

Before the Independent Hearings Panel
At Christchurch City Council

Under the	Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA or Act)
In the matter of	proposed private plan change 23 (PC 23) to the Christchurch District Plan
And	LMM Investments 2012
	Applicant

Joint Witness Statement for Planning

8 June 2026

Applicant's solicitor:

Jo Appleyard / Tallulah Parker
Anderson Lloyd
Floor 2, The Regent Building, 33 Cathedral Square, Christchurch 8011
PO Box 13831, Christchurch 8141
DX Box WX10009 Christchurch
p + 64 3 379 0037
jo.appleyard@al.nz / tallulah.parker@al.nz

**anderson
lloyd.**

Introduction

- 1 This Joint Witness Statement (**JWS**) responds to Minute #4 of the Commissioner Post Hearing Directions. Paragraph [7] states:

I direct that the planning experts undertake caucusing relating to the PC23 ODP provisions and provide an updated schedule of amendments in track change format identifying recommended changes. The document shall include any areas of disagreement between experts, with a summary of reasons provided in comments. The above document is to be provided by 5 pm on Monday 8 June

- 2 The caucusing took place on 8 June 2026.
- 3 Ms Isolina O'Brien, planner for the Canterbury Regional Council (**CRC**), confirmed that as CRC had not sought any amendments to the Outline Development Plan (**ODP**) narrative, she did not seek to input into the caucusing on the ODP text.
- 4 Attendees at the caucusing were:
 - (a) Mr Jonathan Clease
 - (b) Mr Craig Friedel
 - (c) Ms Anna Carter

Code of conduct

- 5 Although this is not an Environment Court hearing, in preparing this statement the experts have read and understood the Code of Conduct for Expert Witnesses included in the Environment Court Practice Note 2023 and agree to comply with it.

ODP Provisions

- 6 There remain significant areas of disagreement between the planners on the appropriate wording of the ODP narrative. We explored capturing the agreed text wording, alternative text preferred by any of the planners, and the reasons for the disagreements within a single document. Despite our best endeavors this generated a document where it was challenging to follow multiple text versions of the same clause (or parts of clauses), along with multiple comments boxes to the point where we determined that a single document would be of limited assistance to the Commissioner.

- 7 To assist with text legibility and to provide transparency on the positions of the three planners, we have prepared two versions of the ODP narrative.
- 8 **Appendix One** shows the agreed position of Mr Clease and Mr Friedel (shown in **black** text), and includes the text sought by Ms Carter that is also agreed by Mr Clease and Mr Friedel. Comments boxes record the origin of the agreed position are included. Appendix One also shows the remaining discrete areas of disagreement between Mr Clease and Mr Friedel. Mr Clease's preferred wording is shown in **blue** text and Mr Friedel's preferred wording is shown in **orange** text. Comment boxes are provided to set out the reasons for the differences in opinion.
- 9 **Appendix Two** builds on Appendix One, and shows the ODP narrative agreed by all three planners in back text, with the additional amendments sought by Ms Carter in **red** text. Ms Carter's recommended additions are not supported by either Mr Clease or Mr Friedel. Comment boxes are again provided to summarise the reasons for disagreement.
- 10 The planners note that the reasons given in the comment boxes are necessarily brief. We are happy to provide further commentary/ explanation on the reasons for disagreement if this would assist the Commissioner.
- 11 The Appendices are provided as pdfs. If it would assist the Commissioner, Mr Friedel, on behalf of the planners, can provide the Commissioner with a word document version of the appendices with 'track change' functionality turned on. This will enable the Commssioner to accept/ reject his preferred text, in the event that he recommends that the plan change be accepted.

Dated this 8 June 2026



Jonathan Clease



Craig Friedel



Anna Carter



Isolina O'Brien

Appendix One: ODP Narrative with comments (JC and CF position)

Appendix Two: ODP Narrative with comments (AC position)

Appendix 1 – PPC23 ODP schedule of amendments

This document shows the position reached between Jonathan Cleese (JC) and Craig Friedel (CF). A second document is provided to capture the text preferred by Anna Carter (AC).

Agreed text between JC and CF is shown as **black** text. Brief comments are shown to record the rationale for the agreement where the agreed text is additional to what was shown in evidence.

Where there are areas of disagreement between JC and CF the preferred wording is shown as **blue** text (JC) and **orange** text (CF). Comments for the differences in opinion are provided.

A separate version of Appendix 2 is provided to show the more substantive amendments sought to the ODP narrative by AC. JC and CF disagree with the text changes sought by AC.

8.10 Appendices

Add a new Outline Development Plan and associated narrative as Appendix 8.10.31.

Amend the ODP plan to record the following recommended changes:

1. Provide pedestrian and cycle corridor connecting the site between Teapes Road and Ōuruhiā School via Turners Road and to Spencerville via Spencerville Road.
2. Provide for a pedestrian and cycle corridor connecting the site to the intersection of Lower Styx Road and Spencerville Road.
3. Provide three additional pedestrian and cycle connections from the site to Turners Road and Spencerville Road from the proposed internal Collector Road near the Teapes Road intersection to the Pūharakekenui-Styx River riparian margin.
4. Provide for a more direct pedestrian and cycle connection from the amended location of the Neighbourhood Centre to the Neighbourhood Parks.

8.10.31.A CONTEXT

- a. This area to the north east of Christchurch lies to the north of the Pūharakekenui-Styx River, one of the primary natural features of Christchurch. Prior to European settlement, the extensive wetlands and easy access to the sea made the Pūharakekenui-Styx an important area for mahinga kai (food gathering) and for the cultivation and harvesting of flax. The Pūharakekenui-Styx River forms part of the southern and eastern boundary of the neighbourhood. Surrounding areas are utilised for a mix of larger farms and smaller rural lifestyle blocks. Chaney's Forest is to the north, Bottle Lake Forest and Spencerville are to the east, and the existing residential area and associated commercial centre of Prestons is located approximately 2km to the south.

8.10.31.B GUIDANCE

- a. Guidance on the means to achieve the development requirements and form and design elements is provided within the Christchurch City Council's Creating New Neighbourhood Design Guide.

8.10.31.C DEVELOPMENT FORM AND DESIGN

a. The following design elements and features are relevant considerations in exercising control over the matters in 8.7.1 - 8.7.4 or the matters for discretion in 8.8. They are not requirements for the purposes of Rule 8.6.11(a) or Rule 14.12.2.16.

1. The main features of this area will be the Pūharakekenui-Styx River and a large open space area located on a lower terrace between the residential development area and the river margins.
2. ~~Where the RNN abuts or is opposite properties in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone larger section sizes are anticipated, with planting buffers and building setbacks along the area's external road edges with Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road.~~
3. Higher densities are appropriately located in adjacent to publicly accessible open space areas and/or the proposed neighbourhood centre, and key active and public transport routes.
4. ~~The total yield shall not exceed 800 households consistent with the available volume of potable water and capacity of the local pressure wastewater network that form part of the supporting infrastructure to service the site.~~
5. Pedestrian and cycle links are to be provided to link the site to local schools, Spencerville, Prestons, Bottle Lake Forest, and along the Pūharakekenui-Styx River corridor.
6. The character is that of an urban village set within a rural context, including the provision of a coherent design layout including landmark buildings and features, centrally located publicly accessible open space, meaningful, while providing for a diversity of residential building scales, types and styles in site size, building typologies and height, which promote visual interest, choice and opportunity for home based business that serve the needs of the community.
7. The future subdivision design should incorporate outcomes that reflect the sensitive cultural, ecological, and landscape values attributed to the area, including through the application of Environmentally Sustainable Design, applied across the entirety of the site.

Commented [JC1]: Agree to delete - issue is relocated to D(1)(4) below

Commented [CF2]: Evidence of Josie Shröder, while noting these are provided for certainty rather than resolving a substantive are of disagreement.

Commented [JC3R2]: Agreed

Commented [JC4]: Agree to delete - issue is relocated to D(1)C below

Commented [CF5]: As per the Transport JWS, (para.5 (c)) and Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.12.2) areas of agreement.

Commented [JC6R5]: Agreed.

Commented [CF7]: As per the Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.18) area of agreement. This has been adapted to focus on the key items and to address Jono's EiC concerns with referencing a guide that sits outside the CDP (any updates to the Ngāi Tahu Subdivision and Design Guidelines would require a Schedule 1 process).

Commented [JC8R7]: Agreed. Also includes reference to ecological values which is sought by AC and agreed by JC and CF

8.10.31.D DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

- a. The development requirements for the purposes of Rule 8.6.11(a) and Rule 14.12.2.16 are described below and are shown on the accompanying plan.

1. INTEGRATION

- a. There are several landowners within this ODP area and a number of existing properties. Subdivision designs are to demonstrate good connectivity between different land ownership areas through road, open space, pedestrian and cycle links.
- b. The development is to provide new road access connections and shared paths to Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road. The development is to provide new shared paths to Teapes Road, Turners Road, ~~and~~ Spencerville Road and Lower Styx Road.
- c. The total yield shall not exceed 800 households unless it can be demonstrated that there is a sufficient consistent with the available volume of potable water and capacity of the local pressure wastewater network that form part of the supporting infrastructure to service the site.
- d. Where the Residential New Neighbourhood Zone abuts or is opposite properties in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone and the Rural Waimakariri Zone, larger section sizes are anticipated required, including 60% of the lots adjoining Turners Road, Teapes Road and Spencerville Road to be a minimum of 1,000m², with planting buffers and building setbacks along the area's external road edges with Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road. Maximum building heights of 5m, a minimum 3m internal building setback, and controls on the application of recessive colours and materials for residential units shall also be applied to the larger (1,000m²) lots where they adjoin Turners Road, Teapes Road and Spencerville Road.
- e. Lots adjoining Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road are not to obtain individual site access from these roads and shall instead obtain access from new internal roads until such time as the rural land opposite the Site is rezoned for urban activities. Open rural-style fencing is to be provided along these three external road frontages, with a 53m deep landscape strip and a 10m deep building setback (20m deep for any lots that are 1,000m² or larger). A minimum of two exotic trees that can grow to medium height (6 to 10m) are required per lot within the landscape strip. Trees planted within the landscape strip are to be maintained. It is anticipated that these outcomes will be delivered via consent notices on the titles.

2. OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

- a. Retention of the lower terrace as a large open space area that can be utilised for a combination of pedestrian and cycle links, recreation, ecological restoration, stormwater management, and farming.
- b. Three neighbourhood parks that are each approximately 3,000m² in size are to be provided to ensure that most residential units are within 500m of a park where child play facilities can be located. Where appropriate, neighbourhood parks are to be co-located with stormwater basins. At least one of these reserves is to be located on the upper terrace, within the north-western quadrant of the site.
- c. A Neighbourhood Centre is to be provided, where it is accessible within the residential catchment via pedestrian paths, is visible from at least one road that is exterior to the site provides a focal

Commented [CF9]: As per the Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.21) area of agreement.

Commented [JC10R9]: Agreed

Commented [CF11]: I generally support a household cap given that all the technical assessments have focused on this yield. However, I am also mindful of the flexibility required to enable infill in the event the adjacent land is ever rezoned. This context isn't reflected in the current wording and it feels like a leap of faith to rely on a subdivision process to substantiate the future yield. Recommend the Proponent consider alternate wording.

Commented [JC12R11]: I prefer the blue wording which requires capacity to be demonstrated but avoid the need for a hard cap

Commented [CF13]: Agree

Commented [CF14]: Agree. Consistent with Urban Design and Landscape JWS.

Commented [CF15]: Area of disagreement in the Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.28) between Ms. Smetham/Ms. Shröder and Mr. Compton-Moen. I prefer Ms. Smetham and Ms. Shröder's evidence due to the critical need for effective interface treatments along the site boundaries where they adjoin the RuUFZ and RuV. This includes to integrate the site into the receiving environment.

Commented [JC16R15]: Disagree - I prefer Mr Compton-Moen's evidence that limits to 5m height and 3m internal setbacks are unnecessary.

If the Commissioner prefers Craig's wording, then I would recommend that 5m be increased to 5.5m to enable single storey with pitched roofs - 5m is very low for single storey. I would also recommend that the height limit is measured from the required FFL rather than ground level to provide some flexibility in meeting FFL requirements by higher than normal foundation designs rather than bulk filling. With an 8m limit FFL references aren't necessary as there is ample room to design a single storey building with higher foundations.

Commented [CF17R15]: Agree in part - a 5.5m maximum height control is consistent with the intent of the development control while providing appropriate flexibility for different roof designs and mezzanine levels.

Commented [JC18]: 'adjoining' rather than 'with frontage to' is agreed by JC, CF, and AC to clarify that such lots may have their frontage to internal roads, but the outcomes is in regard to sites that adjoin the external roads.

Commented [CF19]: Agree. This is required to implement an effective interface/edge treatment to integrate the site into the receiving environment and future proof infill (should the adjacent land ever be rezoned).

Commented [CF20]: Agree. As per above comments on this clause.

Commented [CF21]: As per the Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.17.5) area of agreement.

Commented [JC22R21]: Agree

Commented [CF23]: As per the Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.12.3) area of agreement.

Commented [JC24R23]: Agree

Commented [CF25]: Agree with JC and AC that this amendment hasn't been substantiated in the JWS and may inadvertently contribute to adverse effects.

point for the community, **includes publicly accessible open space**, and is viable. The Centre is to be commensurate with the role and function of a Neighbourhood Centre as set out in Policy 15.2.2.1 Tabel 12.1(E) and is to be no larger than **31,000m² GFA and excludes a supermarket of more than 450m² GFA.**

- d. **The land identified for the Neighbourhood Centre is to be subject to a consent notice that retains the land for commercial or community development for 10 years following the centre lots receiving s224(c) certificates. If no neighbourhood centre activities are developed within 10 years then the land can be utilised for residential development.**
- e. Continuation of the Pūharakekenui-Styx River 'Source to Sea' reserve network along the river corridor.
- f. Where a pedestrian and cycle pathway is denoted, it shall be located within a corridor of a width that provides for unimpeded, safe and efficient movement of cyclists and pedestrians.
- g. Pedestrian and cycle pathways are to be provided along the eastern and western edges of the site to connect the Development Area with the Pūharakekenui-Styx River margins.
- h. Mid-block pedestrian and cycle pathways shall connect the Development Area to Turners Road and Spencerville Road.
- i. A pedestrian and cycle pathway shall be provided to connect the site to Ōōuruhia Model School via the Styx Loop Conservation Park and a short section of Turners Road.
- j. **Pedestrian and cycle links shall be provided to connect the site between Teapes Road and Ōuruhia Model School via Turners Road and to Spencerville via Spencerville Road.**
- k. A pedestrian and cycle pathway shall connect the site via a bridge to Lower Styx Road and then to the intersection of Lower Styx Road and Te Korari Street at the northern entrance to Prestons. A pedestrian and cycle link to Bottle Lake Forest is also to be provided from this pathway.

3. ACCESS AND TRANSPORT

- a. A collector road **looping** through the site ~~to shall~~ provide an internal link between Turners Road and Spencerville Road. **Collector roads within the site shall be designed to accommodate bus services.**
- b. A fully interconnected local road network **and active transport network** across the site that achieves a high level of accessibility for people, including opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport.
- c. **Safe System auditing procedures shall apply to all new roads that are to vest in Council and shall also include Spencerville Road, Turners Road and Lower Styx Road.**
- d. **Upgrades to the sealed width of Turners Road, Spencerville Road, and Teapes Road that include the following:**
 - i. Upgrade of the Turners Road/ Marshland Road intersection to provide a left turn lane from Turners Road **prior to the issue of section 224 (c) certificates** for when more than **500** residential lots are created;
 - ii. **Spencerville Road between the site entrance and Marshland Road is to be upgraded to a 7.5m sealed carriageway;**

Commented [CF26]: As per the Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.13) area of agreement.

Commented [JC27R26]: Agree

Commented [CF28]: I am not opposed to prescribing the 1,000m² GFA recommended by Mr. Yeoman in the PPC23 ODP should the Commissioner remain concerned with the economic viability of a 3,000m² GFA Neighbourhood Centre.

Commented [JC29R28]: My preference is to retain the 3,000 GFA cap. Which is aligned with NCZ policy outcomes. The economic reasons for a smaller cap are simply to do with efficiency (land better used for housing in the short term) rather than effects

Commented [CF30]: Excluding 'supermarkets' is partially consistent with Mr. Cleases' EiC that this activity is unlikely to establish with the proposed NCZ. However, its inclusion addresses the area of partial disagreement in the transport JWS that a supermarket may trigger the need for a upgrade to the Spencerville Road one-lane bridge (para.10 to 12).

Commented [JC31R30]: My preference is to retain the 3,000 GFA cap. I think a supermarket of 1,000m² (the NCZ rule limit) is commercially highly unlikely, and therefore a 'no supermarkets' ban is unnecessary, as an alternative a cap on supermarkets of no more than 450m² GFA would align with the 450m NCZ rule cap on other tenancies and would still enable a large dairy/ 4 square sized store. Have added in a 450m² reference in blue

Commented [CF32]: Agree. This approach works effectively in the SDP context.

Commented [CF33]: Agree. This is critical to enabling future public transport services.

Commented [CF34]: Added for clarification

Commented [JC35R34]: Agree

Commented [CF36]: CF considers it is appropriate to specify the requirements for Site Safety Audits, as per the Transport JWS, para.5 d.

Commented [JC37R36]: I disagree that this reference is necessary or appropriate as part of an ODP. SSAs are common requirements for most new intersections/ street upgrades and their design is invariably a matter discussed and agreed as part of subdivision processes. No other ODPs in the District Plan specify a need for a SSA, yet the vast majority of new intersections generated by these ODPs will have the SSA process applied to subdivision applications. My disagreement is focussed on plan drafting consistency/ appropriate level of detail in an ODP rather than saying a SSA will not be ultimately required.

Commented [CF38]: As per the Transport JWS (para.23 to 25) area of agreement.

Commented [JC39R38]: Agree

Commented [CF40]: As per the Transport JWS (para.7 and 39) area of agreement.

Commented [JC41R40]: Agree

Commented [CF42]: As per the transport JWS (para.23) area of agreement. This includes the edit to reference that the upgrades are from the site entrance, as per Mr. D Smith and my Summary Statements.

Commented [JC43R42]: Agree

iii. Turners Road from Spencerville Road to Marshland Road is to be upgraded to a 6.0m wide carriageway with 0.5m sealed shoulders and reclassification as a Collector Road;

iv. Teapes Road is to be upgraded to a 5.5m carriageway with 0.5m sealed shoulders;

v. The Turners Road and Teapes Road transportation network upgrades shall include the squaring up of the intersection; and

vi. Any land that is required to ensure the minimum sight lines are achieved as part of the Turners Road and Spencerville Road intersection upgrades to the east along Spencerville Road shall be vested in Council as public road.

e. A Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessment (LCSIA) shall be undertaken on the Spencerville Road level crossing to the west of the site that applies the relevant KiwiRail guidance. Any transportation network improvements identified in the LCSIA, including the installation of safety barrier arms, shall be completed prior to the issue of section 224 (c) certificates.

f. Heavy vehicles associated with the development of reticulated services and bulk earthworks on the site shall be limited from using Turners Road.

4. STORMWATER

a. A sustainable stormwater management solution for the neighbourhood integrated with open space reserves.

b. Enhancement of the habitat and ecological values of the Styx River and its margins in association with stormwater management and provision of reserves.

c. Restoration, naturalisation and ecological enhancement of Spencerville Drain.

d. The flood volume of the High Hazard Management Area will not be reduced.

5. WATER SUPPLY AND WASTEWATER

a. ~~A water supply network and an associated new bore and water treatment plant and potential storage facility.~~ A groundwater abstraction and water treatment pump station, designed and constructed in accordance with an Infrastructure Provider Agreement that incorporates Council standards and requirements, supplying into a new water supply network integrated with the Brooklands-Kainga water supply zone.

b. Sufficient water supply to meet fire-fighting requirements.

c. ~~A local pressure sewer network, discharging to a rising trunk sewer to be laid along via a pressure main along Spencerville Road, over the existing bridge and then along into the Lower Styx Road gravity sewer network, including odour treatment, corrosion protection and the upgrade of the to pump station 78 at Heyders Road Pumpstation (PC78), to be designed and constructed in accordance with an Infrastructure Provider Agreement incorporating Council standards and requirements in Spencerville.~~

6. STAGING

a. There are no staging requirements beyond those relating to the provision of infrastructure.

7. NATURAL HAZARDS

Commented [CF44]: As per the Transport JWS (para.25 to 28) area of partial agreement. I prefer recording this upfront in the ODP narrative to ensure adverse nuisance effects are mitigated and transport network safety and efficiency in maintained.

Commented [JC45R44]: Disagree - this is a matter best resolved as part of traffic management plans related to subdivision/ earthworks processes. If the Commissioner considers such wording to be needed in the ODP narrative, then I consider the limitation should just be to 'heavy' vehicles, rather than all vehicles which would include trade utes and vans, private cars used by tradespeople to get to the site etc. The limitation should also just be to subdivision services and bulk earthworks phases, not subsequent house building (which is not subject to TMPs and is challenging in practice to condition regarding access routes

- a. The land to the south of the Residential Development Area is subject to a high flood hazard risk. Activities within this area are subject to the provisions set out in Chapter 5.4.6. The area located between the Residential Development Area and Spencerville Drain is anticipated to be developed as stormwater basins and recreational space. Land located in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone is to be for farming, wetlands, stormwater basins, and recreation.
- b. Any fill within the existing or future floodplain shall provide compensatory storage to:
 - i. Avoid the loss of live flood storage;
 - ii. Ensure that the development will not displace ponded flood waters onto adjacent properties; and
 - iii. Ensure the flood storage volume of the High Hazard Management Area is not reduced.
- c. The minimum land levels for new development shall apply:
 - i. The 1 in 200-year Max of Max flood predictions, which includes the highest series of pre-determined combinations of rainfall and tide Annual Return Interval.
 - ii. A 1.2m SLR (2.88m NZVD) plus any additional factor of VLM; and
 - iii. The finished floor levels for any new dwellings shall apply this peak water level plus 400mm of vertical freeboard.
- d. To allow for the safe egress and ingress of passenger vehicles in the event of an evacuation for flooding, tsunami or other natural disaster, all internal roading, including the intersections with Spencerville Road, Teapes Road and Turners Road, must be built up to a predicted flood depth that is no more than 150mm when measured at the kerb in a 1 in 50 year flood event.

Appendix 2 – PPC23 ODP schedule of amendments

This document shows the position reached between Jonathan Clease (JC) and Craig Friedel (CF) with text preferred by Anna Carter (AC).

Agreed text between JC and CF is shown as **black** text. Brief comments are shown to record the rationale for the agreement where the agreed text is additional to what was shown in evidence.

Where there are areas of disagreement between JC and CF the preferred wording is shown as **blue** (JC) and **orange** (CF) text. Comments for the differences in opinion are provided.

This version of Appendix 2 is provided to show the more substantive amendments sought to the ODP narrative by AC. JC and CF disagree with the text changes sought by AC. **Anna Carter** has recorded her track changes in **red or red strikethrough**.

Commented [JC1]: To avoid repeating comments, unless otherwise stated, I agree with the reasons given by Mr Friedel in his opposition to the changes sought by Ms Carter

8.10 Appendices

Add a new Outline Development Plan and associated narrative as Appendix 8.10.31.

Amend the ODP ~~plan~~ to record the following recommended changes:

1. Provide pedestrian and cycle corridor connecting the site between Teapes Road and Ōuruhiā School via Turners Road and to Spencerville via Spencerville Road.
2. Provide for a pedestrian and cycle corridor connecting the site to the intersection of Lower Styx Road and Spencerville Road.
3. Provide three additional pedestrian and cycle connections from the site to Turners Road and Spencerville Road from the proposed internal Collector Road near the Teapes Road intersection to the Pūharakekenui-Styx River riparian margin.
4. Provide for a more direct pedestrian and cycle connection from the amended location of the Neighbourhood Centre to the Neighbourhood Parks.
5. **Show Turners Road and Spencerville Road as Collector Roads. Where access is available to Lower Styx Road, this road shall be shown as a Minor Arterial and Turners Road shall remain as a Local road.**

Commented [AC2]: Area of Disagreement to be recorded: Extent of Residential new Neighbour zoning. In order to limit overall density, I proposed that the extent of the RNN zoning be amended on the ODP to the top of the contour defining the upper and lower terraces and exclude the stormwater basins (shown in orange on the ODP).

Commented [CF3]: Disagree - The CDP ODPs do not typically record any changes to the network road classifications.

Commented [AC4R3]: Area of Disagreement remains: If the ODP provisions do not record the roading hierarchy changes, where are they recorded? Presumably the roading hierarchy falls back to those listed in the ODP in Chapter 7.5.12 which is not the intention of the transport JWS to reclassify these roads.

8.10.31.A CONTEXT

- a. This area to the north east of Christchurch lies to the north of the Pūharakekenui-Styx River, one of the primary natural features of Christchurch. Prior to European settlement, the extensive wetlands and easy access to the sea made the Pūharakekenui-Styx an important area for mahinga kai (food gathering) and for the cultivation and harvesting of flax. The Pūharakekenui-Styx River forms part of the southern and eastern boundary of the neighbourhood. Surrounding areas are utilised for a mix of larger farms and smaller rural lifestyle blocks. Chaney's Forest is to the north, Bottle Lake Forest and Spencerville are to the east, and the existing residential area and associated commercial centre of Prestons is located approximately 2km to the south.

8.10.31.B GUIDANCE

- a) Guidance on the means to achieve the development requirements and form and design elements is provided within the Christchurch City Council's Creating New Neighbourhood Design Guide.
- b) Transport network modelling shall be undertaken for the development to inform the safe operation of surrounding roads and intersections as part of the Safe System Audit analysis. The modelling shall use the updated CTM/CAST model suite to determine the distribution of traffic and network-wide effects including potential traffic generated by the commercial centre within the development. This modelling shall also inform the timing for when the Turners Road and Marshlands Road intersection upgrade occurs; and may result in that upgrade being required prior to 500 lots being created.

c) Wastewater modelling:

The design and construction of the wastewater servicing and receiving-network infrastructure shall be supported by an integrated assessment of the wider receiving wastewater system and network, including the Kainga-Brooklands-Spencerville receiving environment, and shall factor sea-level rise, relative sea-level rise, wet-weather conditions, groundwater interaction, tidal influences, vertical land movement, and future coastal-system behaviour into the overall assessment and design framework. The assessment shall demonstrate a level of modelling, calibration, validation, certification, and scenario testing sufficient to establish reasonable confidence that low-probability high-consequence wastewater-system events capable of generating substantial future public infrastructure costs, operational liabilities, adaptation requirements, environmental effects, or financial exposure to Christchurch City Council and ratepayers have been adequately characterised prior to rezoning.

For the purposes of this assessment, calibration alone shall not be regarded as sufficient to establish predictive reliability.

The wastewater model relied upon for assessment shall be independently certified by a suitably qualified and experienced wastewater-modelling specialist as having been calibrated, validated, and demonstrated to possess predictive capability for the class of environmental conditions relevant to the receiving wastewater environment. Validation shall be based upon empirical observations of actual wastewater-system behaviour and shall demonstrate the model's ability to reasonably reproduce observed:

- a. wet-weather flow response;
- b. infiltration and inflow behaviour;
- c. groundwater-influenced system response;
- d. surcharge behaviour;
- e. overflow behaviour;
- f. pump-station operational behaviour;

Commented [CF5]: Disagree - There wasn't a consensus amongst the Transport experts that this was required.

Commented [AC6R5]: Area of Disagreement remains: The Transport JWS did note the experts agreement over the use of Safe System Audits – see para 5 (d) of the JWS

Commented [CF7R5]: Agree in part - However, this is covered in the addition of a general reference to a Safe System Audit under 3. ACCESS AND TRANSPORT new item c.

Commented [AC8]: Area of Disagreement: The capacity and modelling of the wastewater network has been challenged by the submitters. John Messerly (a submitter) has compiled this guidance to be included in the ODP for the ODP provisions.

Commented [CF9R8]: Disagree - The need for this additional wastewater modelling isn't substantiated by the expert evidence.

- g. peak-flow response; and
- h. receiving-network performance during significant wet-weather events.

For coastal and groundwater-influenced portions of the receiving wastewater network, validation shall specifically demonstrate predictive capability under conditions modeling interactions of:

- a. elevated groundwater levels;
- b. rainfall-driven infiltration and inflow;
- c. tidal influence where relevant;
- d. sea-level influenced boundary conditions;
- e. compound environmental conditions representative of the receiving environment; and
- f. severe wet-weather events relevant to assessment of low-probability high-consequence wastewater-system risks.

Validation shall utilise empirical data from coastal and groundwater-influenced portions of the receiving wastewater network sufficient to establish reasonable confidence that model predictions are representative of actual receiving-network behaviour within the Kainga–Brooklands–Spencerville receiving environment or other receiving environments demonstrably comparable in terms of groundwater influence, coastal influence, infiltration and inflow susceptibility, and network characteristics.

The validation report shall identify:

- a. the monitoring datasets used;
- b. the wet-weather events used for calibration and validation;
- c. calibration limitations;
- d. validation limitations;
- e. model assumptions;
- f. uncertainty bounds; and
- g. residual uncertainties affecting prediction of severe-event wastewater-system behaviour.

The independent certifier shall expressly state whether the model can be relied upon to provide reasonable confidence in predictions of:

- a. surcharge behaviour;
- b. overflow behaviour;
- c. infiltration and inflow response;
- d. effective network capacity;
- e. pump-station performance; and
- f. receiving-network behaviour under the severe-event and future-condition scenarios required by this Comprehensive Development Plan.

Scenario testing undertaken for 10% AEP, 2% AEP, 1% AEP, future-condition 1% AEP, or compound-event assessments shall not be relied upon unless the independent certifier has concluded that the model possesses predictive capability for the environmental processes materially influencing those scenarios.

d) The preference is for ecological restoration to utilise Ecodomains for planting requirements and where possible, shall include locally sourced seed material.

Commented [AC10]: Area of partial agreement: There has been agreement to add in 'ecological values' at clause 8.10.31.C (8) . This provides guidance for that clause.

Commented [CF11R10]: Disagree - The 8.10.31 c, (8) requirement can stand on its own without specific guidance.

8.10.31.C DEVELOPMENT FORM AND DESIGN

a. The following design elements and features are relevant considerations in exercising control over the matters in 8.7.1 - 8.7.4 or the matters for discretion in 8.8. They are not requirements for the purposes of Rule 8.6.11(a) or Rule 14.12.2.16.

1. The main features of this area will be the **Pūharakekenui-Styx River** and a large open space area located on a lower terrace between the residential development area and the river margins.
2. Where the RNN abuts or is opposite properties in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone larger section sizes are anticipated, with planting buffers and building setbacks along the area's external road edges with Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road.
3. Higher densities are appropriately located in adjacent to publicly accessible open space areas and/or the proposed neighbourhood centre, and key active and public transport routes.
4. The total yield shall not exceed 800 households, consistent with the available volume of potable water and capacity of the local pressure wastewater network that form part of the supporting infrastructure to service the site.
5. Any development within the RNN zone shall be consistent with the available volume of potable water and/or the capacity of the wastewater network, and the safety and capacity of the road network, that forms part of the supporting infrastructure to service the proposed development within the site.
6. Pedestrian and cycle links are to be provided to link the site to local schools, Spencerville, Prestons, Bottle Lake Forest, and along the Pūharakekenui-Styx River corridor.
7. The character is that of an urban village set within a rural context, including the provision of a coherent design layout including landmark buildings and features, centrally located publicly accessible open space, meaningful, while providing for a diversity of residential building scales, types and styles in site size, building typologies and height, which promote visual interest, choice and opportunity for home based business that serve the needs of the community.
8. The future subdivision design should incorporate outcomes that reflect the sensitive cultural, landscape and ecological values attributed to the area, including through the application of Environmentally Sustainable Design, applied across the entirety of the site.

Commented [AC12]: Area of Disagreement: Retain this statement. The density is a significant concern to adjoining neighbours and is relevant as a matter of discretion.

Commented [CF13R12]: Disagree -This has been deleted but moved down to 8.10.31.D 1. INTEGRATION d. to give it greater weight as a requirement rather than a matter of discretion.

Commented [AC14]: Area of Disagreement: Submitters requested no more than 300 new households. In my EIC I proposed that the total yield be capped at 800 within the RNN zone. This figure has been used as a basis for most of the AEEs and mitigation proposed. Retain 8.10.31.C.4.

Commented [CF15R14]: Disagree - Clause 4 hasn't been deleted. It is recommended to be moved to a development requirement under 8.10.31.D to ensure greater weight is placed on it at the time of subdivision.

Commented [AC16R14]: Area of Disagreement remains: I still consider this to be fundamental to development at this site regardless of the activity status and should remain as a matter of discretion. I wish for this to be retained in both Section C and Section D.

Commented [AC17]: Area of Disagreement: If para 4 is to be deleted in its entirety (and we disagree with that) to avoid placing a cap on households, then the second part of that statement still needs to be retained.

Serviceability was agreed in the JWS. It should remain both a matter of discretion; and a standard under Section D.

Commented [CF18R17]: Disagree - Clause 4 hasn't been deleted. It is recommended to be moved to a development requirement under 8.10.31.D to ensure greater weight is placed on it at the time of subdivision.

Commented [AC19R17]: Update to Agreement: as above

DEVELOPMENT CONTRIBUTIONS

9. Costs for upgrading and or constructing new public roads, and rail infrastructure and three waters infrastructure required to achieve the Level of Service (LoS) for the new development identified in the ODP shall fall with the developer and will be reflected through Development Agreements prior to Section 224(c) being issued. Where there is uncertainty as to allocation and maintenance of existing LoS versus new LoS to service the development in the ODP, the developer shall model both the existing and future level of service at their cost.

VESTING OF RESERVES

- 7-10. Areas required for open space, stormwater management and any transportation corridors shall be considered for vesting in Council where appropriate.

8.10.31.D DEVELOPMENT REQUIREMENTS

- a. The development requirements for the purposes of Rule 8.6.11(a) and Rule 14.12.2.16 are described below and are shown on the accompanying plan.

1. INTEGRATION

- a. There are several landowners within this ODP area and a number of existing properties. Subdivision designs are to demonstrate good connectivity between different land ownership areas through road, open space, pedestrian and cycle links.
- b. The development is to provide new road access connections and shared paths to **Lower Styx Road** and **Spencerville Road**, unless it can be demonstrated that the access to **Lower Styx Road** would result in adverse effects on the flood plain and/or downstream properties that would increase levels of inundation beyond more than a minor effect. If the access to **Lower Styx Road** cannot be achieved, the development shall provide new road access connections to **Teapes Road**, **Turners Road**, and **Spencerville Road**. The development is to provide new shared paths to **Teapes Road**, **Turners Road**, **and Spencerville Road** and **Lower Styx Road**.
- b-c. The total yield shall not exceed 800 households. ~~unless it can be demonstrated that there is a sufficient consistent with the available volume of potable water and capacity of the local pressure wastewater network that form part of the supporting infrastructure to service the site.~~
- c-d. Where the **Residential New Neighbourhood Zone** abuts or is opposite properties in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone and the Rural Waimakariri Zone, larger section sizes are ~~anticipated~~ required, including 60% of the lots adjoining **Turners Road** and **Spencerville Road** and **Teapes Road** to be a minimum of 1,000m², with planting buffers and building setbacks along the area's external road edges with **Teapes Road**, **Turners Road**, and **Spencerville Road**. **Maximum building heights of 5.5 m as measured from the required FFL, a minimum 3m internal building setback, and controls on the application of recessive colours and materials for residential units shall also be applied to the larger (1,000m²) lots where they adjoin **Turners Road** and **Spencerville Road** and **Teapes Road****

Commented [AC20]: It was clear through the application that costs are to fall on the developer for any upgrades or new works as they relate to providing the LoS for the new development. As this is set in the Council's Development Contributions Policy, the commentary in the District Plan should be explicit about who is responsible for modelling the existing LoS and the new LoS for attributing these costs.

Commented [CF21]: Disagree - DCs are determined through the LGA.

Commented [AC22R21]: Area of Disagreement remains: I acknowledge that DCs are determined through LGA. However, It provides further clarity for development in this area. Section 208(1)(a)(i) of the Local Government Act 2002 allows a TA to withhold a certificate under section 224(c) of the RMA until a DC has been paid. There is nothing to prevent commentary in an ODP on how Levels of Service are defined for the purpose of rezoning a site given this was a matter raised across the board by submitters and experts alike.

Commented [AC23]: Area of Disagreement: these areas should be vested in Council for public access.

Commented [CF24R23]: Disagree - The vesting of land needs to be determined by CCC through the subdivision process in accordance with the relevant plans and guidance.

Commented [AC25R23]: Area of Disagreement remains but suggest amended wording as set out. "shall be considered for vesting in Council where appropriate and that it is included under Section C as a matter for discretion

Commented [CF26]: Disagree - The need for a Lower Styx Road connection wasn't substantiated by all the transport experts, with other network improvements resolving the identified concerns.

Commented [CF27]: I generally support a household cap given that all the technical assessments have focused on this yield. However, I am also mindful of the flexibility required to enable infill in the event the adjacent land is ever rezoned. This context isn't reflected in the current wording and it feels like a leap of faith to rely on a subdivision process to substantiate the future yield. Recommend the Proponent consider alternative wording.

Commented [JC28R27]: I prefer the strike through wording which requires capacity to be demonstrated but avoid the need for a hard cap

Commented [AC29R27]: Area of Disagreement: I do not support removing the household cap as the technical assessments were reliant in many instances for modelling or determining level of effects and subsequent mitigation not just those relating to potable water and wastewater.

If it is to be retained, then the wording proposed should also be included to include demonstration of sufficient capacity and safety within the roading network.

Commented [AC30]: Area of Disagreement: submitters sought 80% of the lots adjoining these roads

Commented [CF31R30]: Disagree - This wasn't substantiated by the urban design and landscape experts.

Commented [CF32]: Area of disagreement in the Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.28) between Ms. Smetham/Ms. Schröder and Mr. Compton-Moen. I prefer Ms. Smetham and Ms. Schröder's evidence due to the critical need for effective interface treatments along the site boundaries where they adjoin the RuUFZ and RuW. This includes to integrate the site into the receiving environment.

Commented [JC33R32]: Disagree - I prefer Mr Compton-Moen's evidence that limits to 5m height and 3m internal setbacks are unnecessary.

If the Commissioner prefers Craig's wording, then I would recommend that 5m be increased to 5.5m to enable single ...

Commented [CF34R32]: Agree with an amended 5.5m maximum height requirement and reference to the FFL.

e. Lots **adjoining** Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road are not to obtain individual site access from these roads and shall instead obtain access from new internal roads ~~until such time as the rural land opposite the Site is rezoned for urban activities.~~

d.f. Open rural-style fencing is to be provided along these three external road frontages, with a ~~5~~**3**5m deep landscape strip and a 10m deep building setback (**20m deep for any lots that are 1,000m² or larger**). **A minimum of two exotic trees that can grow to medium height (6 to 10m) are required per lot within the landscape strip.** Trees planted within the landscape strip are to be maintained. ~~It is anticipated that~~ These outcomes will be delivered via consent notices on the titles.

2. OPEN SPACE, RECREATION AND COMMUNITY FACILITIES

- a. Retention of the lower terrace as a large open space area that can be utilised for a combination of pedestrian and cycle links, recreation, ecological restoration, stormwater management, and farming.
- b. Three neighbourhood parks that are each approximately 3,000m² in size are to be provided to ensure that most residential units are within 500m of a park where child play facilities can be located. Where appropriate, neighbourhood parks are to be co-located with stormwater basins. At least one of these reserves is to be located on the upper terrace, within the north-western quadrant of the site.
- c. A Neighbourhood Centre is to be provided, where it is accessible within the residential catchment via pedestrian paths, ~~is visible from at least one road that is exterior to the site,~~ provides a focal point for the community, includes publicly accessible open space, and is viable. The Centre is to be commensurate with the role and function of a Neighbourhood Centre as set out in Policy 15.2.2.1 Tabel 12.1(E) and is to be no larger than ~~3~~**4**,000m² GFA ~~and excludes a supermarket of more than 450m² GFA.~~
- d. The land identified for the Neighbourhood Centre is to be subject to a consent notice that retains the land for commercial or community development for 10 years following the centre lots receiving s224(c) certificates. ~~the land can be utilised for residential development but the remaining 1000m² must be retained for a neighbourhood centre activity. If no neighbourhood centre activities are developed within 10 years then the land can be utilised for residential development.~~
- e. Continuation of the Pūharakekenui-Styx River 'Source to Sea' reserve network along the river corridor.
- f. Where a pedestrian and cycle pathway is denoted, it shall be located within a corridor of a width that provides for unimpeded, safe and efficient movement of cyclists and pedestrians.
- g. Pedestrian and cycle pathways are to be provided along the eastern and western edges of the site to connect the Development Area with the Pūharakekenui-Styx River margins.
- h. Mid-block pedestrian and cycle pathways shall connect the Development Area to Turners Road and Spencerville Road.
- i. A pedestrian and cycle pathway shall be provided to connect the site to ~~Ō~~**O**uruhia Model School via the Styx Loop Conservation Park and a short section of Turners Road.
- j. Pedestrian and cycle links shall be provided to connect the site between Teapes Road and Ōuruhia Model School via Turners Road and to Spencerville via Spencerville Road.

Commented [AC35]: Area of Disagreement: opposed by submitters. I note that this matter was not addressed in the JWS by transport. Was it addressed in transport and/or urban design and/or landscape evidence?

Commented [CF36R35]: Disagree - This reflects the position of the urban design and landscape architects in the JWS.

Commented [AC37R35]: Area of Disagreement: this could have unintended consequences on the traffic modelling. I seek this last sentence be deleted.

Commented [CF38]: Agree - As per above comments on this clause.

Commented [AC39R38]: Area of Disagreement: 5m landscape strips are still required by submitters to address effects on rural amenity and character of adjoining site.sAg

Commented [AC40R38]: Area of Disagreement: Suggest the access and the landscaping elements be separated out into two separate clauses.

Commented [JC41R38]: I prefer the evidence of DCM and a 3m landscape strip

Commented [CF42]: As per the Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.17.5) area of agreement.

Commented [JC43R42]: Agree

Commented [AC44R42]: Area of Disagreement: Seek to retain 5m deep landscape strip. Agree to 20m deep for lots that are 1,000m² or larger.

Commented [CF45]: I am not opposed to prescribing the 1,000m² GFA recommended by Mr. Yeoman in the PPC23 ODP should the Commissioner remain concerned with the economic viability of a 3,000m² GFA Neighbourhood Centre.

Commented [JC46R45]: My preference is to retain the 3,000 GFA cap. Which is aligned with NCZ policy outcomes. The economic reasons for a smaller cap are simply to do with efficiency (land better used for housing in the short term) rather than effects

Commented [CF47]: Excluding 'supermarkets' is partially consistent with Mr. Cleases' EIC that this activity is unlikely to establish with the proposed NCZ. However, its inclusion addresses the area of partial disagreement in the transport JWS that a supermarket may trigger the need for a upgrade to the Spencerville Road one-lane bridge (para.10 to 12).

Commented [JC48R47]: My preference is to retain the 3,000 GFA cap. I think a supermarket of 1,000m² (the NCZ rule limit) is commercially highly unlikely, and therefore a 'no supermarkets' ban is unnecessary, as an alternative a cap on supermarkets of no more than 450m GFA would align with the 450m NCZ rule cap on other tenancies and would still enable a large dairy/ 4 square sized store. Have added in a 450m² reference in blue

Commented [AC49R47]: Agree with Craig Friedel.

- k. A pedestrian and cycle pathway shall connect the site via a bridge to Lower Styx Road and then to the intersection of Lower Styx Road and Te Korari Street at the northern entrance to Prestons. A pedestrian and cycle link to Bottle Lake Forest is also to be provided from this pathway.

3. ACCESS AND TRANSPORT

- a. A collector road ~~looping~~ through the site ~~to shall~~ provide an internal link between ~~either Lower Styx Road, or~~ Turners Road (if Lower Styx Road cannot be achieved), and Spencerville Road. Collector roads within the site shall be designed to accommodate bus services.

- b. A fully interconnected local road network and active transport network across the site that achieves a high level of accessibility for people, including opportunities for walking, cycling and public transport.

- c. Safe System auditing procedures shall apply to all new roads that are to vest in Council and shall also include Spencerville Road, Turners Road and Lower Styx Road. These audits shall be provided for at the following stages:

- i. Stage 1 scheme/concept
- ii. Stage 2 preliminary design stage
- iii. Stage 3 detailed design stage
- iv. Stage 4 pre-opening and/or post construction stage Transport network modelling shall be undertaken as part of Stage 1 to inform the safe operation of surrounding roads and intersections. The modelling shall use the updated CTM/CAST model suite to determine the distribution of traffic and network-wide effects including potential traffic generated by the commercial centre within the development.

- ~~b.~~ d. Where a Lower Styx Road connection is not provided to service the development, upgrades to the sealed width of Turners Road, Spencerville Road, and Teapes Road that include the following:

- i. Upgrade of the Turners Road/ Marshland Road intersection to provide a left turn lane from Turners Road prior to the issue of section 224 (c) certificates for when ~~more than~~ 500 residential lots are created;
- ii. Spencerville Road between Turners Road and Marshland Road is to be upgraded to a 7.5m sealed carriageway;
- iii. Turners Road from Spencerville Road to Marshland Road is to be upgraded to a 6.0m wide carriageway and 0.5m sealed shoulders and reclassification as a Collector Road;
- iv. Teapes Road is to be upgraded to a 5.55-5.6m carriageway and 0.5m sealed shoulders;
- v. The Turners Road and Teapes Road transportation network upgrades shall include the squaring up of the intersection; and
- vi. Any land that is required to ensure the minimum sight lines are achieved as part of the Turners Road and Spencerville Road intersection upgrades to the east along Spencerville Road shall be vested in Council as public road.

- e. A Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessment (LCSIA) shall be undertaken on the Spencerville Road level crossing to the west of the site that applies the relevant KiwiRail guidance. Any transportation network improvements identified in the LCSIA, including the installation of safety barrier arms, shall be completed prior to the issue of section 224 (c) certificates.

Commented [AC50]: Area of disagreement: The internal link roads are variable depending on whether Lower Styx Road can be constructed as part of the ODP.

Commented [CF51R50]: Disagree - The need for a Lower Styx Road connection wasn't substantiated by all the transport experts, with other network improvements resolving the identified concerns.

Commented [CF52]: Agree - It is appropriate to specify a general requirement for Site Safety Audits, as per the Transport JWS, para.5 d.

Commented [JC53R52]: I consider this is a level of detail that is not appropriate in ODPs - see my comment on the same clause in Appendix 1

Commented [AC54]: Area of Agreement: JWS - Transport agreed on the use of safe system audits throughout all stages of the development.

Commented [CF55]: As per the Transport JWS (para.23 to 25) area of agreement.

Commented [JC56R55]: Agree

Commented [AC57]: Area of Disagreement: In the JWS - transport Grant Smith sought the inclusion of Lower Styx Road as a connector. Where this can occur - he considered the was no need to upgrade Turners Road and Teapes Road. He noted that Spencerville Road will still upgrading in all situations.

Commented [CF58R57]: Disagree - The need for a Lower Styx Road connection wasn't substantiated by all the transport experts, with other network improvements resolving the identified concerns.

Commented [CF59]: As per the Transport JWS (para.7 and 39) area of agreement.

Commented [JC60R59]: Agree

Commented [CF61]: As per the transport JWS (para.23) area of agreement.

Commented [JC62R61]: Agree

- f. Where a Lower Styx road connection is provided to service the development, upgrades to the sealed width of Spencerville Road that includes the following:
- i. Spencerville Road between Turners Road and Marshland Road is to be upgraded to a 7.5m sealed carriageway; and
- vii.ii. Any land that is required to ensure the minimum sight lines are achieved as part of the Spencerville Road intersection upgrade to the east along Spencerville Road shall be vested in Council as public road.
- g. Heavy vehicles associated with the development of reticulated services and bulk earthworks on the site shall be limited from using not use Turners Road

Commented [CF63]: Disagree - The need for a Lower Styx Road connection wasn't substantiated by all the transport experts, with other network improvements resolving the identified concerns.

Commented [AC64]: Disagree. Construction traffic is a major point of contention for submitters and should not be left to a construction management plan.

Commented [CF65]: As per the Transport JWS (para.25 to 28) area of partial agreement. I prefer recording this upfront in the ODP narrative to ensure adverse nuisance effects are mitigated and transport network safety and efficiency in maintained.

Commented [JC66R65]: Disagree - this is a matter best resolved as part of traffic management plans related to subdivision/ earthworks processes. If the Commissioner considers such wording to be needed in the ODP narrative, then I consider the limitation should just be to 'heavy' vehicles, rather than all vehicles which would include trade utes and vans, private cars used by tradespeople to get to the site etc. The limitation should also just be to subdivision services and bulk earthworks phases, not subsequent house building (which is not subject to TMPs and is challenging in practice to condition regarding access routes

Commented [AC67R65]: Area of Agreement: In JWS transport at para 27 Dave and Grant agreed no construction traffic should use Turners Road.

4. STORMWATER

- a. A sustainable stormwater management solution for the neighbourhood integrated with open space reserves.
- b. Enhancement of the habitat and ecological values of the Styx River and its margins in association with stormwater management and provision of reserves.
- c. Restoration, naturalisation and ecological enhancement of Spencerville Drain.
- d. The flood volume of the High Hazard Management Area will not be reduced.

5. WATER SUPPLY AND WASTEWATER

- a. ~~A water supply network and an associated new bore and water treatment plant and potential storage facility.~~ A groundwater abstraction and water treatment pump station, designed and constructed in accordance with an Infrastructure Provider Agreement that incorporates Council standards and requirements, supplying into a new water supply network integrated with the Brooklands-Kainga water supply zone. The design and construction shall include an assessment on the wider groundwater and freshwater systems including for all hazard scenarios including the 1:200 year (0.5% AEP) storm events.
- b. Sufficient water supply to meet fire-fighting requirements.
- c. A local pressure sewer network, discharging ~~to a rising trunk sewer to be laid along via a pressure main along~~ Spencerville Road, ~~over the existing bridge and then along into the~~ Lower Styx Road ~~gravity sewer network, including odour treatment, corrosion protection and the upgrade of the to pump station 78 at~~ Heyders Road Pumpstation (PC78), to be designed and constructed in accordance with an Infrastructure Provider Agreement incorporating Council standards and requirements in Spencerville. The design and construction shall include an assessment on the wider receiving wastewater system and network and factor in sea level rise, wet-weather conditions and groundwater levels for all hazard scenarios including the 1:200 year (0.5% AEP) storm events, in its overall design including:
- i. system performance under groundwater-influenced conditions
- ii. whether LPS attenuation assumptions are valid without downstream capacity being established
- iii. empirical baseline data (wet-weather flows, I&I, pump performance)
- iv. SLR-driven groundwater rise into wastewater system loading

- v. geotechnical hazards assessment of liquefaction, settlement, and groundwater conditions

6. STAGING

- a. There are no staging requirements beyond those relating to the provision of infrastructure (three waters and roading network requirements).

Commented [AC68]: Agreed but clarify that roading forms part of the infrastructure requirements.

7. NATURAL HAZARDS

The land to the south of the Residential Development Area is subject to a high flood hazard risk. Activities within this area are subject to the provisions set out in Chapter 5.4.6. The area located between the Residential Development Area and Spencerville Drain is anticipated to be developed as stormwater basins and recreational space. Land located in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone is to be for farming, wetlands, stormwater basins, and recreation.

Commented [AC69]: Area of Disagreement: land that is to be set aside for recreation including access to the stream, and/or stormwater and/or flood management should be vested in Council as an appropriate reserve to ensure public access as per Part 2 of the Act - a matter of national importance.

The development is to provide new road access connections to Lower Styx Road and Spencerville Road, unless it can be demonstrated that the access to Lower Styx Road would result in adverse effects on the flood plain and/or downstream properties that would increase levels of inundation beyond more than a minor effect. If the access to Lower Styx Road cannot be achieved, the development shall provide new road access connections to Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road. The development is to provide new shared paths to Teapes Road, Turners Road, and Spencerville Road and Lower Styx Road.

Landuse located in the Rural Urban Fringe Zone is to be for farming, wetlands, stormwater basins, ecological restoration and enhancement, and recreation purposes.

Commented [CF70]: As per the Urban Design and Landscape JWS (para.21) area of agreement.

Commented [JC71R70]:
I disagree with the references to road access connections to Lower Styx Road due to ponding basin function constraints. I agree with the need for enhanced cycle/ pedestrian links

Commented [CF72]: Disagree - The need for a Lower Styx Road connection wasn't substantiated by all the transport experts, with other network improvements resolving the identified concerns.

Commented [AC73]: Area of Disagreement: It had not been adequately demonstrated through technical reports that access to Lower Styx Road was prevented by the presence of natural hazards. The wording of the ODP should recognise that a connection to Lower Styx Road is required unless it can be demonstrated that it would result in adverse effects due to natural hazards.

Commented [CF74]: Disagree - This is manged through the zoning.

- a. **Any fill within the existing or future floodplain shall provide compensatory storage to:**
- Avoid the loss of live flood storage;**
 - Ensure that the development will not displace ponded flood waters onto adjacent properties; and**
 - Ensure the flood storage volume of the High Hazard Management Area is not reduced.**
- b. **The minimum land levels for new development shall apply:**
- The 1 in 200-year Max of Max flood predictions, which includes the highest series of pre-determined combinations of rainfall and tide Annual Return Interval.**
 - A 1.2m SLR (2.88m NZVD) plus any additional factor of VLM; and**
 - The finished floor levels for any new dwellings shall apply this peak water level plus 400mm of vertical freeboard.**
- c. **To allow for the safe egress and ingress of passenger vehicles in the event of an evacuation for flooding, tsunami or other natural disaster, all internal roading, including the intersections with Spencerville Road, Teapes Road and Turners Road, must be built up to a predicted flood depth that is no more than 150mm when measured at the kerb in a 1 in 50 year flood event.**

VESTING OF LAND

8. Areas of land within the development, that are anticipated to be developed as stormwater basins and recreational space, including those located between the Residential Development Area and Spencerville Drain, shall be set aside as appropriate reserves and vested in Council.

Commented [CF75]: Disagree - The vesting of land is best determined through the subdivision process in accordance with CCC requirements.

Commented [AC76R75]: Update: I would agree with removing this clause if there remains a paragraph under 'Context' that supports the vesting of reserves where Council considers it appropriate.