

Private Plan Change 24 Johns Road Industrial - Summary of Submissions and Decisions Requested

The period for making submissions to Proposed Private Plan Change 24 to the Christchurch District Plan closed on 28 August 2026. This is the second stage of the public submission process where people have the opportunity to make further submissions.

Further submissions give the opportunity to either support or oppose any submissions already received. However, further submissions can only be made by a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest or by a person that has an interest in the plan change that is greater than the interest of the general public. It is not another opportunity to make fresh submissions on the Private Plan Change itself, as a further submission can only be in support of or in opposition to a submission already made to the Council (refer to the summary below) .

The Further Submission Form 6 is available at all Council offices and online at <https://letstalk.ccc.govt.nz/pc24>.

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
1	Thomas Blain	1.1	Amend	As well as shared path tie-ins [shown on the Outline Development Plan [ODP] a shared path should be constructed on the whole length of the road site boundary and be separated by railing.	Shared path along whole road site boundary with separation by railing	No
2	Richard Allison, Poppies Preschool	2.1	Oppose	Oppose general manufacturing, as it could create airborne contaminants including particle or odour emissions, which would affect the children and teachers, especially in a northwest wind. No level of contaminants or emissions is safe for children.	If site is rezoned, there should be a condition that no contaminants are allowed to become airborne.	No
		2.2	Amend	Suitable low growing planting along the Johns Road boundary to retain some of the natural appeal of the current landscape. This would also help screen any pollutants.	If approved, low appropriate buffer planting along the boundary with Johns Road.	No
3	Jonathon Ludgater	3.1	Oppose	Oppose any such plan, as it will impact residential areas.	Do not approve this proposal [the plan change].	No
4	Ross Noble	4.1	Oppose	Industrial zoning is inappropriate in this location. It would have negative transport impacts as well as ecology and amenity impacts.	Decline the application [plan change] in its entirety.	No
5	Jenna Nielsen	5.1	Oppose	Clearwater Resort has a unique character as a purpose designed golf resort community, with a peaceful environment, expansive open spaces, attractive landscapes and a high level of amenity. Industrial growth should occur in locations where it is compatible with surrounding land uses, not immediately adjacent to Clearwater. Industrial activities could generate significant adverse effects including heavy truck movements, increased traffic congestion, noise, security lighting and light spill, dust, odour and vibration and dramatic changes in the visual landscape.	Do not change the zoning. If the proposal is approved, submitter requests: a. A substantial landscaped buffer between industrial land and Clearwater Resort. b. Limited building heights adjacent to the resort. c. Strict controls on noise, lighting, outdoor storage, hours of operation and heavy transport movements. d. Significant setbacks to preserve visual amenity. e. Only low-impact industrial activities be permitted adjacent to the resort.	No
		5.2	Oppose	Industrial zoning creates uncertainty for residents as there are a wide range of activities permitted in the zone, immediately beside a premium residential and recreational environment. There will be a direct and lasting impact on property values and a loss of confidence in the existing planning framework for Clearwater.	Do not change the zoning.	No
		5.3	Oppose	Clearwater Resort is a unique recreational asset for the City, attracting visitors and supporting tourism. Much of Clearwater's appeal is based on its tranquil outlook and its separation from intensive urban and industrial activities.	No change to zoning. Ensure incompatible industrial activities are directed to more suitable locations.	No
6	Leslie Browne	6.1	Oppose	Spillage from industrial sites could find its way into rivers and lakes and very negatively impact the birds and other life living on those waterways. This would affect the Groynes, Clearwater and Roto Kohatu lakes.	Application [plan change] should be declined.	No
		6.2	Oppose	It is already problematic to exit Clearwater Avenue at certain times of the day. All traffic leaving the industrial subdivision would have to turn left to the Clearwater roundabout, making exiting Clearwater extremely difficult.	Decline the application [plan change].	No
		6.3	Oppose	There is already plenty of land zoned for Industrial General nearby and elsewhere in the City, so this plan change is unnecessary. This rezoning does not meet the threshold of Policy 8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development.	Decline the application [plan change].	No

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
7	Laura Barrington	7.1	Oppose	Traffic is already crazy on Johns Road and the roundabout by Gardiners Road. It is busy on Gardiners Road onto Sawyers Arms Road. There are preschools nearby. We need to keep the children safe and allow parents to get to work and not be trapped in traffic.	Decline the plan [change].	No
8	Paul Jackman	8.1	Oppose	Lack of verified need for more industrial land here, including no assessment of alternatives. Permanent nature of the proposed change and the precedent that it sets.	Decline the application [plan change] in full.	No
		8.2	Oppose	Potential harm to the fragile ecology of the Otukaikino Stream and nearby conservation area managed by the Isaac Conservation and Wildlife Trust has not been researched sufficiently. This is a nationally significant ecological area which could be put at risk.	Decline the application [plan change] in full.	No
		8.3	Oppose	Potential negative effects on existing neighbours at Clearwater Resort and along Clearwater Avenue in terms of noise, night-time lighting and traffic volumes have not been adequately considered and assessed to ensure they are minimal.	Decline the application [plan change] in full.	No
		8.4	Oppose	Permanent nature of the proposed change and the precedent that it sets. It would permanently alter the rural character of the area.	Decline the application [plan change] in full.	No
9	Stuart Lumsden	9.1	Oppose	Opposes the rezoning from Rural Urban Fringe to Industrial General. There is already enough industrial land available in Christchurch without this land.	That the plan change be declined in full.	No
		9.2	Oppose	In submitter's experience, industrial land makes for bad neighbours. Smith's Cranes, which adjoins this land, have burn-offs creating pollution. In a northwest wind their unsealed site becomes a dust storm. They noisily move cranes in the very early hours of the morning and they do not turn off their hourly sirens over the weekend. Submitter considers that the last thing needed here is more industrial noise and air pollution.	That the plan change be declined in full.	No
10	Lisa Goodland	10.1	Oppose	The plan change would bring a lot more traffic and noise. Currently experience significant noise from the recently widened motorway, especially in a north-westerly wind. Johns Road already experiences traffic jams at certain times of the day and these will be exacerbated.	Decline the application [plan change] to rezone rural urban fringe to industrial	No
		10.2	Oppose	Loss of rural character. Currently experiencing pressure for subdivision expansion at Harewood/Casebrook edge of the neighbourhood. Rezoning will cause a further decay of rural lifestyle.	Decline the application [plan change] to rezone rural urban fringe to industrial	No
		10.3	Oppose	Existing waterways in the area are already under pressure from development at Belfast. Industrial use so close to a sensitive natural landscape is retrograde.	Decline the application [plan change] to rezone rural urban fringe to industrial	No
		10.4	Oppose	There is other industrial land nearby which can be utilised, without moving into sensitive environments.	Decline the application [plan change] to rezone rural urban fringe to industrial	No
11	Trevor Bromley	11.1	Oppose	At present in a northwest wind submitter has to keep windows shut because of the dust and sand that come from the Smith's Crane site. Any further industrial sites will exacerbate that problem.	Decline the application [plan change] in full.	No
		11.2	Oppose	There are many more industrial sites in the city without having to encroach on this well used piece of rural fringe.	Decline the application [plan change] in full.	No
12	Nancy Greensmith	12.1	Oppose	This would take away a lot of the green belt and encroach into a large green area on Johns Road, e.g. Isaac Conservation Walkway, Clearwater Golf Course and the Groynes.	Decline PPC24 in full.	No
13	Mary-Anne Beckingsales	13.1	Oppose	There has been an inordinate amount of land development in the Styx/Hussey/Gardiners Road area in the last 5-6 years. This has affected the wildlife to an unacceptable degree, e.g. pukekos in the area are often hit by cars. The native wildlife in the area deserve to have people advocate for their protection. Stop this carve-up of land for a concrete jungle.	Leave the land as it is and develop away from areas that should be prioritised for protection.	No
14	Lenore Farrelly	14.1	Oppose	The impact this change will have on the area is massive. Our roads are already stretched to capacity. The industrial activities will create dust, noise, traffic. Risk of pollution to waterways is completely avoidable, and the effect on conservation is huge.	Decline PPC24 in full.	No
15	Susan Bliss	15.1	Oppose	Site has not been identified for urban growth in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement or in the Christchurch District Plan.	Council to oppose PPC24 [decline] in full	No
		15.2	Oppose	Loss of rural character with noise, lighting and dust. Rural area has already reduced. Clearwater Resort will not be a pleasant place to stay.	Council to oppose PPC24 [decline] in full	No
		15.3	Oppose	Effect on sensitive wetland area at the Groynes would be damaging.	Council to oppose PPC24 [decline] in full	No
		15.4	Oppose	Traffic volumes and noise will increase considerably for residents nearby.	Council to oppose PPC24 [decline] in full.	No

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		15.5	Oppose	The benefits to a company who prefer freehold land in one locality do not outweigh the destruction of wetlands and rural area.	Council to oppose PPC24 [decline] in full.	No
16	John and Janelle Spearpoint	16.1	Oppose	The proposal creates unacceptable reverse sensitivity effects on established lawful residential use at Clearwater and fails to adequately assess or mitigate environmental effects that will directly affect the submitter's property and the community. The proposal provides no evaluation of effects on Clearwater residents and thereby fails to meet RMA section 32 requirements.	Decline the plan change.	Yes
		16.2	Oppose	The proposal cannot be approved because it will cause further degradation of a waterway already in breach of waterway standards; it offers no protection for at-risk fish habitat; spring assessments are incomplete and pre-development spring mapping should be a pre-requisite; and riparian zone management is unenforceable against fragmented titles. This means the proposal is not in accordance with sound resource management practice.	Decline the plan change	Yes
		16.3	Oppose	High permeability sandy gravels create direct pathways for contaminated stormwater to reach groundwater. The application identifies groundwater flows are generally eastward but provides no modelling of contaminant pathways or of how lateral and seasonal flows could affect groundwater users to the east and northeast, including Clearwater Resort. Groundwater interaction and stormwater quality assessment are deferred to the subdivision stage. The application cannot be approved without complete groundwater and stormwater interaction assessment demonstrating no adverse effects on groundwater quality.	Decline the plan change	Yes
		16.4	Oppose	Proposal projects an additional 176 vehicles per hour during peak periods, but submitter considers this is likely a significant underestimate and there could be more like 400-500 peak hour departure movements. All these vehicles have to use the Clearwater Avenue roundabout, creating more northbound congestion and compromising emergency and routine access to Clearwater. Plan change cannot be approved until NZTA confirms that the intersection can safely accommodate projected traffic generation.	Decline the plan change	Yes
		16.5	Oppose	No noise modelling has been provided to assess compliance with NZS6802:2008, for new industrial uses adjacent to existing residential uses. No acoustic buffer or noise mitigation is proposed whereas an acoustic barrier would likely be required; however, it is difficult to assess noise compliance in the absence of more detail on which industrial uses are anticipated. Proposal will introduce persistent ground-level industrial noise fundamentally incompatible with the character and use of Clearwater Resort and could result in property value reduction.	Decline the plan change	Yes
		16.6	Oppose	Rezoning would materially diminish the separation between industrial activity and established residential use. The rural zone between the existing industrial zone and Clearwater provides important amenity and a transition buffer. There has not been a visual impact assessment to determine whether industrial structures on the site would be visible from Clearwater residential buildings.	Decline the plan change	Yes
		16.7	Oppose	The 2023 GCP Business Capacity Assessment identifies more than 30 years of industrial land supply. The applicant argues that other areas are unsuitable for the activities that would locate here but does not provide evidence that the specific industrial activities cannot locate elsewhere, or that the Harewood North location is essential. This Plan change does not demonstrate that it is the most appropriate way to achieve the District Plan's objectives for industrial land supply (section 32 of the RMA).	Decline the plan change.	Yes
17	Grant O'Neill, operator of Clearwater Golf Club (600 members)	17.1	Oppose	Clearwater Golf Club members, visitors and guests rely on the existing rural and open space character and ecological amenity of the surrounding area including the Groynes, Isaac Conservation Park, Waimakariri Regional Park and Lake Roto Kohatu. All activities at Clearwater were lawfully established well before this private plan change request.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.2	Oppose	The site adjoins and in its northern corner, intersects with a tributary of the ecologically significant Otukaikino Stream. Existing water quality in the Stream and its tributaries is already below the regional plan target for dissolved oxygen. Additional stormwater discharge, sediment	Stop fully and consult	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
				or contaminant loading has the potential to further degrade an already stressed waterway. A threatened native fish species spawning habitat lies a short distance downstream of the site. No species- specific monitoring or adaptive mechanisms are proposed to protect this habitat.		
		17.3	Oppose	There is no long-term funding, maintenance or enforcement mechanism specified to ensure the buffer planting is established, survives and is maintained once the site is subdivided.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.4	Oppose	Construction phase erosion and sediment control is not addressed by plan change standards and is wholly reliant on a subsequent consent process.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.5	Oppose	Investigation of potential springs is incomplete, groundwater interception or disturbance during earthworks and subdivision could adversely affect spring-fed hydrology supporting the waterway.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.6	Oppose	The feasibility of the proposed stormwater discharge to ground has not been demonstrated with current groundwater data, detailed design and independent review. There is a significant risk of contaminants travelling towards areas where residential and recreational uses exist.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.7	Oppose	The applicant's wastewater modelling demonstrates that under an ultimate growth scenario, Council wastewater thresholds will be exceeded, however no immediate upgrades are proposed. Any connection to the Council system should be applicant funded and subject to elevated development contributions.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.8	Oppose	The site gains access from a section of the state highway which is also the primary access to Clearwater via Clearwater Avenue. Increased delay at that intersection has not been assessed in the context of golf, resort or event-related traffic patterns. The interaction between heavy vehicle movements and existing vehicle movements has not been specifically addressed, nor the interaction with shared path users. Road safety auditing needs to be done now not later.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.9	Oppose	The proposal adds to an acknowledged, unfunded congestion issue at the Sawyers Arms Road roundabout, contrary to the RPS's outcome for network congestion management. The concept level access intersection remains subject to consultation with NZTA and could change.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.10	Oppose	No independent traffic assessment has been obtained to test the applicant's modelling.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.11	Oppose	No site-specific noise assessment or rule has been proposed for the interface between the proposed zoning and the golf course, resort accommodation and residential community. Construction phase noise and vibration have not been assessed, nor have night-time or extended operation noise effects.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.12	Oppose	No lighting controls are proposed for the interface with the resort, which relies on a rural, dark, open outlook as part of its accommodation and hospitality offering.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.13	Oppose	The landscape and visual assessment does not include analysis from specific golf course and resort viewpoints.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.14	Oppose	Construction dust management effects on the adjoining golf course, a particularly dust sensitive use, have not been assessed.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.15	Oppose	The submitter notes that the range of activities enabled by the Industrial General zone have not been assessed for odour or air discharge risk to the adjoining golf course and resort.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.16	Oppose	The reverse sensitivity analysis omits any mention of the golf course, resort and residential activities. No reverse sensitivity acknowledgement or covenant is proposed to be registered against future industrial titles.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.17	Oppose	The proposal removes the last remaining area of open rural character buffering Clearwater from existing industrial land and would create a precedent for further industrial zoning closer to or within Clearwater land.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
		17.18	Oppose	Submitter is concerned that the "no alternative supply" argument has not been independently verified, and the underlying issue with the Industrial Park (IP) zoned land to the south may reflect a zoning /market mismatch rather than a genuine absence of developable industrial land in the locality. The Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan identifies a surplus of industrial land for the next 30 years and beyond, therefore there is no need for additional industrial land to be zoned.	Stop fully and consult	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		17.19	Oppose	The section 32 report does not adequately assess the effects of the proposal on the golf course, resort and residential community as receiving environments in their own right, and several of the mitigations relied on are deferred until later consent processes. The submitter considers that the section 32 report lacks sufficient information for a decision maker to determine the plan change.	Stop fully and consult	Yes
18	Sam Jackson	18.1	Oppose	There should be strict rules about noise. Residents shouldn't have to deal with industrial noise that is louder or more disruptive than the normal background noise from traffic and the airport or is outside of normal business hours. Existing houses are not built to specific acoustic and ventilation standards.	Currently against rezoning. Residents, visitors, bore water systems, wildlife and Clearwater all need to be seriously protected before any development occurs.	No
		18.2	Oppose	Concern about industrial activity affecting the groundwater and water supply as some houses in the area rely on bores.	Currently against rezoning. Residents, visitors, bore water systems, wildlife and Clearwater all need to be seriously protected before any development occurs.	No
		18.3	Oppose	Concern about Clearwater losing the character it currently has.	Currently against rezoning. Residents, visitors, bore water systems, wildlife and Clearwater all need to be seriously protected before any development occurs.	No
		18.4	Oppose	Having a large industrial area nearby could force residents to relocate and have an adverse effect on property prices.	Currently against rezoning. Residents, visitors, bore water systems, wildlife and Clearwater all need to be seriously protected before any development occurs.	No
19	Dylan Nicoll	19.1	Oppose	Oppose loss of Rural Urban Fringe land and the existing rural character of the area. Industrial development will be a blight on the area.	Don't make another new environmental botch job, when you [Council?] hasn't and won't fix the infrastructure problems we already have.	No
		19.2	Oppose	Potential effects on the amenity and environmental values of the surrounding area.	Don't make another new environmental botch job, when you [Council?] hasn't and won't fix the infrastructure problems we already have.	No
		19.3	Oppose	Potential effects of traffic and heavy vehicle movements on Johns Road and surrounding roads. Its busy enough with the "new" motorway that was supposed to fix the overwhelming traffic problems we have.	Don't make another new environmental botch job, when you [Council?] hasn't and won't fix the infrastructure problems we already have.	No
		19.4	Oppose	Potential effects on waterways, wetlands, springs and the wider water environment, including the Hedges Waterway. The water quality of the city is already compromised and ruined, and this will only add to it.	Don't make another new environmental botch job, when you [Council?] hasn't and won't fix the infrastructure problems we already have.	No
		19.5	Oppose	Noise, dust, lighting and other effects of industrial development	Don't make another new environmental botch job, when you [Council?] hasn't and won't fix the infrastructure problems we already have.	No
20	Juliana Guimaraes	20.1	Oppose	Oppose loss of Rural Urban Fringe land and further erosion of the rural and open character of the area. There should be appropriate buffers between industrial development and sensitive environmental areas, with long term environmental and community effects of this proposal given significant weight.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		20.2	Oppose	Concern about additional traffic and heavy vehicle movements. Further industrial activity has the potential to increase congestion, noise, safety concerns and pressure on the surrounding road network.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		20.3	Oppose	Potential effects on waterways, wetlands, springs and the wider water environment, including the Hedges Waterway. Increased hard surfaces, earthworks and changes to drainage patterns could create risks to water quality, stormwater management and the ecological health of nearby	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning.	No

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
				waterways and wetlands. Potential effects should be avoided rather than relying solely on mitigation after development.	If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	
		20.4	Oppose	Concern about noise, dust, light spill, visual and other effects of industrial activity, affecting nearby residents, rural land, recreational areas and the general amenity of the surrounding environment.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		20.5	Oppose	Potential loss of rural character and risks to waterways, wetlands, springs and local amenity are not sufficiently outweighed by the benefits of extending industrial zoning into this area.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
21	Jude Shepperd	21.1	Oppose	Oppose loss of Rural Urban Fringe land and further erosion of the rural and open character of the area. There should be appropriate buffers between industrial development and sensitive environmental areas, with long term environmental and community effects of this proposal given significant weight.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		21.2	Oppose	Concern about additional traffic and heavy vehicle movements. Further industrial activity has the potential to increase congestion, noise, safety concerns and pressure on the surrounding road network.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		21.3	Oppose	Potential effects on waterways, wetlands, springs and the wider water environment, including the Hedges Waterway. Increased hard surfaces, earthworks and changes to drainage patterns could create risks to water quality, stormwater management and the ecological health of nearby waterways and wetlands. Potential effects should be avoided rather than relying solely on mitigation after development.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		21.4	Oppose	Concern about noise, dust, light spill, visual and other effects of industrial activity, affecting nearby residents, rural land, recreational areas and the general amenity of the surrounding environment.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		21.5	Oppose	Potential loss of rural character and risks to waterways, wetlands, springs and local amenity are not sufficiently outweighed by the benefits of extending industrial zoning into this area.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning.	No

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
					If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	
22	Leanne Benton	22.1	Oppose	Oppose loss of Rural Urban Fringe land and further erosion of the rural and open character of the area. There should be appropriate buffers between industrial development and sensitive environmental areas, with long term environmental and community effects of this proposal given significant weight.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		22.2	Oppose	Concern about additional traffic and heavy vehicle movements. Further industrial activity has the potential to increase congestion, noise, safety concerns and pressure on the surrounding road network.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		22.3	Oppose	Potential effects on waterways, wetlands, springs and the wider water environment, including the Hedges Waterway. Increased hard surfaces, earthworks and changes to drainage patterns could create risks to water quality, stormwater management and the ecological health of nearby waterways and wetlands. Potential effects should be avoided rather than relying solely on mitigation after development.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		22.4	Oppose	Concern about noise, dust, light spill, visual and other effects of industrial activity, affecting nearby residents, rural land, recreational areas and the general amenity of the surrounding environment.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
		22.5	Oppose	Potential loss of rural character and risks to waterways, wetlands, springs and local amenity are not sufficiently outweighed by the benefits of extending industrial zoning into this area.	Reject PPC24 and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. If plan change not rejected, no rezoning or development should proceed unless there is clear and robust evidence that adverse effects raised in this submission can be avoided. The proposal should include strong protections and enforceable requirements on the matters raised in this submission.	No
23	Diane and John Jones	23.1	Oppose	The introduction of industrial activities will generate adverse effects such and noise, dust and visual pollution, and will fail to protect the well-established residential amenity in the area.	Oppose the rezoning and request that existing zoning be retained.	Yes
		23.2	Oppose	As owners of an existing industrial facility in the Greywacke area, the submitters consider that further industrial expansion into this specific activity is unwarranted and is counterproductive to balanced urban planning.	Oppose the rezoning and request that existing zoning be retained.	Yes
		23.3	Oppose	The proposed development threatens localised rural land and critical waterways that currently support active populations of fish and eels.	Oppose the rezoning and request that existing zoning be retained.	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		23.4	Oppose	The surrounding road network already experiences severe peak-hour congestion, particularly during the northward flow from the airport. Introducing heavy industrial traffic will compound existing network failures and create unsafe delays for residents exiting Clearwater Avenue.	Oppose the rezoning and request that existing zoning be retained.	Yes
		23.5	Oppose	Affected residents were not notified or adequately consulted regarding these proposals. This does not constitute robust community engagement and the public involvement required for significant district planning changes.	Oppose the rezoning and request that existing zoning be retained.	Yes
24	Ryan Brosnahan for Christchurch International Airport Limited	24.1	Neutral /amend	PPC24 should include a mechanism to ensure that future stormwater infrastructure and water bodies are designed and managed so as to not unnecessarily increase birdstrike risk to aircraft using Christchurch International Airport (CIA). The Canterbury Regional Policy Statement identifies the CIA as regionally significant infrastructure. Chapters 5 and 6 include policies which seek to avoid or manage activities that could compromise strategic infrastructure.	Amend PPC24 so that Rule 6.7.4.3.1 P3, which has activity specific standards for new stormwater basins and water bodies, applies throughout the PPC24 ODP area.	Yes
		24.2	Neutral/ amend	Rule 6.7.4.3.1.P3 in the District Plan already contains design standards directed at reducing the attractiveness of new stormwater basins and waterbodies to birds. These standards apply within the Birdstrike Management Area, which is that area within 3 km of the runway thresholds at CIA. The PPC24 area is between 3 and 4 km from the runway threshold, but CIAL considers the current 3 km spatial extent of the Birdstrike Management area does not reflect the full area within which birdstrike risk may be relevant. Therefore, CIAL considers that the PPC24 ODP description should be amended so that any new stormwater basin or water body within the ODP area would be required to meet the same activity specific standards.	Amend PPC24 so that Rule 6.7.4.3.1 P3, which has activity specific standards for new stormwater basins and water bodies, applies throughout the PPC24 ODP area. Any other consequential or similar relief to give effect to the outcomes sought.	Yes
25	Jackie and Simon Jackson	25.1	Oppose	There is no significant benefit to the community from this development going ahead, as it is detrimental to traffic levels on an already congested road; the rural landscape will be forever changed; there are risks to waterways in the area and to human health from noise and dust; there are other industrial areas available e.g. Ryans Road, etc	Decline PPC24 in full.	No
		25.2	Oppose	Industrial activity in this immediate Johns Road area has historically contaminated groundwater and private water supplies in wells with arsenic and chromium, as a result of a stormwater discharge from a timber treatment site. (Council records, 1997). Water contamination from new industrial development is a serious concern for aquatic ecological values, with groundwater pathways not being adequately assessed e.g. for 432 Johns, and not assessed at all for 448 Johns Road, which makes up 37% of the proposed PC area.	Decline PPC24 in full	No
		25.3	Oppose	Including 448 Johns Road in the zone change helps create a consolidated and connected form to the existing industrial area. However, if the 448 Johns Road owner never develops their land, does the outline development plan still work as intended? What happens to the stormwater strategy? Why should the technical assessment of the whole PPC24 be considered sufficient. e.g. geotechnical, contamination and groundwater information is lacking for 448 Johns Road. Is it appropriate to rezone a property where a landowner does not support this? A previous rezoning request for 370, 390 and 432 Johns Road through PC14 was rejected, so the proposers are most likely including 448 Johns as a way to strengthen their application.	Decline PPC24 in full	No
		25.4	Oppose	Groundwater monitoring recommended by PDP needs to be completed before rezoning is considered. This needs to include multiple monitoring wells, seasonal monitoring, groundwater levels and flow direction, hydraulic gradients etc.	Decline PPC24 in full	No
26	Sarah and John Cameron	26.1	Oppose	Clearwater homes, hotel and golf course would be highly negatively impacted by this rezoning.	Deny/decline the proposed plan change	No
		26.2	Oppose	There are already traffic congestion issues along Johns Road particularly around the Sawyers Arms roundabout and Clearwater Avenue exit. A large industrial area would add greatly to this.	Deny/decline the proposed plan change	No
		26.3	Oppose	Construction works will be very noisy over a long period of time. This will particularly affect the Clearwater Golf Club, the Sir Bob Charles Training Facility and Peppers Clearwater Hotel as well as ordinary residents of Clearwater.	Deny/decline the proposed plan change	No
		26.4	Oppose	There will be large amounts of dust and airborne dirt produced during the construction phase, which will affect all nearby properties with particular negative effects on the golf course.	Deny/decline the proposed plan change	No

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		26.5	Oppose	An industrial area would be visible from parts of Clearwater which is totally inappropriate given the current open rural character of the landscape. There will be lighting pollution.	Deny/decline the proposed plan change	No
		26.6	Oppose	The industrialisation of the site will degrade the ecology of the area. Sediment, stormwater discharge and contaminants will affect and ruin the adjoining waterways and wetlands.	Deny/decline the proposed plan change	No
27	Ross Clarke	27.1	Support	There is clearly a lack of industrial land in the right areas of Canterbury, with a very small amount of vacant land that can be sold. Migration of industrial land to Selwyn and Waimakariri Districts is an economic loss to Christchurch City.	Approve PPC24 as it has been submitted for the betterment of Christchurch City.	No
		27.2	Support	This area is prime industrial land with no residential value due to being within the CIAL 50 dBA noise contour, and has no rural value being “hard boney” land, with the risk of livestock escaping onto SH1. It makes sense to continue adjoining industrial land.	Approve PPC24	No
		27.3	Support	There is immediate State Highway 1 access along with access though the airport campus. Developing here instead of in existing Christchurch East industrial areas would reduce heavy traffic through the city and thereby also reduce carbon emissions.	Approve PPC24.	No
28	William Whalan	28.1	Oppose	Submitter is concerned about the potential for pollution of the Otukaikino Stream and its tributaries. Clearwater as named that, due to being located in a catchment of pristine waters.	Reject the plan change and keep the existing zoning	No
		28.2	Oppose	Concern about traffic impacts. It will be very problematic for heavy traffic to enter the State Highway and get up to speed to merge, then immediately slow for the Clearwater roundabout, which is busy anyway without additional traffic. So too is the Sawyers Arms Road roundabout, which has kilometres long traffic jams every weekday morning and night.	Reject the plan change and keep the existing zoning	No
		28.3	Oppose	Noise, air quality and dust associated with heavy industrial is not appropriate in this location.	Not allow the plan change and keep the existing zoning	No
29	Lindsay O'Donnell for Harewood Holdings (2016) Limited.	29.1	Support	PPC24 would add much needed freehold industrial capacity in a location with very limited freehold supply. Other industrial areas in north and northwestern Christchurch do not provide an equivalent substitute in every respect. Constraints include poorer ground conditions and interfaces with sensitive residential activities (North Belfast), different zone purposes and controls (Wairakei Road) and the prevalence of leasehold land (Airport zone).	Approve PPC24 in total including the ODP, subject to any necessary or consequential amendments while maintaining the purpose and outcomes.	Yes
		29.2	Support	Council's Industrial Land Feasibility Assessment 2018 identified adjoining land in Harewood as performing strongly in terms of feasibility, in particular accessibility to the strategic transport network and Christchurch International Airport. The proposed plan change area has the same strategic attributes. These attributes support freight, logistics, warehousing, airport related and general industrial activities.	Approve PPC24	Yes
		29.3	Support	Site is less suitable for other urban uses. Residential development is constrained by airport noise contours and disconnected from nearly residential neighbourhoods by Johns Road. Significant commercial development would be inconsistent with the centres-based framework. Industrial use is compatible with the adjoining land use pattern and is the highest and best use.	Approve PPC24	Yes
		29.4	Support	Areas like this which will not give rise to industrial interface issues with sensitive activities like housing, are inherently well-functioning and highly demanded by industrial businesses.	Approve PPC24	Yes
30	Richard Holden	30.1	Oppose	Supports the submission of Michael Sharp (# 35) on behalf of Clearwater Golf Course. Specific concerns include Effects on Ecological values. The waterways and wetlands surrounding PPC24 land are already degraded and water quality is poor. Concern that industrial development will further degrade them.	PPC24 be declined in its entirety	Yes
		30.2	Oppose	Servicing: There is inadequate information on the feasibility of servicing, especially that stormwater management will be wholly contained within the subject land and not adversely affect adjoining land, waterways or groundwater.	PPC24 be declined in its entirety	Yes
		30.3	Oppose	Increased traffic along the State Highway is a concern, and modelled increased delays at the Clearwater/Johns Road intersection are potentially significant.	PPC24 be declined in its entirety	Yes
		30.4	Oppose	Uncertainty of noise and light spill and adverse landscape and visual effects, dust and odour, and the impacts of those on established outdoor recreational, resort and residential environments.	PPC24 be declined in its entirety	Yes
		30.5	Oppose	The existing environment surrounding Clearwater is tranquil and open, with surrounding land including the Rural Urban Fringe zone acting as a buffer between Clearwater and the Industrial	PPC24 be declined in its entirety	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
				Heavy zone further to the southwest. PPC24 will change this environment and has the potential to create adverse and significant effects.		
		30.6	Oppose	The applicant has not demonstrated a need for additional land to be rezoned for industrial purposes, as the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan identifies a significant surplus of industrial land in greater Christchurch, and this is not a preferred location for growth.	PPC24 be declined in its entirety	Yes
31	Marilyn Austin	31.1	Oppose	Loss of rural identity if rezoned. Clearwater has peaceful natural rural surroundings and the whole area is an important recreational and ecological area which should be protected.	Oppose all of the plan change	No
		31.2	Oppose	The Johns Road motorway will become even more congested and dangerous to travel on. The section of the motorway between Harewood Road and Clearwater is too congested to use after about 3pm.	Oppose all of the plan change	No
		31.3	Oppose	Pollution will affect the bird and fish life and the pristine nature of the waterways.	Oppose all of the plan change	No
		31.4	Oppose	The green buffer to Clearwater is aesthetically pleasing. A large industrial facility able to be seen from any part of the golf course is going to spoil its special rural identity. The golf facilities are important to the Christchurch economy.	Oppose all of the plan change	No
		31.5	Oppose	There is abundant industrial land available towards the south of Christchurch and in the Rolleston area.	Oppose all of the plan change	No
32	Laurence Peak	32.1	Oppose	The development is expected to create a significant increase in vehicle movements, including heavy trucks. This will add pressure to Johns Road and the Clearwater Avenue intersection. Concerned about increased congestion, longer traffic times and road safety.	Decline Proposed Plan Change 24	No
		32.2	Oppose	Increased noise, especially outside normal business hours, and additional lighting could negatively impact the enjoyment of nearby residential and recreational areas.	Decline Proposed Plan Change 24	No
		32.2	Oppose	Construction activities and future industrial operations could increase pollution, sediment runoff and stormwater impacts, which may further affect water quality and local wildlife habitats.	Decline Proposed Plan Change 24	No
		32.4	Oppose	Proposal does not clearly identify what types of industrial businesses or activities are intended for the site. Each activity could have very different impacts in terms of noise, traffic, dust, lighting, odours and air quality.	Decline Proposed Plan Change 24	No
		32.5	Oppose	The site currently provides an important open buffer between existing industrial areas and nearby residential and recreational areas. Rezoning for industrial use would permanently change the character of the area.	Decline Proposed Plan Change 24	No
		32.6	Oppose	There has not been enough evidence to justify the need for additional industrial land in this location, when other industrial land is available elsewhere.	Decline Proposed Plan Change 24	No
33	Kaye Lindsay	33.1	Oppose	This rural area has been an open space ecological region. With proposed new industrial buildings, submitter is concerned about how all this sediment and toxic waste would impact on the already stressed waterways, and harm the wildlife that resides there. Toxic sprays could be used on the land which could seep into the aquifers and waterways.	Reject the plan change in its entirety	No
		33.2	Oppose	Concern that there could be a large AI data centre here which would deplete the water supply, and if the contaminated water isn't sufficiently cooled before being released into the waterways, would kill the native fish and wildlife.	Reject the plan change in its entirety	No
		33.3	Oppose	Noise, dust and construction of any buildings would negatively impact on residents living in the area and could cause significant health effects e.g. on elderly people who walk the tracks in the area.	Reject the plan change in its entirety	No
		33.4	Oppose	Submitter considers that the applicant has not assessed the relevant objective and policies under the Christchurch District Plan, the NPS on Urban Development 2020, and the NPS on Highly Productive Land 2022.	Reject the plan change in its entirety	No
34	Beverly Prebble	34.1	Oppose	Increased cumulative effect on traffic coming on to Gardiners Road.	Refuse the application in its entirety.	No
		34.2	Oppose	Noise, visual and landscape effects, air quality and dust. Loss of open space and rural character. Submitter supports the opposition of neighbours and affected landowners in regard to Johns Road and Clearwater environments.	Refuse the application in its entirety.	No

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		34.3	Oppose	Concern for the effect rezoning will have on an unconfined aquifer and the water quality of Hedges Waterway and the surrounding spring fed wetland.	Refuse the application in its entirety.	No
35	Michael Sharp, for Clearwater Resort Owners Society Incorporated. (206 members)	35.1	Oppose	Clearwater Resort members, residents, visitors and guests rely on the existing rural and open space character and ecological amenity of the surrounding area including the Groynes, Isaac Conservation Park, Waimakariri Regional Park and Lake Roto Kohatu. All activities at Clearwater were lawfully established well before this private plan change request.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.2	Oppose	The site adjoins and in its northern corner, intersects with a tributary of the ecologically significant Otukaikino Stream. Existing water quality in this stream and its tributaries is already below the regional plan target for dissolved oxygen. Additional stormwater discharge, sediment or contaminant loading has the potential to degrade an already stressed waterway. A threatened native fish species spawning habitat lies a short distance downstream of the site. No species-specific monitoring or adaptive mechanisms are proposed to protect this habitat.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.3	Oppose	There is no long-term funding, maintenance or enforcement mechanism specified to ensure the buffer planting is established, survives and is maintained once the site is subdivided.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.4	Oppose	Construction phase erosion and sediment control is not addressed by plan change standards and is wholly reliant on a subsequent consent process.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.5	Oppose	Investigation of potential springs is incomplete. Groundwater interception or disturbance during earthworks and subdivision could adversely affect spring-fed hydrology supporting the waterway.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.6	Oppose	The feasibility of the proposed stormwater discharge to ground has not been demonstrated with current groundwater data, detailed design and independent review. There is a significant risk of contaminants travelling towards areas where residential and recreational uses exist.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.7	Oppose	The applicant's wastewater modelling demonstrates that under an ultimate growth scenario, Council wastewater thresholds will be exceeded, however no immediate upgrades are proposed. Any connection to the Council system should be applicant funded and subject to elevated development contributions.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.8	Oppose	The site gains access from a section of the state highway which is also the primary access to Clearwater via Clearwater Avenue. Increased delay at that intersection has not been assessed in the context of golf, resort or event-related traffic patterns. The interaction between heavy vehicle movements and existing vehicle movements has not been specifically addressed, nor the interaction with shared path users. Road safety auditing needs to be done now not later.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.9	Oppose	The proposal adds to an acknowledged, unfunded congestion issue at the Sawyers Arms Road roundabout, contrary to the RPS's outcome for network congestion management. The concept level access intersection remains subject to consultation with NZTA and could change.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.10	Oppose	No independent traffic assessment has been obtained to test the applicant's modelling.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.11	Oppose	No site-specific noise assessment or rule has been proposed for the interface between the proposed zoning and the golf course, resort accommodation and residential community. Construction phase noise and vibration have not been assessed, nor have night-time or extended operation noise effects.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.12	Oppose	No lighting controls are proposed for the interface with the resort, which relies on a rural, dark, open outlook as part of its accommodation and hospitality offering.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.13	Oppose	The landscape and visual assessment does not include analysis from specific golf course and resort viewpoints.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.14	Oppose	Construction dust management effects on the adjoining golf course, a particularly dust sensitive use, have not been assessed.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.15	Oppose	The submitter notes that the range of activities enabled by the Industrial General zone have not been assessed for odour or air discharge risk to the adjoining golf course and resort.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		35.16	Oppose	The reverse sensitivity analysis omits any mention of the golf course, resort and residential activities. No reverse sensitivity acknowledgement or covenant is proposed to be registered against future industrial titles.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.17	Oppose	The proposal removes the last remaining area of open rural character buffering Clearwater from existing industrial land and would create a precedent for further industrial zoning closer to or within Clearwater land.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.18	Oppose	Submitter is concerned that the “no alternative supply” argument has not been independently verified, and the underlying issue with the Industrial Park (IP) zoned land to the south may reflect a zoning /market mismatch rather than a genuine absence of developable industrial land in the locality. The Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan identifies a surplus of industrial land for the next 30 years and beyond, therefore there is no need for additional industrial land to be zoned.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		35.18	Oppose	The section 32 report does not adequately assess the effects of the proposal on the golf course, resort and residential community as receiving environments in their own right, and several of the mitigations relied on are deferred until later consent processes. The submitter considers that the section 32 report lacks sufficient information for a decision maker to determine the plan change.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
36	Joel Brading	36.1	Oppose	The existing road network in the area is already under significant pressure. The proposal would add further industrial traffic, including heavy vehicles, before the necessary transport upgrades are funded, committed to or delivered, and increase delays and safety risks. The proposal does not adequately assess the traffic impact on surrounding roads e.g. Gardiners Road, which is already being used as a thoroughfare by motorists seeking to avoid daily congestion on Johns Road.	Decline PPC24 application in its entirety	No
		36.2	Oppose	The proposal is contrary to policy direction in Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the Christchurch District Plan, which seek to avoid unplanned urban development outside identified urban growth areas. Industrial growth should occur where it has been strategically planned and is supported by infrastructure. The developer’s preference for this particular land should not override the planning framework or justify the permanent loss of Rural Urban Fringe land, when there is available industrial land elsewhere which should be used before rezoning.	Decline PPC24 application in its entirety	No
		36.3	Oppose	The applicant’s ecological assessment identifies risks associated with stormwater, sediment, contaminants and cumulative downstream effects. The wider area contains some of Christchurch’s most valued environmental and recreational assets, which contribute significantly to the character of northern Christchurch. Industrial development is inconsistent with this.	Decline PPC24 application in its entirety	No
		36.4	Oppose	The proposal would permanently remove an important rural buffer, with the Rural Urban Fringe zoning providing an appropriate transition between urban and rural environments.	Decline PPC24 application in its entirety	No
		36.5	Oppose	It is difficult to understand how a property (448 Johns Road) can be included in a private plan change of this nature without the owner’s knowledge or consent. They do not support it being rezoned. This raises serious questions about consultation.	Decline PPC24 application in its entirety	No
37	Ian Petrie	37.1	Oppose	The Council should not approve a developer’s application for a change, when the change will not comply with the reason the Clearwater resort, golf course and housing development was approved many years ago. People moved to Clearwater for the lifestyle and rural outlook – no air, water or noise pollution. The stream running through the resort has clear water as the name suggests, wonderful bird life and peace and quiet.	Decline the developer’s rezoning application	No
		37.2	Oppose	Object to extra traffic noise and access, industrial noise, water contamination and damage to the ecological surroundings.	Decline the developer’s rezoning application	No
38	Tim Smith, Smith Crane and Construction Limited	38.1	Support	The submitter owns 484 Johns Road and leases more land from Ecan to the southwest [at 550 Johns and part of 57 Greywacke Road]. The plan change should include the leased land, to connect across to the industrial area on Sawyers Arms Road. This would improve access and roading and keep traffic from joining the PPC24 area from the State Highway. Would also provide excellent transport links to the airport and the south.	Approve the Plan change and extend it to cover additional land.	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		38.2	Support	CIA and Christchurch Holdings have wasted valuable industrial land [behind the airport] for a solar farm. Due to this significant reduction in supply, more land for industry needs to be made available especially close to the airport.		Yes
39	Lee and John McVicar	39.1	Oppose	The need and significance case has not been made out. The proposal is a departure from the planned urban form, justified by a shortage of freehold lots in a self-defined local submarket. There is artificiality in the applicant's reliance on a tightly defined Harewood North land market. Define the problem as a shortage of freehold land in a small locality, and the chosen site becomes the answer. The official capacity evidence records a substantial city-wide surplus of industrial land, which has been increased by fast-track approvals of 57.6 ha at Ryans Road. [now appealed] and 60.4 ha northwest of Pound Road. The applicant's answer is that desirable and accessible supply is more constrained than the assessment suggests, but these are arguments about tenure and location within a surplus, not a capacity shortfall.	Primary relief: Decline the plan change in its entirety and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. In the alternative: Council to defer its decision until sufficient information is available e.g. comprehensive site -verified and seasonally continuous wetland and ecological assessments, and an updated transport assessment for IG zoning. As a second alternative: Any rezoning to exclude 370 Johns Road, thereby retaining a materially greater rural urban fringe buffer to nearby residential. If the PC is approved in full or in part, seek amendments to the ODP and rules to address the matters raised in the submission.	Yes
		39.2	Oppose	448 Johns Road is owned by a person who does not want it rezoned. The application relies on that land (about a third of the area) to physically join the existing industrial area to the rest of the PPC24 site, and to portray a consolidated and connected outcome. Its own rules let the land remain rural indefinitely and its lack of control over the parcel undermines those claims. The applicant's section 32 assessment describes the whole 19 ha as readily available for development, which is not the case. Lack of access to 448 Johns has impeded a comprehensive assessment of the effects of rezoning and development of this land, for example key parts of the on-site wetland, spring and ecological assessment that the rest of the site was subject to are unmapped and unverified for 448 Johns Road.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.3	Oppose	This is a poor location for the use proposed. There is a single State Highway access with significant congestion and road safety issues, over an unconfined aquifer, beside a spring-fed freshwater system, in a highly valued ecological, visitor and recreational setting, with multiple nearby residential communities and material unresolved questions about site suitability, servicing and environmental effects. These are not merely information gaps but are locational constraints. Under section 32, having uncertain or insufficient information with which to determine that the land is suitable for rezoning, may weigh against granting the zoning.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.4	Oppose	This is not an ordinary rural-urban fringe but is an unusual "green and blue" part of the city with Clearwater, the Groynes, Roto Kohatu, Willowbank, Styx Mill Reserve and Otukaikino waterways. PPC24 would permanently change the character of the environment within the immediate vicinity of the submitter's property. It would bring large buildings, yards, trucks, loading, lighting, signage, machinery and industrial noise and activity. Such close activity would be distressing and would negatively impact our quality of life. The Rural Urban Fringe here is not development land in waiting but does a job of separation between the long-established industry and the Clearwater -Groynes environment. A planted strip e.g. along the eastern boundary of the ODP is inadequate and cannot replace the function of the Rural Urban Fringe buffer. An application for a building within the narrow planted strip is only a restricted discretionary activity, and the standard expressly states that it cannot be publicly notified, meaning the owner of an adjoining building would have no opportunity to participate.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.5	Oppose	The plan change would increase the level of danger faced in navigating surrounding roads. The existing network is already constrained and there have been a significant number of crashes at both the Sawyers Arms and Clearwater intersections. These roundabouts will have additional	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
				turning movements because of the left- in left-out access to the PPC24 site. The interaction between Greywacke Road acceleration and vehicles entering the PPC24 road needs an expert safety assessment. The use of Gardiners Road requires greater scrutiny. Some longer trucks already use Gardiners Road and Sawyers Arms Road as an alternative route because of difficulty turning right at the Sawyers Arms roundabout. In addition, PPC22 would allow 230 new houses at the northeast corner of Styx Mill Road and Gardiners Road. Growth and additional traffic need to be assessed cumulatively.		
		39.6	Oppose	The applicant itself accepts that the proposal is clearly contrary to the regional and district direction for urban growth.e.g. Chapter 6 of the RPS directions about where urban growth should occur. Policy 8 of the NPS-UD on responsiveness to out-of-sequence development is conditional on adding significantly to development capacity and contributing to well-functioning urban environments. If those considerations are not demonstrated, then the RPS remains a substantial obstacle. In regard to a “well-functioning urban environment”, PPC24 is strongly road dependent with no public transport. Shared path connections are proposed but cannot be assumed in relation to 448 Johns Road. This bears on the NPS-UD Clause 3.8 “well connected” test.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.7	Oppose	It has not been demonstrated that PPC24 gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Infrastructure 2025. It does not address the principle in Policy 11 that responsibility for managing adverse effects rests on the new activity.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.8	Oppose	The site is affected by the Christchurch Groundwater Protection zone with unconfined aquifers. It is premature to state that the groundwater protection zone will not be adversely affected, when seasonal groundwater levels have not yet been established and the final stormwater treatment and disposal system is unresolved.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.9	Oppose	The stormwater management area remains indicative. The feasibility of the stormwater area bears on whether this is sensible land to industrialise. A rule was proposed to ensure that detailed design and investigation would occur prior to development, so that development did not occur in an area that would ultimately be required for stormwater management, but this rule was dropped.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.10	Oppose	Terrestrial ecology, including protected fauna, has not been adequately assessed.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.11	Oppose	Riparian vegetation along the stream and wetland and buffer planting is a benefit only if it is durable i.e. appropriately established, managed and maintained including by future lot owners.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.12	Oppose	There is currently a gap in recording and addressing the outcome of mana whenua consultation, e.g. in regard to waterways, springs and wetlands.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.13	Oppose	The landscape and visual assessment is inadequate in relation to the properties at 5 and 19 Clearwater Avenue and 360 Johns Road, with no viewpoints from these properties. The stormwater management location at the northeast corner of the site is very close to the dwelling at 360 Johns, and that stormwater facility appears to be part of the amenity mitigation.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.14	Oppose	Standard District Plan noise and lighting controls would be inadequate to address this residential interface. Construction dust, noise and vibration need to be controlled over potentially long and staged periods.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		39.15	Oppose	The Johns Road frontage requires continuous landscape screening to a height that screens the activities in full, and area-specific signage control with restrictions on illuminated, digital, moving and off-site advertising signage.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought.	Yes
40	Allan and Lynette Turnbull	40.1	Oppose	Submitters support/ratify all points made in the Clearwater Resort Owners Society submission #35.	Decline the application in its entirety.	No
		40.2	Oppose	To be within sight of and potentially smell and breathe the effects of a heavy industrial operation would destroy the environment that has been created and maintained with nature being at the	Decline the application in its entirety.	

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
				centre of it. Clearwater offers residents, visitors and golfers a tranquil semirural environment adjoining waterways and nature reserve.		
41	Michael Sharp for Clearwater Golf Club Limited (600 members)	41.1	Oppose	Clearwater Golf Club members, visitors and guests rely on the existing rural and open space character and ecological amenity of the surrounding area including the Groynes, Isaac Conservation Park, Waimakariri Regional Park and Lake Roto Kohatu. All activities at Clearwater were lawfully established well before this private plan change request.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.2	Oppose	The site adjoins and in its northern corner, intersects with a tributary of the ecologically significant Otukaikino Stream. Existing water quality in this stream and its tributaries is already below the regional plan target for dissolved oxygen. Additional stormwater discharge, sediment or contaminant loading has the potential to degrade an already stressed waterway. A threatened native fish species spawning habitat lies a short distance downstream of the site. No species-specific monitoring or adaptive mechanisms are proposed to protect this habitat.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.3	Oppose	There is no long-term funding, maintenance or enforcement mechanism specified to ensure the buffer planting is established, survives and is maintained once the site is subdivided.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.4	Oppose	Construction phase erosion and sediment control is not addressed by plan change standards and is wholly reliant on a subsequent consent process.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.5	Oppose	Investigation of potential springs is incomplete. Groundwater interception or disturbance during earthworks and subdivision could adversely affect spring-fed hydrology supporting the waterway.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.6	Oppose	The feasibility of the proposed stormwater discharge to ground has not been demonstrated with current groundwater data, detailed design and independent review. There is a significant risk of contaminants travelling towards areas where residential and recreational uses exist.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.7	Oppose	The applicant's wastewater modelling demonstrates that under an ultimate growth scenario, Council wastewater thresholds will be exceeded, however no immediate upgrades are proposed. Any connection to the Council system should be applicant funded and subject to elevated development contributions.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.8	Oppose	The site gains access from a section of the state highway which is also the primary access to Clearwater via Clearwater Avenue. Increased delay at that intersection has not been assessed in the context of golf, resort or event-related traffic patterns. The interaction between heavy vehicle movements and existing vehicle movements has not been specifically addressed, nor the interaction with shared path users. Road safety auditing needs to be done now not later.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.9	Oppose	The proposal adds to an acknowledged, unfunded congestion issue at the Sawyers Arms Road roundabout, contrary to the RPS's outcome for network congestion management. The concept level access intersection remains subject to consultation with NZTA and could change.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.10	Oppose	No independent traffic assessment has been obtained to test the applicant's modelling.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.11	Oppose	No site-specific noise assessment or rule has been proposed for the interface between the proposed zoning and the golf course, resort accommodation and residential community. Construction phase noise and vibration have not been assessed, nor have night-time or extended operation noise effects.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.12	Oppose	No lighting controls are proposed for the interface with the resort, which relies on a rural, dark, open outlook as part of its accommodation and hospitality offering.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.13	Oppose	The landscape and visual assessment does not include analysis from specific golf course and resort viewpoints.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.14	Oppose	Construction dust management effects on the adjoining golf course, a particularly dust sensitive use, have not been assessed.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.15	Oppose	The submitter notes that the range of activities enabled by the Industrial General zone have not been assessed for odour or air discharge risk to the adjoining golf course and resort.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.16	Oppose	The reverse sensitivity analysis omits any mention of the golf course, resort and residential activities. No reverse sensitivity acknowledgement or covenant is proposed to be registered against future industrial titles.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		41.17	Oppose	The proposal removes the last remaining area of open rural character buffering Clearwater from existing industrial land and would create a precedent for further industrial zoning closer to or within Clearwater land.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.18	Oppose	Submitter is concerned that the “no alternative supply” argument has not been independently verified, and the underlying issue with the Industrial Park (IP) zoned land to the south may reflect a zoning /market mismatch rather than a genuine absence of developable industrial land in the locality. The Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan identifies a surplus of industrial land for the next 30 years and beyond, therefore there is no need for additional industrial land to be zoned.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
		41.19	Oppose	The section 32 report does not adequately assess the effects of the proposal on the golf course, resort and residential community as receiving environments in their own right, and several of the mitigations relied on are deferred until later consent processes. The submitter considers that the section 32 report lacks sufficient information for a decision maker to determine the plan change.	The plan change should not be approved.	Yes
42	Brian McLaughlin	42.1	Oppose	Submitter completely supports the submissions made by Clearwater Resort Owners Society Inc (#35) and Clearwater Golf Club Limited. (#41).	Reject the Plan change in its entirety	No
		42.2	Oppose	Concerns relate to ecology and waterways, stormwater management, services, traffic and transportation, noise, lighting and night sky, visual and landscape effects, air quality and dust, reverse sensitivity, loss of open space and rural/urban character, and the economic case.	Reject the plan change in its entirety	No
43	Kim Seaton for Isaac Conservation Trustees Limited	43.1	Neutral	The Isaac Conservation Trustees and their staff use the existing legal road off Johns Road, where the new main entrance to the proposed rezoned area is to be located, to access the eastern end of their landholdings. They have an access agreement with ECan to authorise their access through a locked gate [and ECan land] at the eastern extent of the legal road, and along a track on the southern edge of Clearwater Resort, to reach the Trustee’s property. It is unclear in the proposed plan change whether or how vehicle access along the legal road will be maintained through the development process. Vehicle access to the Trustee’s land needs to be maintained at all times via this route, including for the purposes of maintenance and enhancement work by staff.	Clarify how vehicular access along the existing legal road corridor is to be maintained to landholdings to the north during construction. Ensure this happens via for example an addition to Rule 16.5.6.1.1 P1 of a further activity specific standard, requiring vehicular access along the corridor to be maintained at all times, or similar relief which achieves the same outcome.	Yes
		43.2	Neutral	The extent to which the proponent intends to form the existing road corridor coloured grey in the ODP to urban standards is unclear, as the road in its entirety sits outside the ODP boundary. This concerns potential access disruption during construction.	As above.	Yes
44	Craig Roberts	44.1	Oppose	Industrial rezoning would degrade the quality of life for those living in the immediate and surrounding area, changing a lovely country aspect and resulting in the loss of rural fringe character. Industrial buildings might be ugly and create a new skyline even on Gardiners Road, and there appears to be no consideration for the appearance of the state highway boundary.	Not to change the current zoning.	No
		44.2	Oppose	There is the potential for Gardiners Road to become a route for much of this [additional] traffic, especially heavy vehicles, on top of additional traffic from the PPC22 area.	Not to change the current zoning.	No
		44.3	Oppose	Submitter is concerned about what noise the businesses might generate and whether new structures would reflect state highway noise back towards the residential zone.	Not to change the current zoning.	No
45	Andrew Klaver	45.1	Oppose	Rezoning part of a working family farm will have a detrimental impact on that farm and surrounding properties.	Retain the land as Rural Urban Fringe	No
		45.2	Oppose	Industrial development could lead to adverse effects on water quality from polluted stormwater or other discharge into streams.	Retain the land as Rural Urban Fringe	No
		45.3	Oppose	Concern about significant increase in noise that could result from industrial activities.	Retain the land as Rural Urban Fringe	No
		45.4	Oppose	Increased noise, traffic and potential pollution could negatively impact the Groynes. Noise, congestion and air quality have already deteriorated following the upgrade of Johns Road and West Belfast Bypass.	Retain the land as Rural Urban Fringe	No
46	Viatcheslav and Natalia Meyn	46.1	Oppose	Submitters agree with and adopt the matters raised in the submissions of Clearwater Resort Owners Society Inc (#35) and J and L McVicar (#39). The applicant itself accepts that the proposal is clearly contrary to the regional and district policy seeking to avoid urban development outside the planned urban area. This conflict requires a strong planning justification, which the applicant has not provided. For example, it has not been	Primary relief: Decline the plan change in its entirety and retain Rural Urban Fringe zoning. In the alternative: Council to defer its decision until sufficient information is available e.g. comprehensive site-verified and	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
				demonstrated that PPC24 gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Infrastructure 2025. It does not address the principle in Policy 11 that responsibility for managing adverse effects rests on the new activity. The section 32 is too narrowly focused on site-specific alternatives for the land without adequately weighing whether there is a need for this land to be industrialised at all.	seasonally continuous wetland and ecological assessments, and an updated transport assessment for IG zoning. As a second alternative: Any rezoning to exclude 370 Johns Road, thereby retaining a materially greater rural urban fringe buffer to nearby residential. If the PC is approved in full or in part, seek amendments to the ODP and rules to address the matters raised in the submission.	
		46.2	Oppose	The need and significance case has not been made out. The proposal is justified by a shortage of freehold lots in a self-defined local submarket. A shortage of vacant freehold land in a narrowly drawn local submarket is not the same as a demonstrated shortage of industrial development capacity. The wider evidence records a substantial city-wide surplus of industrial land, which has been increased by fast-track approvals of approximately 118 ha at Ryans Road and northwest of Pound Road.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.3	Oppose	448 Johns Road is owned by a party who does not want it rezoned. The application relies on that land to physically join the existing industrial area to the rest of the PPC24 site. Its own rules (P3) let the land remain rural indefinitely. The applicant should not be able to rely on an unwilling third party's land to portray a "consolidated and connected outcome", or to found claims of timely delivery. Decision makers should give materially less weight to claims of capacity, timing and consolidation that depend on land the applicant does not control and which has not been investigated to the same standard as the rest of the site.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.4	Oppose	Hedges Waterway runs along the northern part of the site and is a tributary of the ecologically significant Otukaikino Stream, a Site of Ecological Significance in the District Plan. A threatened native galaxias spawning habitat lies approximately 140 m downstream of the site. Existing water quality in this stream and its tributaries is already below relevant water quality targets. The proposal has not adequately assessed the capacity of this connected system to absorb additional sediment or contaminant loading. No species- specific monitoring or adaptive mechanisms are proposed to protect this habitat. The recent confirmation of a natural inland wetland is a substantive planning constraint on the rezoning decision.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.5	Oppose	There is no long-term funding, maintenance or enforcement mechanism specified to ensure the buffer planting is established, survives and is maintained once the site is subdivided.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.6	Oppose	Construction phase erosion and sediment control is not addressed by plan change standards.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.7	Oppose	The site is affected by the Christchurch Groundwater Protection zone with unconfined aquifers. It is premature to state that the groundwater protection zone will not be adversely affected, when seasonal groundwater levels have not yet been established and the final stormwater treatment and disposal system is unresolved.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.8	Oppose	The stormwater management area remains indicative. A rule was proposed to ensure that detailed design and investigation would occur prior to development, so that development did not occur in an area that would ultimately be required for stormwater management, but this rule was dropped with nothing proposed in its place.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.9	Oppose	The applicant's wastewater modelling demonstrates that under an ultimate growth scenario, Council wastewater thresholds will be exceeded, however no immediate upgrades are proposed. Any connection to the Council system should be applicant funded and subject to elevated development contributions.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.10	Oppose	The existing road network is already constrained and there have been a significant number of crashes at both the Sawyers Arms and Clearwater intersections. These roundabouts will have additional turning movements because of the left- in left-out access to the PPC24 site. The	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
				interaction between Greywacke Road acceleration and vehicles entering the PPC24 road needs an expert safety assessment.		
		46.11	Oppose	No site-specific noise assessment or rule has been proposed for the interface between the proposed zoning and nearby residential properties. Construction phase noise and vibration have not been assessed, nor have night-time or extended operation noise effects.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.12	Oppose	No lighting controls are proposed for the interface with nearby residential properties.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.13	Oppose	The landscape and visual assessment is inadequate in relation to the properties at 5 and 19 Clearwater Avenue and 360 Johns Road, with no viewpoints from these properties, and assumptions made about main outlooks from dwellings. A planted strip e.g. along the eastern boundary of the ODP is inadequate, with no requirement to retain existing screening vegetation along that boundary. An application for a building within the narrow planted strip is only a restricted discretionary activity and the standard expressly states that it cannot be publicly notified, meaning the owner of an adjoining building would have no opportunity to participate. The corresponding matter of discretion is inadequate as it is confined to visual amenity only.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.14	Oppose	Construction dust, noise and vibration need to be controlled over potentially long periods. and no assessment has been presented of odour or air discharge risk.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.15	Oppose	The proposal removes the last remaining area of open rural character buffering Clearwater from existing industrial land and would create a precedent for further industrial zoning closer to or within Clearwater land.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.16	Oppose	The Johns Road frontage requires continuous landscape screening, and area-specific signage control prohibiting illuminated, digital, moving and off-site advertising signage.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
		46.17	Oppose	There is currently a gap in recording and addressing the outcome of mana whenua consultation, e.g. in regard to waterways, springs and wetlands.	See above for primary and alternative relief sought	Yes
47	Olivia Robertson for NZTA Waka Kotahi	47.1	Oppose	The proposal will enable a material increase in traffic demand and industrial vehicle activity accessing Johns Road, including heavy vehicle movements. NZTA is concerned that the proposal would introduce additional demand onto a section of the strategic transport network that is already constrained and where future traffic growth is anticipated. Of relevance is that there are currently no funded or planned projects to address even the current operating conditions.	That the proposed plan change is declined.	Yes
		47.2	Oppose	Both CAST modelling and SIDRA modelling have been undertaken and predict increased delay at the Sawyers Arms Road and Clearwater roundabouts. NZTA does not agree that the significance of these effects should be discounted by expressing the additional delay solely as a proportion of assumed total journey time. Rather the effects should be considered in the context of the existing performance of the affected intersections, cumulative traffic growth on the corridor and the long-term strategic movement function of State Highway 1 (SH1). The magnitude of the modelled effects varies considerably between the two models; NZTA considers it appropriate to place greater weight on the more conservative SIDRA results, which indicate more pronounced delays and operational effects at the roundabouts.	That the proposed plan change is declined.	Yes
		47.3	Oppose	The proposal would replace several low-volume rural residential accesses with a single industrial access serving substantially greater traffic volumes associated with industrial activities. The proposed access intersection to the site is situated in close proximity to both the existing Greywacke Road left-in /left-out intersection and the Clearwater roundabout. The Greywacke Road acceleration and merge taper may need to be shortened, or there could be an overlap between merge and diverge manoeuvres. While the applicant suggests that an appropriate design may be achievable, there has been no detailed assessment to show that all requirements can be accommodated within the overall corridor while maintaining the safe and efficient operation of Johns Road, or that future options for improving the state highway corridor would not be precluded.	That the proposed plan change is declined.	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		47.4	Oppose	There would be significant safety effects and increased risk of crashes, including crashes resulting in deaths and serious injuries, caused by the actual speeds of northbound traffic along this section of the road, and the fact that the proposed intersection does not effectively fit into the space available. Heavy vehicles wanting to travel south via a U-turn, so needing to change lanes before the Clearwater roundabout, will increase the safety risk even further. Heavy vehicles approaching from the north, so U-turning at the Sawyers Arms roundabout, will further increase the existing crash risk at this intersection.	That the proposed plan change is declined.	Yes
		47.5	Oppose	The 2024 Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan, which is the Future Development Strategy (FDS) for the subregion, found a significant surplus of industrial land in Christchurch over the next 30 years. The site of this plan change is not identified within any future industrial area and is not required to address any capacity issues.	That the proposed plan change is declined.	Yes
		47.6	Oppose	The FDS also states that urban development should be carefully managed around strategic infrastructure to safeguard its effective operation, maintenance and potential for upgrade. This section of SH1 is a critical strategic freight route and should be prioritised for traffic and freight movement. The proposal for direct access to an industrial development is inconsistent with the intended function of the strategic road network.	That the proposed plan change is declined.	Yes
48	Stacey Walker	48.1	Oppose	Submitter opposes PPC24 until the speed limit along the full length of Gardiners Road is reduced to a consistent 50km/h (rather than a combination of 50km/h and 60km/h) between Johns Road and Sawyers Arms Road. The current speed environment already generates significant noise and vibration effects, which have a material effect on enjoyment of the property. Heavy vehicles and trucks appear to be travelling above the posted speed limits, at estimated speeds of 65-70 km/h.	A continuous speed limit of 50km/h should be implemented between Johns Road and Sawyers Arms Road, before any further development is approved.	Yes
49	Mark Willis, for Willowbank Wildlife Reserve	49.1	Oppose	This land is surrounded by valuable recreational areas and conservation estates. Such areas require sympathetic and complementary surrounds for the city to have appropriate recreational areas and celebrate and live sustainable values. Light commercial property will impact the ability of these areas to deliver their objectives.	Land to remain Rural Urban Fringe.	No
50	Amanda Thompson for Canterbury Regional Council (CRC)	50.1	Amend	Correct the drafting error which currently refers to all the activities listed in Rule 16.5.1.1.P1- P18 (heavy industrial zoning) as permitted activities on this land. The proposed permitted activity rule should refer to the relevant Industrial General activity list. If the reference is intended to refer to heavy industrial activities, then Canterbury Regional Council (CRC) opposes that outcome.	Amend Rule 16.4.X.X.X to ensure that the permitted activity list applies to the proposed IG zone, and to specify the riparian buffer requirements sought under point 50.6. Add heavy industrial activities as a non-complying activity to the area-specific non-complying activities rule.	Yes
		50.2	Amend	CRC's primary concern is the potential effect of rezoning on groundwater and surface water quality. Objective 7.2.3 and Policies 7.3.6. and 7.3.7. of the RPS seek that overall freshwater quality is maintained or improved. Activities within the IG zoning could generate contaminants that enter groundwater or surface water if not appropriately managed. Groundwater beneath the site is likely to be shallow, and while groundwater is generally expected to flow eastwards, local flowpaths towards Hedges Waterway are possible. Groundwater beneath the site is likely to ultimately discharge to the Styx River system. Potential contaminants could include nutrients, metals, hydrocarbons and PFAs. These risks should be recognised in the plan change framework rather than relying on controls at the individual site development stage. CRC seeks that site-specific groundwater monitoring is undertaken before detailed stormwater design is finalised, including assessment of groundwater levels, likely flow directions across the site and monitoring during a period of seasonally high groundwater. The groundwater assessment should also consider potential effects on Hedges Waterway and registered domestic and community drinking water wells in the wider area.	Add an area-specific Rule 16.4.X.X.X- Stormwater Management to the area specific built form standards for this area, to address the concerns in points 50.2 and 50.3. Wording supplied. Also add a corresponding matter of discretion titled Stormwater Management. Wording supplied.	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
		50.3	Amend	The detailed stormwater treatment solution can be determined through subsequent consenting, but the plan change should establish the required outcome. The ODP and associated provisions should require the stormwater management approach to be informed by site-specific groundwater information and to provide for treatment of stormwater prior to infiltration.	Add an area-specific Rule 16.4.X.X.X- Stormwater Management to the area specific built form standards for this area, to address the concerns in points 50.2 and 50.3. Wording supplied. Also add a corresponding matter of discretion titled Stormwater Management. Wording supplied.	Yes
		50.4	Amend	Where there is a 20m setback for riparian planting, CRC does not have certainty that the full setback will function as a protected vegetative buffer. CRC seeks that the setback be managed as a riparian buffer with continuous indigenous planting of locally appropriate eco-sourced species and provide for ongoing maintenance and ecological enhancement.	Amend Rule 16.4.X.X.X – Landscaped areas to reflect this concern. Wording supplied. Also add corresponding matters of discretion. Wording supplied.	Yes
		50.5	Amend	As recommended in the aquatic ecology assessment, the plan change should include improvement of the culvert within 370 Johns Road to improve fish passage, together with assessment of downstream reaches between the site and Otukaikino Creek, to identify other fish passage barriers.	Amend plan change as per the submission point. No specific wording supplied.	Yes
		50.6	Amend	Policies 9.3.1 and 9.3.2 of the RPS require that wetlands be protected where significant. The significance of the wetland should be confirmed against the CRPS criteria. The wetland assessment already undertaken recommends avoiding earthworks or vegetation loss within 10m of the wetland, and requiring an appropriate erosion and sediment control plan within 100m of the wetland, but these recommendations have not been clearly carried through into the plan change. The confirmed wetland extent should be identified on the ODP, and the plan change provisions should implement these recommendations and distinguish the wetland protection requirements from the waterway setback.	Amend the ODP to identify the delineated extent of the natural inland wetland and a minimum 10m setback from the wetland margin. Amend the ODP to identify a 20m riparian planting buffer adjacent to Hedges waterway.	Yes
		50.7	Amend	Artificial lighting should be designed to minimise effects on Hedges Waterway and its riparian habitat. The ODP or built form provisions should require that lighting be directed away from the waterway.	Add an area specific Rule 16.4.X.X.X - Lighting, to reflect this concern. Also add a corresponding matter of discretion.	Yes
		50.8	Neutral	The development site is not identified as an existing urban area, a future development area, or a greenfield priority area in Map A of the CRPS, so is inconsistent with Policy 6.3.1. However, the proposal would be a logical extension of the existing urban area and would enable existing infrastructure to be utilised.	Comment only. No amendment sought.	Yes
		50.9	Neutral	Policy 8 of the NPS-UD provides a pathway for plan changes which are unanticipated by planning documents or out-of-sequence with planned land release. This is contingent on those plan changes adding significantly to development capacity and contributing to well-functioning urban environments. What amounts to a significant addition to development capacity is not defined in the NPS-UD. The section 32 report asserts that the potential floorspace would add significantly to development capacity in the locality, and in Christchurch itself. Whether the proposal satisfies the significance threshold at the relevant spatial scale is a critical consideration.	Comment only. No amendment sought	Yes
		50.10	Neutral	The contaminated land investigation provides an appropriate initial assessment of historical HAIL activities and potential contaminants. However appropriate industry-specific management measures will remain important to prevent new sources of contamination from being established.	Comment only. No amendment sought	Yes
		50.11	Neutral	CRC agrees with the Flood Memo conclusions as the site is outside of the secondary stopbank, putting flood risk at the same level as anywhere else in Christchurch.	Comment only. No amendment sought.	Yes
		50.12	Neutral	Resource consents may be required for the development of the site under the Land and Water Regional Plan and the Canterbury Air Regional Plan. Possible consents required are listed.	Information only.	Yes
51	Maree Hedges	51.1	Oppose	The submitter owns 448 Johns Road, which is part of the land subject to the rezoning request. The submitter also owns 444 Johns Road, which is immediately adjacent to 448 Johns Road. The two parcels have been owned by the submitter's family since 1905. They have historically been used together as a single, interdependent farming and lifestyle property. The submitter has no intention of selling, subdividing or allowing the land to be developed for industrial purposes by either the applicant or a third party. The submitters land is more than one third of the total area	Reject PPC24 in its entirety; or In the alternative, reject the applicants request to rezone the submitter's land to Industrial General, with all associated provisions, rules and the ODP amended accordingly.	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
				for rezoning under PPC24. The plan change could have adverse effects on the submitters land and other neighbouring land.		
		51.2	Oppose	The submitter's neighbouring land at 444 Johns Road also adjoins the area subject to PPC24 and includes Hedges Waterway, which is an area well known for its significant ecological and natural values. In 2002 a conservation covenant under s77 of the Reserves Act was registered over that land in favour of the CCC. An ecological assessment recorded 27 indigenous vascular plants species, a range of native bird species, and identified potential for an indigenous swamp forest. The area forms an important link in establishing an almost continuous corridor of native habitat along the South Branch of the Waimakiriri River and its tributaries. Both the CCC and the submitter have incurred significant expenditure and time in maintaining and enhancing the values on the submitters neighbouring land at 444 Johns Road. The submitter considers that PPC24, if granted, could result in significant adverse effects on this adjoining land, given its ecological and conservation significance. The application does not adequately address these values, nor the vulnerability of this receiving environment to being degraded or damaged by the industrial development.	Reject PPC24 in its entirety; or In the alternative, reject the applicants request to rezone the submitter's land to Industrial General, with all associated provisions, rules and the ODP amended accordingly.	Yes
		51.3	Oppose	The applicant did not consult or engage with the submitter in any meaningful way, during the development of PPC24. This means that the submitter records that she does not consent to any further investigations taking place during the remainder of this PPC24 process, on the two parcels of land she owns.	Information only.	Yes
		51.4	Oppose	The applicant's assertion that the rezoning will achieve a "consolidated and connected urban form" and result in a "logical, contiguous expansion" of the existing industrial area to the west, consistent with the relevant planning objectives and policies, is at odds with the reality of the situation. One third of the rezoned land will remain permanently undeveloped and result in two pockets of industrial land being established to the west and east, with the submitter's land wedged in between.	PPC24 should be declined.	Yes
		51.5	Oppose	The applicant has failed to properly assess several adverse effects arising from PPC24 on the submitter's property or whether any of the mitigation measures would adequately address these. These include: • The reverse sensitivity effects arising from the submitter's property's continued rural and residential use being surrounded by land zoned and developed for industrial purposes. • Cumulative adverse effects from construction, infrastructure, noise, dust, vibration and lighting, including visual, amenity and privacy effects, and effects on ability to continue to graze stock. • Adverse effects on the submitters existing access to her land, along the paper road and when leaving or accessing Johns Road, given that access will now be shared with other vehicles and trucks. • Potential effects on groundwater arising from stormwater management and other industrial activity on adjoining land.	Reject PPC24 in its entirety; or In the alternative, reject the applicant's request to rezone the submitter's land to Industrial General, with all associated provisions, rules and the ODP amended accordingly.	Yes
		51.6	Oppose	Some effects in relation to the submitter's land are overstated: • No geotechnical assessment, environmental site investigation or contamination assessment has been undertaken on the submitter's land at any point. The only basis for stating that the land is suitable for industrial development is inference from adjoining land. Leaving site suitability to be assessed at subdivision stage is inappropriate. • The assumed economics and development capacity benefits appear to include the submitter's land, so are overstated, as the submitters land will remain undeveloped.	Reject PPC24 in its entirety; or In the alternative, reject the applicant's request to rezone the submitter's land to Industrial General, with all associated provisions, rules and the ODP amended accordingly.	Yes

Submitter #	Submitter Name	Point #	Position	Submission Summary	Decision Sought	Heard
				- A full survey of the submitters land for natural wetlands, indigenous vegetation and fauna, both on 448 and 444 Johns Road has yet to be undertaken. A desktop analysis is insufficient to reach sound conclusions on adverse effects on the receiving environment. - The applicant's response to the gaps has been to reduce rather than strengthen initially proposed protective measures. E.g. a spring buffer rule has been removed. The applicant proposes to rely solely on general subdivision rules through a controlled activity application, which cannot be declined. Subdivision mechanisms cannot be assumed to adequately protect any identified springs or broader ecological values on the submitter's neighbouring land.		
		51.7	Oppose	The submitter now has the prospect of a substantially higher rates burden for continuing an existing use of her own land, with the rates burden disproportionately large relative to any benefit of rezoning. This is an adverse economic effect on her.	Reject PPC24 in its entirety; or In the alternative, reject the applicant's request to rezone the submitter's land to Industrial General, with all associated provisions, rules and the ODP amended accordingly.	Yes
		51.8	Oppose	The submitter considers that the adverse effects of the rezoning on other land bordering the site are also likely to be significant.	Reject PPC24 in its entirety; or In the alternative, reject the applicant's request to rezone the submitter's land to Industrial General, with all associated provisions, rules and the ODP amended accordingly.	Yes
		51.9	Oppose	The section 32 evaluation is deficient, as it does not examine the option of rezoning the land while excluding the submitter's land, or the effects of that scenario. The applicant's objective of a consolidated and connected urban form cannot be achieved, and the development capacity benefits are overstated unless the submitter chooses to give effect to the zoning. The provisions are not effective if over a third of the rezoning is unlikely to ever be given effect to. The s32 does not demonstrate that PPC24 is the most appropriate way to achieve the RMA's purpose.	Reject PPC24 in its entirety; or In the alternative, reject the applicant's request to rezone the submitter's land to Industrial General, with all associated provisions, rules and the ODP amended accordingly.	Yes
52	Karina Langley (late submission)	52.1	Oppose	Higher traffic volumes and increased heavy vehicle traffic have safety implications for submitter's children cycling down Gardiners Road to school. Increased traffic will also impact submitter's travel due to increase queueing and turning delays. Congestion on Gardiners Road will escalate.	Decline PPC24 to preserve the wellbeing and quality of life of submitter's community. If not declined, submitter requests: - Strict control on hours of operation – business hours only. - Acoustic mitigation for increased traffic noise - A more robust stormwater management plan and consideration of soil impacts from runoff. - A comprehensive safety assessment specifically addressing Gardiners Road and school -aged children. - Restrictions on high-impact industrial activities near residential areas.	Not stated
		52.2	Oppose	Increased heavy vehicles using Gardiners Road will increase road noise and vibration at submitters address, including in the evenings if there are 24/7 operations.	Relief as above	Not stated
		52.3	Oppose	Concern about diesel emissions from increased truck movements, and industrial emissions affecting air quality.	Relief as above	Not stated
		52.4	Oppose	Concern about contaminants affecting waterways like Hedges waterway, and also about soil contamination from stormwater runoff.	Relief as above	Not stated
		52.5	Oppose	Concerned about industrial expansion into a rural-urban fringe zone and towards residential neighbourhoods.	Relief as above	Not stated

