options.	Ensure that the ODP expressly identify connection on points or interface zones at the western boundary of the stormwater management areas where future integration with adjoining land can occur, and that the design of outlet structures, levels, and capacities not preclude such integration.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.27	Support	The submitter raises concerns that stormwater basin construction could introduce lateral spread risk in a seismic event, despite this not currently being a natural hazard on the site. The geotechnical report identifies high groundwater, weak soils, and liquefaction vulnerability, which may require mitigation if basins are built near the boundary. The submitter is concerned that these effects could extend onto 150 Sparks Road, potentially constraining future development or increasing foundation costs, and argue that impacts on adjoining properties have not been adequately assessed.	Require the applicant to assess the lateral spread risk created by the proposed stormwater basins in relation to their effects on adjoining land, including 150 Sparks Road, and to demonstrate that the basin locations and designs will not create or increase lateral spread risk on the submitter's property.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.28	Support	The submitter raises concerns that stormwater basin construction could introduce lateral spread risk in a seismic event, despite this not currently being a natural hazard on the site. The geotechnical report identifies high groundwater, weak soils, and liquefaction vulnerability, which may require mitigation if basins are built near the boundary. The submitter is concerned that these effects could extend onto 150 Sparks Road, potentially constraining future development or increasing foundation costs, and argue that impacts on adjoining properties have not been adequately assessed.	Require the ODP to have a minimum setback distance between stormwater basins and the boundary with 150 Sparks Road, informed by geotechnical assessment of lateral spread risk, to protect the submitter's development potential.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.29	Support	The submitter is concerned that key infrastructure and design matters for PC18 (including flood levels, stormwater systems, and wastewater design) are being deferred to the subdivision consent stage rather than resolved at plan change stage. The submitter states this means decisions are being made based on conceptual and uncertain modelling, despite zoning being determined at this stage.	Require that provisions be included in the ODP text (rather than deferred entirely to subdivision consent) requiring the stormwater and flood management system to achieve specified performance outcomes, including no increase in flood levels, flood extents, or flood duration 150 Sparks Road under both current climate and climate change scenarios.

57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.30	Support	The submitter is concerned that key infrastructure and design matters for PC18 (including flood levels, stormwater systems, and wastewater design) are being deferred to the subdivision consent stage rather than resolved at plan change stage. The submitter states this means decisions are being made based on conceptual and uncertain modelling, despite zoning being determined at this stage.	Require that the ODP text includes specific requirements for the stormwater management areas to be designed, constructed, and operational before or parallel with residential development in each stage, to ensure that assumed flood mitigation is delivered.
57	Tim Harris on Des and Gaye Skene	57.31	Support	The submitter is concerned they may have limited ability to participate or seek remedies later if actual design outcomes differ from the modelling, particularly given identified uncertainties and gaps in the technical assessments.	Ensure that affected adjoining landowners, including the submitter, be given notification on rights and an opportunity to review and comment on the detailed stormwater and flood management design at the subdivision consent stage.
58	Warren Richard Lewis	58.1	Support	The submitter (who is a landowner of the site) supports the plan change, describes the area as a highly sustainable Greenfield location close to the city centre with strong transport, employment, and community connections.	Approve the private plan change.
58	Warren Richard Lewis	58.2	Support	The submitter states that the site has existing infrastructure and nearby community facilities, and that development would enable efficient use of land, including stormwater treatment through wetlands and reserves.	Approve the private plan change.
58	Warren Richard Lewis	58.3	Support	The submitter states that the proposal is said to provide significant environmental and amenity benefits, including large reserves, ecological enhancement, and creation of a regional park network with cycle and walking links.	Approve the private plan change.
58	Warren Richard Lewis	58.4	Support	The submitter highlights transport advantages, including proximity to bus routes, potential cycle connectivity, and improved road network integration.	Approve the private plan change.
58	Warren Richard Lewis	58.5	Support	The submitter notes economic benefits, including developer contributions, increased rates revenue, and reduced pressure on ratepayers elsewhere, as well as potential housing supply benefits that could improve affordability.	Approve the private plan change.
59	Harriet White	59.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, primarily due to concerns about flooding and infrastructure capacity. The submitter states that development would increase impermeable surfaces and stormwater runoff, worsening flood risk for existing downstream residential areas.	Decline the private plan change.
59	Harriet White	59.2	Oppose	The submitter highlights concerns that the Henderson Basin plays a role in natural flood mitigation, and that its development could undermine this function.	Decline the private plan change.
59	Harriet White	59.3	Oppose	The submitter states that existing stormwater and water infrastructure is already under strain, with ageing pipes, frequent leaks, and insufficient capacity, and that upgrades are not confirmed or funded.	Decline the private plan change.
59	Harriet White	59.4	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns about cumulative effects and climate change.	Decline the private plan change.

59	Harriet White	59.5	Oppose	The submitter states that approving rezoning without certainty of upgraded infrastructure is inconsistent with sound planning practice, national precedents, and RMA principles, particularly around avoiding transfer of natural hazard risk.	Decline the private plan change.
60	Megan Avery	60.1	Support	The submitter supports the plan change, viewing the area as a highly suitable location for additional housing.	Approve the private plan change.
60	Megan Avery	60.2	Support	The submitter considers that more housing would help address housing affordability and competition in the area.	Approve the private plan change.
60	Megan Avery	60.3	Support	The submitter highlights strong access to amenities and community facilities, and good transport accessibility.	Approve the private plan change.
61	Ryan Brinch	61.1	Neutral	The submitter raises concerns that additional housing will push local infrastructure services close to or beyond capacity.	Ensure all relevant infrastructure services are upgraded/adequately provided as part of the subdivision to support current and future development.
61	Ryan Brinch	61.2	Neutral	The submitter notes the area is waterlogged in winter, and that raising land levels for development could potentially increase flood risk elsewhere during high tide or storm events.	Maintain or protect existing wetland areas to help reduce flooding risk.
61	Ryan Brinch	61.3	Neutral	The submitter highlights that Cashmere Road is in poor condition and would require significant upgrading to support further development.	Undertake a proper upgrade of Cashmere Road to improve traffic flow and overall road performance.
61	Ryan Brinch	61.4	Neutral	The submitter express concern about the safety and design of proposed transport changes, particularly the roundabout at Penruddock Rise and Cashmere Road.	Review the design of the Penruddock Rise / Cashmere Road roundabout to improve safety and reduce conflict points.
62	Nick Meeten	62.1	Support	The submitter generally supports the development, but highlights a lack of detail on housing outcomes, stating while higher-density development is anticipated (over 15 households/ha), there is no clarity on the actual yield or building types.	Request the developer to provide more information around the yield and development intentions in Area 4a.
62	Nick Meeten	62.2	Support	The submitter is concerned the site is being overdeveloped (“squeezed”), heightening flood risk to surrounding properties.	Request the developer to back off the extent of development around the Stillwells Drain, to provide more area for stormwater management.
62	Nick Meeten	62.3	Support	The submitter opposes a proposed road link to Blakiston Street.	Let the community know their intentions around the suggested road connection through Kaiwara St reserve.
62	Nick Meeten	62.4	Support	The submitter considered the stormwater modelling transparency to be Insufficient, providing no information on methodology, authors, or results, and concern that climate change impacts may	Request the developer to make available details of the stormwater modelling that has been done.

				not be adequately accounted for. The submitter is concerned about development in a low-lying flood-prone area.	
62	Nick Meeten	62.5	Support	The submitter considered the stormwater modelling transparency to be Insufficient, providing no information on methodology, authors, or results, and concern that climate change impacts may not be adequately accounted for. The submitter is concerned about development in a low-lying flood-prone area.	Take a careful look at the modelling through the lens of increasing stormwater intensities due to climate change.
63	Joe Conaghan	63.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, expressing concerns regarding an increase in traffic congestion and safety risks.	Decline the private plan change.
63	Joe Conaghan	63.2	Oppose	The submitter states the development would erode the semi-rural character; community feel and potentially harm local wildlife.	Where the proposal is approved, substantially revise the proposal to address the concerns outlined within the submission, particularly in relation to transport access and infrastructure capacity, and residential impact and amenity.
63	Joe Conaghan	63.3	Oppose	The submitter states the proposal lacks clear evidence that stormwater, ground stability, and climate change impacts are adequately addressed.	Decline the private plan change.
63	Joe Conaghan	63.4	Oppose	The submitter questions the need for more greenfield land, noting sufficient housing capacity already exists and the site is outside planned growth areas.	Decline the private plan change.
64	Dee Chapman	64.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, expressing concerns regarding worsened congestion, loss of productive land, and increased flood risk.	Decline the private plan change.
64	Dee Chapman	64.2	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about loss of mountain views, increased noise, and reduced overall amenity.	Decline the private plan change.
64	Dee Chapman	64.3	Oppose	The submitter states the site is not identified for large-scale urban development and may be inconsistent with key planning policies, despite some alignment with broader objectives.	Decline the private plan change.
64	Dee Chapman	64.4	Oppose	The submitter highlights potential issues such as liquefaction, subsidence, and contamination, with reliance on outdated or incomplete technical information.	Decline the private plan change.
65	Karsten Moeller	65.1	Oppose	The submitter generally supports the rezoning and future residential development but is concerned about increased traffic from around 300 additional homes.	Provide access to the most updated development plans.
65	Karsten Moeller	65.2	Oppose	The submitter generally supports the rezoning and future residential development but is concerned about increased traffic from around 300 additional homes.	Provide clarification on how the development will retain a semi-rural character and support recreational use of the Henderson Basin.

65	Karsten Moeller	65.3	Oppose	The submitter generally supports the rezoning and future residential development but is concerned about increased traffic from around 300 additional homes.	Ensure there is no road access through Kaiwara reserve.
65	Karsten Moeller	65.4	Oppose	The submitter generally supports the rezoning and future residential development but is concerned about increased traffic from around 300 additional homes.	Enforce a 30kmph speed limit within the RNN area.
65	Karsten Moeller	65.5	Oppose	The submitter generally supports the rezoning and future residential development but is concerned about increased traffic from around 300 additional homes.	Discourage traffic through traffic calming measures.
65	Karsten Moeller	65.6	Oppose	The submitter generally supports the rezoning and future residential development but is concerned about increased traffic from around 300 additional homes.	Maintain the semi-rural character and create recreational areas within the RNN zone.
66	Matt Hill	66.1	Neutral	The submitter is concerned that increased traffic will reduce safety and amenity, particularly for children, and significantly worsen congestion.	Connect the proposed subdivision to Sparks Road.
66	Matt Hill	66.2	Neutral	The submitter is concerned that increased traffic will reduce safety and amenity, particularly for children, and significantly worsen congestion.	Provide a large park with modern children's play area including grasslands, playground and pump track within the subdivision.
67	Audrey McCarthy	67.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, expressing concerns regarding worsened congestion.	Provide vehicle access from the proposed subdivision onto Cashmere Road, Hendersons Road, and Sparks Road.
68	Claire Barry	68.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, expressing concerns regarding increased congestion, safety risks, reduces off street parking, and speeding and lack of enforcement.	Rezone the site to Residential Suburban Zone (RS), instead of Residential New Neighbourhood Zone (RNN).
68	Claire Barry	68.2	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that 300 dwellings will significantly intensify the area beyond its suburban character.	Rezone the site to Residential Suburban Zone (RS), instead of Residential New Neighbourhood Zone (RNN).
68	Claire Barry	68.3	Oppose	The submitter states the proposal is too intensive for a traditionally low-density suburban area, with insufficient local services and retail capacity.	Rezone the site to Residential Suburban Zone (RS), instead of Residential New Neighbourhood Zone (RNN).
68	Claire Barry	68.4	Oppose	The submitter is concerned that increased impervious surfaces will worsen existing flooding and drainage issues.	Ensure stormwater infrastructure is built first to avoid worsening existing flooding issues.
68	Claire Barry	68.5	Oppose	The submitter states there are existing infrastructure issues (e.g. inability to flush toilets during heavy rain) and is concerned that the development will overload wastewater and stormwater systems.	Ensure stormwater infrastructure is built first to avoid worsening existing flooding issues.

69	Laurel Kellerhals	69.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, expressing concerns regarding reduced water pressure and servicing impacts, stating existing low-pressure systems may be significantly affected by new demand.	Ensure there is no reduced water pressure to existing properties.
69	Laurel Kellerhals	69.2	Oppose	The submitter states that the developer should provide new infrastructure (e.g. a new water source) rather than connecting to existing mains.	Ensure there is no reduced water pressure to existing properties.
69	Laurel Kellerhals	69.3	Oppose	The submitter raises concerns about fairness, stating existing residents should not lose water service quality for private development benefit.	Ensure there is no reduced water pressure to existing properties.
69	Laurel Kellerhals	69.4	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about flooding and groundwater impacts, including potential effects from additional housing and infill of retention areas.	Ensure there is no flooding on existing properties.
69	Laurel Kellerhals	69.5	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about loss of privacy and amenity, as well as concerns about building foundations and increased density.	Ensure there will be no housing built along the northern boundary of the site.
69	Laurel Kellerhals	69.6	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about loss of privacy and amenity, as well as concerns about building foundations and increased density.	Ensure the privacy of existing properties is not reduced.
70	Margaret Rose Karreman	70.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, expressing concerns regarding reduced water pressure to their home and the raising of land levels on the northern boundary.	Ensure there will be no housing built along the northern boundary of the site.
70	Margaret Rose Karreman	70.2	Oppose	The submitter is also concerned regarding building height impacts, leading to a sense of dominance and a loss of privacy.	Ensure there will be no housing built along the northern boundary of the site.
70	Margaret Rose Karreman	70.3	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about potential water runoff onto their property.	Ensure there is no flooding on existing properties.
71	Chris Hughes on behalf of Chris and Camille Hughes	71.1	Support	The submitter is a landowner whose property (236 Cashmere Road) is included in the proposal and already has approximately one third of the land zoned residential, while the remainder remains rural. The submitter states that their site already has partial residential zoning and a directly adjoining subdivision development, making rural zoning inconsistent.	Rezone the remaining rural portion of 236 Cashmere Road to residential zoning.
71	Chris Hughes on behalf of Chris and Camille Hughes	71.2	Support	The submitter states the area is already well serviced with schools, healthcare, shops, recreation facilities, and public transport, supporting further growth.	Approve the private plan change.
71	Chris Hughes on behalf of Chris and Camille Hughes	71.3	Support	The submitter states the site is a near-city greenfield area, suitable for housing to meet demand and improve affordability.	Approve the private plan change.
71	Chris Hughes on behalf of Chris and Camille Hughes	71.4	Support	The submitter states the proposal would improve connectivity, including cycle and pedestrian links and better street integration.	Approve the private plan change.

71	Chris Hughes on behalf of Chris and Camille Hughes	71.5	Support	The submitter states the proposal would include environmental and amenity enhancements, such as reserves, wetlands, and improved stormwater management.	Approve the private plan change.
72	Hugh Wallace	72.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, due to the loss of productive agricultural land, arguing it should be protected to support local food production and reduce environmental impacts from transportation of food.	Maintain the rural urban fringe zoning.
72	Hugh Wallace	72.2	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Reopen the northern end of Rydal Street to allow two-way traffic onto Sparks Road.
72	Hugh Wallace	72.3	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Create an additional two-way access route onto Sparks Road, using existing rights of way or publicly owned land.
72	Hugh Wallace	72.4	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Investigate using specific sites for access roads, including Hoon Hay Zone Substation (110 Sparks Road), the 126 Sparks Road right of way, and the pump station at 140 Sparks Road.
72	Hugh Wallace	72.5	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Consider separating inbound and outbound traffic lanes along Sparks Road.
72	Hugh Wallace	72.6	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Explore routing traffic through or around existing commercial sites (Hoon Hay Medical Centre and NZ Post Centre), potentially with land swaps/offsets.
72	Hugh Wallace	72.7	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Increase the number of road connections into the subdivision to distribute traffic more evenly.

72	Hugh Wallace	72.8	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Reduce housing density or total dwelling numbers to lessen traffic and infrastructure pressure.
73	Stephanie Ida Down	73.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, concerned about increased flood risk, including loss of a ponding area that currently helps protect their property, and the loss of natural habitat for birdlife.	Ensure there is no removal natural springs within the area.
73	Stephanie Ida Down	73.2	Oppose	The submitter is concerned regarding a loss of privacy due to higher elevation housing along their boundary, and land level changes, with nearby development at 126 Sparks Road being significantly higher than existing properties.	Ensure there is no housing built along the northern boundary of the site.
73	Stephanie Ida Down	73.3	Oppose	The submitter has expressed a conflict of interest involving the surveying company.	No resolution sought.
74	Hilary Riordan	74.1	Neutral	The submitter is concerned that mixed zoning of Kaiwara Reserve limits its ability to be planned and managed as a single, cohesive open space.	Rezone the entire Kaiwara Reserve as Open Space Community Park.
74	Hilary Riordan	74.2	Neutral	The submitter notes the reserve already functions well as a pedestrian and cycle link and local neighbourhood park and argue it provides safer and better access than alternative parks that require crossing busy roads.	Remove any references in the ODP that suggest a Blakiston Street extension through the reserve.
74	Hilary Riordan	74.3	Neutral	The submitter expresses concern that parts of the reserve and surrounding stormwater areas could be lost or compromised through future development or consent processes.	Retain areas identified as stormwater basins and waterways as Rural Urban Fringe zoning to prevent future redevelopment pressure.
75	Francis Tabley	75.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, concerned about increased stormwater runoff, loss of privacy due to the construction of two storey dwellings, higher building and foundation levels, potential decrease in property value, loss of views, and loss of birdlife.	No decision sought.
76	David Lee	76.1	Support	The submitter states that their property has been included in the plan change proposal without their consent, submitter has their own Outline Development Plan for their property.	For Council to support the submitters Outline Development Plan they have developed for their own property.
76	David Lee	76.2	Support	The submitter states that their property has been included in the plan change proposal without their consent, submitter has their own Outline Development Plan for their property.	For Council to support Plan Change 18 Cashmere Fields to create more section by soil Transfer.
77	Carl Hois	77.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, expressing concerns regarding increased traffic, insufficient existing infrastructure and roads, and a reduction in quality of life for elderly residents.	No decision sought.
77	Carl Hois	77.2	Oppose	The submitter notes that Christchurch already has enough housing intensification, including townhouses and multi-storey units.	No decision sought.

77	Carl Hois	77.3	Oppose	The submitter states the area is already experiencing too much subdivision development.	No decision sought.
78	Glennis Dunstan on behalf of Glennis Dunstan & Warren Grimwood	78.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, primarily due to concerns about infrastructure and environmental effects.	Decline the private plan change.
78	Glennis Dunstan on behalf of Glennis Dunstan & Warren Grimwood	78.2	Oppose	The submitter states raised ground levels may alter natural drainage patterns, redirect water onto surrounding sites, and worsen heavy rain flooding. The submitter raises past local evidence of liquefaction and flooding, questioning whether risks are fully understood or mitigated.	Undertake new and updated flood modelling and stormwater assessments, considering all existing, consented, and planned development in the wider area.
78	Glennis Dunstan on behalf of Glennis Dunstan & Warren Grimwood	78.3	Oppose	The submitter states raised ground levels may alter natural drainage patterns, redirect water onto surrounding sites, and worsen heavy rain flooding.	Ensure the development includes adequate stormwater attenuation and drainage infrastructure, with information made transparent and accessible to affected landowners.
78	Glennis Dunstan on behalf of Glennis Dunstan & Warren Grimwood	78.4	Oppose	The submitter believes increased development will significantly raise runoff, overwhelm drainage systems, and increase flood risk to neighbouring properties.	Require that building platform heights, earthworks, and building design do not increase runoff or flooding impacts on neighbouring properties.
78	Glennis Dunstan on behalf of Glennis Dunstan & Warren Grimwood	78.5	Oppose	The submitter is concerned regarding impacts on property values, drainage, and shared infrastructure systems if not properly managed.	Ensure that building height does not negatively affect neighbour privacy.
78	Glennis Dunstan on behalf of Glennis Dunstan & Warren Grimwood	78.6	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about strain on stormwater, water supply, and water pressure, including an estimated potential 20% drop in water pressure.	Demonstrate that all infrastructure capacity (including water supply and drainage systems) is sufficient prior to any development proceeding.
79	Kate Melnik	79.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, due to the loss of productive agricultural land.	Protected the site to support local food production and reduce environmental impacts from transport.
79	Kate Melnik	79.2	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Reopen the northern end of Rydal Street to allow two-way traffic onto Sparks Road.
79	Kate Melnik	79.3	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Create an additional two-way access route onto Sparks Road, using existing rights of way or publicly owned land.

79	Kate Melnik	79.4	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Investigate using specific sites for access roads, including Hoon Hay Zone Substation (110 Sparks Road), the 126 Sparks Road right of way, and the pump station at 140 Sparks Road.
79	Kate Melnik	79.5	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Consider separating inbound and outbound traffic lanes along Sparks Road.
79	Kate Melnik	79.6	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Explore routing traffic through or around existing commercial sites (Hoon Hay Medical Centre and NZ Post Centre), potentially with land swaps/offsets.
79	Kate Melnik	79.7	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Increase the number of road connections into the subdivision to distribute traffic more evenly.
79	Kate Melnik	79.8	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Reduce housing density or total dwelling numbers to lessen traffic and infrastructure pressure and enable the provision of more stormwater ponding areas.
79	Kate Melnik	79.9	Oppose	The submitter raises traffic and access concerns, stating the subdivision has poor road connectivity, with most traffic funnelled onto Leistrella Road and Hoon Hay Road, which are already constrained. They argue peak traffic would significantly increase (potentially 35%+), worsening congestion, safety, and reliance on limited exit routes.	Set aside more land for flooding mitigation.
80	Sioniah Joubert	80.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, raising concerns about increased traffic and safety issues, noting reduced visibility, parked vehicles, and existing congestion near schools and the CBD route.	Decline the private plan change.
80	Sioniah Joubert	80.2	Oppose	The submitter express significant concern about stormwater and flooding risk.	Decline the private plan change.

80	Sioniah Joubert	80.3	Oppose	The submitter is concerned about loss of amenity, including reduced views, privacy, and increased noise from potential boundary fencing and neighbouring development.	Decline the private plan change.
80	Sioniah Joubert	80.4	Oppose	The submitter anticipates construction and operational impacts, including noise, dust, fumes, and disruption from earthworks and housing construction activities over an extended period.	Decline the private plan change.
80	Sioniah Joubert	80.5	Oppose	The submitter opposes the loss of productive rural land, stating it is inconsistent with government policy.	Decline the private plan change.
81	Debbie Lewis	81.1	Support	The submitter is supportive of the plan change, stating that the plan change will improve connectivity and access, provide a buffer between rural and residential areas, increase native planting and reserve space.	Approve the private plan change.
81	Debbie Lewis	81.2	Support	The submitter states the proposal will improve stormwater and water catchment management, support a safe, walkable and bike-friendly location close to the city, and enhance local recreation and environmental amenity.	Approve the private plan change.
82	Keir Leslie on behalf of Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board	82.1	Neutral	The submitter is neutral to the proposal. The submitter raises concern about increased pressure on the local transport network, noting potential congestion, rat-running, and the need for safe integration with existing roads, including walking, cycling, and public transport connections.	Demonstrate how the development is integrated into the transport network in a way that avoids congestion and rat running.
82	Keir Leslie on behalf of Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board	82.2	Neutral	The submitter is neutral to the proposal. The submitter raises concern about increased pressure on the local transport network, noting potential congestion, rat-running, and the need for safe integration with existing roads, including walking, cycling, and public transport connections.	Require transport infrastructure upgrades, including public transport provision, walking and cycling links, traffic calming, and safe intersections.
82	Keir Leslie on behalf of Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board	82.3	Neutral	The submitter is concerned the proposal lacks a direct connection to Sparks Road, which may increase pressure on Leistrella and Cashmere Roads.	Include a direct road connection to Sparks Road to reduce pressure on surrounding roads.
82	Keir Leslie on behalf of Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board	82.4	Neutral	The submitter is concerned about stormwater and water infrastructure, particularly given existing flooding issues.	Ensure stormwater impacts are properly managed.
82	Keir Leslie on behalf of Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board	82.5	Neutral	The submitter is concerned about stormwater and water infrastructure, particularly given existing flooding issues.	Require the naturalisation of the existing drain system, as a condition of the approval of the proposal.

82	Keir Leslie on behalf of Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board	82.6	Neutral	The submitter highlights ecological importance of the Ōpāwaho/Heathcote catchment.	Require the recommendations from the ecological report to be followed.
82	Keir Leslie on behalf of Waihoru Spreydon-Cashmere-Heathcote Community Board	82.7	Neutral	The submitter supports inclusion of mixed-use elements, such as local shops, early childhood facilities, and community amenities, to reduce reliance on private vehicles and ensure adequate local services, noting existing pressure on nearby schools and preschools.	Provide local non-residential amenities (e.g. shops, playgrounds, early childhood facilities) within the development.
83	Sarah Flynn	83.1	Oppose	The submitter opposes the plan change, concerned about traffic congestion, the site being swampy and potentially unsuitable for development, and local infrastructure, including schooling, being inadequate.	Decline the private plan change.
84	Faye Collins on behalf of Waipuna Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board	84.1	Neutral	The submitter states that existing transport and servicing deficiencies in the area are likely to be worsened by additional housing.	Only approve the proposal where adequate provision is made to address the existing and future deficiencies in the transport system and infrastructure together with flooding issues in the local area.
84	Faye Collins on behalf of Waipuna Halswell Hornby Riccarton Community Board	84.2	Neutral	The submitter states that there are existing local flooding issues, which appear to be getting worse, and expresses concern about increased flood risk.	Only approve the proposal where adequate provision is made to address the existing and future deficiencies in the transport system and infrastructure together with flooding issues in the local area.
85	Ministry of Education	85.1	Neutral	The submitter states that an increase in residential capacity that is proposed by Private Plan Change 18 has the possibility of creating pressure and affecting the school networks' capacity in Christchurch.	The Hendersons Outline Development Plan, 8.10.18D.(3) is amended as follows: 3. OPEN SPACE, RECREATION, EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES (f). Consultation is to be undertaken with the Ministry of Education on the development, staging and timing.
85	Ministry of Education	85.2	Neutral	The submitter states the provision of the anticipated development timeframes and related information relevant to the proposed plan change will assist the Ministry to better understand the implications of the proposed growth in the surrounding area's school network and effectively plan for growth.	The Hendersons Outline Development Plan, 8.10.18D.(3) is amended as follows: 3. OPEN SPACE, RECREATION, EDUCATION AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES (f). Consultation is to be undertaken with the Ministry of Education on the development, staging and timing.
86	Canterbury Regional Council	86.1	Neutral	The submitter is concerned whether reliance on Policy 8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development is appropriate.	The submitter seeks that this concern is addressed.

86	Canterbury Council	Regional	86.2	Neutral	The submitter is concerned regarding the potential effects on primary production, and the extent to which urban rezoning may limit future productive use of the land.	The submitter seeks that this concern is addressed.
86	Canterbury Council	Regional	86.3	Neutral	The submitter is concerned whether urban development of the site pursuant to the rezoning can be managed in a way that retains the storage capacity of Hendersons Basin and avoids or mitigates displacement effects on other properties.	The submitter seeks that this concern is addressed.
86	Canterbury Council	Regional	86.4	Neutral	The submitter is concerned about the potential presence of naturally occurring contaminants (such as arsenic).	The submitter seeks that this concern is addressed.
86	Canterbury Council	Regional	86.5	Neutral	The submitter is concerned about the potential effects on surface water and groundwater quality and hydrology, including management of shallow groundwater during both construction and ongoing operation of the site.	The submitter seeks that this concern is addressed.
86	Canterbury Council	Regional	86.6	Neutral	The submitter is concerned regarding potential impacts on indigenous biodiversity, At Risk–Declining species in the local drain network, and the ecological and hydrological functioning of nearby wetlands, including indirect effects from changes to surface water flows or stormwater management.	The submitter seeks that this concern is addressed.