

REPORT

TO: Chair of Proposed Selwyn District Plan Hearing Panel

FROM: Robert Love – Team Leader Strategy and Policy

DATE: 19 March 2021

SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE OF LATE SUBMISSIONS ON THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN

RECOMMENDATION

That:

- a) all late submissions received up to the date of this report, and included as part of this report are accepted and be included in the summary of submissions; and*
- b) no late submissions (excluding further submissions) received after the date of this report will be accepted.*

1. PURPOSE

To accept submissions that Selwyn District Council has received on the notified Proposed District Plan post close of the submission period (11 December 2020).

2. HISTORY/BACKGROUND

The procedure set out in Selwyn District Council's policy manual (R501) regarding late submissions is to have the Hearing Commissioner(s) consider the late submissions and determine if they should be accepted and included in the summary of submissions.

As part of this consideration the Hearing Commissioner(s) shall take into account the following:

- a) The Council's duties under Section 37A of the Resource Management Act 1991;
- b) The principles of natural justice; and
- c) Any views expressed on the matter by the applicant, the late submitter, any other affected party, and the Council's Reporting Officer(s).

3. DISCUSSION

To accept the late submissions received as of 19 March 2021 to be included as part of the summary of submissions.

By accepting these late submissions attached at **Appendix A** it has been determined that:

- the Proposed District Plan process will not be delayed by their acceptance due to the summary of submission process being carried out until this point;
- no parties will gain anything or prejudice the process by submitting a late submission up to the point where it can be included in the summary of submissions; and

- some of the late submissions have genuine reasons for lateness that in the interests of natural justice should be accepted.

4. OPTIONS

- a) To accept the recommendation to accept the late submissions;
- b) To partially accepted the recommendation by only accepting some of the late submissions; or
- c) To reject the recommendation and not accept the late submissions.



Robert Love
TEAM LEADER STRATEGY AND POLICY

DECISION

Having considered the reasons for lateness provided by the submitters (as set out in Appendix A attached to Mr Love's report), my decision is that Option 4(a) above is adopted for the bullet point reasons set out in section 3 of Mr Love's Report.

In adopting that option, and therefore accepting Recommendations a) and b) set out at the commencement of Mr Love's Report, I acknowledge that no late submissions (excluding further submissions) received after 19 March 2021 will be accepted by the Council.



Rob van Voorthuysen
Chair of Proposed Selwyn District Plan Hearing Panel
24 March 2021

Appendix A – Late Submissions

Submitter ID	Name	Date Received	Provision	Summary of Submission	Late Reason
DPR-0293	Patrick & Lisa Cooper	11/12/2020 – 6:21pm	SASM Nga Turanga Tupuna Overlay	Opposes as considers the reasons for introducing an additional overlay is unclear. The ambiguity surrounding the intention of this addition is concerning as to what the future may hold for farmers within the catchment.	“Unforeseen work commitments submission was submitted approximately 6pm on the 11 th of December. Reasons why our submission should be included is due to our farm being located close to Lake Ellesmere and the proposed overlays and amendments may potentially have a significant effect on our dry stock farm.”
			SASM-R6	Consider that this could capture shelter belts, regenerative and riparian plantings and that a requirement to obtain a resource consent is another unnecessary burden on farmers. The enhancement to the environment, benefits of shade and shelter would certainly out way any potential risks.	
			SASM-R2	Considers that requiring a resource consent to drive a post further than 200mm is ridiculous. Adding additional compliance costs when there is no significant or potential risk to either the environment or neighbouring properties is unnecessary.	
DPR-0355	Ellis Darusette	14/12/2020	Re-zone	Rezoning Part RS 5192 (CB15K/1489) is both appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth and development of Rolleston and meet the requirements of the NPS-UD 2020.	“Aston lodged a submission on the Proposed Selwyn District Plan on behalf of Ellis Darusette by email on Monday 14th December at 10.53am. This was less than one working day after the submission period closed on Friday 11th December at 5pm. We request on behalf of Ellis Darusette that the submission be accepted as a late submission. No parties will be affected as it was lodged only 2 ½ working hours after the
			Development Area	Not specified	

			UG-P13	Not specified	submission period closed. Aston lodged a significant number of submissions on the Proposed District Plan (21 in total), all others on time. The Ellis Darusette submission was fully prepared and ready to lodge well within the submission period. Failure to lodge on time was simply an administrative oversight. In the circumstances, we consider it is entirely appropriate for the submission to be accepted as a (very slightly) late submission."
DPR-0455	Paul & Fay McOscar	12/12/2020	Plains Flood Management Overlay	Glentunnel sits on a plateau around or over 20 metres above the general flow and riverbed. Should Glentunnel be affected even in the heaviest of rainstorms, tornados, etc., many villages, farmland properties downstream including houses would be wiped off the map	"I'm sure if you look at the original email you'll see that it bounced back from a SDC email address that I may have entered incorrectly. If I recall I sent the original email the evening before the deadline. I submitted it in good faith assuming you'd note the redirected email realising I'd just missed the deadline. If you want to play by the rules go ahead but I think it's sad not displaying any flexibility, but that's up to you."
			NON-DPR	Council needs to recognise the impact that both domestic and international tourism has on the services and assets within the Selwyn District.	
			LLRZ-R11 SKIZ-R10 TEZ-R9 MPZ-R9 KNOZ-R8 GRAZ-R19 GIZ-R19 LRZ-R14 GRZ-R14 SETZ-R14 GRUZ-R15 NCZ-R10 LCZ-R12 LFRZ-R9	Council needs to recognise the impact that both domestic and international tourism has on the services and assets within the Selwyn District. There appears to be anomalies relating to properties consented as accommodation providers, who are required to meet industry standards as well as general regulations such as fire, egress, H&S, and those who do not. The impact of this is that for approved accommodation providers	

			TCZ-R12	they are required to meet targeted rate charges while under the counter operators do not.	
			NON-DPR	We have many community groups that are willing to enhance not only Council administered reserves, banks of waterways and waste ground with native regeneration plantings. Joint collaboration with the community on such projects would enhance the relationship between Council and the Community.	
			NON-DPR	If Council can fund regeneration projects on private land it should also do so for land it has responsibility over.	
			NON-DPR	The constant flow of milk tankers and large supply trucks rumbling through Glentunnel during the small hours is disruptive to many of the residents. The quality of the road surface does not help with truck sides and parts rattling. The typography of Glentunnel also contributes and exacerbates the noise. The lack of traffic noise in the small hours was illustrated during the Covid-19 lockdown.	
			LLRZ-R3 LRZ-R3 GRZ-R3 GRUZ-R6 SETZ-R3	Where a property is capable of having a smaller 2nd residence alongside the principal dwelling, this should be permitted. Operative district plan rules allowing such facilities to be established for a family member creates issues if the family member ceases to live there and under Council rules the	

				residence would sit empty or will require removal or demolition of a valuable asset.	
			SUB-REQ1	Smaller sections may meet the needs of many property purchasers due to cost, work requirements including travel and reducing time available for property maintenance.	
			NON-DPR	Rural township properties do not have access to water races or have stock to water or have access to them for irrigation.	
			NON-DPR	Community Centres are meant to be the hub of the community. The Council's centralisation of control is a mistake and will lead to lesser use and a decrease in local empowerment.	
			NON-DPR	<p>Specialist staff at Lincoln, Leeston and Darfield could investigate issues and report back to specialist Rolleston staff, handle general inquiries or explain Council procedures or policies.</p> <p>This would reduce Rolleston staff time including travel and transport expenses. It would also reduce the time and cost of residents having to travel to Rolleston.</p> <p>It would also reduce the angst of residents being told they must visit the Councils Rolleston offices and to make an appointment first. If the right staff were appointed it would create better a relationship plus improve Council/community linkages.</p>	

			NON-DPR	The centralising and terminating roles of voluntary community committees will see Council costs increase greatly as has its staff numbers. It will also affect community empowerment and reduce community involvement. Soon Councils due to increasing costs will soon have a limit on what they can tax ratepayers and will need to prioritise its expenditure.	
DPR-0464	New Zealand Motor Caravan Association Inc.	17/12/2020	Building	The definition of 'building' captures caravans. For the submitter, this creates a number of potential implications, which stem from the fact that members with non-motorised caravans will, by definition, be parking and using a 'building'.	<p>"The NZMCA only became aware of Selwyn's proposed district plan close to the submission deadline date. We immediately contacted the Council and were advised by a Council officer that a late submission by up to a week would still most likely be accepted by Council. The NZMCA's submission was only four working days late. The NZMCA represents over 101,000 individual New Zealanders who enjoy travelling NZ in their selfcontainment motorhomes and caravans. The proposed plan will have major implications on the ability for our members, in particular those who reside in Selwyn, to camp and park their motorhomes and caravans throughout the District. For these reasons, we believe the Council will be acting in accordance with sections 37 and 37A of the RMA 1991 in accepting the NZMCA's late submission."</p>
			DPR-GEN	The Freedom Camping Act 2011, council bylaws, the Reserves Act 1977 and reserve management plans generally regulate where freedom camping (as defined by s5 of the Freedom Camping Act 2011) can occur. However, most zones in the PDP do not provide for freedom camping and therefore the activity is captured by the 'catch-all' rule requiring land use consent as a discretionary activity. It would be more appropriate for council to explicitly exclude freedom camping from the PDP, to avoid the need for land use consent in areas where a council bylaw or reserve management plan permits freedom camping.	

DPR-0466	Geoffrey Railton Barker & Lyna Sumaylo Barker	21/12/2020	Flood Management Overlay	Considers that the inclusion of Aurora Estates subdivision within the Flood Plain Management Area should be re-undertaken and revised to reflect earthworks undertaken across the site to address the issues deemed as cause of a potential flood risk in a 200 year weather event. Further seeks that any findings found to differ from the previous overlay be then corrected to reflect these changes on the property LIM	"As per my initial inquiry into the subsequent submission (which was answered by District Plan Review Duty Planner Andrew) we were unaware that the property at 28 Ashford Avenue fell into a risk zone of a 200 year flood and that this information was being added to the properties LIM until we received delayed (lost and redirected) mails from NZ Post. Unfortunately the corrected delivery of these mails came post submission cut off, thus we were unaware that our property was affected by and our need to forward any submission until after the cut off date."
DPR-0467	Helen Reid	21/12/2020	HH NEW-SCHED	Considers building on property should be included in the Historic Heritage Schedule. Refer to original submission for full reason, including attachments	"I had made several attempts to contact the council re the buildings in question and the reply was vague - I did not understand the process. Given the length of time between district plans it is likely be too late to save the dwellings by the next cycle. I'm 77 years old and needed to wait until a family member was with me to complete the application."
DPR-0472	Gourlie Family	06/01/2021	GRUZ-R28	<p>Opposes as consider that helicopter operations for rural and commercial use are, outside of mining and quarrying, quite possibly the most intrusive and damaging neighbours to have to endure and are not run of the mill activities.</p> <p>The submitters consider there may be a place for heli-pads on larger rural properties of 40 hectares or more, and where logically there is more demand for rural heli-services. Given the speed and rate larger farms are being subdivided into much smaller blocks there are huge tracts of the General Rural Zone</p>	"The submission was dropped into the Selwyn District Council's Lincoln Library on the day after the submissions closed. I hadn't been able to get to the Library before it closed on the Friday but had phoned ahead and checked that things addressed to the wider Selwyn District Council wouldn't be delivered to Head Quarters in Rolleston until the Monday anyway. This being the case, the submission would have been handled as though it had arrived on time BUT FOR the submission in an envelope at some point - Library or HQ- was dropped into the outward mail. As it had an incomplete address on it (a descriptive address - something along the lines of 'District Plan Submission', not a mailing address) eventually the submission and its original

				<p>where there is simply no demand for helicopters for rural purposes making the heli-pads rural activities based or otherwise not only redundant but inappropriate.</p> <p>The submitters consider that non notified and even limited notified consent applications make it too easy for commercial activities outside of rural activities to gain traction and resource consent by stealth.</p> <p>The submitters consider that the Council made a mistake which ratepayers shouldn't have to live with and that proposed plan provision doesn't go far enough.</p>	<p>envelope made its way back to me courtesy of NZ Post who had opened it to find an address to forward it to. After I received it back from NZPO I dropped it in to SDC HQ on 6th January 2021 explaining what had happened to the person I handed it off to – complete with original envelope and notations from NZPO attached to the submission. Apparently the SDC's Compliance Officer has already seen the submission?"</p>
			GRUZ-REQ12	<p>Opposes because considers that helicopter operations for rural and commercial use are, outside of mining and quarrying, quite possibly the most intrusive and damaging neighbours to have to endure and are not run of the mill activities.</p> <p>Opposed to heli-pads for rural activities consented as of right, with a cosmetic change in the proposed plan under GRUZ-REQ12 moving the boundary out to 500 metres, which is not far enough.</p> <p>The submitters consider that four helicopter movements a day over any seven days only 500 metres away is still far too close to neighbours properties.</p>	

				<p>The submitters consider there may be a place for heli-pads on larger rural properties of 40 hectares or more, and where logically there is more demand for rural heli-services. Given the speed and rate larger farms are being subdivided into much smaller blocks there are huge tracts of the General Rural Zone where there is simply no demand for helicopters for rural purposes making the heli-pads rural activities based or otherwise not only redundant but inappropriate.</p> <p>Considers that the Council made a mistake which ratepayers shouldn't have to live with and that proposed plan provision doesn't go far enough.</p>	
			GRUZ-R28	<p>Opposes as consider that helicopter operations for rural and commercial use are, outside of mining and quarrying, quite possibly the most intrusive and damaging neighbours to have to endure and are not run of the mill activities.</p> <p>The submitters consider that four helicopter movements a day over any seven days only 500 metres away is still far too close to neighbours properties.</p> <p>The submitters consider there may be a place for heli-pads on larger rural properties of 40 hectares or more, and where logically there is more demand for rural heli-services. Given the speed and rate larger</p>	

				<p>farms are being subdivided into much smaller blocks there are huge tracts of the General Rural Zone where there is simply no demand for helicopters for rural purposes making the heli-pads rural activities based or otherwise not only redundant but inappropriate.</p> <p>The submitters consider that only property owner operators should be allowed to fly in and out of their rural activities heli-pad, and that no subcontractors or unrelated parties can use the heli-pad as a regular base.</p> <p>The submitters consider that the Council made a mistake which ratepayers shouldn't have to live with and that proposed plan provision doesn't go far enough.</p>	
DPR-0473	Clare Ryan	13/12/2020	HH	<p>The submitter believes the Selwyn Huts should be listed as a site of historic and cultural significance in the District Plan.</p>	<p>"The reason my submission was late was because previous submission dates for SDC that I had submitted on closed 5.00pm on Sunday and I mistakenly assumed the 10 Year Plan submissions followed the same pattern. I had the weekend noted in my diary for months. I think my submission was sent on the Sunday afternoon after the Friday closing date. That is the reason for the late submission- the research I did for the submission was done on Friday and Saturday and the work written up and submitted on Sunday - with a request for clemency!"</p>
DPR-0476	Murray Boyes	09/02/2021	Rezoning	<p>Considers that an amendment is needed to the subject site zoning from General Rural Zone (GRUZ) to enable a mix of Low Density Residential and Large Lot</p>	<p>"Necessarily late due to commercial negotiations (which have created an interest in the Property) completing last Friday.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter Mr Boyes (Submitter, Mr Boyes) has recently been involved in commercial

			<p>Residential zoned land consistent with land uses to the south of the site and zoning appropriate for a reserve and/or activities which are appropriate within the 300m setback from existing business activities. The site is legally described as Section 1 Survey Office Plan 1227 (Certificate of Title CB39B/123) to the east of Darfield. Reasons include that the rezoning will promote a consolidated town form, will maximise the land's value, will improve amenity, is logically integrated with existing development, near strategic transport connections and can be supported by extensions to existing infrastructure. (refer to submission for more detail).</p> <p>The land is subject to Proposed Plan Change 61. The submitter states that the outcome sought by this submission is more appropriate than both the status quo and the outcome sought by PC61.</p>	<p>negotiations with the landowners, the Wrights, relating to the Property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · These negotiations have arisen due to the Submitter making a submission in opposition (via his local business) on a plan change (Plan Change 61) advanced by the Wrights, and this Plan Change being set down for hearing in March this year. · The negotiations have resulted in the Submitter obtaining a financial interest in the future development of the Property as of 5 February 2020. · The Submitter is aware of the Wright's submission on the Proposed Plan. · Succession to the Wright's submission is not an option due to some content of Mr Boyes submission likely being outside scope of the Wrights submission. · Mr Boyes through his submission is seeking have the option to address the content of his submission during the District Plan process (it being a separate and later process than the current Private Plan Change 61 process). <p>I had provided advice to Mr Boyes last week that if he wanted to make a submission on the District Plan it should be drafted and lodged asap, and prior to the summary of submissions being notified. There will be no prejudice to other parties arising from accepting the late submission, including for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · The submitter is aware of the Wright's submission already made on the Property; · The proposed District Plan process is still in the very early and initial stages; · A summary of submissions has not been notified; and · Further submissions have not yet opened. · The definition of working day in the RMA excludes time between 20 December to 10
--	--	--	--	---

					January (thereby reducing the apparent lateness of this submission)."
DPR-0481	Graeme and Virginia Adams	12/02/2021	MAP	Considers that the size of SCA-RD11 should be reduced to existing development area and that the EDA should only recognise existing development. Refer to original submission for full reason	<p>"Please accept our late submission based on the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The Proposed District plan is a massive document & there have been multiple issues we have had to keep an eye on over the past six months in our already busy farming business, especially a significant increase in workload in regard to environmental compliance & the recent New Freshwater rules & regulations that came into force late last year. -The EDA is a small element of the large Proposed District Plan & we missed it, it was overlooked at the time. It has since come to our attention and the significance of SCA-RD11 as it currently stands, we now realise has the potential to have extreme adverse impacts on our small rural farming settlement/community & existing farming activities. -That the plan is only in the early stages of the public participation process. -That the summary of submissions has not yet been released, and further submissions have not yet been requested. -That no party would be disadvantaged by accepting the late submission."
			MAP	Considers that land that hasn't been developed should be SCA-RD2, or any other alterations that achieves the same affect and any consequential amendments. Refer to original submission for full reason	
			MAP	Considers that it would be appropriate to "take it out of the current zoning". Refer to original submission for full reason.	
			GRUZ-O1	Supports GRUZ-O1 as notified	
			GRUZ-P1	Supports GRUZ-P1 as notified	
			GRUZ-P7	Supports GRUZ-P7 as notified	
DPR-0482	Jayne Grace Philp	14/02/2021	Intro2	Considers producing a 10 year plan under the RMA is not in good faith given that the RMA will be overhauled or abolished. Considers that subdivision of valuable farming land is unsustainable. Refer to original submission for full reason	"I would implore you to consider accepting this submission as the plan requires to ensure it is fit for purpose with the current review of the RMA. Along with this it was unclear that the council had consulted with the landowners to retain the grandfather clause and they had decided to retain this. This information was never provided to

			HPW3	Considers that no consideration has been given to the upcoming removal or overhaul of the RMA	<p>directly impacted parties around the area. Further to the above the following reasons are also supplementary to why the submission is late:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - I also work in the Primary industries, and have recently undergone a restructure at work. The time the submission was due I was also providing feedback on that and trying to save my position at work. - I help out on the farm on the weekend and have hardly had a chance to take a breath. - The plan is still in early stages of the participation processes - The summary of submissions have not been released as of yet. - No party will be disadvantaged by accepting this late submission. It is fair and reasonable to accept this."
			SD-DI-O1	Considers that by allowing additional subdivisions, the Council is not meeting the Plan requirements, including the character of the community, roading, servicing, capacity of the local school. Refer to original submission for full reason	
			SD-DI-O2	Considers that by allowing additional subdivisions, the Council is not meeting the Plan requirements, including the character of the community, roading, servicing, capacity of the local school. Refer to original submission for full reason	
			SD-DI-O3	Considers that by allowing additional subdivisions, the Council is not meeting the Plan requirements, including the character of the community, roading, servicing, capacity of the local school. No consideration has been given to the scale of subdivisions in Greendale and pressure on aquifers. Refer to original submission for full reason	
			SD-DI-O4	Considers that by allowing additional subdivisions, the Council is not meeting the Plan requirements, including the character of the community, roading, servicing, capacity of the local school. Refer to original submission for full reason	
			SD-DI-O5	Considers that by allowing additional subdivisions, the Council is not meeting the Plan requirements, including the character of the	

				community, roading, servicing, capacity of the local school. Refer to original submission for full reason	
			SD-DI-P1	Considers that GRUZ-O1 is not considered when allowing for large subdivisions in Greendale, in that it does not prioritise primary production, it hinders production, including the introduction of fireworks into the community, road users not aware or use to being around stock or horses, risk of activists on farm, use of irrigated land, introduction of non-rural persons. Refer to original submission for full reason.	
			SD-DI-P4	Considers that GRUZ-P4 is not considered when allowing subdivision of SCA-RD11. The subdivision will not have a direct relationship with or are dependent on the surrounding primary industries.	
			SD-DI-P6	Considers that GRUZ-P6 is not considered when allowing subdivision of SCA-RD11. The subdivision will not have a direct relationship with or are dependent on the surrounding primary industries.	
			SD-DI-P7	Considers that GRUZ-O1 is not considered when allowing for large subdivisions in Greendale, in that it does not prioritise primary production, it hinders production, including the introduction of fireworks into the community, road users not aware or use to being around stock or horses, risk of activists on farm, use of irrigated land,	

				introduction of non-rural persons. Refer to original submission for full reason.	
DPR-0483	Castle Hill Property Investment Ltd	15/02/2021	MAP	Seeks clarification of zoning maps to reflect consented environment.	"This change in the business zone was not immediately recognised at the time of the formal Proposed District Plan submission period and we respectfully ask that the Commissioner recognises our submission to more closely align the resource consent intention in the underlying zoning."
DPR-0485	Rod Stuart	01/03/2021	SUB	Considers that the rule for subdividing sites within the Large Lot Residential Zone should be clarified to allow for 4000m2 lots to create smaller life style blocks without using farmland.	"I was not aware of the 5000m ² average law until recently. When I found out I decided to make a submission."
DPR-0486	Coleridge Downs Limited	02/03/2021	REZONING	Considers that sites identified within the Urban Growth Overlay (UGO) in Lake Coleridge should be rezoned from GRUZ to SETZ to allow for the extension of the Village.	<p>"When the Proposed Plan was notified, CDL focused its resources into the changes affecting its three significant farming operations. Regrettably, CDL has only recently become aware that the Sites were both affected by a re-zoning and are partially within the new UGO overlay under the Proposed Plan, hence the delay with preparing and making this late submission.</p> <p>Counsel has only recently been instructed to consider the implications of the Proposed Plan for the Sites proximate to the village. COL therefore respectfully seeks a waiver from the SOC pursuant to Section 37, Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) of the timeframe to file a late submission on the Proposed Plan in respect of the confined issue of a proposed re-zoning for the Sites.</p> <p>Grounds</p> <p>CDL considers there will be no unreasonable delay or prejudice to any party if this late submission is accepted, because:</p>

					<p>The re-zoning request only applies to the Sites owned by CDL at Lake Coleridge; The Council has not notified its summary of submissions or set a specific timeframe for notification. The Reporting Officers will therefore have ample time to consider and summarise CDL's submission; and Because the Summary of Submissions is yet to be notified by SOC, the 10 working day Further Submission period is yet to commence. Other submitters will therefore have ample opportunity to consider and state their position either in opposition/support of the submission.</p> <p>Overall, Counsel consider that because the summary of submissions is yet to be notified, and this late submission is available to be included within the summary, there can be no prejudice to any third party or delay to the RMA, Schedule 1 process.</p> <p>Counsel notes the Court's observation in Omaha Park Limited v Rodney DC 1 that the RMA:</p> <p>"encourages participation (in an orderly way, certainly) in the decision-making process, with the general philosophy that the possible inconvenience, delays and costs caused are hopefully outweighed by better informed decision-making and better environmental outcomes".</p> <p>CDL should not be prevented from participating in the Proposed Plan because of the delay in making this submission . The Proposed Plan re-zoning will have implications for COL's Land. To allow CDL to be involved in this process will result in better informed decision making and better environmental outcomes as CDL is disputing</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>whether the notified GRUZ is the most appropriate zoning for the Sites. If CDL's submission is not accepted, this may prejudice to CDL as it will not be able to be heard on the most appropriate late zoning for the Sites.</p> <p>10 It is crucial that COL's submission is accepted so that an adequate assessment of the effects of the Proposed Plan are taken into account."</p>
DPR-0487	Kelvin and Sue McIntyre	07/03/2021	REZONING	<p>Lots 2-3 DP 77579 lie within the natural boundaries of Doyleston township, but the property is zoned Rural.</p>	<p>"Following discussions with one of your Planners (Jon Trewin) I respectfully request that our late submission for the Proposed Selwyn District Plan be considered and accepted. The current owners of 1423 Leeston Road (Mr and Mrs McIntyre) are an elderly retired couple who find matters such as this confusing and overwhelming. Mr McIntyre is recovering from prostate cancer and therefore his health has been their primary concern. Five trips per week to hospital for treatment over many weeks take their toll. His prognosis is now positive with clear results. He recently asked me to approach Council about having their parcel of land rezoned and I agreed to submit a late application on their behalf. The Proposed District Plan is still being considered and therefore we wouldn't gain any advantage over others with a late application. If our application is accepted, we will then submit other documentation to support this application. This might include geotech reports, a draft survey plan, HAIL report, etc.</p> <p>When looking at the current boundaries of the township of Doyleston, the McIntyre's property is the only significant land parcel zoned rural that falls within this. It makes sense to incorporate this area into the township for future residential development."</p>

DPR-0488	Dally Family Trust and Julia McIlraith	08/03/2021	REZONING	Rezoning the land shown outlined in red in Figure 1 of the submission (corner Shands Road and Blakes Road, Prebbleton) is appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth and development in the district and to meet the requirements of the NPS-UD.	<p>"We are writing on behalf of our clients, Mr Robbie McIlraith and the Dally Family Trust who own properties at 2/602 Shands Road and 203 Blakes Road respectively. They have instructed Aston to prepare and lodge a late submission on their behalf relating to their properties and adjoining properties, seeking rezoning for Large Lot Residential purposes. Aston provided some preliminary resource planning advice regarding rezoning to the Dally Family Trust property (and neighbouring land as appropriate) in 2018. This included a letter to Selwyn District Council (as attached) in April 2018 outlining the merits of and need</p> <p>for the proposed rezoning, and requesting that... the Council consider how the planning processes currently underway can best accommodate this request, given the importance of making provision for a variety of residential living choices in the District, including rural residential.</p> <p>There was not further discussion or communication with the Council at this time. David Dally, trustee, then approached Aston in late January 2021, regarding this matter. He misunderstood the Proposed Selwyn District Plan submissions process, and thought that the 2018 letter would be treated as a submission on the PSDP. By this time, he was also now working with neighbour Mr McIlraith on the rezoning project. Aston explained the process, and checked with other Aston clients first to ensure no conflicts of interest, prior to accepting instructions from the Trust and Mr McIlraith to prepare a late submission on their behalf.</p> <p>Accordingly, we request on behalf of the Trust and Mr McIlraith that the submission be accepted as a</p>
			REZONING	There is strong unmet demand for large lot residential sites in eastern Selwyn, especially in the more affordable 1000m ² - 3000m ² size range.	
			SUB-REQ1	There is strong unmet demand for large lot residential sites in eastern Selwyn, especially in the more affordable 1000m ² - 3000m ² size range.	
			SD-UFD-O2	Amendments to the PDP policy framework are appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth and development in the district and to meet the requirements of the NPS-UD.	
			UG-Overview	Amendments to the PDP policy framework are appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth and development in the district and to meet the requirements of the NPS-UD.	
			UG-P3	Amendments to the PDP policy framework are appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth and development in the district and to meet the requirements of the NPS-UD.	

			UG-P4	Amendments to the PDP policy framework are appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth and development in the district and to meet the requirements of the NPS-UD.	late submission. No parties will be affected as the submission has been lodged ahead of notification of the Summary of Submissions. The fact that a submission was not lodged on time was due to a misunderstanding regarding the PSDP submissions process and what constitutes a submission. The rezoning proposal had previously been raised with SDC with a request for the Council to consider how planning processes could best accommodate the proposal." "In the circumstances, we consider it is entirely appropriate for the submission to be accepted as a late submission."
			UG-P7	Policy UG-P7.4 is not necessary as it duplicates UG-P11.2.	
			UG-P9	Amendments to the PDP policy framework are appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth and development in the district and to meet the requirements of the NPS-UD.	
DPR-0491	Paul and Sue Robinson	16/03/2021	Rezoning	Opposes the General rural zone being applied to Lot 2 DP 303903 and Lot 2 DP 487910 (71 and 77 Tramway Rd, Kirwee), and considers that a residential zone would be the most appropriate, efficient and effective means of achieving the purpose of the RMA.	"We are writing on behalf of our clients, Paul and Sue Robinson, who own the property at 77 Tramway Road Kirwee. He has instructed Aston to prepare and lodge a late submission on his behalf relating to his property and the adjoining property at 71 Tramway Road, seeking rezoning to Large Lot Residential or Settlement Zone. Mr Robinson was aware of the Proposed District Plan and thought he had lodged an online submission on time. He sought advice from Aston about his submission in early March 2021, and we asked him to obtain a copy of the online submission from SDC. It was at this point, that he discovered that the submission had not been received. Possibly he had not pushed the 'submit' button (see email
			DEV (Development Area)	The requested rezoning (DPR-0491.001) should be accompanied by an outline development plan.	

			SD-UFD-O2 UG-Overview UG-P4 UG-P9 UG-P10 UG-P11 UG-P14	The objectives and policies do not give effect to the NPS-UD 2020.	trail with SDC attached as Appendix 1). Mr Robinson then requested that we prepare and lodge a submission on his behalf, having received advice from SDC that it would need to be received before 19th March 2021 (but with SDC officers also advising that the decision on acceptance or otherwise of late submissions was to be made by the Hearings Commissioner). The submissions process and online form can be confusing. Fortunately, the Robinsons discovered that they had inadvertently not submitted before public notification of the Summary of Submissions (at which point, arguably persons could be affected by acceptance of a late submission, which they would not have had the full opportunity to submit on). No persons will be adversely affected by acceptance of this late submission. In the circumstances, we consider it is entirely appropriate, and request that, the submission to be accepted as a late submission.”
DPR-0492	Kevler Development Ltd	16/03/2021	Rezoning	Opposes the General rural zone for Lot 2 DP 61162 and considers that a General residential zone is appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth and development of Rolleston and meet the requirements of the NPS-UD 2020	“We are writing on behalf of our clients, Kevler Development Ltd, who have a confirmed conditional offer to purchase a 15.9 ha property at Springston Rolleston Road, adjoining the existing Faringdon residential subdivision. Their offer was made and accepted very recently, after undertaking due diligence, all well after the closing date for submissions on the Selwyn Proposed

			SD-UFD-O2 UG-Overview UG-P7 UG-P10 UG-P11 UG-P13	<p>The objective does not give effect to the NPS-UD 2020.</p>	<p>District Plan. The offer is conditional on a number of matters, including approval of this rezoning submission.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the location of the property immediately adjacent to the current south Rolleston urban boundary, the current owners, CJFA Holdings Ltd, have not lodged either a private plan change application or submission on the Proposed District Plan seeking rezoning for residential purposes. The property is within the Rolleston Projected Infrastructure Boundary on Map A of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, and is within the proposed Rolleston Future Development Area shown on Map A as amended by Proposed Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</p> <p>The submitter, (the conditional purchaser) Kevler Development Ltd, is a well-established award winning house building company, with an extensive portfolio of housing built in Rolleston and Christchurch City – see https://www.kevlerhomes.co.nz/About/About/. They build approximately 150-200 houses per year, and have built around 100 houses to date at Rolleston, including at Acland Park, Falcons Landing, Faringdon and Branthwaite Drive. They have built affordable multi-units on ‘super lots’, and intend to build more of this type of affordable housing, with floor areas from 90m2, including single garage, on smaller sections (200-300m2), with a price point largely not available in Rolleston to date ie. \$400 - \$450 000 and achievable for first home buyers. Kevler Homes have an excellent reputation for quality building, with superior ‘after care’, including a three year maintenance warranty.</p> <p>Kevler urgently need a continued supply of land at Rolleston for building to satisfy demand and to supply forward workload for their 40 strong in</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

					<p>house team. For the last 3-5 months they have been inundated with requests from clients for sections for building, in the face of a severe shortage of available sections. They advise in the current market they could readily sell 200 a month! Given the 'stranglehold' on available sections, and very little in the 'pipeline', Kevler have elected to purchase the Springston Rolleston Road block which is not yet zoned. They need the land to be rezoned urgently. They would have preferred to also apply for a private plan change rezoning request, which would have been quicker, but this option simply wasn't available, due to the fact that the Proposed District Plan had already been notified. No persons will be adversely affected by acceptance of this late submission as it is being lodged well ahead of the Summary of Submissions being notified for further submissions.</p> <p>In the circumstances, we consider it is entirely appropriate, and request that the submission to be accepted as a late submission."</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

DPR-0493	Gallina Nominees Ltd and Heinz-Wattie Ltd Pension Fund	17/03/2021	REZONING	Opposes the General rural zoning for Lot 3 DP 20007 and Lot 4 DP 20007 (201-236 Dunns Crossing Road, Rolleston) and considers that rezoning is both appropriate and necessary to achieve sustainable growth and development of Rolleston and meet the requirements of the NPS-UD 2020.	<p>'We are writing on behalf of our clients, Gallina Nominees Ltd & Heinz-Wattie Ltd Pension Plan, who own the property at 201-236 Dunns Crossing Road Rolleston (46.32 ha). The property is currently used for specialist chicken breeder farm operations, under a terminating land and buildings lease to Tegel New Zealand.</p> <p>Just yesterday, Aston was approached by the owner's valuer, regarding planning advice on possible future rezoning and development options for the property. We explained the current status of the Proposed District Plan Review, and private plan change requests including PC 73 for rezoning 160 ha at Dunns Crossing Road for urban residential purposes (appx 1800 new households). Our client's land is sandwiched in between the two PC 73 sites, with frontage to the western side of Dunns Crossing Road (see location plan attached as Appendix A).</p> <p>We advised that our clients would need to urgently lodge a late submission requesting rezoning for residential purposes, given that we had just become aware of the imminent 'cut off' date for receiving late submissions in time for them to be considered for acceptance by the Hearings Commissioner. Accordingly, they instructed us to urgently prepare a brief holding submission, which can be supplemented with additional supporting information, technical reports and an Outline Development Plan in due course.</p> <p>The trustees of Galina Nominees and Heinz-Wattie Ltd Pension Plan are both Auckland based and were not aware until yesterday that the Selwyn District Plan was under review, or of the substantial neighbouring rezoning request proposed by way of private PC 73. No persons will be adversely affected by acceptance of this</p>
			SD-UFD-O2 UG-Overview UG-P3 UG-P4 UG-P7 UG-P10 UG-P11 UG-P13 LLRZ-P1	The provision does not give effect to the NPS-UD 2020.	

					late submission as it is being lodged well ahead of the Summary of Submissions being notified for further submissions. In the circumstances, we consider it is entirely appropriate, and request that the submission to be accepted as a late submission.'
--	--	--	--	--	--