



# **Preliminary Draft Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan**

## **Officer's Recommendations on Amendments in Response to Public Comments**

**24 March 2016**

**CONTENTS PAGE**

**Contents Page.....2**

**1.0 Introduction .....8**

1.1 Purpose of the Report..... 8

1.2 Format of the Report ..... 8

**2.0 Background .....10**

2.1 Recovery Plan Rationale..... 10

2.2 Consultation to Date ..... 10

2.3 Legislative requirements for the Recovery Plan ..... 10

**3.0 Community involvement on the pDRP .....14**

3.1 Overview of consultation timeline and methods..... 14

3.1.1 Background to the 3D Model..... 15

3.1.2 How it works ..... 15

3.1.3 3D Model engagement ..... 15

3.2 Media analysis..... 16

3.3 Overview of Comments Received ..... 17

3.3.1 Key Themes ..... 18

3.3.2 3D Model community sessions – key themes ..... 19

3.3.3 3D Model school sessions- Key themes ..... 19

**4.0 General Non-Geographic Comments .....21**

4.1 Introduction ..... 21

4.2 New ideas / projects ..... 21

4.2.1 Emphasising / utilising the Kaiapoi River ..... 21

4.2.2 Creating a native bush area ..... 21

4.2.3 Recreational facilities ..... 21

4.2.4 Creating a World Class Rowing Venue ..... 21

4.2.5 Creating a skin diamond and playing fields for softball ..... 21

4.2.6	Pre-school and playground .....	21
4.2.7	Major functions.....	22
4.2.8	Land banking areas for future activities – Major Tertiary Institute .....	22
4.2.9	Kairaki Commercial Venture .....	22
4.2.10	Discussion.....	22
4.2.11	Recommendations.....	22
4.3	Residential and rural residential development.....	22
4.3.1	Discussion.....	24
4.3.2	Recommended amendments.....	26
4.4	Business development .....	26
4.4.1	Discussion.....	27
4.4.2	Recommended amendments.....	28
4.5	Design of sports areas, recreation and ecological linkages and the ash internment cemetery / memorial garden.....	28
4.5.1	Discussion.....	28
4.5.2	Recommendations .....	28
4.6	Intensive farming of rural areas .....	28
4.6.1	Discussion.....	29
4.6.2	Recommended amendments.....	29
4.7	Ongoing consultation .....	29
4.7.1	Discussion.....	29
4.7.2	Recommendations .....	29
4.8	Remaining private residences in the regeneration areas .....	29
4.8.1	Discussion.....	30
4.8.2	Recommendations .....	30
4.9	Infrastructure and services .....	30
4.9.1	Discussion.....	31
4.9.2	Recommended Amendments .....	33

4.10	Maintaining the underlying zoning .....	33
4.10.1	Discussion .....	33
4.10.2	Recommended amendments .....	34
4.11	Purchasing red-zone land.....	34
4.11.1	Discussion .....	34
4.11.2	Recommended amendments .....	34
4.12	Greater recognition of natural hazards and the natural hazards plan change .....	34
4.12.1	Discussion.....	34
4.12.2	Recommended amendments .....	35
<b>5.0</b>	<b>Comments received on the Vision and Goals.....</b>	<b>36</b>
5.1	Introduction .....	36
5.2	Sports Areas .....	36
5.2.1	Discussion.....	36
5.2.2	Recommended Amendments .....	36
5.3	Reserves and Parks.....	36
5.3.1	Discussion.....	36
5.3.2	Recommended Amendments .....	37
5.4	Clarity .....	37
5.4.1	Discussion.....	37
5.4.2	Recommended Amendments .....	37
5.5	Economic growth and cost to ratepayers .....	37
5.5.1	Discussion.....	37
5.5.2	Recommended Amendments .....	37
5.6	Intensification of residents within the Town Centre.....	37
5.6.1	Discussion.....	38
5.6.2	Recommended Amendments .....	38
5.7	A compact, efficient and exciting Kaiapoi Town Centre .....	38
5.7.1	Discussion.....	38

5.7.2	Recommended Amendments .....	39
5.8	Servicing .....	39
5.8.1	Recommended Amendments .....	39
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Comments on the Issues .....</b>	<b>40</b>
6.1	Lack of recognition between land and water.....	40
6.1.1	Discussion.....	40
6.1.2	Recommended amendments.....	40
6.2	Cost to ratepayers.....	40
6.2.1	Discussion.....	40
6.2.2	Recommended Amendments .....	41
6.3	Sports fields.....	41
6.3.1	Discussion.....	41
6.3.2	Recommended Amendments .....	41
6.4	Effects and needs of green zone residences on the edge of the Red Zone .....	41
6.4.1	Discussion.....	41
6.4.2	Recommended Amendments .....	42
6.5	Social Development .....	42
6.5.1	Discussion.....	42
6.5.2	Recommended Amendments .....	42
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Comments by Area (West, South, East, The Pines Beach and Kairaki) .....</b>	<b>43</b>
7.1	Kaiapoi West .....	43
7.1.1	Introduction .....	43
7.1.2	Sport and recreation reserve (Area 1) .....	43
7.1.3	Business (Area 2).....	45
7.1.4	Road Works .....	46
7.1.5	Dudley Drain and stormwater management .....	47
7.2	Kaiapoi South .....	47
7.2.1	Introduction .....	47

7.2.2	Business area (Area 3).....	47
7.2.3	Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area (Area 4).....	49
7.2.4	Rural (Area 5) .....	51
7.2.5	Neighbourhood park (Area 6) .....	52
7.2.6	Recreation and ecological linkage (Area 7).....	53
7.2.7	Kaiapoi South Community Events .....	54
7.2.8	Kaiapoi South sport and recreation areas.....	54
7.2.9	Kaiapoi South road layout (Area 8) – comments and discussion .....	55
7.2.10	Kaiapoi South 3 Waters Infrastructure.....	55
7.3	Kaiapoi East .....	56
7.3.1	Introduction .....	56
7.3.2	Recreation and ecological link (Area 9).....	56
7.3.3	Sports fields (Area 10).....	58
7.3.4	Proposed Memorial Garden - ash internment cemetery (Area 11).....	61
7.3.5	Rural (Area 12) .....	64
7.3.6	Kirk Street Reserve (Area 13) .....	66
7.3.7	Access Link (Area 14).....	66
7.3.8	Campervan / Motorhome overnight parking (Area 15).....	67
7.3.9	Parking (Area 16).....	69
7.3.10	Business Area (Area 17).....	69
7.3.11	Corcoran Reserve Holiday Park .....	70
7.3.12	Pump Stations .....	71
7.3.13	Stormwater detention areas .....	71
7.3.14	Kaiapoi East road layout (Area 18) .....	72
7.4	Pines Beach .....	74
7.4.1	Introduction .....	74
7.4.2	Potential Private Lease (Area 19).....	74
7.4.3	Tūhaitara Coastal Park (Area 20).....	76

7.4.4	Recreational and ecological linkage (Area 21) .....	77
7.4.5	Recreational equipment.....	77
7.4.5.1	Discussion .....	77
7.4.5.2	Recommended Amendments.....	77
7.5	Kairaki.....	78
7.5.1	Introduction .....	78
7.5.2	Potential Private Lease (Area 23).....	78
7.5.3	Tūhaitara Coastal Park (Area 24).....	79
7.5.4	Tūhaitara Coastal Park extension (Area 24a) .....	80
7.5.5	Car park reserve (Area 25) .....	81
7.5.5.1	Discussion.....	81
7.5.5.2	Recommended Amendments.....	82
<b>Officers Report – Appendices.....</b>		<b>83</b>

## 1.0 INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

This report has been produced to support the Waimakariri Red Zone Recovery Plan development process, and more specifically the public hearing of comments on the Preliminary Draft Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan (“the pDRP”). It has been prepared by a Core Project Team contractor with support from Waimakariri District Council officers and draws on consultants engaged by the Council to provide advice. My qualifications and experience are set out in the appendices to this report.

The report sets out at a high level the submissions received and changes sought to the pDRP. The report discusses the amendments sought and the appropriateness or otherwise of those amendments. Changes to the pDRP considered to be appropriate are provided as recommended amendments to the Hearings Panel. These are set out either generally, shown as amendments to the spatial plan, or are shown as track changes to the pDRP, where greater specificity is required.

This report aims to assist the Hearing Panel prepare their Hearings Report and provide their recommendations to the Waimakariri District Council on matters heard and considered.

In preparing this report I have relied on the technical information that informed the pDRP and the further technical advice referred to in this report.

### 1.2 FORMAT OF THE REPORT

The report is structured with separate sections dealing with general themes where these have been raised in the comments, and in accordance with the geographic areas where comments have been made on specific areas. A particular comment from a person or organisation may be dealt with across various sections depending on the breadth of the comment. In some instances a commenter has made the same comment against the vision and goals, issues and geographic areas. To avoid repetition, where possible and appropriate these have been grouped and considered in the most appropriate location.

The report does not specify or respond to every individual comment point received, but rather responds to issues raised in a more general manner. This is intended to keep the report clear and concise, whilst still providing relevant information and recommendations. Particular amendments sought by commenters may be referred to or specifically set out in the text for clarity. While the Crown, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and organisations have generally been identified in this report, individual commenters have not.

This report draws on a number of technical reports prepared by Waimakariri District Council officers and other experts engaged by the Council. These reports are contained in the appendices to this report which include the following:

- T and T Geotechnical Technical Report
- Colliers Valuation and Economic Feasibility Technical Report
- WDC Three Waters Technical Report
- WDC Roading Technical Report
- WDC Green Space Technical Report
- Impact Assessment Memo
- WDC Natural Hazards Plan Change Memo



The Council has decided to describe the red zone areas as regeneration areas, I have therefore used the term 'regeneration areas' throughout this report.

## 2.0 BACKGROUND

### 2.1 RECOVERY PLAN RATIONALE

The rationale for preparing a recovery plan was set out Section 2 of the pDRP along with commentary on the progress to date. I therefore have not repeated this in this Officer's Report.

### 2.2 CONSULTATION TO DATE

A significant amount of consultation with the Waimakariri community and other key stakeholders has taken place. Details are set out and referred to in Section 2.7 of the pDRP. I therefore have not repeated this in this Officer's Report.

### 2.3 LEGISLATIVE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE RECOVERY PLAN

The Waimakariri Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan (Recovery Plan) is being developed under the CER Act. Although the CER Act is being repealed in mid-April 2016 by the Greater Christchurch Regeneration Bill, in that Bill the recovery plan provisions of the CER Act remain operative for the development of this Recovery Plan.

The Council has appointed a Hearing Panel (Panel) to hear and make recommendations on the public comments on the Recovery Plan, and assess the pDRP in light of those public comments and the technical reports it receives. These recommendations from the Hearing Panel will be made to the Council.

The Council will then prepare a draft Recovery Plan to be forwarded to the Minister for Canterbury Earthquake Recovery, who will then seek further public comment on the draft Recovery Plan. Following this consultation the Minister will make the decision to adopt, amend or reject the Recovery Plan.

The Ministerial Direction of 3<sup>rd</sup> September 2015 sets the detailed legal framework for the Council in preparing the draft Recovery Plan. These are equally as applicable to the Hearing Panel in carrying out its task of hearing and making recommendations to the Council on the public comments. Paragraph 8 (re Development) of the Direction, in particular 8.4, contains matters the Hearing Panel should be satisfied the pDRP is supported by:

- Appropriate technical information for recommended uses;
- Consultation undertaken;
- Assessment of impacts of recommendations; and
- Assessment of proposals against relevant statutory and non-statutory instruments.

The Ministerial Direction refers to 4 Objectives for the Recovery Plan. Those 4 Objectives are:

- Decisions about the residential red zone should promote the well-being of greater Christchurch communities;
- Decisions about the residential red zone should result in outcomes that are resilient and enduring;
- Decisions about the residential red zone should support economic development and growth;
- Decisions about the residential red zone should be affordable and consistent with the government’s commitment to principles of responsible fiscal management.

The Ministerial Direction uses 3 phrases which are legally important and have been interpreted by the Courts. A summary of the case law as it applies to these 3 phrases, and the Panel’s role, is as follows:

- (a) *“Must have particular regard”* to the Objectives for the Recovery Plan.

The Panel, in its report to the Council, needs to discuss each of the four Objectives separately. The Report needs to show careful weighing up in coming to a conclusion, and subsequent recommendations to the Council, by the Panel.

- (b) *“Having regard”* to other Recovery Plans.

The Panel must give other Recovery Plans consideration in its Report and recommendations to Council as those other Recovery Plans have statutory effect.

- (c) Recovery Plan *“is not inconsistent”* with other Recovery Plans. The Panel needs to compare the pDRP and their recommendations to the Council with existing Recovery Plans to ensure they can *“live together”* and *“agree in substance”*.

The Panel process in hearing public comments is not a quasi-judicial process; it is akin to the Council hearing Annual Plan submissions. The Council is free to adopt which of the Panel’s recommendations it wishes.

“Quasi-judicial” refers to a council hearing which has similarities to a court hearing in terms of procedure and evidence, and usually has a right of appeal to a court. Quasi-judicial hearings also involve legal restrictions about how the council deals with a panel’s recommendations. An example of a quasi-judicial hearing is the hearing of a resource consent application.

In the Direction the Council is required to consult the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Authority (the Authority / CERA), as representing the Crown in the wider earthquake recovery context as well as a landowner, and other collaborative partners listed in the Direction<sup>1</sup> on the development of the Recovery Plan. It is expected that consultation has occurred in preparing the pDRP. The Council is

---

<sup>1</sup> Canterbury Regional Council, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and NZ Transport Agency.

also expected to consult with CERA as to any inconsistency with existing or developing recovery plans<sup>2</sup>.

The Greater Christchurch Recovery Bill<sup>3</sup> provides that the Authority, as a legal entity, ceases to exist upon the repeal of the CER Act. From 1 March 2016 the Crown have been represented by the Department of the Prime Minister and Cabinet<sup>4</sup> on matters related to Waimakariri Residential Red Zones and the Recovery Plan process.

The phrase “long term” in the Direction extends past dates referred to in the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP). The Panel is being directed to make recommendations on the pDRP, which can include matters referred to in the LURP, despite the Land Use Recovery Plan not specifically including residential red zone land.

The Panel can make recommendations to the Council, taking a long term view, which may not be consistent with an existing Recovery Plan, such as the LURP. If so, the Council could, if it wished, begin a conversation with the Minister to amend the LURP or use another mechanism to give effect to such recommendations, if he was persuaded as to the merits of the comments.

The Direction requires the Council to identify the practical next steps to implement the Recovery Plan, such as ownership, funding and management of different areas. The Panel has been appointed to make recommendations to the Council on those matters in so far as they are necessary to enable implementation of the Recovery Plan.

The Recovery Plan is also required to provide for necessary amendments to the statutory framework to enable proposed uses of residential red zone land. The Panel has also been asked to make such recommendations to the Council.

The Panel’s recommendations to the Council by themselves (and Council’s provision of the draft Recovery Plan to the Minister) do not make any amendments to other statutory processes. The Direction requires the Council to identify the amendments to relevant statutory processes. For example, the Panel can recommend a road be stopped or a reserve be revoked but the process of doing so is a matter for subsequent consideration.

Once the Panel begins finalising its recommendations to the Council further legal advice may be required regarding matters such as “*inconsistency*” with other Recovery Plans, and “*necessary amendments*” to other statutory processes.

---

<sup>2</sup> The existing recovery plans are: (a) the Christchurch Central Recovery Plan; (b) the Residential Red Zone Offer Recovery Plan; (c) the Land Use Recovery Plan; and (d) the Lyttelton Port Recovery Plan. The Transitional Recovery Plan is being developed.

<sup>3</sup> References to the Greater Christchurch Recovery Bill relate to the wording as at the date of this summary, subsequent changes to that Bill may necessitate a reconsideration of its impact on the RZRP process.

<sup>4</sup> It is the DPMC that the Council is expected to liaise with on the Recovery Plan in place of CERA.

### *Purpose of the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act*

The purpose of the CER Act is set out in Section 3 of the Act.

In order for the elements of the Recovery Plan to be considered recovery for the purposes of the CER Act, there must be a link between these elements and the purposes set out in section 3 of the Act.

The relevant purposes are:

- (a) *to provide appropriate measures to ensure that greater Christchurch and the councils and their communities respond to, and recover from, the impacts of the Canterbury earthquakes:*
- (b) *to enable community participation in the planning of the recovery of affected communities without impeding a focused, timely, and expedited recovery:*
- (c) *to provide for the Minister and CERA to ensure that recovery:*
- (d) *to enable a focused, timely and expedited recovery:*
- (e) *to enable information to be gathered about any land, structure, or infrastructure affected by the Canterbury earthquakes:*
- (f) *to facilitate, co-ordinate, and direct the planning, rebuilding, and recovery of affected communities, including the repair and rebuilding of land, infrastructure, and other property:*
- (g) *to restore the social, economic, cultural, and environmental well-being of greater Christchurch communities:*
- (h) *to provide adequate statutory power for the purposes stated in (a) to (g).*

The CER Act defines recovery as including “restoration and enhancement”, and defines rebuilding as including:

- (a) *extending, repairing, improving, subdividing, or converting any land, infrastructure, or other property: and*
- (b) *rebuilding communities.*

### 3.0 COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT ON THE PDRP

#### 3.1 OVERVIEW OF CONSULTATION TIMELINE AND METHODS

The pDRP was publicly released on 5 February 2016 and the community was asked to provide their comments by 4 March 2016 on the proposed land uses and roading options for the five regeneration areas in Kaiapoi, Kairaki and The Pines Beach.

Communications to reach and engage with the community involved;

- Production of a Summary document for the pDRP - 25,000 copies
- Pre-release briefing invitation and meeting for the red zone property owners / residents attended by 22 people
- Letters and the Summary document sent to red zone property owners / residents and property owners / residents in green zone areas in Kaiapoi, Kairaki and The Pines Beach.
- 21,000 Summary documents distributed to every household in the Waimakariri District
- Publishing of the pDRP, including background technical reports, on the project website - [www.redzoneplan.nz](http://www.redzoneplan.nz) for viewing and downloading
- Videos of Kaiapoi West, Kaiapoi South, Kaiapoi East, Kairaki and The Pines Beach - 2,000 views
- Facebook posting on [www.facebook.com/LetsDiscussLetsPlanLetsDo](http://www.facebook.com/LetsDiscussLetsPlanLetsDo) - 28 posts, with 26,000 views and over 3,000 clicks, likes, comments and shares during 6 February to 4 March 2016
- Emails to community organisations, sports clubs, local businesses, strategic project partners – CERA, Environment Canterbury, Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Te Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga, Council elected representatives and staff on 1 February (pre-notification), 19 February and 3 March 2016
- Posters distributed for display in local Kaiapoi businesses
- Invitations to interested / community organisations to meet with Council staff to learn more
- Business and community leaders breakfast meeting on 23 February 2016 – 36 people attended
- Radio advertising campaign of 600 adspots on NewstalkZB, Radio Sports, MOREFM, and The Breeze during 5 February to 4 March 2016
- Print advertising in The Press, Northern Outlook, The News, and the Kaiapoi Advocate during 5 February to 4 March 2016 – 8 advertisements (7 full page in local papers)
- Editorials in The Press, Northern Outlook, The News, Kaiapoi Advocate - 20 articles from 14 January to 11 March 2016
- 3 billboards, located at the southern entrance to Kaiapoi, in the town centre, and at the entrance to The Pines Beach and Kairaki

A key community engagement method for Let's Plan involved the development and display of a touring three dimensional interactive model of the five regenerations areas.

---

### 3.1.1 BACKGROUND TO THE 3D MODEL

The idea for the 3D Model came from work done in the UK by an organisation called 'Planning for Real'. They have a 25-year history of designing and facilitating community engagement programmes on diverse scales and issues that have worked with and supported communities to have a say in what happens in their neighbourhoods.

The Planning for Real model was appealing because:

- It was hands-on, simple and allowed active participation.
- It had wide appeal across all age groups.
- It was proven to get a greater level of participation.
- It was cost-effective.
- It allowed us to 'go to the where the people' are rather than wait for the people to come to us.
- It was visible and tangible.

---

### 3.1.2 HOW IT WORKS

Enlarged maps of the five regeneration areas (Kaiapoi West, Kaiapoi South, Kaiapoi East, Pines Beach, and Kairaki) were printed onto standard paper foam board and laid on trestle tables (this allowed people to walk around the maps and see the scale of the proposed land uses). Keys to the coloured areas were printed on to cards so people could see the different land uses that were proposed.

People were invited to put flags onto the model telling us:

- What they liked (blue flag);
- What they were concerned about (orange flag); and
- Any new ideas they had (pink flag).

Staff were able to interact with visitors to the model and help them understand the uses and explain some of the detail contained in the full plan.

In addition to the 3D Model, maps showing both the preferred and alternative roading options for Kaiapoi South and Kaiapoi East and their associated strengths, weaknesses and costs were displayed on large boards. While looking at the 3D Model, the public could consider which of the roading options they preferred, and colour dots were provided so the public could vote for their preferred option.

---

### 3.1.3 3D MODEL ENGAGEMENT

#### *Local Schools*

The 3D Model was displayed at following local schools:

- St Patricks Primary School 10 February
- Kaiapoi High School 11-12 February
- Kaiapoi North Primary School 15-16 February
- Woodend Primary School 17 - 18 February

- Clarkville Primary School (at the Ruataniwha Civic Service Centre) 22 - 28 February and
- Tuahiwi School (at the Ruataniwha Civic Service Centre) 22 - 28 February
- Kaiapoi Borough Primary School 29 February - 1 March

These primary schools were approached to participate in the 3D Model consultation as they are located within the Kaiapoi High School zone, and as such were likely to live locally and have a connection to the Kaiapoi Township.

In total over 1100 students engaged with the model and almost 4000 ideas were 'posted' on the model.

### Community Centres

- The 3D Model was displayed at following local locations:
- Waimakariri Sailing & Powerboat Club 13-14 February,
- Ruataniwha Kaiapoi Civic Centre 22 - 28 February
- Kaiapoi Workingmen's Club 3-4 March

In total over 446 people attended the sessions, with 197 'flags' posted on the model as the graphs below show.

Following receipt of formal comments, those who commented were sent an acknowledgement letter noting whether the commenter had indicated that they wished to be heard at the hearing. Where this was not clear commenters were contacted and asked to confirm if they wished to be heard. Comments were recorded into a database and a summary of comments was produced.

The individual comments and a summary of comments were uploaded to the Recovery Plan web site on 24th March 2016. The Council contacted all those who made comments on the 24th March providing information about where and how the comments and Officer's report on comments can be sourced.

## 3.2 MEDIA ANALYSIS

Since the Minister's direction was published on 3 September 2015, articles that have been published online, in print and on the radio have been monitored. The following table records the number of articles published during the project phases and identifies during the Let's Discuss phase there was very little interest from media channels.

**Table 1: Published Articles**

Date	Phase	Number
3 Sep - 2 Oct 2015	Direction from Minister and pre Let's Discuss	20
3 - 30 Oct 2015	Let's Discuss	2
1 Nov 2015 - 4 Feb 2016	Between Let's Discuss and Let's Plan	16
5 Feb - 4 Mar 2016	Let's Plan	18
5 Mar - current (16 Mar 2016)	Post Let's Plan	3
<b>Total</b>		<b>59</b>

### 3.3 OVERVIEW OF COMMENTS RECEIVED

The Let's Discuss consultation drew 137 formal comments. Of these 20 were from organisations / companies (see details below) and 116 were from individuals. 38 requested to be heard.

The location of the commenters:

- 76 from Kaiapoi
- 10 from Pines Beach
- 11 from Kairaki
- 7 from Rangiora
- 1 from Woodend

11 from Rural Waimakariri (Ashley, Balcairn, Ohoka, West Eyreton, Fernside, Clarkville, Woodend/Ashley, TKTT, Mandeville, Sefton)

- 4 from North Canterbury (Amberley, Balcairn, MainPower, NCSRT)
- 10 from Christchurch (includes the Crown)
- 2 from wider New Zealand (HRC, NZMHA)
- 4 cannot be identified
- The organisations / companies represented are:
- TRONT /Ngāi Tūāhuriri
- Crown
- Te Kohaka o Tūhaitara Trust
- Waimak Model Aircraft Club
- North Canterbury Sport & Recreation Trust
- NZ Motor Home Association
- MainPower
- Kaiapoi Promotions Association
- Human Rights Commission
- Kaiapoi Softball
- PLC Group (developer)
- Ashley Estates (developer)
- Waimak Sailing & Powerboat Club
- Pines Kairaki Beaches Association
- Sport Canterbury
- Kaiapoi Croquet Club
- Woodend Ashley Community Board
- Kaiapoi Community Board
- Kaiapoi Croquet Club

---

### 3.3.1 KEY THEMES

Table 2 below provides an overview of points raised in comments. As can be seen, the highest number of points were raised in relation to Kaiapoi East (81), with considerable support (39) and partial support (31), nine opposed and two neutral. The vision and goals had the next highest number of points raised (61), with high number of support (49) and partial support (7), and only three in opposition and two neutral. In relation to non- area specific themes, the highest number of points were raised in relation to recreation (39), with support (25), partial support (9) and five in opposition. Other non-area related points raised include business, ecological, tourism and residential housing.

**Table 2: Number of comment points received by topic**

	Points	Support	Partial Support	Oppose	Neutral
<b>General</b>	17	0	8	2	7
<b>Vision and Goals</b>	61	49	7	3	2
<b>Issues</b>	44	37	5	2	0
<b>Kaiapoi West</b>	52	37	7	7	1
<b>Kaiapoi South</b>	58	36	19	2	1
<b>The Pines Beach</b>	52	35	9	7	1
<b>Kaiapoi East</b>	81	39	31	9	2
<b>Kairaki</b>	59	36	7	15	1
<b>Implementation</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Monitoring</b>	0	0	0	0	0
<b>Recreation</b>	39	25	9	5	0
<b>Business</b>	6	0	4	2	0
<b>Ecological</b>	6	3	3	0	0
<b>Tourism</b>	7	7	0	0	0
<b>Residential Housing</b>	12	1	3	8	0
<b>Total</b>	<i>494</i>	<i>305</i>	<i>112</i>	<i>62</i>	<i>15</i>

### 3.3.2 3D MODEL COMMUNITY SESSIONS – KEY THEMES

- The vast majority of the comments received supported the land use concepts suggested, and if new ideas were suggested the majority of these ideas could be considered when undertaking the master planning process for the specific projects.
- The only comments which suggested ideas which were contrary to the land uses proposed related to the dog park or sports fields being located in Kaiapoi South (Area 5) instead of Kaiapoi East (Area 10), and the location of the cemetery was questioned due to the proximity to the sports fields and the existing residential areas.
- Within the Pines Beach and Kairaki areas there were concerns that the Te Kōhaka o Tūhaitara Trust Coastal Park not be able to maintain the regeneration areas. There were also concerns that the private leases as could result in untidy buildings being constructed in the areas.

### 3.3.3 3D MODEL SCHOOL SESSIONS- KEY THEMES

- There were very few land uses proposed within the Residential Red Zone Recovery Plan that the students ‘liked’ or were ‘concerned with’. The majority of the ‘likes’ were in relation to the sports and recreational areas in Kaiapoi East (Areas 9 and 10),

while the majority of the 'concerns' were in response to food and beverage ideas suggested adjacent to the Kaiapoi South regeneration area.

- The majority of the ideas related to the Kaiapoi East and Kaiapoi South regeneration areas.
- Most of the ideas proposed by the students related to business or recreation activities and were consistent with the land uses proposed within the pDRP. Given the detail of ideas that were suggested, it is considered that these ideas can be considered when undertaking the master planning process for the specific projects.
- The most popular business ideas were 'commercial recreation' (go carts; mazes; theme parks; ice skating rinks; mini golf; rock climbing wall, etc), 'entertainment' (Opera house; time zone; movie theatre;), 'food and beverage' and 'retail services'.
- The most popular recreation type was 'sports facilities' (dance club; netball courts; skate park; rugby stadium; swimming pools; dodge ball; cricket nets and pitch; fitness track; indoor soccer; scooter park; performance stage; baseball stadium; indoor skating rink).

## 4.0 GENERAL NON-GEOGRAPHIC COMMENTS

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

A number of commenters identified specific ideas or commented on topics that were not assigned to any identified geographic area (e.g. Kaiapoi South or Area 12), were assigned to more than one geographic area or could apply to other areas. These comments are assessed below.

### 4.2 NEW IDEAS / PROJECTS

#### 4.2.1 EMPHASISING / UTILISING THE KAIAPOI RIVER

A number of comments sought that more emphasis and use should be made of the Kaiapoi River. Walkways, swing bridges (e.g. linking Kaiapoi South and Kaiapoi East), water sports and a Tuhoë replacement with stop off points along the river were suggested. One commenter sought an additional boat ramp on the south side of the Kaiapoi River near the flood gates below Courtenay Lake.

#### 4.2.2 CREATING A NATIVE BUSH AREA

Once commenter suggested letting the land in Kaiapoi South and Kaiapoi East revert to native bush with a secure predator proof fence environment, so that a Riccarton Bush type area could develop. Another commenter suggested a bird sanctuary, with trees / bushes to attract nature and a raised boardwalk in Kaiapoi South. Improvements to Courtney Lake were also proposed.

#### 4.2.3 RECREATIONAL FACILITIES

One commentator suggested that the land in East Kaiapoi should be devoid of rural, campervan parks and yard business and instead be made for amazing recreational facility as a destination for locals and day trippers that draws people from Christchurch to Kaiapoi with walking and running tracks, boot camps, mini duathlon tracks with different distance walks.

#### 4.2.4 CREATING A WORLD CLASS ROWING VENUE

One commenter suggested that a world class rowing venue should be considered to bring in thousands of spectators, supporting guest accommodation and it would be a cost effective answer to any potential flooding.

#### 4.2.5 CREATING A SKIN DIAMOND AND PLAYING FIELDS FOR SOFTBALL

A number of commenters referred to the Kaiapoi Softball Club, its growth (currently it has over 200 members) and suggested that an area should be developed for a skin diamond and playing fields for the Club (the Club has used the Kaiapoi Rugby Club grounds, Murphy Park, Hinemoa Park and Wylie Park). This would help grow the sport, provide the ability to host top level games and also provide another sporting option for Kaiapoi and the surrounding areas, as it is the only softball club in the North Canterbury area.

#### 4.2.6 PRE-SCHOOL AND PLAYGROUND

One commenter suggested that a preschool could be built with a 0-8 year old playground also constructed, providing various opportunities for play and interaction with rural environment.

#### 4.2.7 MAJOR FUNCTIONS

There were a number of comments related to providing facilities / space for major functions. Two commenters suggested setting aside an area / creating a facility for major functions / events such as veteran car meets, market days, scout meetings, concerts, outdoor theatre productions, sports events, public gatherings, public and community picnics, rallies, buskers and commercial displays. Another commenter also supported outdoor picture theatres. This would be a venue that would bring people into town and patronise local businesses. Another commenter stated that Kaiapoi had lost many of its spaces to hold community events, noting that the riverbank used to provide this, but is no longer that space. This commenter considered that space needed to be provided for these activities, for example in the Sport and Recreational Area 10 and suggested amenities such as toilets, power, drinking fountain and picnic tables.

#### 4.2.8 LAND BANKING AREAS FOR FUTURE ACTIVITIES – MAJOR TERTIARY INSTITUTE

One commenter suggested retaining some of the large areas of the regeneration areas (4, 5, 10, 11 and 12) in single Crown ownership, possibly for a major tertiary institute.

#### 4.2.9 KAIRAKI COMMERCIAL VENTURE

One commentator supported the proposals but considered that a hire or buy shop for fishing gear, jet skis, surfboards, etc was needed in Kairaki.

#### 4.2.10 DISCUSSION

The softball and major functions proposals have been considered in the Kaiapoi East analysis. Of the remaining ideas, many are interesting and potentially innovative. However, they will likely require significant further investigations and in some case private operators as partners. At present these proposals are not sufficiently formed to be included in the pDRP, however these could be considered in the future.

#### 4.2.11 RECOMMENDATIONS

- No amendments are recommended beyond changes proposed in the specific geographic areas.

### 4.3 RESIDENTIAL AND RURAL RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

A number of commenters suggested that residential development (rural-residential, standard and high density residential) would be appropriate in the regeneration areas. For example, one commenter considered that Kaiapoi West would be better suited to high density residential while another proposed mixed use, with a terrace of two storey apartments facing the river. For Kaiapoi South, one commenter considered that areas 3, 4 and 7 and parts of 5 south and west of Courtenay Drive could be remediated for a balance of commercial (e.g. retail), high density living (townhouses, apartments or retirement villas) and open spaces. Another commenter provided a number of comments and a

map with development ideas. Their principal idea is to lift the height of the land to the height of the stop bank along the central area with mixed use development (2-4 levels in height) involving retail on the ground floor and offices or apartments upstairs. A number of pictures from Europe were included as examples.

Rationales provided for these proposals included that increased intensification of residential activities within close proximity to the Town Centre would revitalise business and activity, helping reinvigorate the “retail, health and hospitality centre of Kaiapoi”. One commenter considered this would help reposition Kaiapoi as a compact residential and retirement town with a boutique shopping centre, river walks, easy beach access and varied recreation opportunities.

In proposing residential or mixed use activities some commenters questioned the technical evidence provided with the pDRP, noting that it had not considered high density residential development. Others recognised the technical evidence but considered that in the future these activities could be economically viable. As a comment against the issues section, one commenter stated that undue weight has been put on the cost of repairing regeneration land and that the role of the Council and the Crown is to prepare a sensible and sustainable recovery plan with land uses that benefit the Kaiapoi community for the next 100 years. This commenter noted that the market will decide which areas will develop and when. One commenter proposed alternative floating foundations as a cheaper and easily removable foundation option.

The Crown has also noted the preliminary nature of the technical analysis, stating that it is seeking further information to assist with determining whether or not residential development is feasible in parts of the regeneration area, and that without this information the Crown believes that it is premature for residential development options to be discounted at this stage of the process. Regarding rural residential development specifically, the Crown’s initial view is that all areas identified for ‘rural use’ should be identified for ‘rural residential use’, in order to allow for a range of potential uses both in the medium and longer term, even if rural use is the preferred option in the short term.

#### 4.3.1 DISCUSSION

##### *Standard density to high density residential development*

In terms of standard density residential development, in his report Mr Jacka states that the assessment undertaken by Tonkin and Taylor (T+T) indicates that residential development is likely to be feasible from an engineering perspective in some (or potentially all) of the Kaiapoi regeneration areas. However, significant cost may be occurred in managing the significant technical constraints and there is potential for adverse effects on neighbouring areas from the works. On the quantum of costs, Mr Jacka notes that given the early stages of the design and the limited information available, there is considerable uncertainty in the estimate of these costs and potential effects. This uncertainty was represented in the T+T Stage 1 report through the use of optimistic, most likely, and pessimistic cost estimates.

Mr Jacka states that the intent of this approach was to enable recovery planning to proceed with confidence in locations where the information was clear-cut (e.g. where even optimistic cost estimates were assessed as being not economic), while allowing further refinements over time in areas where the recovery plan identified potential opportunities.

In terms of high density residential development, Mr Jacka confirms that the the T+T report assumed the same residential density as was present before the earthquakes, where lot sizes were typically 650m<sup>2</sup>. Mr Jacka considers that apart from infrastructure demand, there are no significant engineering factors governing the choice of residential lot size, so small lots are likely to be feasible from an engineering perspective. He also confirms that it would be possible to spread the remediation costs over a greater number of smaller properties, reducing the per lot cost.

However, Mr Jacka states that the land improvement works costed are intended to allow a typical single-level “brick and tile” dwelling to be constricted on a TC2 waffle slab foundation, and that two-level dwellings would likely be limited to light weight construction or would require more robust foundations. He also notes that the land improvement works assumed in the current cost estimates would likely not be sufficient for terrace-type blocks of houses or dwellings higher than 2 levels.

In terms of alternative foundation designs, Mr Jacka states that he is not familiar with the specific details of the floating foundation system referred to in the submission, but states that it might be technically feasible provided it meet building consent and resource consent requirements.

In his report, Mr Sellars disagrees that the feasibility for residential development is flawed, as it has been based on low to medium density housing. He notes that any higher level of development, such as multi-level high density residential, would likely require a greater level of ground remediation and also foundations, and that this has not been costed by T + T to date. Without completing detailed analysis it is difficult to categorically state that high density residential development would be more economic. It is his observation that there is only a limited demand for high density residential in any area, and this is supported by the fact that in most greenfield subdivisions the high density residential component is the most difficult to sell and takes a longer time-frame to sell.

That said, Mr Sellars considers that the Kaiapoi West business area would be better suited to high density residential use, subject to economic feasibility. In relation to Kaiapoi South he agrees that high density residential could be an option subject to feasibility.

### *Rural residential development*

The minimum section size of 'rural residential' development varies across New Zealand. For the purposes of this exercise the Council has been guided by the definition of 'rural residential' contained within the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (CRPS). The CRPS defines 'rural residential' as: residential units at an average density of between 1 and 2 households per hectare. Under CRPS Policy 6.3.9, any proposed additional rural residential-zoned areas must be identified through a rural residential development strategy prepared under the Local Government Act 2002.

Given this limitation on providing additional rural residential areas, the T+T and Colliers technical analysis assessed development on sections averaging 4999m<sup>2</sup> in size. While this density of development is not considered to be 'rural residential' development under the CRPS, it has nevertheless been described as 'rural residential' development or 'rural lifestyle' development in these technical reports and the pDRP.

In relation to utilising the rural land for a rural residential use, in his technical report Mr Jacka states that the assessment undertaken by T+T to date indicates that rural residential development is likely to be feasible from an engineering perspective in some (or potentially all) of the Kaiapoi red-zone areas. However he notes that there is potential for significant cost and adverse effects on neighbouring areas (albeit less than for the urban-residential scenario), and considerable uncertainty at this time, and that rules will need to be put in place to ensure appropriate engineering design and mitigation of effects on neighbouring areas.

Mr Sellars has addressed this in his technical report. He states that while rural residential development could be feasible from a geotechnical perspective, the economic feasibility needs to be further explored. In his initial report he states that economic analysis for rural residential in Areas A (land identified as Areas 9, 10, 11, 12, and 13) and B (land identified as Area 5) produced results that suggest this type of development is not economic in the current market.

The T+T report identifies a number of uncertainties for the development scenarios considered in each red-zone area, proposing a number of next steps that may provide greater certainty about these matters, thereby confirming the cost of development, and in turn the economic viability. However, Mr Jacka does note that the cost of some of this further work may be significant and that there will need to be a careful balance to ensure that the cost and detail of this work is proportionate to the final use of the land.

### *Conclusions*

In my opinion the technical evidence indicates that, based on the most likely anticipated remediation requirements and current market returns, residential development is not economically viable in the business regeneration areas. However, given the comments received and the uncertainty over the future financial viability of residential development at different densities, it is reasonable to not foreclose on these activities in the draft Recovery Plan. I therefore consider that the identified business areas should be described as suitable for a mix of activities, including residential, depending on further technical and economic analysis. The draft Recovery Plan will continue to need to state that the exact mix of activities and their density will be determined via a district plan change and also refer to the future review of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Strategy. I consider it is highly desirable that these proceed as an integrated programme.

I also recommend that the identified rural areas are further explained in the draft Recovery Plan as areas that may evolve over time, with an interim (short-medium term) rural use anticipated, but with alternate uses (including residential) potentially possible in the longer term.

#### 4.3.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Describe the business areas in Kaiapoi West, Kaiapoi South and Kaiapoi East as suitable for a mix of business activities, including residential.
- Explain that the rural areas in Kaiapoi South and Kaiapoi East may evolve, with an interim (short-medium term) rural use anticipated.

#### 4.4 BUSINESS DEVELOPMENT

Business areas were proposed in the pDRP in Kaiapoi West (Area 2), Kaiapoi South (Area 3) and Kaiapoi East (Areas 16 and 17). Given the technical evidence, suitable business activities were described as being car parking and yard based retail (e.g. plant nurseries and car sales yards).

Commenters supported and opposed various aspects of the business land proposals. Where area specific comments are provided in relation to the identified business areas, these are also considered later in this report under the area headings.

For all the business areas identified, many commenters questioned the suitability and demand for yard-based activities in these locations. One commenter noted that car dealers like to front a main road and that garden centres and nurseries have largely been replaced by garden departments of big box stores. They also noted that yard-based activities such as truck depots, commonly occurred in rural zoned areas. They noted that just because it is possible to remediate the ground to be suitable for these types of activities, this does not mean they are the best solution for a particular area or that there will be demand for such land. Comments were also received questioning the attractiveness of this type of activity and lack of coherence with the landscape.

Another commenter opposed the business areas in Kaiapoi West and East in order to not undermine the Kaiapoi Town Centre. This commenter considered that the Kaiapoi Town Centre Plan is outdated, having been developed before the earthquakes and being based on an outmoded concept of what the public wants in a town centre. The commenter sought to create a compact, modern attractive Town Centre in the area between Williams St, Bowler St, Kaiapoi River and the Railway Line. One commenter sought to keep the Township in a tighter hub than proposed, with ample parking as the focus.

Some commenters have opposed the Plan 'foreclosing' on other types of activities such as standard retail and high density residential development in these locations. Many of these commenters recognised the technical evidence, but considered that in the future these activities could be economically viable.

Regarding the 3D modelling, for the schools, I note that most of the ideas proposed by the students related to business or recreation activities, with the majority related to the Kaiapoi East and Kaiapoi South regeneration areas. The most popular business ideas were 'commercial recreation' (go carts; mazes; theme parks; ice skating rinks; mini golf; rock climbing wall, etc), 'entertainment' (Opera house; time zone; movie theatre;), 'food and beverage' and 'retail services'.

#### 4.4.1 DISCUSSION

The business areas have been identified in locations that are considered the most appropriate for future business activities, based primarily on proximity to the existing Kaiapoi Town Centre. Business uses were considered appropriate given the identified business demand<sup>5</sup>, geotechnical and flooding constraints<sup>6</sup> and the market valuation of business activities.<sup>7</sup> The Council also carefully considered whether the existing Kaiapoi Town Centre would be undermined by an expansion of core retail and commercial services beyond its existing identified boundary.

As a result of the advice received, the pDRP indicated that yard based activities would be the most likely activities to establish in these locations. The Council was confident that these types of business activities would not undermine the existing Kaiapoi Town Centre. They were of this view given the fact that the land is in the single ownership of the Crown. Therefore, release to the market and development proposals can be closely managed. The Council would like to continue its partnership with the Crown in this regard.

The issue of whether standard retail or indeed other commercial activities would undermine the existing Kaiapoi Town Centre was not fully known at the time of preparing the pDRP and is still not known. Further evidence would be required to determine this.

In terms of the appropriateness of residential development in the identified business areas, this type of activity is generally acceptable in standard business zones, especially those in close proximity to other residential areas. This matter has been considered in the residential section earlier in this report.

In his technical report Mr Sellers states that he agrees with the comment that car dealers usually require frontage to a main road and that there is reducing demand for garden centre type activities due to increasing competition from big box stores. In relation to comments covering Kaiapoi West, he agrees that business use, especially yard based is inappropriate and that the area would be better suited to high density residential subject to economic feasibility. In relation to Kaiapoi South Mr Sellers agrees that yard based activities are not appropriate so close to the Kaiapoi Town Centre. Subject to feasibility, he agrees that high density residential could be an option, but he does not necessarily agree with the submission that high density residential would be more economical, without further costings from T + T and economic feasibility analysis.

#### *Conclusions*

In my opinion the technical evidence provided with the pDRP indicated that low intensity yard based business activities would be the most likely activities to establish in these locations. However, given: the nature of the comments received about yard based activities; the desire for some residential activity in the identified business locations; the advice from Mr Sellers; and uncertainty over remediation costs - it is reasonable to not foreclose on these alternative activities in these locations in the draft Recovery Plan.

---

<sup>5</sup> Kaiapoi Town Centre Business Land Requirements (October 2015) by Property Economics Ltd

<sup>6</sup> Kaiapoi Red Zones Engineering Feasibility of Potential Land Uses (December 2015) by Tonkin & Taylor Ltd

<sup>7</sup> Kaiapoi Red Zone Feasibility Analysis (December 2015) by Colliers Ltd

I therefore consider that the identified business areas should be described as suitable for a mix of activities, including residential, depending on further technical and economic analysis. The draft Recovery Plan will need to state that the exact mix of activities and their density will be determined via a future review of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Strategy and the district plan change, which will consider such things as potential impact on the existing Kaiapoi Town Centre, providing for residential amenity, and managing off-site flooding effects. I consider it is highly desirable that the review of the Kaiapoi Town Centre Strategy and the district plan change proceed as an integrated programme.

#### 4.4.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- See the recommended amendments under the residential discussion above.

### 4.5 DESIGN OF SPORTS AREAS, RECREATION AND ECOLOGICAL LINKAGES AND THE ASH INTERNMENT CEMETERY / MEMORIAL GARDEN

A number of commenters made equipment, design and naming suggestions for these areas. For clarity, comments on the location of these activities are discussed under Section 7 – comments by area.

#### 4.5.1 DISCUSSION

As set out in section 3.5 of the Green Space technical report (attached in the appendices), the pDRP involves high level spatial planning. The green space proposals for the five regeneration areas set out the proposed park types, their location and approximate size. The spatial plans do not detail site specific development information, such as, the location of car parking, public toilets, seats, trees, food forests, signs etc. This detailed, site-specific development information will form part of the implementation of any approved Recovery Plan through the preparation of master plans and concept plans. These master and concept plans will be prepared in consultation with stakeholders and the community, including Ngāi Tahu, Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Environment Canterbury where required.

I consider that the comments provided on the pDRP will be helpful when that detailed design work is undertaken, should the Recovery Plan be approved by the Minister.

#### 4.5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- No changes are recommended.

### 4.6 INTENSIVE FARMING OF RURAL AREAS

One commentator supported the exclusion of intensive farming if this related to livestock farming, but wanted to provide for intensive horticulture. They considered that the term “intensive farming” needed to be defined to make sure this was not misunderstood. The commenter also sought more detail in the final plan concerning subdivision and ownership, suggesting that consideration be given to providing small lots to allow people living in Kaiapoi to have access (potentially through leasehold) to land to grow vegetables for themselves or for small horticultural enterprises selling produce at farmers markets. Another commenter also questioned how rural use would be defined and what would specifically be excluded under intensive farming.

#### 4.6.1 DISCUSSION

The exclusion of intensive farming was intended to refer to intensive livestock farming. This can be made clearer in the draft Recovery Plan by including a definition.

#### 4.6.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Add a definition of “intensive farming” (drawn from the Waimakariri District Plan) into the glossary or change the relevant text to make it clearer that intensive livestock farming will be excluded, but that intensive horticultural activities will not.

#### 4.7 ONGOING CONSULTATION

One commenter thanked the Council for keeping land owners and the general public informed. They stated that consultation with remaining private land owners was a must or needed to be considered. The need for ongoing consultation was also raised by other commenters in relation to specific areas / proposals.

Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Te Runanga o Ngāi Tahu support the approach that the Council will work in partnership with Ngāi Tūāhuriri and Te Runanga for the implementation of the Recovery Plan.

The Impact Assessment also identified a need for a clearer statement about ongoing consultation with the community generally, as well as in relation to specific proposals.

#### 4.7.1 DISCUSSION

As set out in various sections in the pDRP, the Council is proposing to undertake further consultation with the community and stakeholders as part of the implementation steps. However, there is no clear single statement about the Council’s commitment to ongoing consultation, and how this will be done. I therefore consider it would be appropriate to add a statement in Section 5 Implementation about this.

#### 4.7.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- Add a statement on consultation in Section 5 Implementation, that sets out the Council’s ongoing commitment to consultation and the ways this is anticipated to occur during the implementation phase.

#### 4.8 REMAINING PRIVATE RESIDENCES IN THE REGENERATION AREAS

One commenter stated that the remaining residents in the regeneration areas will be problematic and place constraints on the efficient design and comprehensive development of the regeneration areas. They considered that these residents should have limited / no right of appeal and objection to proposals that benefit many others.

It was also suggested that the properties of the Red Zone “*stayers*” should be taken under the Public Works Act in order that the redevelopment can be undertaken in a coordinated and cost effective manner.

Contrary to the above comments, the Human Rights Commission welcomed the acknowledgement of the property rights of existing private property owners in the regeneration areas and commended the account taken of these rights in the development of the proposed land uses.

#### 4.8.1 DISCUSSION

In the issues section the pDRP recognises the fragmentation of the regeneration areas as a result of the remaining private residences. However, it is noted that the Government's residential red zone offer was purposefully voluntary and that the remaining private residences have exercised their rights to remain. I consider that the pDRP should continue to recognise their right to remain within the regeneration areas. This approach is supported by the Human Rights Commission.

#### 4.8.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

- No amendments are recommended.

### 4.9 INFRASTRUCTURE AND SERVICES

A number of comments were provided on infrastructure. These included comments on the costs and level of services provided to remaining private red-zoned properties, the efficient use of infrastructure generally, and new infrastructure. Some of the comments were general, some were applied against specific areas, while others were made in response to the vision, goals and issues.

In its comment the Crown promoted the efficient and financially responsible use of existing infrastructure as a theme to be highlighted in the draft Recovery Plan.

In terms of services provided to remaining private red-zoned properties, one commenter stated that providing services to remaining private residences in the regeneration areas should not be funded by rates. Rather, the remaining residents should pay for the upkeep of services. Another commenter stated that providing services to "stayers" has been a burden to the other residents of Kaiapoi. Another commenter asserted that the Council had undertaken to continue to provide the existing services and questioned who should be liable for the costs – all ratepayers or the owners who have opted to stay. They considered that costs to maintain services to isolated properties could be significantly higher given the relative isolation of some of these properties.

The Woodend Ashley Community Board also expressed views about the reasonableness and affordability of providing services to the existing properties within the regeneration area.

Mainpower commented that they would like to maintain their current high voltage cable routes, some of which will be located in future farm land and parks. Mainpower have sought input into the final Recovery Plan to ensure that the integrity of these routes is maintained. Mainpower also commented that they will remove redundant sub-stations and low voltage cables, and install new streetlight cabling, with the extent and location depending on the final Recovery Plan. A new substation is required in Currie Park and the stormwater pond in Hall Street appears to encroach on a remaining substation.

There were a number of submissions on the provision of toilets to the proposed campervan park, the proposed sports fields and The Pines Beach area. Additionally, there are a number of comments

regarding relocating facilities or adding facilities within the proposed spatial plan areas. One commenter suggested that the Kairaki Beach Carpark should have a sealed surface.

Some submissions have sought that provision be made for further residential or commercial development within the regeneration areas.

---

#### 4.9.1 DISCUSSION

In terms of services to remaining private properties in the regeneration areas, an assessment and response on this matter is set out in the 3 Waters Servicing technical report by Mr Simpson (in the attached appendices). In his report he states that firstly, it is important to note that a legal opinion commissioned by the Council and CERA confirmed that the Council is legally obligated to continue provision of services to existing properties that remain within the regeneration area. Furthermore, the Council has received formal comments from the Human Rights Commission that support this position. Mr Simpson considers that the key matter for consideration then becomes what level of service should be provided to those properties and how those services should be funded.

Mr Simpson notes that the Council has already effectively reinstated permanent services to some properties within the regeneration areas. The model developed for this is that the Council has funded the works to restore services to the property boundary, but in some cases the property owners have accepted a modified level of service. This predominantly relates to the provision of wastewater, where the cost to reinstate a gravity service would be excessive and the resilience offered by such a service would not be in the best interests of the ratepayer or the property owner. In these instances, the gravity sewer connections have been replaced by an on-site wastewater pump station, funded and installed by the Council, but that the ongoing ownership and maintenance responsibility of the on-site system rests with the property owner. Mr Simpson considers that this method has been found to provide the best balance of affordability (to both the property owner and the ratepayer), resilience, and fairness.

The draft Recovery Plan has therefore made provision for the residential properties that remain within the regeneration areas to continue to receive water and wastewater services, but that the level of service, particularly relating to wastewater, may be changed from the pre-earthquake level of service.

In his 3 Waters technical report, Mr Simpson notes that there is a lot of existing key infrastructure through the proposed rural land, particularly in Kaiapoi East, which is located predominantly within the existing road reserve. For example, a key trunk sewer main runs up Jollie Street and then east along Cass Street to the eastern boundary of the regeneration area. Services such as these will need to be maintained within the road reserve. He considers that this will be a key consideration and potential limiting factor in the change in proposed use of this land.

As set out in Mr Lake's technical roading report (attached as an appendix) at this stage it is proposed not to uplift the legal status of the existing road corridors, so the legal protection of services within these corridors will continue. If road stopping is contemplated, then discussions would be held with all service authorities, including Mainpower, at the planning stage. Road stopping is controlled by the Local Government Act, and full consultation is required before roads can be legally stopped.

Furthermore, during the detailed design for new or repaired roading, consideration will be given to service requirements. The pDRP states (Sections, 4.3.6 and 4.4.9) that the Council will consider the appropriate level of servicing requirements for private properties that remain in the red zone as an implementation action. Servicing requirements include: electricity; water; sewerage disposal; rubbish collection etc.

Mr Simpson notes that there are also existing services located in The Pines Beach and Kairaki areas, either within an existing road reserve, or on Crown land protected by an existing easement. He considers that it will be important to ensure the alignment is protected for maintenance and future replacement of these assets for any future land use.

### *Servicing new developments*

In terms of provision of toilets to the proposed campervan park, the proposed sports fields and The Pines Beach area, and relocating services, in his report Mr Simpson states that there are existing nearby services to cater for such provisions, although the extent the services will need to be extended is dependent on the final proposed location of the toilets. He states it is important to note that when moving facilities or adding facilities, services will need to be extended to those new locations.

Mr Simpson has broadly considered the proposed changes to the draft spatial plan and is satisfied that these changes would not result in substantial additional costs associated with water and wastewater servicing.

In terms of provision for further residential or commercial development within the regeneration areas, in his report Mr Simpson states that the servicing that has been planned and budgeted for, makes provision to service the specific facilities that have been shown in the Spatial Plan, and to some extent these services will have spare capacity. However, specific provision has not been made to service the undeveloped areas on the Spatial Plan which include the rural and business areas. That said, he notes that the existing and proposed trunk infrastructure within and adjacent to the regeneration areas generally does have capacity to accommodate the levels of development that could reasonably be expected and that it would be incumbent on the developer of this land to design and install the infrastructure to service any development areas and to link it into the existing trunk infrastructure.

Mr Simpson is satisfied on balance that this approach is the most efficient and cost effective way to plan for the infrastructure requirements of the areas, now and in the future. This will ensure that ratepayers and taxpayers are not overly burdened by constructing infrastructure for a demand that may never arise, but at the same time will ensure that future development could be accommodated with a reasonable level of infrastructure investment.

Mr Simpson considers that there would be some benefit in preparing an overall plan covering key infrastructure services that will need to be maintained in Council owned land. The purpose of such a plan would be to ensure the existing alignment and position of key infrastructure is protected for maintenance and future replacement of these assets, for any future land use. He states that this infrastructure plan will be prepared and included as an appendix in the final draft of the Recovery Plan.

Mr Simpson also considers that the draft Recovery Plan should include more detail on the purpose and need for both existing and proposed infrastructure within the regeneration areas.

### *Efficient Utilisation of Existing Roads*

As stated in Mr Lake's roading technical report, the Crown has submitted that greater emphasis needs to be placed on efficient and financially responsible use of existing infrastructure. Over the past five years, the Council has carried out a programme of repairs to damaged roads and this is now complete in the Kaiapoi West, Pines Beach and Kairaki regeneration areas. The scope and scale of those works have been tailored to the condition of the assets, and agreed on a project by project basis with the New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA).

The roads within the Kaiapoi East and Kaiapoi South regeneration areas are heavily damaged and require significant works to restore them to an acceptable standard. The proposals in the pDRP utilise the existing road corridors and the underlying pavement structure as much as practicable. The project costings allow for road surface reshaping rather than total reconstruction wherever possible, based upon detailed condition assessments of the existing roads. In addition to this, kerb and channel has been omitted from the proposals, where appropriate, in favour of more economical drainage facilities. As with the road earthquake repairs carried out to date, Council will continue to liaise with NZTA to ensure appropriate and economic solutions are implemented.

Given the above, I understand that the Council has considered the efficient and financially responsible use of existing infrastructure.

#### 4.9.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Note in the draft Recovery Plan that the Council should continue to liaise with the service authorities.
- Include more detail on the purpose and need for both existing and proposed infrastructure within the regeneration areas in the draft Recovery Plan.
- Append an infrastructure plan to the draft of the Recovery Plan, covering key infrastructure services that need to be maintained in Council owned land.

#### 4.10 MAINTAINING THE UNDERLYING ZONING

One commenter suggested that the underlying residential classification should remain to avoid a costly and time consuming process should the area be developed at some stage in the future. Likewise the existing roading network should remain as paper roads.

The Kaiapoi Community Board also sought the retention of the underlying residential zoning and road designations across the regeneration area in order to facilitate future development and growth beyond the projected timelines advocated in the pDRP.

##### 4.10.1 DISCUSSION

The pDRP purposefully identified land uses / activities rather than zones for the regeneration areas, stating that zoning decisions were further actions. Where further work identifies that an alternative zone is better suited to provide for the anticipated long term activities in an area, then this will be progressed. Until this further work is undertaken, the pDRP proposed retaining the underlying residential zoning in accordance with the commenter's suggestion. I support this approach.

#### 4.10.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No changes are recommended

#### 4.11 PURCHASING RED-ZONE LAND

One commenter sought the opportunity to buy some adjacent red zone land identified for rural purposes in Kaiapoi East.

##### 4.11.1 DISCUSSION

It is not surprising that some adjacent green zone landowners may wish to purchase or lease land in the regeneration areas adjacent to their sections. Depending on the amount of land sought, this option will likely not meaningfully undermine achievement of the proposed spatial land use pattern set out in the draft Recovery Plan, nor have any meaningful impact on achieving the draft Recovery Plan's vision, goals or the objectives contained in the Minister's Statutory Direction. It is considered that this option is a matter for the Crown, as the landowner, to explore directly with the requesting landowners. It is noted that this could provide an option for deriving value from the Crown's assets.

##### 4.11.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No changes are recommended.

#### 4.12 GREATER RECOGNITION OF NATURAL HAZARDS AND THE NATURAL HAZARDS PLAN CHANGE

The Crown sought that the draft Recovery Plan provide greater recognition and detail about natural hazards and also on the proposed natural hazards plan change to the Waimakariri District Plan.

##### 4.12.1 DISCUSSION

As set out in the technical memo from the WDC Development Planning Manager (refer appendices) the Council is currently preparing a plan change (Proposed Plan Change 27) that reviews the Waimakariri District Plan (the District Plan) provisions relating to natural hazard management. The proposed plan change reviews recent hazard information and modelling within the context of RMA and regional policy requirements, in particular the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS). The proposed plan change recognises that understanding of natural hazard management has evolved since the District Plan was first developed in the late 1990s and seeks to reconcile recent technical information and regional policy changes to help ensure the District Plan remains current.

The scope of the plan change relates to natural hazards as they apply to the district as a whole, including areas covered by the Recovery Plan. The purpose of the plan change is limited to Waimakariri District specific geophysical events or natural occurrences in regard to flooding, earthquake, liquefaction, coastal hazard and climate change.

The proposed plan change does not address future climate change effects associated with sea level rise in relation to potential direct source coastal inundation. However, two key climate change values are factored into the flood modelling that informs the proposed plan change, being additional rainfall volume and an allowance for 1m sea level rise. The effect of these modelled values is reflected in maximum flood depth and flood hazard categories.

The draft of the plan change is in advanced state, and consultation with statutory consultees is underway. The plan change requires approval of the Council to publicly notify it following RMA requirements. The notification date has not been determined at this time, although it proposed to occur within the second quarter of 2016.

In terms of providing greater recognition and detail on natural hazards, I consider that the pDRP already strongly recognises and is heavily influenced by natural hazards. However, I think that additional references need to be provided to the natural hazard provisions of the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (NZCPS) and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013 (CRPS). In particular, I consider that references to coastal hazard risk over the next 100 years should be included for The Pines Beach and Kairaki areas given the findings of the TAP Report.

#### 4.12.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Include the additional detail on the natural hazards plan change in section 2.4 of the draft Recovery Plan
- Include references to the NZCPS and CRPS provisions and requirements.

## 5.0 COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE VISION AND GOALS

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

61 comment points were received on the vision and goals. Of these: 49 supported the vision and goals as set out in the pDRP; two were neutral; seven were in partial support; and three were in opposition. Specific comments received are considered below. I note that the Kaiapoi Community Board agreed with the vision and goals.

### 5.2 SPORTS AREAS

One commenter specifically sought less sports areas as these are too seasonal and limited (potentially in response to Goal 3). As an alternative they sought more entertainment, cafes, a market place, etc as activities for everyone. In contrast to this, Sport Canterbury requested more explicit reference to use of the land for active sport and recreation purposes.

#### 5.2.1 DISCUSSION

The vision and goals support a range of activities. The proposed sport and recreation areas have received many supportive comments and it is considered appropriate to make more explicit reference to active sport and recreation.

Further specific assessment of the sports areas and opportunities are considered under the geographic sections later in this report.

#### 5.2.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Amend Goal 3 to refer to active sport and recreation.

### 5.3 RESERVES AND PARKS

One commenter disagreed with the vision and goals, requesting that all the regeneration areas should be left as reserves and parks. Another commenter (in response to the issues section) stated that they did not support areas being designated as rural and open to being sold off for farm blocks. They considered the land tapu and that it must all be available for community use.

#### 5.3.1 DISCUSSION

I consider that maintaining all the areas as reserves and parks available for community use would be a fundamental shift in the proposals for the regeneration areas. This would not likely achieve the fiscal requirements set out in the Statutory Direction, having financial implications for Waimakariri District ratepayers and New Zealand taxpayers, nor achieve the wider goals of the Recovery Strategy.

As set out under the proposed land uses / activities in each of the five regeneration areas, the pDRP already proposes a significant amount of additional reserves and parks. I understand from the Green Space Technical report that further reserves and parks are not necessary to meet Council Green Space levels of service.

### 5.3.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

## 5.4 CLARITY

One commentator was unsure what “economically vibrant” meant, noting that it was hard to support a vision statement that is difficult to understand. Another commenter also stated the vision and goals (e.g. Goal 6) lacked clarity.

### 5.4.1 DISCUSSION

The vision and goals are purposefully ‘high level’, as they do not need to direct detailed design. This is subject to future processes. It is common planning practice to take this hierarchical approach to a strategic document and process. This provides flexibility while ensuring a common aim. I note that the majority of comments received (49) were in support of the vision and goals, and a number of comments explicitly commended the clarity of the vision and goals.

### 5.4.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

## 5.5 ECONOMIC GROWTH AND COST TO RATEPAYERS

One commenter considered that it was wrong to consider economic growth as this was prospering from previous owners’ heartache.

### 5.5.1 DISCUSSION

The Minister’s statutory direction requires that decisions about the residential red-zone should represent acceptable financial costs to New Zealand taxpayers or Waimakariri District ratepayers (Section 4.1.1). Decisions should also support economic development and growth (Section 4.1.3). As such, the draft Recovery Plan must include economic growth considerations as part of the recovery of the wider area.

### 5.5.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

## 5.6 INTENSIFICATION OF RESIDENTS WITHIN THE TOWN CENTRE

One commenter supported the vision and goals but considered that the goals do not encompass intensification of residents living within the town centre limits to support business and create vibrancy of the town centre.

### 5.6.1 DISCUSSION

The vision and goals are purposefully high level and do not provide that level of detail on individual activities, rather they refer to a range of activities. While the concept of intensification is generally supported and this is not ruled out, it is considered that it is inappropriate to specifically seek this as a goal given the geotechnical and flooding evidence presented to date which indicates these activities are not economically feasible in the regeneration areas. Furthermore, the Kaiapoi Town Centre is not located within the regeneration area.

See also the commentary on residential development in Section 4 of this report.

### 5.6.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

## 5.7 A COMPACT, EFFICIENT AND EXCITING KAIAPOI TOWN CENTRE

One commenter suggested that the second part of Goal 2 be amended as follows:

“...Providing for a range of land uses that support ~~and extend the role and~~ the development of ~~the a~~ a compact, efficient and exciting Kaiapoi Town Centre for business and jobs ~~and~~ that attracts shoppers and visitors to the town.”

### 5.7.1 DISCUSSION

I note that the commenter opposes the proposed business areas in Kaiapoi West and Kaiapoi East stating that the town centre is already poorly defined, disjointed and unattractive to shoppers at present and having yet another business area would compound this. The suggested changes to Goal 2 are consistent with this position of maintaining the Kaiapoi Town Centre as compact.

I support adding in the word “shoppers” as one undesirable feature of the Kaiapoi Town Centre (as set out in the Property Economics Technical report) is the ‘leakage’ of retail spend to other centres. However, I consider that the words “and extend the role and” are appropriate as this is consistent with Section 4.1.3 of the Statutory Direction which states that decisions about the residential red zone should where relevant, facilitate innovation and economic development. In so doing, it is conceivable that these activities will extend the role of the Kaiapoi Town Centre.

In terms of the proposed words “compact, efficient and exciting”, I consider that there is merit in this suggestion as this is consistent with the Kaiapoi Town Centre Strategy, however the pDRP specifically identifies additional business areas that will extend the Kaiapoi business area, and as such this addition could undermine internal consistency within the draft Recovery Plan.

See also the commentary on business development in Section 4 of this report.

#### 5.7.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Reword Goal 2 as follows:

*“...Providing for a range of land uses that support and extend the role and development of the Kaiapoi Town Centre for business and jobs ~~and~~ that attract shoppers and visitors to the town.”*

#### 5.8 SERVICING

As set out in Mr Simpson’s 3 Waters Technical report, Goal 1 suggests that levels of service will be restored, while elsewhere in the document it is acknowledged that servicing and roading to private properties in the red zone will remain but at a lower level of service (e.g.: private on-site pump stations). I agree with Mr Simpson that this goal needs some qualifying words such as “where practicable”.

#### 5.8.1 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Amend Goal 1 to refer to “where practical”.

## 6.0 COMMENTS ON THE ISSUES

44 comments points were made on the identified issues set out in Section 3 of the pDRP. Of these: 37 agreed with the identified issues; five were in partial support; and two were in opposition. Specific comments received are considered below. I note that the Kaiapoi Community Board agreed that the main issues have been identified.

### 6.1 LACK OF RECOGNITION BETWEEN LAND AND WATER

One commenter stated that a clear oversight in the pDRP was the lack of recognition between land and water and that we have the chance to design and develop our future in respect of both. They considered that both need to be acknowledged as essential to human welfare and wellbeing. Another commenter stated that the Recovery Plan needed to acknowledge land and water with equal regard, elevating water into design thinking and subsequent development.

#### 6.1.1 DISCUSSION

I agree with the comments that water and water quality is not sufficiently considered in the pDRP. I note that the Impact Assessment (contained in the appendices) also identified a lack of consideration of the pDRP's impact on water quality. I also note that Recovery Strategy Goal 6 refers to water quality. I consider this matter significant and that the draft Recovery Plan should better recognise existing water quality and the opportunity to enhance this through land use activities in the regeneration areas.

#### 6.1.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Add a reference to water quality in Section 3.4 bullet 2 – opportunities to enhance the natural environment.
- Add statements about opportunities for water quality enhancement in the design of Council assets such as the sports fields and the stormwater detention areas.

### 6.2 COST TO RATEPAYERS

One commenter questioned how would / could the Council / ratepayers buy, develop and maintain areas 4, 5, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 24, noting that 5 and 12 could be leased but still required purchasing. Another considered it important to not place financial implications on the ratepayers to fund any proposed infrastructure works, which need to be completed in a timely manner.

#### 6.2.1 DISCUSSION

The issue of funding is significant. I understand that the Council has considered the cost implications of all the proposals that would require Council expenditure. These are outlined in Section 6 of the pDRP. Of those listed by the commenter, the costs associated with Area 10 (District Sports and Recreation Reserve) and 11 (Cemetery) have been considered by the Council as these activities are proposed to be owned by the Council.

I understand that the costs associated with Area 4 (Heritage and Mahinga Kai area), Area 16 (parking), Area's 20 and 24 (Tūhaitara Coastal Park) are uncertain at this time as ownership and

management structures are yet to be determined. I understand that the areas will be co-managed by the Council, Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūāhuriri , and it is possible that this land would remain in Crown ownership.

It is anticipated that the Council / ratepayers would not be responsible for costs associated with Area's 5 and 12 (Rural), and Area 17 (Business). I understand that this land will remain in Crown ownership until such time as it is on sold. Interim lease arrangements can provide a financial return to the Crown in the short term.

The issues statement already identifies that funding is needed to establish, maintain and manage the proposed land uses (Section 3.2, bullet 6) and that future land owners will face ongoing costs of the land (Section 3.2, bullet 2). As such, this matter is already identified as an issue. However, the issues could be more clearly worded to identify that it may be the Council that accrues the financial burden.

#### 6.2.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Amend Section 3.2 bullet 6 to identify that funding may need to come from the Council, and therefore the ratepayer, for proposed Council assets.

### 6.3 SPORTS FIELDS

One commenter stated that they did not agree there was a need for further sports fields.

#### 6.3.1 DISCUSSION

In my opinion this matter was identified as an issue in Section 3.4, 5th bullet. The need for sports fields is set out in the Green Space Technical report and considered under the geographic areas elsewhere in this report.

#### 6.3.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

### 6.4 EFFECTS AND NEEDS OF GREEN ZONE RESIDENCES ON THE EDGE OF THE RED ZONE

One commenter stated that more consideration needed to be given to the effects and needs of the people who still live on the edge of the regeneration areas and the effects of any development in the regeneration areas will have on an existing residents' quality of life.

#### 6.4.1 DISCUSSION

In my opinion this matter is a significant issue and is identified in the issues statement (Section 3.1, first and 4th bullets; Section 3.4, 3rd and 4th bullets). This issue has also driven the spatial plan design, particularly the use of recreation and ecological links to act as buffers between the new activities and existing residences and the proposed restrictions on intensive farming in the rural areas. Furthermore, the implementation timing of key projects that will provide relief to Green Zone residents

(such as road repairs) have been identified to take place within the short term. This provides direct benefit to Green Zone residents and demonstrates that sufficient consideration has been given to their well-being in the pDRP.

#### 6.4.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

### 6.5 SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT

One commenter stated that the Plan did not sufficiently emphasise the social development of Kaiapoi and the surrounding area, in ways of more than jobs and money. They suggested an addition to Section 3.1 (Social Issues section) on page 22 that sought to support social interaction and development and the social wellbeing of Kaiapoi and its people. Another commenter stated that many of the social issues noted in Section 3.1 should have little weight, stating that the properties of red zone “stayers” should be taken under the public works act to allow development to be undertaken in a coordinated and cost effective manner.

#### 6.5.1 DISCUSSION

In my opinion social development is a worthy goal and is captured explicitly in Goal 3, and generally across all the goals. In terms of the social issues of the remaining private residences this matter was covered earlier in Section 4 of my report.

#### 6.5.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

## 7.0 COMMENTS BY AREA (WEST, SOUTH, EAST, THE PINES BEACH AND KAIRAKI)

### 7.1 KAIAPOI WEST

#### 7.1.1 INTRODUCTION

52 comments were received on the Kaiapoi West regeneration area. Of these: 37 were in support; seven were partial support; seven were in opposition; while one was neutral. Specific comments received are considered below. I note that the Kaiapoi Community Board agrees with the land use proposals for Kaiapoi West.

#### 7.1.2 SPORT AND RECREATION RESERVE (AREA 1)

As set out in Section 4.1 of the attached Green Space Technical report (contained in the appendices), an additional sport and recreation reserve within the Kaiapoi West regeneration area was proposed in the pDRP between Raven Quay, Rich Street, Hilton Street and Black Street (Area 1). This additional reserve would complement Murphy Park, and the two sites would be considered together as a recreation hub in terms of planning and operation. The additional reserve was proposed as an alternative site for the Croquet Club and to provide additional parking to support use of Murphy Park. As well as supporting Murphy Park, the reserve was intended to support the surrounding residential community.

There were varied comments received on this area. I have outlined the supporting reasons below. Further information on the comments for this area are set out in Section 4.1 of the Greenspace Technical report.

The proposed additional parking received a number of comments: one commentator supported the proposal and stated that parking was definitely needed for the Borough School; three commenters supported additional overflow parking for Murphy Park; another commentator supported some public parking. One commenter expressly stated that no sports clubs or parking were required and proposed removing the remaining red zoned house.

In terms of activities, a number of suggestions were made: one commenter supported the activities as proposed in the pDRP; one commenter supported specific sports facilities, i.e. lawn bowls, croquet, hockey for all the sports areas, not just rugby fields across the board; another wanted some sort of adventure / agility park / facility for the wider community to use, while two others sought petanque / boules / a bowling alley and perhaps keep fit stations; one commenter wanted the area to remain as a grassed open space with a walkway, trees, seating and a small playground. One commenter suggested the area might be suitable for freedom camping.

In terms of the Croquet Club relocation, one commenter considered the Croquet Club had a small and declining membership and did not deserve special treatment. Another considered that the area was not suited to the croquet club and referred to flooding and the shape of the available land. They considered land in Kaiapoi East might prove more suitable, specifically referring to areas 15, 16 and 17. Another commenter made a similar comment and referred to areas 9, 17 and 15 as alternative locations. Importantly, the Kaiapoi Croquet Club also did not support the proposal stating they wanted to remain in their current Murphy Park location.

More generally, one commenter considered the reserve would be of considerable benefit to the Kaiapoi community. One commenter suggested that the land could be used for stormwater retention.

Te Runanga and Ngai Tuahiri support the inclusion of environmental enhancements to this area, as they will contribute to supporting mana whenua and Ngāi Tahu values and will provide a positive response to flood risk within the area.

#### 7.1.2.1 DISCUSSION

In the Greenspace Technical report, Ms Flanagan makes the following comments in response to the comments received:

- The remaining sport and recreation reserve could provide overflow parking for Murphy Park. This could potentially be used by the school during drop off and pick up times.
- A full softball diamond (as proposed more generally by a number of commenters, not specifically for Kaiapoi West) in the Kaiapoi West Regeneration Area would be a tight fit. There is sufficient space in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area (Area 10 – Sport and recreation reserve) for a diamond to co-exist with a field based code.
- The Kaiapoi Croquet Club has indicated they do not wish to move from Murphy Park.
- A petanque or boules court and keep fit stations could be located in Kaiapoi West. This detailed design will be considered as part of combined concept plan for Area 1 and Murphy Park.

Mr Simpson states in his 3 Waters Technical report that some form of stormwater attenuation is likely to be required to address the increase in the impervious area in the proposed business area of Kaiapoi West. This will be dependent on the nature and extent of the impervious area proposed by the future development and whether the existing stormwater system has capacity to accommodate the increased flows.

In his 3 waters technical report Mr Simpson states that the proposed land use / activity of a sport and recreational reserve, particularly the playground and paths, seating, planting, are well suited to be integrated into the proposed Dudley Drain reserve as neighbouring land uses.

#### 7.1.2.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Amend Section 4.2.1 Area 1 to read:

The Council proposes that Area 1 will include a new sport and recreation reserve. This reserve could include ~~a future lawn based sport club a croquet club (relocated from Murphy Park)~~, overflow parking for Murphy Park, a playground, open turf area for informal ball play, paths, seating and planting.

~~The Kaiapoi Croquet Club greens and pavilion were damaged in the earthquakes and need repairing. The reconstruction of the Club at its existing location is not preferable given the potential flooding and land suitability issues. Relocating and building a new facility on this site both reinstates this supported activity, and enables Murphy Park to be reconfigured to create additional playing fields and rowing infrastructure. Murphy Park is currently operating at capacity for league, with the Northern Bulldogs Rugby League Club requesting additional junior fields. The rowing clubs have also approached the Council seeking opportunities to construct rowing infrastructure (e.g. storage sheds) at the park.~~

The proposed vehicle parking is required because there is a current shortfall at Murphy Park. ~~The proposed additional parking will also service the proposed reserve and relocated Croquet Club.~~ A new playground and open turf area in this location would support the residential activities in the area

and can be used by the nearby Kaiapoi Borough School. It would also complement the activities at Murphy Park.

The proposed activities are preferred for this area given the identified flooding and geotechnical risks, support from the community for recreation and integration with neighbouring land uses.

- Delete references to the Kaiapoi Croquet Club in the Key Actions and Stages section

### 7.1.3 BUSINESS (AREA 2)

The proposed business area was identified to enable suitable business activities to take place on this site. Business was the preferred use for this area given: 1) it is immediately adjacent to the Kaiapoi Town Centre; 2) the identified business land demand<sup>8</sup>; 3), the identified geotechnical and flooding risks<sup>9</sup>; and the identified car parking needs in the area<sup>10</sup>. Based on the technical reports, the pDRP identified yard based activities as the most viable activities in the area.

Two commenters supported the activities as proposed in the pDRP, with one stating that a plant nursery was needed in Kaiapoi. Another agreed but considered that before yard based activities were allowed, consideration should be given to how heavy vehicles will access those businesses. They noted that the parking area could have longer time limits. Another commenter supported land banking around the town centre stating this was important for future town expansion.

Two commenters opposed car sales yards, with one suggesting more entertainment areas, cafes, a restaurant and market places, etc as alternatives. Another supported businesses which enhance the area and views, stating that a car yard would not do that but a plant nursery was a good option. One commenter was concerned that the area could become disjointed and recommended consultation with the private landowner (presumably the remaining private residence). Another commenter considered that the economic viability of yard based activities did not stack up and a cemetery was a better use in this location. One commenter said it was silly to contemplate business activities given how poorly the ground performed in this area and that a larger community garden may be an option in this area. This commenter also considered that the business area could be used for sports team storage i.e. dragon boats or for businesses to set up kayaking or water-based tourist activities.

One commenter considered business use, especially yard based was inappropriate in this location due to poor visibility, proximity to transport routes and accessibility for truck delivery, considering the area would be better suited to high density residential. They considered that increased intensification of residential activities within close proximity to the Kaiapoi Town Centre would revitalise business and activity, whereas town centre spread was unwarranted and would not attract commercial investment.

One commenter sought that the area could be in mixed use, with those sections facing Hilton Street being used for parking and business and those facing north bordering Raven Quay should be

---

<sup>8</sup> Property Economics Report

<sup>9</sup> Tonkin and Tayloer Report

<sup>10</sup> Abley's Report

remediated and used for residential purposes. A terrace of two storey apartments facing the river was suggested, and that “Inner town living” by the historic Kaiapoi River should be promoted.

One commenter opposed the business area, providing a number of reasons including: incompatibility with the proposed reserve; inconsistency with CPTED principles; possible effects on the future option of a second bridge across the Kaiapoi River at the northern end of Black Street; possible effects on the construction of a bypass; and that it would compound issues with the poorly defined, disjointed and unattractive-to-shoppers existing town centre.

One commenter suggested that consideration should be made in this area for park and ride and a railway station.

A number of commenters sought that the whole Kaiapoi West area be a large reserve / recreation area.

---

#### 7.1.3.1 DISCUSSION

Clearly there is a divergence of views on the proposed use in Kaiapoi West. Section 4 of this report sets out an analysis of business and residential uses in this area, so I will not repeat these here.

In terms of stormwater management, in his 3 Waters Technical report Mr Simpson states that the proposed land use / activity of a sport and recreational reserve, particularly the playground and paths, seating, planting, are well suited to be integrated into the proposed Dudley Drain reserve as neighbouring land uses. The width of the reserve may need to be increased if intensive business development was to be proposed immediately adjacent to the reserve.

#### 7.1.3.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- See the recommended amendments proposed in Section 4 of this report.

---

#### 7.1.4 ROAD WORKS

Two commenters discussed the state of the roads in this area, specifically referring to the road works that have recently been completed. A number of roading improvements were suggested.

---

#### 7.1.4.1 DISCUSSION

These matters relate to arears outside of the regeneration area. However, the roading network will need to be considered as part of any redevelopment of Kaiapoi West.

#### 7.1.4.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

## 7.1.5 DUDLEY DRAIN AND STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

One commenter supported the widening and regeneration of Dudley Drain. Another commentator supported enhancement of the Dudley Stream for wildlife and humans.

Te Runanga and Ngai Tuahiri support the inclusion of environmental enhancements to this area as they will contribute to supporting mana whenua and Ngāi Tahu values, and will provide a positive response to flood risk within the area.

### 7.1.5.1 DISCUSSION

In his 3 Waters Technical report Mr Simpson states that the objectives of the proposed Dudley Drain reserve are to allow for the drain to be repaired (retaining walls along its banks were damaged in the earthquakes) and to allow for the drain to be regenerated to improve amenity. As this drain is upstream of the Dudley Drain pump station, he considers it to be part of the Council's network, as opposed to a receiving environment. Therefore he is not proposing any aquatic habitat work but the planting will be native and will enhance the environment adjacent to the drain. The proposed reserve width is 20m (approximately 10m either side of the drain) and will provide an opportunity for a pathway linkage. However, he notes that the width of the reserve may need to be increased if intensive business development was to be proposed immediately adjacent to the reserve.

Mr Simpson states that it is likely that a Stormwater Management Area (SMA) will be required to address the increase in the impervious area in the proposed business area. This will be dependent on the nature and extent of the impervious area proposed by the future development and whether the existing stormwater system has the capacity to accommodate the increased flows.

### 7.1.5.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

## 7.2 KAIAPOI SOUTH

### 7.2.1 INTRODUCTION

58 comment points were received on the Kaiapoi South Regeneration Area. Of these: 36 were in support; 19 were in partial support; two were in opposition; while one was neutral. Specific comments received are considered below. I note that the Kaiapoi Community Board agrees with the land use proposals for Kaiapoi South.

### 7.2.2 BUSINESS AREA (AREA 3)

The pDRP identified this area for business use given the areas close proximity to the existing town centre, the identified flooding and geotechnical risks and identified business and public car parking needs in the town centre.

One commenter opposed car sales yards, suggesting more entertainment areas, cafes, a restaurant and market places, etc as alternatives. Another commenter disagreed with the business use, querying how many yard sale business Kaiapoi needed and stating that a plant nursery is a business that is not

sustainable with the advent of big box retailers. They suggested the land should be allocated for community uses and events.

Four commenters supported some land being used for public car parking, noting this would support businesses in the area. Another commenter considered more parking needed to be provided in Kaiapoi South generally. Another supported a park and ride facility although they did not identify a site for this. Another commenter supported this land use. Another considered that heavy industrial activities were not supported due to the flooding and geotechnical constraints.

One commenter considered that the area lends itself to business use, however yard based activities are not appropriate so close to the town centre. They considered that the business area could also accommodate high density residential, noting that the remediation costs identified for residential land was based on low density housing with large sections whereas high density housing would be more economical. One commenter considered that developing land for business / car parking adjacent to the civic centre was logical and that this area could also be a good location for a community hall. Another commenter considered that the area should be focussed on the establishment of a properly designed, compact and attractive town centre between Williams St, Bowler St, Kaiapoi River and the railway line.

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu oppose the proposed business area which is adjacent to the heritage and mahinga kai area (Area 4). They consider this area should be viewed as significant in its entirety and consider that the business area will have a significant adverse effect on the proposed adjacent Heritage and mahinga kai area which they support due to its significant mana whenua and Ngāi Tahu values.

---

#### 7.2.2.1 DISCUSSION

Section 4 of this report sets out an analysis of business and residential uses in this area, so I will not repeat these here.

In terms of Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu's comment, I note that a significant area has already been set aside in the pDRP for Heritage and Mahinga Kai activities. This particular area is also significant in terms of being immediately adjacent to the Kaiapoi Town Centre and as such it has the ability to support, and in turn be supported by, the Kaiapoi Town Centre. I note that additional public car parking is supported by the parking technical report<sup>11</sup> and a location in this area would support the rebuilt library and the often at capacity existing public car park adjacent to it. I also note that of the regeneration areas, this area has the most potential as a public transport interchange and that this is an option the Council wishes to investigate further.

In terms of the identified parking area, I consider that this should be removed from the spatial plan. A parking area can still be located within Area 3. However, I consider that it is appropriate to determine the specific location of this activity in co-ordination with wider area planning.

As set out in the analysis table for each area, the proposed business use generally meets the objectives of the Minister's Direction, the pDRP's vision and goals and the planning framework. Overall, I therefore consider that business use as proposed in the pDRP is the most appropriate use for this area.

---

<sup>11</sup> Kaiapoi Parking Business Case Model Results and Discussion. Abley Transport Consultants 17 October 2014

### 7.1.2.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- See the recommended amendments proposed in Section 4 of this report.
- Remove the parking 'layer' from the Kaiapoi South Spatial Plan, as per the appended map.

### 7.2.3 HERITAGE AND MAHINGA KAI AREA (AREA 4)

As stated in the Green Space Technical report, the Kaiapoi River, its tributaries, springs and margins are of immense cultural and traditional significance to Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūāhuriri. A Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area was therefore proposed in the pDRP. The proposed future uses focus on restoring and enhancing indigenous fauna and flora with management via a joint management plan between Council, Ngāi Tahu and Ngāi Tūāhuriri Rūnanga.

In terms of comments, one commenter supported this proposal, noting that the recognition of the importance of Maori heritage had been ignored in the past. Another commenter supported this proposed use but noted that the area was being driven over continuously during the whitebait season last year. A marked copy of the Kaiapoi South Spatial Plan was provided showing pathways used to get to the river at the dam area at the end of Raven Quay. Any new planting of trees may be disturbed by this continuing activity. The commenter suggested reinstating the former access road along the stop bank. Another commenter supported this activity. Another commenter supported public access and food production such as apple trees. Another commenter considered it was good to keep the area as natural as possible and take into account the walks which are already in place. One commenter questioned who would look after it.

One commenter suggested that not enough land was planned as ecological/wetland/reserve areas. Conversely another commenter considered too much land was set aside for this but noted that this probably reflects the unstable land and so there was very little else that it could be used for. A commenter requested a dog park be located between Courtenay Drive and the Kaiapoi River. Another commenter stated the Plan lacked clarity on this and questioned what mahinga kai means in reality. They wanted assurances that the area would be available to all people at no cost (presumably as opposed to just mana whenua) and that this should be made clear.

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Ngai Tuahiriri support the proposed heritage and mahinga kai area. They consider that there are significant mana whenua and Ngāi Tahu values identified in the south for the area, adjacent to the Kaiapoi River, particularly in relation to access to mahinga kai areas and past occupation. They consider that there are opportunities to further advance significant mana whenua / To Ngai Tuahiriri Runanga and Ngāi Tahu values of the area and in particular in areas where access to Mahinga Kai and taonga plant species can occur.

#### 7.2.3.1 DISCUSSION

In terms of size, as set out in the Green Space Technical report, in the Kaiapoi South Regeneration Area there is approximately 21.1 hectares of area that could become ecological/wetland/reserve areas. This comprises the proposed Heritage and Mahinga Kai area (8.1 hectares), the proposed recreation and ecological linkage (two hectares) and 11 hectares of existing reserve (NCF Park, Courtenay Drive Drainage Reserve, Courtenay Drive Esplanade Reserve, Courtenay Downs Walkway, The Oaks and the Kaiapoi Riverbanks). I understand that the area proposed for the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area will provide an opportunity to support the cultural values in the identified areas.

In terms of river access, in the Green Space Technical report Ms Flanagan states that the Council has no plans to reinstate the access route along the Raven Quay stop bank, however access to the end of Raven Quay will be maintained from Courtenay Drive through the Courtenay Drive Drainage Reserve. The area is however intended to be fully open for public access and would include walking and cycling tracks. The development of the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area will be subject to a concept plan which will identify this access route so that other activities, such as food forests, are away from the access. It is envisaged that the area will be the subject of a joint management agreement or plan which would form part of the implementation of any approved Recovery Plan.

Regarding a proposed dog park, as set out in the Green Space Technical report it is proposed to locate a dog park in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area (Area 10, south of Cass Street). Dog owners will still be able to walk their dogs in the Heritage and Mahinga Kai areas in accordance with Council's dog control bylaw.

In terms of naturalness, as set out in the Green Space Technical report, the focus of the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area (ecology, Mahinga kai, edible landscapes, heritage recreation and joint management) is consistent with this goal. Walking and cycling links through the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area will also complement existing links and improve connectivity with existing reserves.

In terms of what a Heritage and Mahinga kai area is, I consider that the pDRP did not provide sufficient detail on what this proposed land use is. As set out in the Green Space Technical report I understand that the key outcomes, from a Council Green Space perspective, for the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area are as follows:

- Ecology - restored and enhanced indigenous flora, fauna, habitats, ecosystems and biodiversity, which were once evident in the area, particularly around traditional mahinga kai sites.
- Mahinga kai - sustainable cultural harvest and long-term use of natural resources.
- Edible landscapes - Opportunities for the community to establish and harvest edible landscapes.
- Heritage - restored natural environments and open space that tells the story of the land, the water, and the people. This includes aspects of outdoor education.
- Recreation - public space for informal recreation.
- Management - collaborative management via a joint management plan.

As set out in the Green Space Technical report the following provisions/assets could be included in the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area:

- Walking and cycling access
- Car parking – at a key entry
- Public toilets – at a key entry or gathering point
- Park furniture – seating, picnic tables, litter bins
- Signage – identification and wayfinding signage, interpretive signage to enhance visitor experience
- Trees and gardens – native regeneration, opportunities for edible landscapes
- Play equipment – with an educational, sensing and natural play focus

I note that further information is also provided on this matter in the Heritage and Mahinga Kai report.

### 7.2.3.2 Recommended Amendments

- Provide greater detail in the draft Recovery Plan for Area 4 on what a Heritage and Mahinga Kai area is by adding the following to Section 4.3.2 Area:

“It is intended that the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area will have the following key outcomes:

- Ecology - restored and enhanced indigenous flora, fauna, habitats, ecosystems and biodiversity, which were once evident in the area, particularly around traditional mahinga kai sites.
- Mahinga kai - sustainable cultural harvest and long-term use of natural resources.
- Edible landscapes - Opportunities for the community to establish and harvest edible landscapes.
- Heritage - restored natural environments and open space that tells the story of the land, the water, and the people. This includes aspects of outdoor education.
- Recreation - public space for passive recreation.
- Management - collaborative management via a joint management plan.”

### 7.2.4 RURAL (AREA 5)

The pDRP proposed a rural use for Area 5 given the significant geotechnical and flooding risks associated with this area. Given the proximity to existing residents, restrictions on intensive farming and residential development were proposed.

In terms of comments received, one commenter suggested that future residential activity could occur in this area. Another commenter was concerned that the area would look unsightly and untidy and suggested that the area could be planted with native trees or something more appropriate to a residential area than farmland. Another commenter supported rural activities in this location, just not a lot of paddocks with horses. Another commenter sought that the Council allow model aircraft flying (as it does for Kendall and nine other parks).

One commenter had significant concerns about this activity noting that the area was not practical for rural use given its divided nature and could not support farming given the gravel pads from former houses and existing weeds / trees (e.g. poisonous) plants. They raised the possibility of domestic dog attacks on animals, and that the Courtenay Downs subdivision residents did not purchase the properties expecting rural living issues. They considered that some animal grazing leads to flies, noise and smell, and that cattle yards / ramps will be required. They suggested that the rural land, including fence lines and road verges would need to be maintained in a clean, weed-free, manicured state as befits a residential subdivision. Another commenter wanted “intensive farming” defined.

One commenter suggested a short golf course (par 3 or similar), while another suggested a tertiary institute.

#### 7.2.4.1 DISCUSSION

For comments and recommendations about possible residential or rural residential development in this area see the comments in Section 4 of this report.

In terms of suitability for and management of rural activities as an interim use, sufficient support has been received to warrant this as an interim use. The types of activities, management of adverse

effects, maintenance requirements and lease / rent / sale can be determined as a next step, should the Minister agree to this proposed activity in the final Recovery Plan.

In terms of a golf course, this could be accommodated in this area by resource consent should the Crown wish to create this but it is noted that there is already an existing Kaiapoi golf course in close proximity. As set out in the technical report from Mr Jacka the construction of a tertiary institute may be possible from an engineering perspective providing large scale ground improvement works and specialised foundations are used, but this would not be possible to determine without more detailed assessment.

As set out in the analysis table for each area, the proposed rural use generally meets the objectives in the Minister's Direction, the pDRP's vision and goals, and the planning framework. Overall I therefore consider that rural use is the most appropriate use for this area.

#### 7.2.4.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- See the recommended amendments set out in Section 4 of this report.

#### 7.2.5 NEIGHBOURHOOD PARK (AREA 6)

In the Green Space Technical report Ms Flanagan explains that a neighbourhood park was proposed in the pDRP to serve the residential community between Bowler Street, Courtenay Drive and Courtenay Downs Walkway. While this community did not have a neighbourhood park prior to the earthquakes (the nearest is Jim Bryden Reserve to the south), NCF Park served a neighbourhood park function with its open space and play equipment. Post-earthquakes, this community was physically separated from NCF Park by the regeneration area.

In terms of comments received, four commenters referenced the neighbourhood park (Area 6) in the Kaiapoi South regeneration area. One commenter was opposed to this park as this was located right next to their house when there was plenty of other red-zone land it could be located on. They considered that the existing playground at the end of Courtenay Drive could be upgraded instead. One commenter supported the park, while another also supported it, and proposed exercise equipment around it or a purpose built cycle park for children with stop / give way signs, a roundabout, pedestrian crossings, etc. Another commenter supported the park but noted that it had a lot of road exposure and keeping children safe needed to be carefully considered. Another commenter supported it and sought a boules court.

#### 7.2.5.1 DISCUSSION

In her report Ms Flanagan notes the concern expressed over the location of the park and proposes that instead of providing a stand-alone neighbourhood park in the Kaiapoi South regeneration area, this could be located to incorporate some play elements in the Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area. In her opinion these elements would fit more with the natural experience of this area and are likely to have an educational and 'natural-play' focus. These would enable children to learn about and experience the environment around them.

As Ms Flanagan notes, locating these elements in the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area means however that the Kaiapoi South residential community is largely outside the desirable ten minute walk catchment. However, she anticipates that improved walking and cycling links and the different nature

of the play equipment and features would partially alleviate this. I understand that the final decision to locate these facilities in this area and the design would be determined through the Kaiapoi South masterplanning process. I accept Ms Flanagan’s conclusions.

#### 7.2.5.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Remove Area 6 – Neighbourhood Park from the Kaiapoi South Spatial Plan and show this area instead as Rural, as per the appended Spatial Plan for Kaiapoi South.

#### 7.2.6 RECREATION AND ECOLOGICAL LINKAGE (AREA 7)

Additional recreation and ecological linkages are proposed in the pDRP to improve connectivity between Kaiapoi South and the riverbanks (between Hilton Street and the riverbanks). A further recreation and ecological linkage is proposed to link Courtenay Drive with Courtenay Drive Esplanade Reserve (an existing recreation and ecological linkage reserve) and widens the existing esplanade reserve. The purpose of this green space is twofold. Firstly, it improves connectivity between Kaiapoi South and NCF Park, and it provides a buffer zone between existing reserve area (NCF Park and the esplanade reserve) and potential other land uses.

In terms of comments, one commenter specifically supported this proposal.

##### 7.2.6.1 DISCUSSION

The Green Space Technical report states that in the pDRP a link between Courtenay Drive and the riverbanks, opposite Dawson Douglas Place, was included, but that it is now suggested that this link be incorporated into the adjacent Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area. Ms Flanagan states that this key link is still proposed, and that this is not a physical change but rather a categorisation change.

Similarly, it is suggested that the proposed recreation and ecological linkage extending along the boundary with NCF Park be incorporated into the Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area. This link was originally proposed to improve connectivity between Kaiapoi South and NCF Park, and provide a buffer zone between existing reserve area (NCF Park and the esplanade reserve) and potential other land uses. As set out in the Green Space Technical report, Ms Flanagan considers that the proposed Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area will provide good connectivity with walking and cycling tracks. In addition the Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area and recreation and ecological linkage are similar, and therefore again it is a categorisation rather than physical change.

I agree with these changes as these links are not expressly needed given the proposed permeability of the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area. Should the Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area not form part of any approved Recovery Plan, reinstatement of the recreation and ecological link opposite Dawson Douglas Place and along the boundary of NCF Park should be reconsidered.

##### 7.2.6.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Delete Area 7- Recreation and ecological linkage between Courtenay Drive and the Kaiapoi Riverbanks (opposite Dawson Douglas Place) as shown on the appended Spatial Plan. This key linkage will be provided through the Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area.

- Delete Area 7- Recreation and ecological linkage around the edge of NCF Park. This would not be a physical change but rather a park category change as shown on the appended Spatial Plan. Public access through this area will be via the Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area.

---

## 7.2.7 KAIAPOI SOUTH COMMUNITY EVENTS

One commenter disagreed with the proposals for Kaiapoi South as they sought an area to run community based events from, and stated that the area is an ideal location for a Village Green and Village Common which can be used for carnival and outdoor concerts and entertainment. They stated that the Kaiapoi Promotion Association has been asking for an area to run community based events from.

---

### 7.2.7.1 DISCUSSION

As stated in the Green Space Technical report, Kaiapoi already has a community events space at Trousselot Park and it is considered that there is sufficient room in Area 9 - Recreation and ecological linkage and Area 10 – Sport and recreation reserve on (between Cass Street and Bracebridge Street) for a community event space. I accept this conclusion.

### 7.2.7.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

---

## 7.2.8 KAIAPOI SOUTH SPORT AND RECREATION AREAS

One commenter considered that apart from some designated access ways and a small neighbourhood park, there does not appear to be any provision for sport and recreation activities in Kaiapoi South. They suggested this should be considered.

---

### 7.2.8.1 DISCUSSION

As set out in the Green Space Technical report, it is intended that the entire Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area would be available for informal recreation such as walking, cycling, food and resource gathering, education and community gathering and natural play. The formal sport and recreation areas have been grouped in Area 10 to create a hub close to the town centre and surrounding neighbourhoods. The informal recreation area in Kaiapoi South takes advantage of its natural setting next to the Kakanui and Kaiapoi Rivers, and existing green space areas.

### 7.2.8.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No changes are recommended.

### 7.2.9 KAIAPOI SOUTH ROAD LAYOUT (AREA 8) – COMMENTS AND DISCUSSION

As set out in the Rooding Technical report (attached in the Appendices), Mr Lake states that the vast majority of submissions did not respond to the specific question about their preferred rooding options for Kaiapoi South and made no other specific reference to rooding matters. Those that did express the preferences summarised as follows:

**Table 3: Kaiapoi South – rooding preferences**

Option 1	Option 2
19 (68%)	9 (32%)

Mr Lake concludes that there is therefore a majority of support for the road option preferred by Council and the Kaiapoi Community Board.

In his 3 Waters Technical report, Mr Simpson states that he supports the proposed option of retaining the existing road alignment. While there is still damaged infrastructure in these roads (e.g. the large 1200mm stormwater main that needs to be repaired), by and large the existing 3 waters services are in good condition. Mr Simpson states that realigning the road as per Option 2 in Appendix 5 of the pDRP would have significant costs not currently budgeted for, and would mean that key infrastructure is not located within the road.

In terms of other rooding comments, as set out in Mr Lake’s report, three respondents have expressed concerns about vehicle speeds along Courtenay Drive and this is also representative of feedback from earlier consultation. Mr Lake notes that both rooding options presented would include appropriate speed control measures.

Mr Lake notes that one respondent has called for the reinstatement of the access road that existed pre-earthquake along the true right bank of the river to the eastern edge of the regeneration area. He considers that the stopbank repair/raising works have left insufficient width to reinstate this road and instead it is intended that vehicle access to the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area will be from Courtenay Drive.

#### 7.2.9.1 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

### 7.2.10 KAIAPOI SOUTH 3 WATERS INFRASTRUCTURE

In his 3 Waters Technical report Mr Simpson states that there are existing wastewater and stormwater services through Area 3, which may need to be relocated depending on final land use and landownership. Currently this area slopes away from the road to a central low point running parallel to the river, which may need to be filled and raised to fall out to the road reserve, particularly for any activity that requires the construction of buildings. It is also noted that this area is prone to flooding in the 200 year event, therefore raising of ground levels may be required for proposed building, not just large format retail as indicated in the pDRP. The wastewater main through this area currently services some of the existing private properties in Bowler Street, which will be rationalised and abandoned in the future once an alternative permanent system is provided to service these properties.

In his report Mr Simpson states that the Kaikanui stormwater management area (SMA) is located to the south of this area off the Oaks reserve. This SMA was repaired following the earthquakes, however it is restricted by limited space for access and future expansion (to improve water quality treatment). He therefore considers that a 30m wide strip of land adjacent to the SMA be set aside to transfer to Council for future-proofing the development of the Kaikanui SMA.

In his report Mr Simpson supports retaining the proposed recreational and ecological linkage opposite Charters Street in the heritage and mahinga kai area, as the Council has a key wastewater rising main that is located in the existing walkway. He considers that the development of this reserve needs to consider the presence and access for maintaining / replacing this main in the future.

In his report Mr Simpson states that there is scope to change the location of the proposed wastewater pump stations in the Kaiapoi South area. He considers that locating the pump stations in the proposed Heritage and Mahinga Kai area is not the most appropriate location. I agree with this and note that locating these stations on the opposite side of Courtenay Drive in the proposed rural area means they will be located within the areas they will most likely service. Mr Simpson notes that the design of the pump stations will include landscaping to ensure that the pump stations blend in with the surrounding area and are not an eyesore.

#### 7.2.10.1 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Include a 30m wide strip of land adjacent to the SMA to be set aside to transfer to Council for future-proofing the development of the Kaikanui SMA, as shown on the appended Kaiapoi South Spatial Plan.
- Relocate the proposed wastewater pump stations in the Kaiapoi South area from the proposed Heritage and Mahinga Kai area to the areas they will service on the opposite side of Courtenay Drive in the proposed rural area, as set out in the appended Kaiapoi South Spatial Plan.

### 7.3 KAIAPOI EAST

#### 7.3.1 INTRODUCTION

81 comment points were received on Kaiapoi East. Of these: 39 were in support; 31 were in partial support; nine were in opposition; while two were neutral. Specific comments received are considered below I note that the Kaiapoi Community Board agrees with the land use proposals for Kaiapoi East.

#### 7.3.2 RECREATION AND ECOLOGICAL LINK (AREA 9)

In the Green Space Technical report Ms Flanagan describes the purpose of the recreation and ecological link (Area 9), which wraps around the proposed sport and recreation reserve and rural areas. She states that this green space serves multiple functions:

- Providing a buffer for the residential neighbourhoods to the north of the Kaiapoi East regeneration area
- Enhancing connectivity between the residential neighbourhoods, the town centre and riverbanks, and other recreation areas
- Recreation and ecological links (biodiversity corridors)
- Walking and cycling network

- Opportunities for edible landscapes

In terms of comments, one commenter considered that it was great to have cycle and walkways around the parks and river. Another supported these, noting that they fulfilled the function of “intermediate zones” between existing and proposed activities. One commenter sought the provision of a boules court and keep fit stations. They also sought a learners’ cycle track with a street-like setting to teach children how to ride a bike. Three commenters have requested an additional recreation and ecological link between Feldwick Drive and Moore Street.

Six commenters made specific reference to food forests and/or community gardens. All supported food forests and/or community gardens, and requested various amendments to the pDRP. One commenter stated that the quadrangle formed by the new road extension to Jones Street, Meadow Street, Cass Street and Oram Place would be suitable for a food forest, given its orientation and dimensions, its close proximity to town, and good vehicle and foot traffic for security.

Te Runanga and Ngai Tuahiri support the inclusion of environmental enhancements to this area, as they will contribute to supporting mana whenua and Ngāi Tahu values and will provide a positive response to flood risk within the area.

I note that the majority of the ‘likes’ from the 3D Model Schools sessions were in relation to the sports and recreational areas in Kaiapoi East (Areas 9 and 10).

---

#### 7.3.2.1 DISCUSSION

As set out in the Green Space Technical report, the pDRP identified that recreation and ecological linkages would be an appropriate location for edible landscapes. There are approximately 5.2 hectares of recreation and ecological linkages in the Kaiapoi East regeneration area, including two larger blocks at approximately 5000m<sup>2</sup> (Area 9 between Cass Street and Oram Place, and Area 9 between Blackwell Crescent and Bracebridge Street). There is also the opportunity for edible landscapes within the existing recreation and ecological linkages, such as Corcoran Reserve.

In her report, Ms Flanagan considers it appropriate that edible landscapes could be located within the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area. Edible landscapes are considered a good fit with the Mahinga Kai, natural resource management, education, and community focus of the area.

Ms Flanagan considers it not desirable to identify specific locations for edible landscapes, including food forests, until further more detailed investigation, design and consultation has been undertaken. Identifying specific locations in the draft Recovery Plan would tie the Council and the community to these locations, irrespective of whether they are the most appropriate location. It is considered that identifying broad areas where edible landscapes could be located would still provide flexibility. As part of the implementation of any approved Recovery Plan, the Council would work with groups wanting to develop/manage edible landscape areas. The relocation of existing trees in the regeneration area could be considered at the concept plan stage.

In terms of an additional recreation and ecological link between Feldwick Drive and Moore Street, in the Green Space technical report Ms Flanagan states that this is a sensible suggestion and should be added to the Kaiapoi East regeneration area. This would also give effect to suggestions by two commenters who would like to see a walking/fitness track around Area 12. I accept Ms Flanagan’s conclusions.

### 7.3.2.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Add a recreation and ecological link between Feldwick Drive and Moore Street, as shown on the revised Kaiapoi East Spatial Plan.

### 7.3.3 SPORTS FIELDS (AREA 10)

As set out in the Green Space Technical report, Area 10 is proposed to be a large district sport and recreation reserve centred on Cass Street. The area north of Cass Street could accommodate four full sized playing fields, space for other sport activities such as warm up fields, or a softball diamond, etc. Recreation facilities at the reserve could include a playground and/or youth facility (e.g. half basketball court) and open space for informal play. The area south of Cass Street could accommodate a community BMX track and dog park. These features could be integrated with a stormwater management area proposed for this location.

- The benefits of locating a large sport and recreation reserve in the Kaiapoi East regeneration area include:
- The provision of a district sport and recreation reserve to provide for future population and recreation growth in the district.
- A large recreation cluster close to the town centre and riverbanks area.
- There is good connectivity with the town centre and existing green space.
- The large area enables the required north-south orientation for the sports fields.

There is good vehicle access to the proposed reserve from the existing road network (although it is acknowledged the road alignment and streetscape design is likely to alter).

Twenty eight commenters made specific comment on Area 10 – Sport and recreation reserve. Of these fifteen supported the proposals, including ten requesting a soft ball diamond, eight opposed the proposals and five did not indicate a preference but made comment.

One commenter considered the proposal very sensible, noting that too often recreational facilities are located well away from urban areas and public transport routes. It was suggested that the district indoor sports centre be located between Jones and Charles Street (Areas 15, 16, 17). One commenter sought more parkland in this area, considering that only two sports fields rather than the proposed four were necessary. Two others stated there was no need at all for any of them. Another commenter suggested that the existing sports areas are not fully utilised. Another commenter objected to these fields, stating that they were too close to their house, they didn't need noise every weekend and there were plenty of sports fields in Kaiapoi. They suggested that Area 9 (recreation and ecological link) could be extended through Area 10 and 11. One commenter considered that clearing the land of existing fruit trees for sports fields was an incredible waste of land and destruction of food producing trees, and as a minimum these could be shifted to a designated food forest area. They suggested that the proposed sport fields located between Cass and Grey Crescent be developed into a botanical park with walkway links and cycle tracks instead. Another commenter considered that the fields would only create noise, traffic, litter and unsavoury activity as people often gather at parks after hours. An equestrian centre was proposed as an alternative to rugby fields. Two commenters sought that the sports fields be shifted to Kaiapoi South, with one suggesting Areas 5, 6 and 7. The commenters noted that there is plenty of cleared land in Kaiapoi South (removed trees) and less population than Kaiapoi East. Locating the fields in Kaiapoi East as proposed would require tree removal and would therefore result in less bird life.

One commenter requested adequate parking for the sports fields, as parking on road sides is very disruptive for residents. Two commenters sought that an area be designated for Rugby League in order to shift from Murphy Park where parking is limited and because the area will be subject to flooding in the future with sea level rise. Another commenter supported the proposal, identifying ideas for inclusion in the area such as mini courts with netball / basketball hoops for practice. Another commenter sought that the Council allow model aircraft flying (as it does for Kendall and 9 other parks). Another commenter suggested the inclusion of an 'oval' type sports ground with a pavilion / changing rooms.

Six commenters specifically supported the proposed dog park, but one sought it be shifted south east to be closer and have access to the Kaiapoi River (a map was provided). Another suggested locating it in the Kaiapoi South Heritage and Mahinga Kai area. Three commenters supported the proposed BMX track, with one suggesting roading changes to support this. One commenter sought the removal of all red-zoned houses, as they had themselves left the area.

Sport Canterbury supported the provision of the areas designated for active sport and recreation. They state that as a principle they prefer the development of fewer, larger sport and recreation parks, as opposed to multiple smaller parks. They note that larger parks facilitate sports hubs, have increased flexibility, enable economies of scale for development, are more cost effective maintenance-wise, allow for efficient delivery of sport and recreation, and draw a critical mass of participants.

As indicated earlier in section 4 of this report, a number of commenters sought that the sport and recreation reserve accommodate softball facilities, particularly a skin diamond (a permanent facility with a specialized surface and appropriate fencing).

I note that the majority of the 'likes' from the 3D Model Schools sessions were in relation to the sports and recreational areas in Kaiapoi East (Areas 9 and 10). The most popular recreation type was 'sports facilities' (dance club; netball courts; skate park; rugby stadium; swimming pools; dodge ball; cricket nets and pitch; fitness track; indoor soccer; scooter park; performance stage; baseball stadium; and an indoor skating rink).

---

#### 7.3.3.1 DISCUSSION

In terms of sports field oversupply, in Section 4.6 of the Greenspace Technical report Ms Flanagan states that the Council's level of service for sport and recreation reserves for Kaiapoi is met. However, there will be a shortfall in the District by 2025 (under the current level of service). The proposed sport and recreation reserve (north of Cass Street) resolves this shortfall by providing a district facility. In addition Murphy Park is currently operating at capacity for rugby league, and ten commenters also indicated a desire for softball facilities in the district. The proposed sport and recreation reserve (Area 10) could accommodate a softball diamond.

In terms of extending Area 9 (recreation and ecological linkage) through Areas 10 and 11, Ms Flanagan notes that the spatial plans for the Kaiapoi East regeneration area already include approximately 6.7 hectares for recreation and ecological linkage. Additional recreation and ecological linkage is not considered to be needed in Kaiapoi East.

Regarding loss of trees, I note that there is no evidence as to the quantity, quality or type of trees being lost. Ms Flanagan notes that in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area, the recreation and ecological linkages (Area 9) have been identified as potential locations for edible landscapes (e.g. food forests, urban orchards, community gardens). The Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area in Kaiapoi

South has also been identified as a location for edible landscapes. This provides approximately 15 hectares of land within which edible landscapes could be located. She notes that in addition, existing reserve areas, such as Corcoran Reserve, Askeaton Park and Gray Crescent Reserve, may be suitable for edible landscapes. Ms Flanagan considers that there is ample space provided in Kaiapoi East and Kaiapoi South for edible landscapes.

In terms of loss of specimen / fruit trees, Ms Flanagan states that the concept design of the sport and recreation reserve has not yet been undertaken. At the time of design it would be appropriate and desirable to identify and retain any significant specimen/fruit trees where possible. At this time the Council could also look at the potential relocation of individual trees, however the viability of this would depend on the species, size and health of the tree and the potential costs.

With regard to an indoor sports centre, Ms Flanagan states that the Council has not yet determined the location of a District indoor sports centre and is currently preparing a functional design brief for the project.

Regarding softball, in the Green Space Technical report Ms Flanagan notes that the Kaiapoi Softball club currently uses Kaiapoi Park, a facility it shares with rugby and cricket. There is no permanent skin diamond at Kaiapoi Park. She considers that there is sufficient space at the proposed sport and recreation reserve (north of Cass Street) to accommodate a skin diamond (as well as four full sized playing fields). Given that softball is a summer sport there is also the potential for the playing fields to be used for other sports in the winter off-season.

Regarding rugby league, the Green Space Technical report states that Council staff are aware that Murphy Park is currently operating at capacity for rugby league with the North Canterbury Rugby League Club (Northern Bulldogs) requesting additional junior fields. The club is also looking to expand its temporary clubroom facilities (established post-earthquake following damage and demolition of previous facilities) and there is also a current parking shortfall at the park.

Ms Flanagan notes that as the Kaiapoi Croquet Club have indicated that they do not wish to relocate from Murphy Park; there is therefore a reduced opportunity to create additional playing fields at Murphy Park.

The relocation of rugby league to the proposed sport and recreation reserve (north of Cass Street) is feasible. There is sufficient space to locate four full sized playing fields in a north-south orientation. There is also sufficient space for a clubroom and car parking. It is also considered that rugby league would be a good sporting fit with softball, and the Council would encourage shared use of clubrooms to share costs and consolidate buildings.

Regarding access and parking, the Greenspace Report states that the proposed sport and recreation reserve would have access from Feldwick Drive, Cass Street and Charles Street. Some off-street parking would be provided on the reserve, and this is likely to be accessed from Cass Street so that users can access both sections of the reserve (north and south of Cass Street). The corridor treatment of the new Feldwick Drive link and Cass Street would also take into account the potential traffic generated by the sport and recreation reserve, with access in and out of the surrounding neighbourhoods maintained.

Regarding a proposed equestrian area, in the Green Space Report Ms Flanagan states that there is ample room in the adjacent rural zone for a provider to establish an equestrian area if desired, and that in addition there is also a district equestrian facility for members to use within the Mandeville Sports Ground (a Council sport and recreation reserve).

With regard to the proposed dog park, in the Green Space Technical report Ms Flanagan states that Green Space staff constantly field requests for additional dog parks in the Waimakariri District, particularly in Kaiapoi. Research by Roy Morgan in 2015 found that 34% of people in Canterbury own a dog. Coupled with smaller urban residential sections, people are looking for places to exercise their dogs. Anecdotally, feedback suggests that dog parks also serve a community function whereby pets and their owners can socialise. In terms of a Kaiapoi South location, Ms Flanagan states that a dog park was considered in this area, however, it was considered to be incompatible with the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area. Dog owners will still be able to walk their dogs in the Heritage and Mahinga Kai area in accordance with Council's dog control bylaws. In terms of a river location, Ms Flanagan states that although some dog parks have a water feature for dogs to play in, these are often small streams or lakes, not a significant river such as the Kaiapoi River. She does not consider it appropriate for the dog park to provide access to the Kaiapoi River.

The Green Space technical report states that the other various facilities/elements proposed do not conflict with the primary purpose of a sport and recreation reserve and could be considered when a concept plan for the reserve is prepared. I accept Ms Flanagan's conclusions.

As set out in the analysis table for each area, the proposed sport and recreation use generally meets the objectives in the Minister's Direction, the pDRP's vision and goals, and the planning framework. Overall, I therefore consider that this proposed use is the most appropriate use for this area.

#### 7.3.3.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Provide for a range of sporting facilities by amending Section 4.4.2 Area 10 to read:
- The Council proposes that the area to the north of Cass Street could contain: up to four full-sized playing fields, space for other sporting facilities, junior or warm-up fields, a pavilion and changing rooms, onsite car parking, and space for informal play.

#### 7.3.4 PROPOSED MEMORIAL GARDEN - ASH INTERMENT CEMETERY (AREA 11)

I am advised that due to possible misconceptions about the appearance of the proposed ash cemetery that going forward it will be referred to as a Memorial Garden. I am advised that this more accurately describes its appearance and purpose, and also reflects comments received.

In the Green Space technical report Ms Flanagan states that under the Burial and Cremation Act 1964, local authorities have a duty to establish and maintain a suitable cemetery for persons dying within its District (unless sufficient provision is otherwise made) (Part 1, Section 4(1)). As the population continues to grow there is likely to be a corresponding demand for interment space at the District's cemeteries. The Kaiapoi, Rangiora and Oxford Cemeteries currently have sufficient capacity for the next thirty years for projected interments. Beyond this (2044), additional cemetery space would be required for the District.

Ms Flanagan states that it is often difficult for the Council to establish cemeteries close to established urban areas due to the lack of available and affordable land, and the perceived sensitivity of the land use. The suggested Memorial Garden in Kaiapoi East provides an opportunity for an urban integrated cemetery; one that provides for ash interment in an open garden setting that is also part of the wider open space network.

Thirty one commenters referenced the district cemetery. Of these, sixteen were opposed to the cemetery, with five of these opposed to the location. Ten commenters supported the cemetery, with one suggesting an alternative location. Six commenters did not specify support or opposition, but raised specific issues.

Of those in support, one commenter supported the idea, suggesting that it should be designed as a peaceful and restful garden cemetery like the Ruru Cemetery on Linwood Ave. Similarly, another commenter supported the proposal, seeking a peaceful garden setting and not a large open grassed expanse divided up by concrete strips. One commenter was happy that the cemetery was located on their old plot of land. They considered this proposal was forward thinking by the Council as existing cemeteries will not have capacity in years to come for all the new residents.

One commenter suggested renaming this a memorial garden and relocating this to the area north of Jones Street to be more centrally located, accessible by public transport and near to an existing church and surviving attractive trees. Another commenter supported it being a memorial garden for ash internment (as opposed to an ash cemetery). Another commenter was neutral on the proposal but sought it be shifted to the east end of the area set aside as “rural”.

Of those opposed, one commenter suggested that it was insensitive to locate a cemetery here amongst sport and recreational areas. Another commenter simply opposed locating a cemetery next to a sports field but gave no reasons. This opposition also came through the 3D Model community sessions.

Another commenter opposed this proposal, noting that after a good rain the area is under water. One commenter questioned whether the local Iwi had been consulted as to the cultural sensitivities of this and noted that this activity did not bring in income to businesses in the area. Another commenter noted that the road could get very congested when sport is on. One commenter was concerned the cemetery could eventually become a standard cemetery and noted that the water table was very high in the winter months, noting the possibility of discharges leaking into underground water. Car parking was suggested as an alternative use for the land.

One commenter suggested shifting it beyond the boat ramp while two others suggested shifting it south of Cass Street. Another suggested shifting it by the river at the end of Charles Street as those who have passed on may have had a connection with the river rather than a residential area. Another suggested locating it in the middle of the District Sport and Recreation Reserve (Area 10) while another suggested shifting it eastwards into the proposed rural area. Another suggested locating it by the former Kirk Street reserve. One commenter noted that if the area was not on high ground it would flood in heavy rain. Another commenter considered the area was more than is needed and that it could accommodate the ashes of several hundred thousand people. They suggested a smaller area would be more appropriate and identified area 17 adjacent to St Bartholomew’s Church.

While supporting it, one commenter requested that no spreading of ashes be allowed in or near recreational land. In their comments Te Runanga and Ngāi Tūāhuriri sought to highlight the sensitivities with this proposal and its location in an urban environment and stated that they would like to engage with the Council further on this matter.

#### 7.3.4.1 DISCUSSION

##### *Memorial Gardens Location*

In the Green Space technical report Ms Flanagan considers that locating a cemetery next to a sport and recreation reserve is not a conflict, citing edge treatment, interment hours, and the fact that there have been no complaints in relation to the Rangiora Lawn Cemetery being located immediately adjacent to Maria Andrews Park.

Ms Flanagan has however considered the various suggested relocation options, discounting the relocation of the cemetery to the eastern end of Askeaton Park, the river end of Charles Street, into the rural area (Area 12 east of Feldwick Drive) and the Kaiapoi West Area. However she supports a relocation to south of Cass Street, considering this location appropriate for the following reasons:

- It would be further away from residential neighbourhoods north of Feldwick Drive (where many of the comments in opposition came from).
- It would be accessible via Cass Street and the Charles Street extension.
- It could be easily integrated with the wider open space network.
- It would be immediately adjacent to a residential property in Cass Street. A submission from this address provided an alternative regeneration plan for Kaiapoi East which showed a district cemetery to the immediate east of their property.
- While the area is potentially at greater risk of flooding, the proposal to develop and integrated stormwater management solution (shown in Area 10), should alleviate this.

However, Ms Flanagan does note that the Charles Street extension would require a higher level of service for an additional length (approximately 150-200 metres).

In the Geotechnical Report, Mr Jacka states that both the Gray Crescent and Cass Street locations are susceptible to severe liquefaction, with the Cass Street location also susceptible to major lateral spreading. This means that the Memorial Gardens would need to be carefully designed to manage floatation issues in either location during normal groundwater conditions, as well as flooding and liquefaction events.

I note that relocating the Memorial Gardens as proposed will resolve a number of the comments in opposition to the proposal. I also note that the land north of Cass Street is geotechnically 'better' than the land south of Cass Street. In my opinion siting a low intensity Memorial Garden south of Cass Street enables the 'better' land to the north to be utilised for alternative potentially higher intensity activities. I understand that the Memorial Gardens can be designed for the conditions. For these reasons I support Ms Flanagan's relocation proposal.

##### *Memorial Gardens Size and Interment Type*

As set out on the Greenspace Technical report, the proposed Memorial Gardens, at approximately 2.9 hectares, is comparable with other cemeteries in the Waimakariri District (Kaiapoi Cemetery, 3.1 hectares; Rangiora Cemetery 2.7 hectares; Oxford Cemetery, 4.0 hectares). The number of interment plots will depend on the design of the Memorial Gardens and the mix of different plot types (e.g. lawn berms, garden berms, octagon plots, memorial trees and columbarium). It is intended that the Memorial Gardens would contain a minimum of 3,000 plots. It is expected that this would support the District for in excess of 100 years from the time the Memorial Gardens are established.

While the Memorial Gardens are larger than what is needed for interment, having a larger area enables different interment plots such as octagon plots and memorial trees. Having a large area also leaves significant space for paths, gardens, lawns, trees and parking. There is also the need to accommodate a wide edge to the Memorial Gardens to provide a transition buffer through to adjacent activities.

In response to concerns regarding a standard cemetery and spreading of ashes, Ms Flanagan states that the Council will prepare a management plan for the Memorial Gardens confirming its status as an ash interment cemetery only, with no spreading of ashes, and update the Cemeteries Manual to reflect this.

In response to suggestions of labelling the cemetery a memorial garden, Ms Flanagan states that the proposed cemetery is intended to be a memorial park or garden type cemetery and that it was labelled as a cemetery rather than a memorial garden in the pDRP for transparency to make the community fully aware of the potential future land use. She states that it is likely the cemetery would be formally named as a memorial gardens at the time of its future establishment. I accept Ms Flanagan's conclusions.

---

#### 7.3.4.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Rename Area 11 – District Cemetery as Area 11 – Memorial Garden
- Relocate Area 11 – Memorial Gardens, south of Cass Street to between Area 10 – District sport and recreation reserve and Area 12 – Rural residential as set out in the revised Kaiapoi East Spatial Plan.
- Retain the size of the Memorial Garden at 2.9 hectares.
- Limit the Memorial Gardens to ash interment only, with no scattering of ashes. This would be confirmed in the management plan for the Memorial Gardens, and the Council Cemeteries Manual.
- Amend Section 4.4.3 Area 11 to read (amendments underlined):
- Area 11 is currently zoned Residential 2 in the District Plan. The Council proposes that this area be developed into memorial gardens type cemetery (for cremation interment only). The memorial gardens could contain ash plots, columbarium (for storage of cinery urns), on-site car parking, paths and park furniture, specimen trees and landscape gardening.

---

#### 7.3.5 RURAL (AREA 12)

This pDRP identified this are for rural activities given the significant geotechnical and flooding risks associated with the area. Given its proximity to existing residential areas restrictions were proposed on future land uses to ensure that dwelling houses and intensive farming cannot be established.

In terms of comments received, two commenters did not agree with any of the land being designated rural. They supported the land being used for community-based activities such as sports areas, walkways, community gardens, orchards, dog parks, reserves and recreation areas, sculpture/ artwork an aviary and a paddling pool for picnicking young families. Another commenter stated that there was an opportunity to develop the land and make Kaiapoi a destination, referring to things like an outdoor drive in cinema. Another did not support rural activity, noting that they did not want farm animals near their house. Another commenter considered that rural activities would cause extensive damage to the vegetation in the area and that the plan did not show access ways for vehicles tending stock. One commenter supported a horse or mountain bike track being established around this area. Another commenter wanted pedestrian access through it. Another commenter support rural activities

if managed appropriately, and wondered who would decide on the rural farming, noting smell and noise can be an issue for neighbours. Another commenter suggested having garden allotments with community groups being responsible for an area.

A few commenters sought that a food forest be included to the south of the rural area, noting such things as: the opportunity this could be as a drawcard (ecotourism); that it would be consistent with the community's desires as expressed in the Canvas consultation; it would be a good neighbour; it would support community revitalisation and engagement; it would improve public health; and it would help children learn. They consider that the recreation and ecological linkage areas will not work well for a food forest as they require sheltering trees, and open spaces to allow light in, root crops and ground cover. This activity could be shared with a dog park, sculpture area, picnic area and work out areas and an internment cemetery. Supporting material was provided.

The Woodend Ashley Community Board considered that part of Areas 12 and 13 could be considered for use as grazing for those with horses, including water troughs and jumps for riders. They also sought a walking track around Areas 12 and 13 that could be used for recreation and fitness. These comments were repeated by another commenter.

---

#### 7.3.5.1 DISCUSSION

See the residential comments in Section 4 of this report which are applicable in this area.

For commentary on food forests, see the discussion under Sports Fields (Area 10) in this report. I also note that with the proposed relocation of the Memorial Gardens southwards, this will reduce the area available for a food forest in this location

I support the proposal for a walking track circling the area, as this provides greater connectivity with the other recreation and ecological links proposed

In his 3 Waters Technical report, Mr Simpson states that there is existing underground infrastructure (including a wastewater rising main that serves approximately one third of Kaiapoi) within the Kaiapoi East area, in particular Area 12, that needs to be protected and provisions made to ensure maintenance and replacement can be easily undertaken in the future. This is not only for Council services but other utility providers as well (e.g. Mainpower). He assumes that while Area 12 is shown as converting to rural, the underlying road reserve status will still remain which will give Council and other utility providers continued access for maintenance and replacement of assets. He considers that this is a key aspect that needs to be clearly set out in the draft Recovery Plan.

Mr Simpson notes that there is the Feldwick Drain stormwater pump station located at the south east corner of the Kaiapoi East area. The pump station is old and is programmed to be upgraded but may be replaced at a different location (potentially further back along Feldwick Drain at Beach Road). However, access for maintenance purposes is still required to this pump station, whether this is for the short or long term. Access to this pump station is not clearly shown on the current plan, which essentially could be an extension of the access to the boat ramp.

As set out in the analysis table for each area, the proposed interim rural use generally meets the objectives in the Minister's Direction, the pDRP's vision and goals, and the planning framework. Overall I therefore consider that the proposed land use is the most appropriate use for this area.

### 7.3.5.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- See Section 4 for recommended changes relevant to rural areas
- Append an infrastructure plan to the draft Recovery Plan covering key infrastructure services that need to be maintained in Council owned land
- Show access to the Feldwick Drain stormwater pump station near Askeaton Park.
- Amend the spatial plan for Kaiapoi East to reflect the appended plan.

## 7.3.6 KIRK STREET RESERVE (AREA 13)

Kirk Street Reserve is a neighbourhood park located between Kirk Street and Cass Street. The primary purpose of a neighbourhood park is to provide for local recreation, play and open space. As Kirk Street Reserve is now located in a regeneration area, it no longer serves a neighbourhood as such. It is therefore proposed to uplift the reserve classification of the Kirk Street Reserve.

One commenter supported this proposal to uplift the reserve status. Another highlighted the importance of Norman Kirk in the history of Kaiapoi and suggests that since Kirk Street Reserve is no longer a neighbourhood park, that the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area should be known as the 'Norman Kirk Fields'.

### 7.3.6.1 DISCUSSION

In the Green Space technical report Ms Flanagan considers referencing Norman Kirk and the history of Kaiapoi in any new reserve names is a good suggestion. The Kaiapoi Community Board currently holds the delegation for approving reserve names. It is considered that during the preparation of a concept plan (development plan) for the reserve areas discussion could be had on potential reserve names.

I note that reserves are not able to be uplifted under the CER Act and as such this would need to be undertaken under the Reserves Act.

### 7.3.6.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

## 7.3.7 ACCESS LINK (AREA 14)

The Council proposes that this area is included as a land swap in order to provide an additional walking and cycling link between the Kaiapoi River and the north-eastern section of Kaiapoi.

One commenter supported this link as it is a good access for linking up silver walkway.

### 7.3.7.1 DISCUSSION

In his 3 Waters technical Report, Mr Simpson states that Area 14 east of Feldwick Drain should be separately identified as land to transfer to Council for a potential land swap with the adjacent property owner. This will give an additional 16m (not 10m) along Feldwick Drain to form a reserve for

enhancement of the drain and for amenity purposes such as a walkway linkage and planting. This link should be shown to extend down to the Feldwick Drain stormwater pump station. I accept Mr Simpson's conclusions.

#### 7.3.7.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Area 14 east of Feldwick Drain should be separately identified as land to transfer to Council for a potential land swap with the adjacent property owner. The proposed reserve link along Feldwick Drain should be 5-16m wide (depending on design and land swap negotiations) and extend down to the Feldwick Drain stormwater pump station as shown on the revised spatial plan.
- As shown on the appended spatial plan for Kaiapoi East, re-label the rural area as Area 12 A, subject to the potential land swap.

#### 7.3.8 CAMPERVAN / MOTORHOME OVERNIGHT PARKING (AREA 15)

During consultation during the preparation of the pDRP the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association expressed an interest in establishing a campervan park in the red zone. The Association indicated that a one hectare site would be appropriate and that it would be desirable to be located close to local amenities such the town centre, shops and walking tracks.

The proposed campervan park is shown as Area 15 in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area, covering approximately one hectare. The campervan park would cater for short-stays for self-contained vehicles. The campervan park would be managed by the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association under a leasing arrangement with Council.

In terms of comments, twelve commenters commented on the campervan park. Six commenters supported the idea, two noted that this would encourage more visitors / tourists. Two commenters supported the idea of providing for camping / overnight parking but sought that this be made available for every self-contained vehicle, including tourists, rather than just NZMCA. A composting toilet / additional toilets were suggested, along with rubbish containers. Another commenter supported the proposal noting that this would be a great benefit to the businesses in Kaiapoi and that the proposed location was good, being in close proximity to the supermarket, existing dump station and bus routes. Another commenter considered the proposed area was too narrow and could be incorporated into Area 16, while two other commenters sought to increase the size of the area, with one suggesting adding another entrance, perhaps through the "boat trailer area" onto Jones Street. Another commenter sought to shift it eastwards, with a green buffer between it and the proposed business area. Another commenter recommended shifting it westwards to Area 17 on the west side of Jones Street. One commenter suggested realigning it along the Charles Street frontage. Another commenter suggested that the areas designated rural in Kaiapoi South could be used for this activity. A number of reasons were provided in support of this proposal. One commenter suggested the park be incorporated into the Quality Holiday Park, while another commenter suggested that Kaiapoi needed a camping area for holidaymakers in addition to the overnight motorhome area.

One commenter supported the idea but considered that if this area is for tourists it should not be 'shoved down by an ugly industrial area' and that there is a good opportunity to create an area with a stage, a natural amphitheatre and usable flat space for running community events. Another commenter suggested a freedom camping area with a donation box and moveable units, e.g shipping containers.

One commenter opposed the proposal stating that there are already businesses that support the NZCMA and that this proposal will (presumably negatively) impact on the existing businesses of Kaiapoi. The commenter also questioned the return on investment from leasing the land.

The NZMCA provided a detailed submission setting out background to the association, its membership, how motorhome parks are run and the benefits they provide to the local economy, environment and community. They also support the proposed 1.0 ha Motorhome park but seek a square area as opposed to the proposed rectangle shape to support an inclusive atmosphere and provide better security with only one access point.

---

#### 7.3.8.1 DISCUSSION

In terms of negative impacts on existing businesses, as stated in the Green Space technical report the commenter does not elaborate on what the impacts on businesses will be. The comments from the NZMCA identify that the campervan industry has economic, social and environmental benefits, and that independent market research (commissioned by the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association in 2012) indicates that the average member couple spends on average \$117 per day in the local shops.

Regarding sufficient toilets and rubbish bins, the management of the park by the New Zealand Motor Caravan Association will enable appropriate management and the provision of appropriate facilities.

Regarding making this area available for every self-contained vehicle, not just NZMCA members, in her report Ms Flanagan notes that without the NZMCA managing the campervan park there is the high potential for non self-contained units to use the park. Council leases land to three other private campground operators at Woodend Beach, Waikuku Beach and Kairaki Beach which are available for camping/overnight parking.

Regarding location, shape and size of the area, Ms Flanagan considers that the realignment of the campervan park into an approximate one hectare square fronting Charles Street is sensible and feasible. However she does not support a bigger area, noting that the size of the proposed campervan park was determined on advice from the New Zealand Motor Camp Association. She does not support relocating it into Area 17, as this area is better suited for business activities. In terms of a Kaiapoi South location, Ms Flanagan notes that during the preparation of the pDRP, locating the proposed campervan park in Kaiapoi South was investigated. However, a location in Kaiapoi East was considered more appropriate given:

- The New Zealand Motor Caravan Association expressed interest in a campervan park in this vicinity.
- The close proximity of the existing Council effluent disposal station on Charles Street.
- The close proximity to the supermarket, Kaiapoi Information Centre, Kaiapoi River and associated recreation areas including the riverbanks area.
- A Kaiapoi East location did not conflict with the proposal for a Heritage and Mahinga Kai Area.

I accept Ms Flanagan's conclusions. As set out in the analysis table for each area, the proposed use generally meets the objectives in the Minister's Direction, the pDRP's vision and goals, and the planning framework. Overall, I therefore consider that a campervan / motorhome use is the most appropriate use for this area.

### 7.3.8.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Realign Area 15 – Campervan park to a square profile, with frontage to Charles Street, as shown on the appended spatial plan for Kaiapoi East.

### 7.3.9 PARKING (AREA 16)

As set out in the Greenspace technical report, the Coastguard is currently constructing their new building at Charles Street. As part of this development they also intend to construct a new boat ramp. The Coastguard has indicated that they intend to share the boat ramp facility with the community. This has dual benefits; firstly the ramp would provide safe entry to the river; secondly making the boat ramp available for private recreational use gives the coastguard the opportunity to promote boating safety and education. It is likely that users would need to pay a nominal fee for use to assist with maintenance of the facility.

To support the Coastguard in allowing public access to their boat ramp, the Council considered that parking would be needed for users, including boat trailer parking. A car park (Area 16) was identified in the Kaiapoi East Regeneration Area for this purpose. This car park would also provide parking for those using other Kaiapoi facilities.

One commenter supported the proposed parking but stated that unless there is to be a second boat ramp there should be no need for boat trailer parking and that there is plenty of space where the old BMX track was (Askeaton boat ramp). Two commenters also supported boat parking being relocated to Askeaton, while others noted the distance between the boat parking and the Askeaton boat ramp, indicating this was too far. Another commenter did not support this activity stating that these are noisy activities and will have a negative effect on Kaiapoi's centre. Another commenter said it would be unlikely to be needed more than one or two days a year and considered some of Area 17 fronting onto Charles Street west of Jones Street could be used.

#### 7.3.9.1 DISCUSSION

Ms Flanagan considers that there is already sufficient informal parking at Askeaton Park for the use of the public boat ramp there. The proposed parking adjacent to Charles Street (Area 16) would be to support public use of the Coastguard boat ramp at Charles Street. I accept Ms Flanagan's conclusions.

### 7.3.9.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

### 7.3.10 BUSINESS AREA (AREA 17)

This pDRP proposed this area be identified for a range of business activities, considering these activities to be the most suitable for this area given its proximity to the Kaiapoi Town Centre.

One commenter stated that there was no need for any more car yards in Kaiapoi which another queried how many could Kaiapoi take and what the impact would be on existing businesses. Another suggested that the area between Charles and Sewell Street should be considered for a fire station and associated parking, and a possible St John's ambulance station. One commenter opposed car

sales yards, suggesting more entertainment areas with alfresco dining, cafes and play areas as alternatives. However, they did support parking. One commenter noted that Area 17 had some significant trees which were important to Kaiapoi’s overall landscape and would therefore need protection via the Recovery Plan.

One commenter disagreed with the volume of business land, as well as yard based uses, considering the business zoning should stop at Jones Street. Another suggested they should stop at Sewell Street to make a tighter hub. They considered there was an opportunity to have high density residential within close proximity to the river and new amenity proposed in the Spatial Plan. Another commenter said the proposed expansion of the Business Zone into this area is flawed and will further spread out the Kaiapoi Town Centre and that the focus should be on the establishment of a properly designed, compact and attractive town centre between Williams St, Bowler St, Kaiapoi River and the Railway line.

Another commenter sought that the area east of Jones Street be set aside for the later stages of a food forest.

---

**7.3.10.1 DISCUSSION**

See the discussion under business uses in section 4.

As a result of the proposed campervan park shift, the opportunity has arisen to extend the business area. Given the proposed mixed use in the business areas, and the demand identified in the Property Economics report, I consider it appropriate to extend the business area, as per the appended spatial plan. This will create a business area of 4.5 hectares, adding 0.8 hectares to the earlier proposed business area.

**7.3.10.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS**

- See the recommendations under section 4.
- Enlarge Area 17 as shown on the appended spatial plan.

---

**7.3.11 CORCORAN RESERVE HOLIDAY PARK**

One commenter suggested establishing a Holiday Park with an ablution block and fully equipped kitchen on the Corcoran Reserve between Charles Street and the Kaiapoi River to attract regular campers who support Kaiapoi.

---

**7.3.11.1 DISCUSSION**

I note that this specific proposal is outside the red zone and that, as the land is Council-owned, this proposal could be considered by the Council in the future.

**7.3.11.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS**

- No amendments are recommended.

### 7.3.12 PUMP STATIONS

Three comments were received concerning the pump station located near 51 Feldwick Drive referring to the noise, the effect this would have on dogs and neighbours and that it would block views. Alternative locations were suggested.

#### 7.3.12.1 DISCUSSION

Mr Simpson states in his 3 Waters technical report, that when locating a wastewater pump station, there is always a difficult balance to achieve between finding the optimum location to minimise the depth of the sewer (which affects the cost and resilience) whilst minimising the impact on adjacent properties. Mr Simpson states that the proposed location has been selected as it is at the intersection of two incoming wastewater lines, and therefore minimises the depth of the sewer. The effect on the neighbouring properties has been considered and been accounted for in the following ways:

- The pump station will be constructed below ground, with only an electrical cabinet, fence, and landscaping above ground. The photo below shows a similar pump station located on Hilton Street. This pump station would be very similar and would have minimal visual impact.
- The pump station site is surrounded by landscaping to further reduce the visual impact of the site.
- The pumps are installed approximately 5 metres below ground in the pump chamber and below water level. It is therefore difficult to hear the pumps running when standing on the pump station and it certainly would not be possible to hear the pumps running from the neighbouring boundary.

However, despite the minimal impact the pump station would have on the property at 51 Feldwick Drive, Council staff have reviewed the location and acknowledge there is an opportunity to move it slightly, so that it is 10 metres off the southern boundary of 51 Feldwick Drive, which will further reduce the impacts on that property. The spatial plan has been amended to reflect this change. I support this recommendation.

#### 7.3.12.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Relocate the proposed pump station adjacent to the property at 51 Feldwick Drive to be 10 metres off the southern boundary the property, as shown on the amended Kaiapoi East spatial plan.

### 7.3.13 STORMWATER DETENTION AREAS

Once commenter suggested having one large stormwater basin in Azalea Place rather than two. Another commenter was concerned that these would become “mosquito farms”. Another suggested moving the western one to rural land east of Jolie Street as this would give more flexibility for future uses of recreation land and roading corridors.

#### 7.3.13.1 DISCUSSION

In his 3 Waters technical report, Mr Simpson states that in Kaiapoi East, the position of the two proposed stormwater management areas (SMAs) are indicative only and are based on locating the areas at the existing low points. There are two SMAs as there are two low points, with a localised

high point generally on the alignment of Jollie Street. The final position, shape and size of the SMA's is still to be determined and will be integrated with the adjacent land uses / activities. Mr Simpson notes that the size of the SMAs is dependent on the impervious percentage of the contributing catchment, and therefore any development proposed as part of the draft Recovery Plan will increase the required size of the SMA. In particular, Mr Simpson notes that with the proposed business and parking and campervan park in Areas 15, 16 and 17 the western SMA will need to be bigger than currently indicated to allow for the increased treatment and attenuation of stormwater required.

As set out in his report Mr Simpson considers that there is scope to shift or change the shape of the SMAs to integrate with surrounding land uses, but any significant changes would also increase costs due to additional earthworks. In response to one comment, Mr Simpson notes that it may be possible to amalgamate the SMAs into one area adjacent to Feldwick Drain, but this would require larger more expensive infrastructure to convey the stormwater to this area. Furthermore, he considers that the nature of a SMA is well suited to be adjacent to recreational and ecological links, district sports and recreation reserve (such as the dog park) and rural land uses. He also notes that there is existing Mainpower infrastructure that will need to be taken into account when positioning the SMAs.

In terms of being a 'mosquito farm', Mr Simpson states that this is a consideration that will be addressed as part of the design to ensure the pond depth, configuration of the inlet and outlet, and proposed planting, are appropriate to prevent warm stagnant water occurring (which causes mosquito breeding).

Mr Simpson notes that the type of SMA is likely to be a wet pond, given the high groundwater in the area. This potentially could be a wetland-type pond for stormwater treatment with an adjacent dry detention area for stormwater attenuation. This type of system is similar to the Southbrook Park SMA which is integrated with the adjacent dog park. Mr Simpson notes that the design and construction of the SMA will need to follow the development of the concept plan for the dog park and BMX track. The land for the SMA and associated infrastructure needs to be vested in Council, including a link (road or walkway) from Sewell Street through to the SMA for a route for existing stormwater flows.

I accept Mr Simpson's conclusions.

#### 7.3.13.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Add a link (road or walkway) from Sewell Street through to the SMA for a route for existing stormwater flows as shown on the revised Kaiapoi East Spatial Plan.
- Shift the western SMA eastwards as shown on the revised Kaiapoi East Spatial Plan.

#### 7.3.14 KAIAPOI EAST ROAD LAYOUT (AREA 18)

As stated in the Roding technical report, the vast majority of submissions did not respond to the two specific questions about their preferred roading options for Kaiapoi East and made no other specific reference to roading matters. Those that did express a preference are summarised as follows:

**Table 4: Kaiapoi East – roading preferences**

Option 1	Option 2	Option 3	Option 4
18 (60%)	7 (23%)	4 (13%)	1 (4%)

Mr Lake states that among those that expressed a preference, there was a majority of support for the road option preferred by Council and the Kaiapoi Community Board (Option 1).

A number of commenters have noted the importance of access to the existing boat ramp in Askeaton Park, which is currently accessed from Hall Street. Five commenters expressed concern about dust and undesirable driving behaviour and suggested that this road be sealed.

Two commenters requested a walking link between Moore Street and Feldwick Drive. Five commenters have requested a bridge over the Kaiapoi River to provide a cycle/walking link between Kaiapoi South and Kaiapoi East.

One commenter has expressed a concern about traffic congestion in the local streets generated by the potential sports facilities in Kaiapoi East. One commenter is unhappy that options for a new access road in Kaiapoi East, which were consulted upon in March 2015, have been significantly modified for the Recovery Plan.

---

#### 7.3.14.1 DISCUSSION

The following is set out in the Roading technical report (refer appendices).

##### *Askeaton Park Boat Ramp Access*

The current proposal is to create a new unsealed (gravel) road, wide enough for boat trailers to pass, as this is appropriate in terms of level of service versus cost. The geometry of this new access road will follow the “paper road” which exists off the eastern end of Charles Street, although the exact alignment and any land requirements will need to be confirmed through design. The road would be engineered to a standard appropriate to the poor ground conditions. Consideration should be given to sealing this proposed road.

##### *Cycle and Walking Routes*

A walking link between Moore Street and Feldwick Drive would be desirable in terms of improved connectivity through the area. Therefore it is proposed to revise the plan to include a recreational and ecological link between Feldwick Drive and the existing walkway along the eastern boundary of the Regeneration Area.

A bridge over the Kaiapoi River to provide a cycle/walking link between Kaiapoi South and Kaiapoi East would provide opportunities to connect the pathways and cycleways on each side of the river. However consideration should be given to whether a new bridge is within the scope of the Plan. Further work would be required to assess its feasibility and whether it would provide sufficient benefits to justify the cost. The views of the Green Space Team should also be obtained to determine how a new bridge might fit in with their reserves plans.

##### *Traffic Behaviour*

In terms of concern about traffic congestion in the local streets generated by the potential sports facilities in Kaiapoi East, the intention is that off-road parking will be included in the facility and that the main access will be from Cass Street rather than the residential roads to the north.

### *Previous Consultation on Roading Options*

In terms of previous consultation options, changes have been necessary to create areas of sufficient size and layout for the proposed future land uses. The current proposals make better use of the existing road network and seek to optimise the length of new road required to serve the proposed future land uses.

### *Changes to Kaiapoi East Proposed Road Layout*

As a result of submissions received, the proposed Memorial Garden (ash internment cemetery) has been relocated to the south of Cass Street. Access will be via Cass Street and/or the extension of Charles Street that will service the Askeaton Park boat ramp. Relocation of the Memorial Gardens and the Crown's acquisition of 7 Nandina Place, have provided the opportunity to revise the proposed road layout and maximise the rural land use area. It is now proposed to access 10 Feldwick Drive from Cass Street, removing the need to reinstate most of the damaged section of Feldwick Drive.

I accept the conclusions of Mr Lake.

#### 7.3.14.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Amend the roading plan as set out in the revised spatial plan for Kaiapoi East appended to this report.

## 7.4 PINES BEACH

### 7.4.1 INTRODUCTION

52 comments were received on the Pines Beach section of the pDRP. Of these: 35 supported the proposals; nine provided partial support; seven were in opposition; and one was neutral. Specific comments received are considered below. I note that the Kaiapoi Community Board agrees with the land use proposals for The Pines Beach.

### 7.4.2 POTENTIAL PRIVATE LEASE (AREA 19)

The pDRP identifies two options for Area 19. Option 1 involves the area being vested in the Council and being leased back to private individuals nor non-permanent structures. Option 2 involves the area being vested in the Council and being leased for rural land uses.

One commenter supported the idea but wondered what the process would be in determining who was able to be the private leaseholders and what they could do on the land. Another commenter opposed the idea considering the Council was profiting off others misfortune. One commenter sought further residential development at the Pines as freehold rather than leased as the infrastructure is already there and the cost of maintenance could make it unaffordable for such a small community. Further redevelopment would mean property values would increase. Another commenter disagreed with the proposal and stated that Pines needed rebuilding on Dunns Ave with permanent houses or move temporary housing onto those sites for reasonable rent. They considered Pines was a 'ghost town' with plenty of open space but not enough houses. Others sought that this land be offered back to the owners first. Three noted that selling the land would be the simplest option. Three commenters considered the western block would be suitable for rural leasing, while the north eastern block would

be suitable for lease similar to Area 23. Another commenter simply wanted an allowance for some residential activities to return.

One commenter sought to encourage low intensity residential housing similar to the temporary housing that occurred at the Kaiapoi Domain. One commenter considered that as permanent buildings were not allowed the proposal should be scrapped and the land added into the proposed reserve space.

One commenter preferred Option 2 for this area, considering that Option 1 could lead to a shantytown type of development with caravans. They considered Option 2 was more in keeping with the new look for the area. Two commenters were similarly concerned that Pines would become untidy if it became an outdoor storage area (e.g. for wood, cars, boats), and this was also raised through the 3D Model community sessions. One preferred a BMX track, playground, native tree planting and picnic areas while the other preferred grass. Another commenter suggested mini golf and a paddling pool. Two commenters supported no buildings on leased land but no reasons were given.

One commenter requested that this area be amalgamated with Rinaldi Reserve.

The Crown stated that if there are areas at risk of inundation (as identified by technical experts) as a result of sea level rise, the Crown's initial view is that the draft Recovery Plan should provide for mechanisms to ensure permanent dwellings are not able to be established in those areas in the future. Such a decision should not preclude interim built uses and activities. The Crown notes that further discussion will be required about ownership and management responsibility for such land.

---

#### 7.4.2.1 DISCUSSION

The proposed change in land use from the previous residential development has been strongly influenced by the Technical Advisory Panel Report which identified The Pines Beach regeneration area as being not suitable for residential development as the area would be impacted by shoreline retreat due to passive water inundation from sea level rise. Given this technical advice and some of the comments received, I consider that permanent structures should be restricted in Area 19. However temporary activities could be appropriate as set out in the pDRP and should be further explored in consultation with The Pines Beach community.

As stated in Section 4 of this report, a natural hazards Waimakariri District plan change is anticipated to be progressed this year by the Council. This plan change will cover The Pines Beach and Area 19, and the issue of sea level rise.

In terms of amalgamation with the Rinaldi Reserve, as stated in the Greenspace technical report this was considered during the preparation of the pDRP, however Rinaldi Reserve is currently not used for reserve purposes (it is leased for grazing) and additional reserve area is not considered necessary to meeting the Council's level of service for The Pines Beach.

In his 3 Waters technical report, Mr Simpson states that there is existing drainage infrastructure in the section of Kay Avenue shown to be changed to a Council reserve that needs to be protected along with another pipe across Area 19. There is also a damaged section of pipe through the Council land opposite McGarry Reserve. It is understood that this land will become part of the recreation and ecological reserve, but this needs to be made clear in the draft Recovery Plan. These pipes need to be protected, and provisions made to ensure that maintenance and replacement can be easily undertaken in the future.

#### 7.4.2.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No amendments are recommended.

#### 7.4.3 TŪHAITARA COASTAL PARK (AREA 20)

In the pDRP, land east of Dunns Avenue and Batten Grove is proposed to be amalgamated into the Tūhaitara Coastal Park (Area 20).

Three commenters supported the land going under the control of the Tūhaitara Coastal Park. One commenter sought horse grazing and a dog park to be provided for at Pines Beach and the land remain as Council – owned land, rather than be included in the Tūhaitara Coastal Park. Others sought that the land should not be amalgamated into the Coastal Park. One commenter was opposed to the possibility of a commercial venture on land between Reid Memorial and Chichester Street. Three commenters could not support the proposal without further information on the Trust’s plans and how they are going to fund them. Another commenter provided conditional support for this proposal and developing the area for recreational activities, ecological enhancement and restoration planting so long as the Trust is in a position to do so with adequate resourcing and that they inform residents of their proposals. Another commenter sought further clarification in regards to the intended use of the land and that private land owners must be kept informed. Concerns over maintenance were also raised through the 3D Model community sessions.

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Ngai Tuahiriri support the proposal as outlined. They consider that there are significant mana whenua / Te Ngai Tuahiri Runanga and Ngāi Tahu values in the Pines Beach area which was a rich Mahinga Kai resource. The adjacent Tūhaitara Coastal Reserve is acknowledged as strong significance to Mana Whenua and Ngāi Tahu.

Te Kohaka o Tūhaitara Trust supports this proposal. They consider that this area would allow the Trust to establish a significant southern entrance point to the Park, with defined access points, information signage and possibly a kiosk or structure. They state that over time this area would be heavily planted with native species to support the few remaining native garden plants.

#### 7.4.3.2 DISCUSSION

As stated in the Green Space technical report, Green Space staff do not consider that additional reserve land in The Pines Beach is needed to meet its current levels of service. Ms Flanagan considers that Area 19 could be used for horse grazing in a similar way that Rinaldi Reserve is currently leased and used. She also states that a second dog park has not been considered for The Pines Beach/Kairaki, as there are significant reserves in the area for dog walking.

Turning to the issues associated with the development and maintenance of the land, Ms Flanagan states that this would be the responsibility of the Trust. I consider that that it is important that the Trust meaningfully engages with The Pines Beach community in land use proposals and that any proposals have identified funding and a maintenance programme before changes are made to the use of these areas by the Trust.

#### 7.4.3.3 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Add as the second bullet point to Section 4.5.2 Area 20, Key Actions and Stages section the following:

“Should the area be incorporated within the Tūhaitara Coastal Park, the Te Kohaka o Tūhaitara Trust will prepare a management plan for Area 20 in consultation with stakeholders, including The Pines Beach community.”

---

#### 7.4.4 RECREATIONAL AND ECOLOGICAL LINKAGE (AREA 21)

- Area 21 is proposed to be vested in the Council as an ecological reserve, providing an attractive entrance to The Pines Beach.
- Five commenters supported this proposal, but no reasons were given.

---

##### 7.4.4.1 DISCUSSION

As stated in the Green Space technical report, while additional reserve is not considered necessary in The Pines Beach to achieve Council’s current level of service, it was considered desirable to protect the entrance to the township. The proposed recreation and ecological linkage surrounds existing Council land, and could have landscape planting and appropriate signage to create an attractive entrance.

##### 7.4.4.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No changes are recommended.

---

#### 7.4.5 RECREATIONAL EQUIPMENT

Once commenter requested that a skate park, swings and kids paddling pool should be developed. They also considered that a mobile coffee shop would work well here.

---

##### 7.4.5.1 DISCUSSION

It is understood that a skate park and swings are contained within The Pines Oval which is outside of the regeneration area and is not covered in the pDRP. I consider that, given the close proximity of Pines Oval to Area 21, there is no need to replicate the play equipment. I am unclear about the need for a paddling pool but note that the Council could provide one if appropriate. I note that a mobile coffee shop could establish in a number of places.

##### 7.4.5.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No changes are recommended.

## 7.5 KAIRAKI

### 7.5.1 INTRODUCTION

59 comments were received on the Kairaki section of the pDRP. Of these: 36 support the proposals; 17 were in partial support; 15 were in opposition; and one was neutral. Specific comments received are considered below. I note that the Kaiapoi Community Board agrees with the land use proposals for Kairaki.

### 7.5.2 POTENTIAL PRIVATE LEASE (AREA 23)

A number of comments were received about the potential private lease of this area. One commenter (a previous landowner) supported the idea but wondered what the process would be in determining who was able to be the private leaseholders and what they could do on the land. They queried whether they would be given priority of first chance to lease their original land back. One commenter considered selling the land would be the simplest option. Some commenters were concerned that this might enable a lot of makeshift caravans, and sheds and outdoor storage which could be unsightly or create a shanty town and that this needed to be avoided, including restrictions on subleasing and camping, or alternatively just planting the area in native trees. This was also raised through the 3D model community sessions.

Two commenters supported the proposal but said there needed to be consultation with private adjacent landowners and the leases needed clear conditions. Another commenter opposed the idea, considering the Crown was profiting off others misfortune. One commenter agreed that there should be no permanent buildings on leased land, and that the leases needed to be issued in a fair manner, with consultation with affected private land owners regarding permitted activities.

One commenter sought further residential development at Kairaki as freehold rather than leased, as the infrastructure is already there and the cost of maintenance could make it unaffordable for such a small community. Further redevelopment would mean property values would increase. Others specifically requested that this land should be returned to private ownership, including being offered back to the former owners first. Another commenter considered that some housing, designed to mitigate possible flooding conditions be developed. Another commenter simply wanted an allowance for some residential buildings to return, as the services were already there. One commenter specifically sought retention of the existing Residential 3 zoning to manage many of the concerns.

The Crown stated that if there are areas at risk of inundation (as identified by technical experts) as a result of sea level rise, the Crown's initial view is that the draft Recovery Plan should provide for mechanisms to ensure permanent dwellings are not able to be established in those areas in the future. Such a decision should not preclude interim built uses and activities. The Crown notes that further discussion will be required about ownership and management responsibility for such land.

#### 7.5.2.1 DISCUSSION

The proposed change in land use from the previous residential development has been strongly influenced by the Technical Advisory Panel Report which identified the Kairaki regeneration area as being not suitable for residential development as the area would be impacted by shoreline retreat due to passive water inundation from sea level rise. Given this technical advice and some of the

comments received, I consider that permanent structures should be restricted in Area 23. However, temporary activities could be appropriate as set out in the pDRP and should be further explored in consultation with the Kairaki community.

As stated in Section 4 of this report, a natural hazards Waimakariri District plan change is anticipated to be progressed this year by the Council. This plan change will cover Kairaki and Area 23, and the issue of sea level rise.

In his 3 Waters technical report, Mr Simpson states that there are existing drainage swales protected by easements through Area 23. These need to be protected and any private leases would need to allow for the presence of the drainage swales and ensure future maintenance or replacement is not compromised.

#### 7.5.2.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- No changes are recommended.

#### 7.5.3 TŪHAITARA COASTAL PARK (AREA 24)

In the pDRP, land east of Featherstone Avenue is proposed to be amalgamated into the Tūhaitara Coastal Park (Area 24).

Three commenters supported the idea generally. Other commenters were concerned as they had no idea what the Trust was planning to do with the land and how they were going to fund the proposed land uses, so it was difficult to comment. One commenter wanted the opportunity to lease land on their northern boundary for more recreational facilities like a tennis court. One commenter opposed the idea as they did not want native scrub next door bringing in rats and mice and fire hazards. They preferred grass. Fire hazard was also raised by another commenter who noted that the area would need to be maintained to mitigate this risk. Funding for this was raised as a concern. Concerns over maintenance were also raised through the 3D Model community sessions.

Other commenters sought further clarification in regards to the intended use of the land and that private land owners must be kept informed. One commenter disagreed with the amalgamation as it surrounds existing residential properties with Trust land. How the land was maintained and any future plans were seen as important for the remaining residents who wanted to have input into this planning.

Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu and Ngai Tuahiriri support the proposal as outlined. They consider that there are significant mana whenua / Te Ngai Tuahiri Runanga and Ngāi Tahu values in the Kairaki area which was a rich Mahinga Kai resource. The adjacent Tūhaitara Coastal Reserve is acknowledged as strong significance to Mana Whenua and Ngāi Tahu.

Te Kohaka o Tūhaitara Trust supports this proposal. In their comment the Trust stated that the previous residential sections would offer opportunities for extensive native planting, the placing of community recreation facilities, some of which have already been raised through community submissions (e.g. a tennis court). The Trust also sees the five southernmost parcels of Area 24 supporting sympathetic commercial activities to assist the Trust to maintain and develop the portion of Tūhaitara Coastal Park and seek these be transferred as fee simple to support this, or classified as Local Purpose Reserve under the Reserves Act 1977. The area also provides the opportunity to develop community gardens and mahinga kai sites.

The Trust comment also provides details on how it may afford to maintain and develop the lands. This includes a negotiated maintenance transition period for mowing and other maintenance activities, commercial partnerships similar to those operating at Otukaikino Reserve, leasing of lands for recreation facilities, boat storage sites, carbon sequestration areas and other sympathetic commercial opportunities, consistent with the Reserves Act to support the maintenance and development of the areas proposed for inclusion in the Coastal Park.

#### 7.5.3.1 DISCUSSION

As set out in the Green Space technical report, Ms Flanagan does not consider that additional reserve land in Kairaki is needed to meet its current levels of service. In terms of issues associated with the development and maintenance of the land, I consider that that it is important that the Trust meaningfully engages with the Kairaki community on land use proposals and that any proposals have identified funding and a maintenance programme, before changes are made to the use of these areas by the Trust.

#### 7.5.3.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Add as the second bullet point to Section 4.6.2 Area 24, Key Actions and Stages section the following:

“Should the area be incorporated within the Tūhaitara Coastal Park, the Te Kohaka o Tūhaitara Trust will prepare a management plan for Area 24 in consultation with stakeholders, including the Kairaki community.”

#### 7.5.4 TŪHAITARA COASTAL PARK EXTENSION (AREA 24A)

This area is identified for further discussions regarding amalgamation into the Tūhaitara Coastal Park should Area 24 be amalgamated into the park.

One commenter suggested that if this proposed proceeded that it should be arranged that access for the fire brigade water supply is maintained. Three commenters noted that this area was not part of the red zone and that this area should be deleted from the Plan.

Te Kohaka o Tūhaitara Trust supports this proposal. In their comment the Trust states that this is a narrow strip running between the Trust land to the east and the previously residential properties on the eastern side of Featherston Avenue. This land is higher than the residential sections and would form the basis of a coastal protection indigenous back dune forest, providing protection for the Kairaki community from projected sea level rise and support the biodiversity network linking the Waimakariri and Ashley Rakahuri through Tūhaitara Coastal Park.

#### 7.5.4.1 DISCUSSION

As stated in the Green Space technical report it is acknowledged that Area 24a does sit outside the regeneration area. However it was included in the pDRP to show the potential link between the existing coastal park and Area 24. While the amalgamation of the Council-owned Area 24a can be undertaken outside of a recovery plan, I note that the Section 6.3 of the Statutory Direction provides for additional areas to be included in the Recovery Plan if this is justified.

In terms of alternative uses for this area, I note that Ms Flanagan does not consider that additional reserve land in Kairaki is needed to meet its current levels of service and as such this land is not needed for reserve purposes. While Ms Flanagan considers that the Council does not need additional reserve land, the Council-owned land in Area 24a is not actively managed by Council. She indicates this area could therefore benefit from active management which it would get if potentially used by the Trust in the Coastal Park.

As stated in the Green Space technical report, Ms Flanagan recommend that the wording for Area 24a on the Spatial Plan is amended to remove the word ‘amalgamation’ as other options exist for including or bundling this area in with the Coastal Park. I accept Ms Flanagan’s conclusions.

#### 7.5.4.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Reword the Kairaki Spatial Plan description for Area 24a as follows:

“Should Area 24 be amalgamated in the Tūhaitara Coastal Park, the Council supports discussion on further Council-owned land being used for the Coastal Park.”

---

#### 7.5.5 CAR PARK RESERVE (AREA 25)

As part of the Kairaki regeneration area the nearest available section to the Sailing and Power Boat Club is proposed to be added to the Kairaki Beach Car Park Reserve.

Two commenters noted that the land next to the sailing club (known as the Griffith’s Section) is proposed for car parking but that the original proposal was for a rigging area for the sailing club. The commenters sought that this area is identified as a rigging only area. The Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club identified public safety and possible vehicle damage resulting from members rigging their boats in the existing public car park.

The Woodend Ashley Community Board also supported this area being a rigging area, and picnic area when boats are not accessing the water. Another commenter sought that this area be a boat park. Another commenter sought it be a parking and rigging area. Three commenters sought that this area not be amalgamated into the existing Kairaki Beach Car Park but be leased to and maintained by the Yacht club. This suggestion was also made by the Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club and another commenter.

Four commenters oppose the inclusion of the Kairaki playground into the Kairaki Beach Car Park Reserve.

---

##### 7.5.5.1 DISCUSSION

As set out in the Green Space technical report, Area 25 is proposed to be leased to the Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club for their use as a rigging and/or boat storage area. This is consistent with the comments received.

In terms of amalgamation of the Kairaki playground into the Kairaki Beach Car Park Reserve, in the Green Space technical report Ms Flanagan states that there are no plans to remove the Kairaki playground and replace this with car park. The Kairaki playground is located in the Kairaki Reserve

next to the Kairaki Beach Car Park Reserve. The Kairaki Reserve label was omitted from the Kairaki Regeneration Area map. I accept Ms Flanagan's conclusions.

In his 3 Waters technical report, Mr Simpson states that there is a pipe through Area 25 which is protected by an easement. This needs to be protected, and any private leases would need to allow for the presence of pipes and ensure future maintenance or replacement is not compromised.

#### 7.5.5.2 RECOMMENDED AMENDMENTS

- Amend Section 4.6.3 Area 25 to read:

“The Council proposes that this area be vested in the Council as reserve and be amalgamated into the Kairaki Beach Car Park Reserve. This area could then be made available for lease to the Waimakariri Sailing and Power Boat Club for boat rigging and storage. This is the preferred use for the area as the Kairaki Beach Car Park is a heavily used asset.”



## OFFICERS REPORT – APPENDICES

*(Contained in a separate printed volume)*

Appendix 1 – Experience and Qualifications of Reporting Officer

Appendix 2 – Report on 3D Model – School Sessions

Appendix 3 – Report on 3D Model – Community Sessions

Appendix 4 – Recommended Spatial Plan

Appendix 5 – Planning Analysis Table

### ***Technical Expert Reports***

Appendix 6 – T and T Geotechnical Technical Report

Appendix 7 – Colliers Valuation and Economic Feasibility Technical Report

Appendix 8 – WDC Three Waters Technical Report

Appendix 9 – WDC Roading Technical Report

Appendix 10 – WDC Green Space Technical Report

### ***Technical Memorandums***

Appendix 11 – Impact Assessment Memo

Appendix 12 – WDC Natural Hazards Plan Change Memo

Appendix 13 – WDC Kaiapoi River Rehabilitation Memo