

Ellesmere Area Plan – Summary of Submissions – Council Officer’s Comments and Recommendations

| Submitter # | Submitter | Township Submitting On | Submission Points | Relief Sought | Staff/Technical Comments & Recommendations |
|-------------|---|------------------------|--|--|--|
| 1 | Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB) | Ellesmere | <p>1.1 We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Malvern & Ellesmere Area Plans. The future health of our populations is not just reliant on hospitals, but on a responsive environment where all sectors work collaboratively.</p> <p>1.2 While health care services are an important determinant of health, health is also influenced by a wide range of factors beyond the health sector. Health care services manage disease and trauma and are an important determinant of health outcomes. However health creation and wellbeing (overall quality of life) is influenced by a wide range of factors beyond the health sector.</p> <p>1.3 These influences can be described as the conditions in which people are born, grow, live, work and age, and are impacted by environmental, social and behavioural factors. They are often referred to as the ‘social determinants of health’.</p> <p>1.4 The most effective way to maximise people’s wellbeing is to take these factors into account as early as possible during decision making and strategy development.</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.5 The CDHB notes that the Selwyn District Council's 30 Year Infrastructure Strategy shows there is little proportional spending proposed for water supply and sewerage schemes in comparison to roads and community facilities. Drinking water is of great importance to the health and wellbeing of communities. There are a number of townships within the Selwyn District that are not currently compliant with the Drinking Water Standards (DWS). It is noted that all water supplies have a current water safety plan with timelines in place to upgrade water supplies to meet the Drinking Water Standards. Statements regarding compliance with the Health Act, DWS, or water being managed through water safety plans, should be included for all supplies.</p> <p>1.6 Overall households in the small townships in the Selwyn district, particularly in the Malvern area, have on site septic tanks for their waste water system. To date, these have provided households with a suitable means to dispose of their waste. As townships grow in size, and intensification of residential sections occurs, there is the need to reconsider whether this is the appropriate means to dispose of waste. Comments in the area plans include those from ECAN as follows: “higher density housing typologies cannot reasonably be serviced by on-site systems”</p> <p>1.7 ECAN have also stated that the absence of a reticulated sewer network and current reliance on individual properties to treat and discharge wastewater on-site presents a potential public health risk and a risk to groundwater quality. CDHB agrees that this presents a potential risk.</p> <p>1.8 Provision of reticulated wastewater systems is required to allow for managed growth and to facilitate high density living. The capacity of an existing waste water system, e.g. Leeston, needs to be considered in relation to any community growth for those communities using the system.</p> <p>1.9 Any growth for communities which would see human waste discharged within a drinking water protection zone will not be supported by CDHB. Drinking water suppliers have a statutory</p> | <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 Statements regarding compliance with the Health Act, DWS, or water being managed through water safety plans, should be included for all supplies</p> <p>1.2 Suitable and adequate water supplies be guaranteed, and safe waste water disposal achieved prior to higher density housing being considered for any of these communities.</p> <p>1.3 That drinking water supplies and waste water disposal systems are prioritised for the Selwyn District Council in accordance with maintaining or improving public health as requirement by Section 101B of the Local Government Act 2002.</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.4 That the Council considers whether existing community facilities meet needs and whether their current location gives people easy access to services needed for daily living .</p> <p>1.5 That any upgraded public toilet facilities comply with NZS4121 to ensure that they are fully accessible</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.6 That the Council and Environment Canterbury continue to monitor demand for public transport to ensure that transport needs are met and people are able to access essential services. Integrated public transport and options for Park and Rides between towns should be considered so that people have access to alternative transport modes e.g. Kirwee and Darfield.</p> <p>1.7 The CDHB recommends that Council investigate the potential for using the rail corridor for public transport in the medium to long term.</p> <p>1.8 Leeston - The CDHB supports a pedestrian link to the hospital.</p> <p>1.9 Rolleston - The CDHB recommends that Council Consider a park-and-ride facility at a centralised location</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.10 That the Selwyn District Council considers a consent pathway for IFHCs as part of its District Plan review. Christchurch City Council has provisions for IFHCs in its Replacement District Plan.</p> <p>1.11 That the Council considers the following points for new housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The availability of smaller section sizes, these would be more manageable for people to maintain. • The availability of smaller houses of one or two bedrooms which may be more manageable and cheaper to heat. • Standards for Lifemark (or similar) and energy efficient houses could be adopted as part of the District Plan Review so new builds are warmer and drier therefore healthier for people. • Opportunities in the zoning rules for granny flats for those wishing to have an extended family living situation. Older people living in one person homes may feel isolated and there is the potential for safety/health/welfare issues. • Proximity and connections to community services and public transport options | <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Council has recently introduced a district rate for water supplies which has enabled funding for treatment plant upgrades for a number of smaller schemes which would otherwise have been unaffordable. Significant investment is proposed in the 10 year plan for treatment upgrades. This is a matter for Councils Water Safety Plans. The implementation step ‘Managing the water supply network in accordance with the approved Water Safety Plans’ is appropriate’</i></p> <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>A new Joint Public Transport Committee has been set up between the Councils and includes the CDHB as a non-voting member. It will be looking at wider issues to improve the provision and use of PT services. Environment Canterbury is responsible for providing metro bus services and accessing demand and if services are justifiable and/or affordable in the first instance. It is unlikely that this will be the case in the Ellesmere area unless a full user pays service is provided by a third party. On this basis no investment in specific Park N Ride facilities would be warranted based on other informal parking opportunities available.</i></p> <p><i>Council has approved a \$500,000 budget for rapidly advancing its 2016/17 footpath extension programme. It is also underway with consulting with communities to establish walking and cycling township network plans as part of its update of its Walking and Cycling Strategy. NZTA is engaging through business case processes to identifying state highway improvements and Council continues to highlight severance issues.</i></p> <p><i>Park N Ride for Rolleston has been identified for some time and more recently through the Town Centre Master Plan. It remains unfunded due to a lack of current demand. This could change in time</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Consideration of a consenting pathway to provide for IFHCs is a matter that may be addressed as part of the District Plan Review.</i></p> <p><i>The Area Plans have identified locations where more intensive high density housing may be located in Leeston, subject to resolution of infrastructure issues. In addition, the current District Plan does provide a consenting pathway for 2nd dwellings (and subsequent subdivision) to locate within existing established areas. Furthermore, providing for smaller section sizes and houses shall be considered more fully as part of the District Plan Review.</i></p> <p><i>With regards to the District Plan making provision for standards for lifemark and energy efficient houses; It is considered that the District Plan is not the most suitable vehicle to provide for this. Such initiatives are better realised through other mechanisms, such as the building consent processes. As such, an amendment to the Building Act is considered the most suitable method to resolve this issue.</i></p> <p><i>However, I understand the District Plan Review (DPR) will be considering some elements of the matters identified in this</i></p> |

| | | | |
|--|--|---|--|
| | | <p>obligation under the Health Act 1956, to take “reasonable steps to contribute to protection of source of drinking water”</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.10 The CDHB encourages the Council to consider accessibility and universal design when it is constructing community facilities and infrastructure. It is important that the built environment be as accessible as possible to people of all ages and abilities. Consideration for universal design needs to be incorporated at all levels of local government planning to ensure that facilities and infrastructure are fit for purpose.</p> <p>1.11 The delivery of health care facilities has changed in recent years with more emphasis on ensuring that health services are delivered more efficiently in local neighbourhoods. Integrated Family Health Centres (IFHCs) are one way of delivering more cohesive healthcare. These are health care facilities where multiple services are located within one building. This is especially important with an aging population.</p> <p>1.12 In the long term, health services may be further integrated within the Selwyn district and this may result in IFHCs.</p> <p>1.13 The CDHB is pleased to see that our earlier recommendation of including potential options for green waste and recycling opportunities have been included in the Area Plans.</p> <p>1.14 Community facilities such as halls, playgrounds and sports fields are important assets for people for both physical and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>1.15 Doyleston - The CDHB support the development of the park and playing fields for recreational activities, and the upgrading of the playground.</p> <p>1.16 Dunsandel - The CDHB supports the extension of the playground, provision of a new sports and community centre.</p> <p>1.17 Leeston - The CDHB supports a feasibility study for a dedicated community centre for Leeston</p> <p>1.18 Rakaia Huts - The CDHB supports the establishment of forums to investigate opportunities to enhance the local walkway network.</p> <p>1.19 Southbridge - The CDHB supports the extension of Southbridge park and the provision of new playground facilities.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.20 The CDHB commends the Council on its consideration of the appropriateness of consolidated urban forms for specific towns. As recognised in the Plans, there are positive social outcomes for providing infill housing as it provides opportunities for elderly persons’ housing, facilitates more affordable homes and provides smaller homes and sections that better meet the needs of the wider community. The CDHB acknowledges that there are constraints to providing more intensive housing due to natural hazards and levels of infrastructure.</p> <p>1.21 The CDHB would like to reiterate the need to provide for housing for the elderly. More people wish to age in place, this allows people to remain wherever they currently reside as long as possible. There are many benefits of enabling people to age in place, including independence, positive mental health, comfort and familiarity. Ageing in place also reduces demand on the health services.</p> <p>1.22 It is important the Council considers the following points for new housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The availability of smaller section sizes, these would be more manageable for people to maintain. | <p><i>submission, such as providing for energy efficient housing. Additional matters such as standards for Lifemark and the nature of any District Plan response (either at the policy level or as methods to implement policy) can be considered through the DPR process.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amend Table 1 – Implementation Steps – All Townships Local Facilities & Community Development as follows:• Add an implementation step where Council is to consider the appropriateness of providing for a consenting pathway for Integrated Family Health Centres (Short Term – Selwyn District Council Planning Department & Strategy & Policy Work Programme) |
|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|---|---|
| | | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The availability of smaller houses of one or two bedrooms which may be more manageable and cheaper to heat. • Standards for Lifemark (or similar) and energy efficient houses could be adopted as part of the District Plan Review so new builds are warmer and drier therefore healthier for people. • Opportunities in the zoning rules for granny flats for those wishing to have an extended family living situation. Older people living in one person homes may feel isolated and there is the potential for safety/health/welfare issues. • Proximity and connections to community services and public transport options <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.23 The CDHB supports investment into Footpath Extension Forward Works and investment and implementation of Walking and Cycling Strategies for all towns.</p> <p>1.24 The CDHB has an interest in the provision of healthy environments, this includes people having the opportunity to cycle, walk and use public transport. Investment in active transport infrastructure will provide people with more transport choices, leading to less reliance on car travel.</p> <p>1.25 Safer crossing points across key transport routes are important to ensure that fewer accidents occur.</p> <p>The CDHB supports corridor management plans that would mitigate town severance and supports the Council's ongoing work with Kiwi Rail to ensure that accidents at railway crossing points are reduced.</p> | | |
| 2 | Southbridge School Board of Trustees | Southbridge | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Support further development in Southbridge but oppose suggested change of zoning from Outer Plains to Residential on the back field of the School grounds.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Retain the existing zoning of the land on which the School is located.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The Area Plan is a strategic high level documents that give direction, over the 15 year lifetime of the Ellesmere Area Plan, on where future potential development options is best located, subject to further detailed assessment and design work.</i></p> <p><i>While Council appreciates the submitters concern in retaining the current zoning, this area represents a logical growth path to cater for long term growth and development. In addition, the Area Plan does not rezone any land. Rezoning of areas identified as possible future growth options in the Ellesmere Area Plan will be required to go through a more detailed technical and s32 RMA assessment.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided for, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners and stakeholders to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|-----------|---|---|--|
| | | | | | <p><i>In addition, Southbridge School is designated (ME13) in the Selwyn District Plan for 'Education Purposes'. It is considered , the use of livestock for teaching opportunities as set out in the submission falls under the purposes of the designation. As such, issues with compliance (or otherwise) with the pertinent District Plan rules is not relevant.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <p>Nil</p> |
| 12 | Tim Yellowlees | Dunsandel | <p><i>Other</i></p> <p>1.1 Trees on northern side of Dunsandel sports ground too high and block the sun</p> | <p><i>Other</i></p> <p>1.1 Chop trees down</p> | <p>Other</p> <p><i>This is an operational issues and should be referred to the Dunsandel Community Committee (who manage the reserve) for consideration.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <p>Nil</p> |
| 13 | Rachel Reid | Dunsandel | <p><i>Transportation</i></p> <p>1.1 The speed and safety of the main road into Dunsandel</p> | <p><i>Transportation</i></p> <p>1.1 Pedestrian crossings and traffic lights, or decreased road speed limits</p> <p>1.2 Footpaths installed around Irvines Road and Tramway Road</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>NZTA are currently undertaking a business case process for SH1 south of the Selwyn River. Council staff have been highlighting such issues to the NZTA and severance that SH1 creates through the township.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Area Plans signal that the Council will facilitate a Corridor Management Plan in the medium term. It is expected that the plan will consider such issues as highlighted by this and other submitters.</i></p> <p><i>Council has approved a \$500,000 budget for rapidly advancing its 2016/17 footpath extension programme. Council has approved extensions on Irvines Rd relating to school access but not Tramway Rd.</i></p> <p><i>It is also underway with consulting with communities to establish walking and cycling township network plans as part of its update of its Walking and Cycling Strategy.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |
| 14 | Kathleen Dawson | Dunsandel | <p><i>5 Waters</i></p> <p>1.1 Would like to see a sewerage scheme put into Dunsandel, so we can subdivide and the big piece of land next to the sport centre can be sold off for housing and development</p> <p><i>Transportation</i></p> <p>1.2 Would like to see traffic light on the intersection of state highway 1 and Dunsandel Leeston road Want to be able to subdivide big piece of land next to sports centre for housing and development</p> | <p><i>5 Waters</i></p> <p>1.1 Introduce a sewage scheme to Dunsandel</p> <p><i>Transportation</i></p> <p>1.2 Traffic lights of intersection of SH1 and Dunsandel – Leeston Road</p> | <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>The area plan includes an implementation step to 'Investigate the drivers and feasibility of developing a reticulated sewer network'</i></p> <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>SH1 and its intersections are managed by NZTA. They would not allow the use of traffic signals on a high speed section of highway. Any new developments are responsible for mitigating any transport issues – including providing new and upgraded roads and intersections.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Area Plans signal that the Council will facilitate a Corridor Management Plan in the medium term. It is expected that</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|--------------|-----------|--|--|--|
| | | | | | <p><i>the plan will consider such issues as highlighted by this and other submitters.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan Amend Table 3 – Implementation Steps – Dunsandel as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |
| 20 | Katy Norton | Dunsandel | <p>1.1 In general, the submitter feels that the proposed development options for Dunsandel are fair and appropriate</p> <p>Transportation 1.2 Submitters feel there has been significant planning oversight in relation to the Dunsandel School road frontage – as a parent the submitters have immediate and significant concerns around the road frontage of the school. The submitter supports further investigation into Dunsandel Primary School road frontage for access to playground & sports field. Anything we can do to protect the most valuable and vulnerable members of our community should be considered with upmost priority</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.3 Selwyn Village - The Selwyn Village is a unique settlement consisting of 11 houses on residential sized sections sitting within the Outer Plains. There are several Existing Development Areas (EDA) in the Selwyn District which are areas where for one reason or another development has already taken place. An example of this is “Raven Drive” an EDA comprised of 14 residential sections located within the Inner Plains. In the case of Selwyn Village, not only has the development already taken place, but the township has a long standing history as a continuously occupied settlement since its formation in 1862 (154 years!). It would be hard to imagine that the area does not fall within the classification of an EDA.</p> <p>Alternatively, based on its rich history, Selwyn village should be classified as a “Special Character Area”. A “Special Character Area” is described in “Selwyn 2031” as an area of “historic settlement pattern associated with the presence of special amenity, natural or cultural values”. We would argue that the historical town of Selwyn, strategically positioned on the banks of the River Selwyn and the first settlement to be created in both the Ellesmere area and the possibly the Selwyn district, fits perfectly within such parameters. The original town of Selwyn not only needs such recognition to preserve its history, it deserves it. New Zealand is a young country with an almost non-existent European culture. Is it not important that we recognize the Selwyn story as part of our country's heritage and culture?</p> | <p>Transportation 1.1 Suggests zebra crossing created and more visible access between the school and sports playing field 1.3 A review of the parking area design and drainage take place and improvements made 1.4 Reinstate electronic speed sign and visible deterrents such as zebra crossings and/or speed bumps are put in place</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.5 Recognition of the Selwyn Village as a low density “Special Character Area” or Existing Development Area (EDA)</p> | <p>Transportation <i>Irvine's Rd has low traffic volumes. It is the schools responsibility to safely manage the passage of children across the road. A supervised/patrolled crossing is likely the best option when it is needed.</i></p> <p><i>Council policy is that it does not fund school roadside parking upgrades as parking should be on site where it is the safest.</i></p> <p><i>Council rotates electronic speed warning devices around sites in the district</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>The area plans are strategic high level documents that give direction, over the 15 year lifetime of the Ellesmere Area Plan, on where future potential development options are best located within existing urban areas as identified with Living Zones under the Selwyn District Plan.</i></p> <p><i>While Council appreciates the submitters concern and recognises the rich history of Selwyn Village, it is not within the scope of the Ellesmere Area Plan to provide the relief sought by the submitters.</i></p> <p><i>The Area Plan is limited to dealing with areas defined as townships by having a Living Zone in the District Plan. This is on the basis that the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement discourages dispersed settlement patterns where they are not supported by appropriate levels of community facilities, local services or integrated network infrastructure; or to facilitate papakāinga. In addition, isolated settlements can dilute the amenity attributed to rural outlook, reduces the productive capacity of rural land through intensification and gives rise to reverse sensitivity effects with surrounding land uses through incremental development that is often difficult to proactively manage. The District Plan Review is better placed to address this issue through a review of the appropriateness of the rural volume where these urban conglomerations are currently managed through either the rural or existing development area provisions</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil </p> |
| 23 | Peter Baylis | Leeston | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.1 Leeston requires more Commercial and Industrial land and the options from figure 9 LEE A3 would suit Leeston. 1.2 There appears to be no suitable sections left to build on. I see we have 3 sections not built on and 1 for sale at an unrealistic price.</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development 1.3 I agree with carrying out the feasibility study for a dedicated community centre for Leeston including the redevelopment of the Leeston Rugby Club building.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.1 I would like to see the Council to take a look at rezoning area LEE A3 in the short term.</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development 1.2 Carry out the feasibility study for a dedicated community centre for Leeston including the redevelopment of the Leeston Rugby Club building.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided for, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------|---------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</i></p> <p><i>The area subject to this submission has been identified in the Draft EAP and will be considered through the DPR process and in accordance with Table 1 – Implementation Steps – All Townships and Table 2 – implementation Steps – Leeston.</i></p> <p><i>It is too soon at this stage to confirm whether the DPR, and subsequent proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP) will be operative in the short term.</i></p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development <i>A feasibility study on community facility provision for Leeston has been completed (including the potential future use of the Leeston Rugby Club building. Some further information is being sought to enable a thorough assessment of the recommended option.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil |
| 24 | John Ferguson | Leeston | <p>1.1 Submission support the general direction of the Ellesmere Plan for Leeston, but disagrees with many of the conclusions reached by Council in relation to development constraints and the availability of residential land.</p> <p>1.2 Council have identified a raft of issues with every township, many of which are very conservative, as evidenced by the circular band of issues surrounding these townships in the Area Plan.</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.3 With regard to Leeston in particular, these issues are not insurmountable. Council states that growth should be precluded to the north-west, to avoid any further stormwater discharges entering Leeston Creek. Yet the Leeston North Stormwater Diversion will largely solve this issue, and it is already underway.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.4 Land around the perimeter of the existing township needs to be zoned to accommodate growth of the township into the future. There is little point identifying the potential for infill in an established township that historically has not used infill to obtain growth.</p> <p>1.5 The vast majority of growth in Leeston over the last 6 years has been on Greenfields sites off Manse Rd and in the Chervier St area, with comparatively little coming from residential infill.</p> <p>1.6 Leeston has shown a strong demand for residential sections, and will undoubtedly continue to do so if they are made available for development.</p> <p>1.7 Surely the way to stagnate growth is by locking down development options so that people are required to live elsewhere.</p> | <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 the Leeston North Stormwater Diversion will largely solve any development constraints and is already underway.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.2 Council to give further consideration to areas LEE A1, A2 and A3 with a view that development is progressed now to allow for the landowners to consider their options over the next few years and make provision for development to start in due course.</p> <p>1.3 Action to be taken is either to rezone the land, or to identify it as a "winner" as was done in the Rural Residential Strategy</p> | <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>The Leeston North Stormwater Diversion will greatly improve the stormwater flooding situation. However, high groundwater levels and some soil types will mean that stormwater management is a critical aspect of any future development.</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The Area Plan is a strategic high level document that gives direction, over the 15 year lifetime of the Ellesmere Area Plan, on where future potential development options is best located, subject to further detailed assessment and design work.</i></p> <p><i>The purpose of the Area Plan is not rezone land identified as being Possible Future Growth Options; this will need to occur as part of a formal Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) process – either through the District Plan Review, or alternatively, through a privately initiated Plan Change.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review. The DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided for, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------------|-------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | <p><i>the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</i></p> <p><i>The Council's Rural Residential Strategy (RRS) was also prepared under the Local Government Act (2002) (LGA), but was to be implemented, in simple terms, through the Land Use Recovery Plan. This process meant sites that met relevant RRS criteria and which were identified as 'winners' in the RRS would ultimately enable them to be considered for zoning (Living 3) in the Selwyn District Plan, while being excluded from the RRS meant applications were not able to be fully considered through a RMA plan change process.</i></p> <p><i>The Area Plans follow a significantly different and more conventional LGA process such that I consider it is not appropriate to identify 'winners'. More detailed technical work and public consultation through the 1st Schedule RMA is required to confirm that the Potential Future Development Areas are in fact suitable. In addition, any proposals to rezone future land for the purposes as set out in the Area plans will need to be assessed against the cost/benefit requirements of Section 32 of the RMA. It is considered that the District Plan Review process, or alternatively, private plan change processes are the most appropriate mechanisms to realise this. To that end</i></p> <p><i>Further consideration to assess Lee A1 2 3 including the uplifting of the deferral and assess areas in wider context (see implementation steps in table 2 of Ellesmere Area Plan) are scheduled within a scoping project and a town centre study.</i></p> <p><i>Infill options for the towncentre will be further explored to allow for the development of smaller, easy maintenance sections in proximity to services. This approach is a district wide response to community feedback encouraging alternative housing options for a wide demographic.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil |
| 26 | Craig Clark | Southbridge | <p><i>Population, Growth & Urban Form</i></p> <p>1.1 The submitters support further development in Southbridge Township. Their property is at 44 Taumutu Road, on the south eastern side of the Road adjacent to the Southbridge Domain and opposite the Oakbridge development. The property is zoned Outer Plains</p> <p>1.2 The submitters do not support the extension of residential zonings onto land that does not currently have a strong relationship to the existing residential zonings, particularly where there are more appropriate opportunities available</p> <p>1.3 The submitters contend their property would be more appropriately zoned for higher density living and residential development.</p> | <p><i>Population, Growth & Urban Form</i></p> <p>1.1 The submitters support further residential zoning of land in Southbridge</p> <p>1.2 The submitters support more residential development in the vicinity of their property.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Residential zoning along both sides of Taumutu Road would allow for a natural progression of the township and is largely consistent with the Area Plan Principles as set on page 11 of the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan, principally those associated with Urban Form, Growth & Intensification (achieves a consolidated settlement pattern with clear township boundaries)..</i></p> <p><i>However, the Area Plan does not rezone land identified as being Possible Future Growth Options; this will need to occur as part of a formal Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) process – either through the District Plan Review, or alternatively, through a privately initiated Plan Change.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review. The DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|------------|---------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | <p><i>section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify the area subject to this submission (south of Taumutu Road and north of the existing Southbridge Reserve) as Southbridge Area STH A4 and as being suitable standard to low density residential development• Any consequential amendments to the Area Plan required to give effect to recognising the area as STH A4 |
| 30 | Helen Reid | Leeston | <p><i>Population, Growth & Urban Form</i></p> <p>1.1 Submission seems to suggest that 6.8 hectares of land immediately south of the existing urban boundary on Leeston and Lake Road be rezoned for residential purposes, while a parcel of 5.2ha south of that is zoned for future industrial purposes.</p> | <p><i>Population, Growth & Urban Form</i></p> <p>1.1 Submission seems to suggest that 6.8 hectares of land immediately south of the existing urban boundary on Leeston and Lake Road be rezoned for residential purposes</p> <p>1.2 A parcel of 5.2ha land south of that is the existing urban boundary on Leeston and Lake Road be rezoned for future industrial purposes.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The Area Plan is a strategic high level document that gives direction, over the 15 year lifetime of the Ellesmere Area Plan, on where future potential development options is best located, subject to further detailed assessment and design work.</i></p> <p><i>This is not considered to be the most appropriate area to locate additional development; development in this area is considered to be inconsistent with Area Plan Principles as set out on page 11 of the EAP, principally Urban Form, Growth and Intensification.</i></p> <p><i>However, the Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review. The DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</i></p> <p><i>This review is better able to consider the points raised in the submission.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil |

| | | | | | |
|----|---------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| 35 | Brent Nahkies | Dunsandel | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Dunsandel has stagnated in terms of population growth due to the current District Plan. Historically growth has been hampered by a lack of appropriately zoned and available land and there is a need to pro-actively re-zone greenfield sites in Dunsandel.</p> <p>1.2 A lack of zoned and available land has meant that any growth in Dunsandel has been forced to occur by subdivision of existing sections in the Living 1 and Living 2 zones in the township, neither of which is desirable.</p> <p>1.3 There has been large areas of rural land subdivided into 10 acre blocks to provide lifestyle blocks which is a poor use of rural land and contrary to the objectives of the District Plan.</p> <p>1.4 Compared to Dunsandel's "peers" (Kirwee & Doyleston), Dunsandel has the advantage of a significantly greater level of local employment both in terms of numbers and proportion of population, and there are a number of significant employment opportunities close to Dunsandel.</p> <p>1.5 The township is well endowed with a range of community infrastructure, contrary to a statement in the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan that states that Dunsandel suffers from an "absence of the necessary community infrastructure or services required to support additional growth".</p> <p>1.6 Growth has not been slow because of its poor location. Dunsandel is located close to Christchurch and Rolleston and is strategically located to benefit from current growth trends in relation to Christchurch City and the construction of the new southern motorway</p> <p>1.7 The Opus 5 Waters Review states that "of the settlements west of the Selwyn River, Dunsandel is more suited to growth than those located closer to the coast (Leeston, Doyleston and Southbridge)". The review also notes that Darfield and Kirwee both have constraints to growth.</p> <p>1.8 The Draft Ellesmere Area Plan fails to address the legacy of the 1km Rule</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The land south of the township boundary (i.e. south of SH1 and adjacent to the Business 2 zone) should be re-zoned to Living 2 or similar</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The area in question could potentially be suited to further low density residential development if issues, including but not limited to reverse sensitivity with rail corridor and adjacent commercial premises could be overcome.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that including this area as an alternative growth area for residential development is inconsistent with the Area Plan Principles as set out on page 11 of the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan, specifically those relating to Urban Form, Growth & Intensification.</i></p> <p><i>The Area Plan notes there is over 30 hectares of already zoned (deferred) residential land that sits within the township boundary and would be better suited for development than the area in question.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review. Table 1 – Implementation Steps – All Townships notes that the District Plan Review will 'review the appropriateness of Growth of Township policies and methods to coordinate sustainable and integrated urban growth.....'</i></p> <p><i>This review is better able to consider the points raised in the submission. At this stage it is not considered appropriate to include the area subject to this submission as a Possible Future Development in the Area Plan.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |
| 40 | Lisa Matthews | Dunsandel | <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 We agree with the development options however we would like to have far more emphasis on the effect of traffic build-up on State Highway 1.</p> <p>1.2 The intersection with SH1 and Browns Rd. This intersection is the only recognised crossing point on SH1 between Rakaia and Burnham. The Transit NZ sign outside the vets blocks vision South West along SH1 especially with Trucks, School Buses and Tractors.</p> <p>1.3 Extension of broken yellow no parking lines from Happers Honda to the corner. When vehicles park here it totally blocks vision from the same direction as above but this issue also includes cars, bikes and pedestrians. Users have to creep out onto the Highway to see. Especially problematic when large vehicles park here. Note here that the Traffic Safety Camera vehicle often parks here.</p> <p>1.4 Access onto or across SH1 from the railway side is very dangerous as large vehicles parked by millennium shelter block vision to traffic from the North East. This is especially problematic if large vehicles park here.</p> <p>1.5 The Speed Reduction signs on the North East of the Township. These signs block vision from the Hotel Car park. These should be relocated and we would like to see the provision of electronic "Slow Down" signs at both ends of the township.</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 Relocation of the Transit NZ sign outside the vets</p> <p>1.2 Extension of broken yellow no parking lines from Happers Honda to the corner.</p> <p>1.3 Speed (through the township on SH1?) should be reduced to 50km</p> <p>1.4 We would like to see an investigation into the provision of traffic lights at this intersection (SH1 & Browns Road?).</p> <p>1.5 Relocate Speed Reduction signs at the North East of the township and make provision for electronic "Slow Down" signs at both ends of the township</p> <p>1.6 Widen the footpath between the township and the Dunsandel tavern (along SH1?) to facilitate more users especially wheelchair/ mobility scooters.</p> <p>1.7 Development of a footpath along Railway Rd and then for a more controlled crossing of the Railway Line.</p> <p>1.8 There is a need for a path around the Irvines Rd, Leeston Rd, Tramway Rd block.</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>NZTA are currently undertaking a business case process for SH1 south of the Selwyn River. Council staff have been highlighting such issues to the NZTA and severance that SH1 creates through the township.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Area Plans signal that the Council will facilitate a Corridor Management Plan in the medium term. It is expected that the plan will consider such issues as highlighted by this and other submitters.</i></p> <p><i>Council has approved a \$500,000 budget for rapidly advancing its 2016/17 footpath extension programme. Council has approved extensions on Irvines Rd as relating to school access as the most important project to be funded in Dunsandel.</i></p> <p><i>It is also underway with consulting with communities to establish walking and cycling township network plans as part of its update of its Walking and Cycling Strategy that can identify and include other projects.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |

| | | | | | |
|----|------------------|-----------|---|---|--|
| | | | <p>1.6 Many Hotel patrons walk to the hotel from 2 directions. Firstly they use the footpath between the corner and the hotel. This path needs to be widened to facilitate more users especially wheelchair/ mobility scooters as at present they cannot pass oncoming users. Secondly they walk across the railway line from Railway Rd. This is a good option for those living on the South side of the township however this crossing is totally undeveloped and has many trip hazards. We would like to see the development of a footpath along Railway Rd and then for a more controlled crossing of the Railway Line.</p> <p>1.7 Currently there are no walking areas in Dunsandel. There is a provision in our 10 year plan to include some sort of exercise/walking area in the domain but there is a need for a path around the Irvines Rd, Leeston Rd, Tramway Rd block. This is extensively used now but along Tramway Rd users have to walk on the road.</p> | | |
| 41 | Deane Matthews | Dunsandel | <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 We agree with the development options however we would like to have far more emphasis on the effect of traffic build-up on State Highway 1.</p> <p>1.2 The intersection with SH1 and Browns Rd. This intersection is the only recognised crossing point on SH1 between Rakaia and Burnham. The Transit NZ sign outside the vets blocks vision South West along SH1 especially with Trucks, School Buses and Tractors.</p> <p>1.3 Extension of broken yellow no parking lines from Happers Honda to the corner. When vehicles park here it totally blocks vision from the same direction as above but this issue also includes cars, bikes and pedestrians. Users have to creep out onto the Highway to see. Especially problematic when large vehicles park here. Note here that the Traffic Safety Camera vehicle often parks here.</p> <p>1.4 Access onto or across SH1 from the railway side is very dangerous as large vehicles parked by millennium shelter block vision to traffic from the North East. This is especially problematic if large vehicles park here.</p> <p>1.5 The Speed Reduction signs on the North East of the Township. These signs block vision from the Hotel Car park. These should be relocated and we would like to see the provision of electronic “Slow Down” signs at both ends of the township.</p> <p>1.6 Many Hotel patrons walk to the hotel from 2 directions. Firstly they use the footpath between the corner and the hotel. This path needs to be widened to facilitate more users especially wheelchair/ mobility scooters as at present they cannot pass oncoming users. Secondly they walk across the railway line from Railway Rd. This is a good option for those living on the South side of the township however this crossing is totally undeveloped and has many trip hazards. We would like to see the development of a footpath along Railway Rd and then for a more controlled crossing of the Railway Line.</p> <p>1.7 Currently there are no walking areas in Dunsandel. There is a provision in our 10 year plan to include some sort of exercise/walking area in the domain but there is a need for a path around the Irvines Rd, Leeston Rd, Tramway Rd block. This is extensively used now but along Tramway Rd users have to walk on the road.</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 Relocation of the Transit NZ sign outside the vets</p> <p>1.2 Extension of broken yellow no parking lines from Happers Honda to the corner.</p> <p>1.3 Speed (through the township on SH1?) should be reduced to 50km</p> <p>1.4 We would like to see an investigation into the provision of traffic lights at this intersection (SH1 & Browns Road?).</p> <p>1.5 Relocate Speed Reduction signs at the North East of the township and make provision for electronic “Slow Down” signs at both ends of the township</p> <p>1.6 Widen the footpath between the township and the Dunsandel tavern (along SH1?) to facilitate more users especially wheelchair/ mobility scooters.</p> <p>1.7 Development of a footpath along Railway Rd and then for a more controlled crossing of the Railway Line.</p> <p>1.8 There is a need for a path around the Irvines Rd, Leeston Rd, Tramway Rd block.</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>NZTA are currently undertaking a business case process for SH1 south of the Selwyn River. Council staff have been highlighting such issues to the NZTA and severance that SH1 creates through the township</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Area Plans signal that the Council will facilitate a Corridor Management Plan in the medium term. It is expected that the plan will consider such issues as highlighted by this and other submitters.</i></p> <p><i>Council has approved a \$500,000 budget for rapidly advancing its 2016/17 footpath extension programme. Council has approved extensions on Irvines Rd as relating to school access as the most important project to be funded in Dunsandel.</i></p> <p><i>It is also underway with consulting with communities to establish walking and cycling township network plans as part of its update of its Walking and Cycling Strategy that can identify and include other projects.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |
| 42 | Rebecca Marshall | Dunsandel | <p>Transportation</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 Relocation of the Transit NZ sign outside the vets</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>NZTA are currently undertaking a business case process for SH1 south of the Selwyn River. Council staff have been highlighting</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------------|---------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>1.1 We agree with the development options however we would like to have far more emphasis on the effect of traffic build-up on State Highway 1.</p> <p>1.2 The intersection with SH1 and Browns Rd. This intersection is the only recognised crossing point on SH1 between Rakaia and Burnham. The Transit NZ sign outside the vets blocks vision South West along SH1 especially with Trucks, School Buses and Tractors.</p> <p>1.3 Extension of broken yellow no parking lines from Happers Honda to the corner. When vehicles park here it totally blocks vision from the same direction as above but this issue also includes cars, bikes and pedestrians. Users have to creep out onto the Highway to see. Especially problematic when large vehicles park here. Note here that the Traffic Safety Camera vehicle often parks here.</p> <p>1.4 Access onto or across SH1 from the railway side is very dangerous as large vehicles parked by millennium shelter block vision to traffic from the North East. This is especially problematic if large vehicles park here.</p> <p>1.5 The Speed Reduction signs on the North East of the Township. These signs block vision from the Hotel Car park. These should be relocated and we would like to see the provision of electronic “Slow Down” signs at both ends of the township.</p> <p>1.6 Many Hotel patrons walk to the hotel from 2 directions. Firstly they use the footpath between the corner and the hotel. This path needs to be widened to facilitate more users especially wheelchair/ mobility scooters as at present they cannot pass oncoming users. Secondly they walk across the railway line from Railway Rd. This is a good option for those living on the South side of the township however this crossing is totally undeveloped and has many trip hazards. We would like to see the development of a footpath along Railway Rd and then for a more controlled crossing of the Railway Line.</p> <p>1.7 Currently there are no walking areas in Dunsandel. There is a provision in our 10 year plan to include some sort of exercise/walking area in the domain but there is a need for a path around the Irvines Rd, Leeston Rd, Tramway Rd block. This is extensively used now but along Tramway Rd users have to walk on the road.</p> | <p>1.2 Extension of broken yellow no parking lines from Happers Honda to the corner.</p> <p>1.3 Speed (through the township on SH1?) should be reduced to 50km</p> <p>1.4 We would like to see an investigation into the provision of traffic lights at this intersection (SH1 & Browns Road?).</p> <p>1.5 Relocate Speed Reduction signs at the North East of the township and make provision for electronic “Slow Down” signs at both ends of the township</p> <p>1.6 Widen the footpath between the township and the Dunsandel tavern (along SH1?) to facilitate more users especially wheelchair/ mobility scooters.</p> <p>1.7 Development of a footpath along Railway Rd and then for a more controlled crossing of the Railway Line.</p> <p>1.8 There is a need for a path around the Irvines Rd, Leeston Rd, Tramway Rd block.</p> | <p><i>such issues to the NZTA and severance that SH1 creates through the township.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Area Plans signal that the Council will facilitate a Corridor Management Plan in the medium term. It is expected that the plan will consider such issues as highlighted by this and other submitters.</i></p> <p><i>Council has approved a \$500,000 budget for rapidly advancing its 2016/17 footpath extension programme. Council has approved extensions on Irvines Rd as relating to school access as the most important project to be funded in Dunsandel.</i></p> <p><i>It is also underway with consulting with communities to establish walking and cycling township network plans as part of its update of its Walking and Cycling Strategy that can identify and include other projects.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil |
| 43 | Murray Bell | Leeston | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The submitter is supportive of the future development proposal for LEE A3, they have declined any initiative to have a private initiated plan change until now. The submitter sees a glaring need for business land in Leeston to be made available - over the last 4 years they have been approached by 5 different purchasers wanting business land to be made available from Station Street. They see there is a place for Council to help in planning and moving this forward. As they see it, the lifeblood of our smaller rural communities is to have businesses located within the town that are employers of local residents.</p> <p>I</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Move the process of changing land zoning from outer plains to business two zoning along Station St (Area LEE A3)</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Agree with submission in part. However, the Area Plans are strategic high level documents that give direction on where development options present themselves but do not initiate any rezoning - this will need to occur as part of a formal Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) process.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review. The DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|----------------|-------------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</i></p> <p><i>Alternatively, rezoning of this area for the purposes identified in the Area Plan through the formal RMA process could be initiated through a privately initiated Plan Change.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil |
| 47 | Grant Clibborn | Southbridge | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 While we support some development in Southbridge we consider it is also important to retain the township’s current and existing rural character.</p> <p>1.2 We reside on the north-western side of McKenzie Avenue, currently zoned ‘Outer Plains’ in the Selwyn District Plan. The street scene here is appealing in that it has a residential aspect near High Street and progresses into a rural character as you head towards the north east. Properties here are larger and maintain a rural outlook and character, containing not only dwellings but also sheds, plantings and many animals.</p> <p>1.3 The Area Plan for Southbridge is suggesting a future rezoning along McKenzie Avenue and its surrounds (STH A1) to ‘residential’ development. We would not support higher density living in this area for the following reasons:</p> <p>1. It would substantially change the character and amenity of this part of the township to be one of ‘suburban’ style living which is not in keeping with the character of the township. Many buyers coming to Southbridge are looking for larger section sizes and a place to have some semi-rural type activities, such as keeping livestock or horses for recreational purposes, along with more open space to enjoy the quieter amenity values associated with a small township. 2. The rural nature of the street with a wide grassed berm and no formal definition via kerb and channel, combined with the space to enjoy the established trees provides a tranquil setting that is not only quieter and peaceful but also an attractive living environment away from the busier smaller sections in the town or other intensified townships in Selwyn.</p> <p>3. The current zoning and development on McKenzie Avenue provides for a sensible graduation to the larger rural and farming setting beyond and buffers the rest of the township from potential reverse sensitivity effects that might occur with higher density development.</p> <p>4. We do not support more residential development at the end of McKenzie Avenue that would lead to significantly higher traffic movement. The need to upgrade the avenue to support higher vehicle use would significantly detract from the amenity and landscape features of the street scene and also put at further risk pedestrian and student safety in accessing the school grounds from its rear boundary gate located adjacent to McKenzie Avenue.</p> <p>5. There are other more succinct, ‘pocketed’ locations for intensive development in Southbridge that would result in</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 We oppose any further residential zoning of land along either side of McKenzie Avenue, at the end of it, or to the immediate rear of the north-western properties along this street (STH A1).</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The Area Plan is a strategic high level documents that give direction, over the 15 year lifetime of the Ellesmere Area Plan, on where future potential development options is best located, subject to further detailed assessment and design work.</i></p> <p><i>While Council appreciates the submitters concern in retaining the current zoning, this area represents a logical growth path to cater for long term growth and development and provides a logical opportunity for mixed density development (standard density through to rural residential style development akin to a Living 3 zone) in vicinity to the local school, and provides benefits should people wish to subdivide their land. It is also considered that the submitters property, and others on the north side of McKenzie Avenue, represents the logical location for Living 3 type development.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----------------------------|---------|---|--|--|
| | | | attractive levels of development which would also retain the township's current amenity and landscape values. | | |
| 48 | Leeston Community Committee | Leeston | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Industrial Land - The committee supports the identifying and zoning of suitable industrial land to support the township need through a Town Centre Study. Additional Business 2 zoned locations are definitely sought after and current industrial land owners would be reluctant to relinquish land they see as future-proofing their own businesses.</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.2 Community Centre - The committee appreciates the feasibility study undertaken to progress the Ellesmere Community Centre concept. A community centre managed by Council would relieve the pressure on other centres in the District and the current Leeston Library community room. It is necessary to look into how to establish a rating system to be ready to meet the cost of establishing a Community Centre for Ellesmere in a similar way to having rates for system upgrades ready before the upgrade is needed.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.3 Transportation (Parking) - Town centre parking issues have been growing in Leeston and do not look like resolving in the immediate term. The community would like to retain the heritage nature of the town centre and in view of the investment to go into the Ellesmere Heritage Park, it would be prudent to look at solutions that retain the current aesthetic for the benefit of Selwyn District. The committee are pleased to see this issue is to be addressed in the Town Centre study.</p> <p>1.4 Transportation (Footpaths) - While digging up the area for flood mitigation, sewerage upgrading and other necessities it would be a great time to address the issue of footpaths. There is just one small area for Leeston that is a major priority and that is at the top of Cunningham St connecting with Pound Road, outside Ellesmere Hospital. The area requires curb and channeling and a footpath suitable for wheelchairs to accommodate the residents of Ellesmere Hospital and the many students walking through to Ellesmere College. There is an additional area on the Northeastern side of Leeston Park in Chervier St that has seen a large increase in foot traffic due to the Millbridge subdivision and would only require a short distance of footpath to connect the current paths with the Park walkways.</p> <p>1.5 Transportation (Public Transport) - The Leeston community have always been eager for a bus service into Christchurch but the commercial options presented have proved to be too expensive. The Park N' Ride concept is thoroughly supported and a bus service connecting with these sites at Lincoln and Rolleston would be logical. The Committee would ask that Council do everything within it's power to remove the current impediments to these connections.</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.6 5 Waters (Sewage) - The sewerage system in Leeston is meeting, and in many cases beyond, its life-of-type for the connections and piping that was installed initially. Page 19 'Leeston Snapshot' shows a predicted 49% increase in population. The Ellesmere Wastewater Treatment Plant needs land allocated to counter reverse sensitivity issues and major works are needed to upgrade the connections before the system</p> | | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Table 1 – Implementation Steps – All Townships and Table 2 – Implementation Steps – Leeston both consider the provision of Business land in Leeston and the wider Ellesmere area. Table 1 notes that the District Plan Review is to consider ‘the appropriateness of growth of Township policies and methods to coordinate sustainable Business 1 and 2 growth and provide for community needs by taking into account the identified Area Plan Issues and Opportunities’. Table 2 notes that a Leeston Town Centre Study shall be initiated, which is to identify ‘the location and quantum of additional Business 1 and Business 2 land required to provide for Leeston’s future retail, commercial and industrial requirements out to 2031’.</i></p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p><i>It is likely that Council will review the current rating system for community facilities sometime in the near future. This may have impacts for rating new facilities including anything proposed for Leeston. Prior to any rating being put in place for Leeston, costs related to any future development and its operation will need to be determined.</i></p> <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>Council has identified it needs to resource parking enforcement going forward in higher growth areas.</i></p> <p><i>Council has approved a \$500,000 budget for rapidly advancing its 2016/17 footpath extension programme. Council has approved the extension on Cunningham St and Chervier St as part of this.</i></p> <p><i>It is also underway with consulting with communities to establish walking and cycling township network plans as part of its update of its Walking and Cycling Strategy that can identify and include other projects.</i></p> <p><i>Council has identified Park N Ride at Rolleston and Lincoln for some time and these are referenced in the respective Town Centre Upgrade Plans.</i></p> <p><i>A new Joint Public Transport Committee has been set up between the Councils. It will be looking at wider issues to improve the provision and use of PT services. Environment Canterbury is responsible for providing metro bus services and accessing demand and if services are justifiable and/or affordable in the first instance. It is unlikely that this will be the case in the Ellesmere area unless a full user pays service is provided by a third party. On this basis no investment in specific Park N Ride facilities would be warranted based on other informal parking opportunities available.</i></p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Council staff support the use of ‘low pressure sewer’ in areas where the ground water table is high.</i></p> <p><i>Council staff support considering reverse sensitivity around the Ellesmere Wastewater Treatment Plant.</i></p> <p><i>Upgrades to the disposal fields are underway with an additional pivot planned for the year 2016/7.</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|------------------|-----------|--|---|---|
| | | | <p>will be ready for the estimated 402 extra households. P26 Leeston area 1 it describes difficulties with gravity sewer system we should look at pumped schemes into gravity schemes as a solution.</p> <p>Other</p> <p>1.7 There are a number of errors in the document that require correction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> pg 22 para 1 Ellesmere (not Malvern). pg 22 para 4 the formal pedestrian connection opportunity is between Palladio Ave and Cunningham St/Pound Rd corners past the ponds (not through the Hospital land). pg 22 para 5 Ellesmere Wastewater Treatment Plant (at Leeston, not named Leeston), see also other instances of incorrect title further in the document. pg 24 Leeston Consolidated School (which is the primary-level school at Leeston), see also other instances of incorrect title further in the document. pg 30 point (2) the mention of truck stops along SH73 has no relation to Leeston whatsoever. Leeston has a heavy-traffic bypass to avoid trucks stopping or otherwise congesting the town centre. pg 30 cycling connection with Doyleston should be Short term as it is included in the 16/17 budget. pg 31 Ellesmere College (not Leeston High School), see also other instances of incorrect title further in the document. | | <p><i>Opus Consultants are reviewing operational capacity and will provide advice on timing of future upgrades.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the Ellesmere Area Plan to correct minor errors as follows <ul style="list-style-type: none"> pg 22 para 1 Ellesmere (not Malvern). pg 22 para 4 the formal pedestrian connection opportunity is between Palladio Ave and Cunningham St/Pound Rd corners past the ponds (not through the Hospital land). pg 22 para 5 Ellesmere Wastewater Treatment Plant (at Leeston, not named Leeston), see also other instances of incorrect title further in the document. pg 24 Leeston Consolidated School (which is the primary-level school at Leeston), see also other instances of incorrect title further in the document. pg 30 point (2) the mention of truck stops along SH73 has no relation to Leeston whatsoever. Leeston has a heavy-traffic bypass to avoid trucks stopping or otherwise congesting the town centre. pg 30 cycling connection with Doyleston should be Short term as it is included in the 16/17 budget. pg 31 Ellesmere College (not Leeston High School), see also other instances of incorrect title further in the document. |
| 53 | Millar Doyleston | Doyleston | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Support in principle the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan and in particular identification of Doyleston Area 2 (DOY A2), as a low density residential area subject to amendments.</p> <p>1.2 The identification of development areas on the Doyleston Area Plan map provides direction and certainty to the community, development sector, service providers and land owners in respect to urban development is anticipated within Area Plan area.</p> <p>1.3 It is not appropriate and contrary to the RMA to rely on private plan change requests to implement zoning of the development areas shown in the Ellesmere Area Plan. The DPR should rezone these areas.</p> <p>1.4 The stated overall EAP approach is that there is sufficient developable available to accommodate projected household and business growth and/ or that there are constraints which currently preclude additional development - but that this does not preclude any additional greenfield land from being considered for zoning through privately-initiated plan change requests under the RMA.</p> <p>1.5 It is contrary to the purpose of the RMA in enabling people and communities to provide for their economic and social welfare to rely solely on private plan changes to facilitate future urban growth when there is a DPR underway. This is not the most appropriate method and is inefficient and ineffective compared to DPR rezoning land (especially where the landowner actively supports zoning and assists in providing required technical supporting information).</p> <p>1.6 There is very little available Living 1 land remaining at Doyleston. There is however, a strong demand for additional sections especially post-earthquakes. The take up of the remaining</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Amend the overall Area Plan approach to identify preferred development areas rather than possible future development options, with urban zoning to be implemented through the District Plan Review.</p> <p>1.2 Include Doyleston Area 2 in the EAP as a preferred mixed standard and low density preferred residential growth area, with provision for standard residential development along the Drain Road and Doyleston Domain boundaries of Area 2 (minimum average lot size not less than 650m2), and lower density residential development (minimum average lot size not less than 5000m2) for the balance land, generally as per the map attached as Appendix A of the submitters submission.</p> <p>1.3 In addition identify land between Leeston Road and Beethams Rd as a low density residential area (minimum average lot size not less than 1 ha), as shown on the map attached as Appendix A.</p> <p>1.4 Any consequential amendments to the MAP to give effect to the intent of the submission.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>It is not considered appropriate to amend the EAP to identify Possible Future Development Options as Preferred Options.</i></p> <p><i>The Area Plan Assessment that identified the Possible Future Development Options was carried out at a very high level; more detailed technical assessments, along with a more detailed cost benefit analysis in accordance with section 32 of the RMA is required. In addition, no 1st Schedule RMA consultation has been carried out. Until such assessments and consultation has been carried out it is not considered appropriate to identify these areas as ‘Preferred’ areas for development.</i></p> <p><i>It may be appropriate to identify DOY 2 for a mix of standard to low density development as it is considered such a zoning pattern may be consistent with the Area Plan Principles set out on page 11 of the EAP..</i></p> <p><i>It is not considered appropriate to identify land between Leeston road and Beethams Road as low density residential. It is considered that such an approach is inconsistent with the Area Plan Principles as set out on Page 11 of the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan, and in particular those Principles associated with Urban Form, Growth and Intensification.</i></p> <p><i>However, the recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review is better able to consider the points raised in the submission. Table 1 – Implementation Steps – All Townships notes that the District Plan Review will ‘review the appropriateness of Growth of Township</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|--------|-----------|--|--|---|
| | | | <p>residential subdivision at Petticoat Lane, Dolyeston has been rapid, with approximately 30 sections developed and sold since the earthquakes.</p> <p>1.7 There is a lack of availability of slightly larger 1000m2 sites at Doyleston and no land or sections available or zoned for low density residential purposes.</p> <p>1.8 The only other possible residential development area at Doyleston identified in the EAP is Doyleston Area 1 – low density development, supplemented with mixed density residential development. This is not a greenfield site but comprises a mix of landowners and existing development including some business land. Development is likely to be piecemeal and organic and occur incrementally over a longer timeframe depending on the aspirations of individual landowners.</p> <p>1.9 The Ellesmere Area Plan identifies potential development constraints for Area 2 relating to high ground water, localised flooding and poor drainage which will need to be resolved prior to development proceeding; and Class III Versatile soils. However, it is understood that these potential development constraints do not apply and/ or are not a significant issue for Area 2 for a number of reasons.</p> | | <p><i>policies and methods to coordinate sustainable and integrated urban growth.....’</i></p> <p><i>Any such process under the DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend the Area plan to identify Area DOY 2 as an area potentially suitable for a mix of ‘Standard to low density residential development’ Any consequential amendments to the Area Plan required to give effect to the amendments noted above. |
| 64 | Survus | Dunsandel | <p><i>Population, Growth & Urban Form</i></p> <p>1.1 The submissions asks that the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan be amended to include the area adjacent to the Business 2 Land south of SH1 and the Main South Line railway (attached as Appendix A to their submission) as a preferred development area for residential and/or business purposes. Urban development would ‘fill in’ a gap in the urban form of Dunsandel south of the SH1, and access can be provided from Tram Road, avoiding any potential reverse sensitivity effects with the SH.</p> | <p><i>Population, Growth & Urban Form</i></p> <p>1.1 Amend the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan to include the area adjacent to the Business 2 Land south of SH1 and the Main South Line railway as indicated in Appendix A to their submission.</p> | <p><i>Population, Growth & Urban Form</i></p> <p><i>The area in question could potentially be suited to further low density residential development if issues, including but not limited to reverse sensitivity with rail corridor and adjacent commercial premises could be overcome.</i></p> <p><i>It is considered that including this area as an alternative growth area for residential development is inconsistent with the Area Plan Principles as set out on page 11 of the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan, specifically those relating to Urban Form, Growth & Intensification.</i></p> <p><i>The Area Plan notes there is over 30 hectares of already zoned (deferred) residential land that sits within the township boundary and would be better suited for development than the area in question.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review. Table 1 – Implementation Steps – All Townships notes that the District Plan Review will ‘review the appropriateness of Growth of Township policies and methods to coordinate sustainable and integrated urban growth.....’</i></p> <p><i>This review is better able to consider the points raised in the submission. At this stage it is not considered appropriate to include the area subject to this submission as a Possible Future Development in the Area Plan.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | |
| 67 | Doyleston Community Committee | Doyleston | <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 If potable water is a short term issue, waste water is a short term one too as it requires more issues to be taken into account therefore they need to be done at the same time.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.2 The walking –cycle way is in the budget for 2016-2017 and the walking and cycle way in Drain Road is noted as medium but should be short</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.3 DOY A2 This area could go more towards Leeston. The flooding area east of Beethams Road is less of an issue than other areas shown</p> <p>Other</p> <p>1.4 Please note that Doyleston is 30 minutes from Hornby not Christchurch</p> <p>1.5 Page 32 Figure 10 – The old library site in Leeston Road is not shown</p> <p>1.6 Page 33 – The engineering business not noted in Queen Street</p> <p>1.7 Page 34 Under Issues – paragraph starting Development should read Greenan Place not Graham Place</p> <p>1.8 Page 37 – DOY A1 Advantages. Wastewater will require a pumping station for this area.</p> | <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 Amend waste water in the Doyleston Implementation Steps to a short term project.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.2 Amend the Area Plan by noting that the proposed walking –cycle way along Drain Road is a short term implementation step</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.3 Amend the Area Plan by showing DOY A2 going more towards Leeston.</p> <p>Other</p> <p>1.4 Amend Area Plan to note that Doyleston is 30 minutes from Hornby not Christchurch</p> <p>1.5 Amend the Area Plan to show The old library site on Leeston Road and the engineering business on Queen Street</p> <p>1.6 Amend the Area plan by changing Graham Place to Greenan Place</p> <p>1.7 Amend the Area Plan by noting that advantages for DOY A1include wastewater will require a pumping station for this area.</p> | <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Waste water is not mentioned in the published in the Doyleston Implementation plan.</i></p> <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>Council is underway with consulting with communities to establish walking and cycling township network plans as part of its update of its Walking and Cycling Strategy that can identify and include other projects.</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>It is considered that amending the Doyleston Area Plan to allow Area DOY A2 to move closer to Leeston is inconsistent with the Area Plan Principles as set out on page 11 of the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan, in particular those principles relating to Urban Form, Growth and Intensification.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amend Area Plan to note that Doyleston is 30 minutes from Hornby |
| 69 | Clayton Fairbairn | Doyleston | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The area plans should identify land to the west of Railway Terrace and the south of Drain Road, either side of Osbourne Park, to allow the township to grow and to provide a variety of larger section sizes.</p> <p>1.2 The township should be enabled to grow via ribbon development along Drain Road and Railway Terrace in the short term with land available to enable further growth toward Leeston along Leeston Road.</p> <p>1.3 Infill development should not be identified for growth in Doyleston at this stage of the towns development.</p> <p>1.4 The draft area plans are outdated and do not accurately identify the land uses that may constrain growth. There are obvious error in the identification of intensive farming activities and no consultation has been undertaken with the intensive farm land owners as to the short to medium term use of the land, however these land uses are identified as constraints in the area plans.</p> <p>1.5 In all Ellesmere towns additional land should be identified for growth. Small towns with low land prices especially need an easy means for growth, that is parcels of land in several holdings, in case one property owner does not want to develop holding up growth for a generation, and making easier the plan change process.</p> <p>1.6 Small towns provide amenity and low cost housing not found in larger urban areas. The growth in small towns makes the infrastructure cheaper for the community and when these towns have reached larger low density size then infill development will begin. Now is the time to identify the land for growth. Council cannot be caught short with insufficient land identified (Rolleston, Prebbleton, Leeston).</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Identify land to the west of Railway Terrace and the south of Drain Road, either side of Osbourne Park, to allow the township to grow and to provide a variety of larger section sizes</p> <p>1.2 Enable the town to grow via ribbon development along Drain Road and Railway Terrace in the short term with land available to enable further growth toward Leeston along Leeston Road</p> <p>1.3 Do not provide for infill development</p> <p>1.4 Identify additional land for growth in all townships</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>It is considered that much of the relief sought by this submitter is inconsistent with the Area Plan Principles as set out on page 11 of the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan, in particular those principles relating to Urban Form, Growth and Intensification.</i></p> <p><i>Additional land has been identified to the south of Osborne Park for additional low density residential development. Additional provision would be inconsistent with Area Plan Principle ‘Promote settlement patterns and facilitate growth that is directed to existing townships and the amount of growth is consistent with the Selwyn 2031 Township Network’. As such identifying additional areas in the Area Plans is not considered necessary at this stage.</i></p> <p><i>Providing for ribbon development is in my opinion not good planning practice and is inconsistent with the Area Plan Principles that seeks to direct growth to existing townships and the amount of growth is consistent with the Selwyn 2031 Township Network, and growth that ‘achieve consolidated settlement patterns with clear township boundaries.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------|---------|--|---|--|
| | | | <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.7 The potential flooding issues that have been identified do not have any reference with regard to frequency. Flooding is common over the Canterbury coastal confined aquifer but is not necessarily an impediment to development.</p> <p>1.8 The plans refer to limited capacity in the Leeston wastewater facility however the council asset department does not identify any capacity issues with the plant that may effect potential growth.</p> | | <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</i></p> <p><i>This review may better be able to consider the points raised in the submission.</i></p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Doyleston is located in an area of high groundwater. The township is located between the Drain Road drain and Boggy Creek, both drainage systems are prone to flooding in high rainfall events.</i></p> <p><i>Stormwater ultimately discharges to the sensitive environment of Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere. Careful consideration of the location and design of future development needs to take into account these considerations.</i></p> <p><i>Upgrades to the Ellesmere STP disposal fields are underway with an additional pivot planned for the year 2016/7. Opus Consultants are reviewing operational capacity and will provide advice on timing of future upgrades.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil |
| 71 | Ben and Rebecca Fearnley | Leeston | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Given that Station Street is the commercial/industrial hub for Leeston, it would be a logical step for council to re-zone this remaining portion of land. We also run a building business and where possible we try to use local businesses/services. We think that re-zoning the land will encourage businesses to start or stay, which in turn leads to growth, employment and opportunity for the community which has got to be good for our businesses and other businesses within the community.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Given that Station Street is the commercial/industrial hub for Leeston council to re-zone this remaining portion of land</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The Area Plan has identified an area for a possible commercial/industrial hub (Area LEE A3). In addition, Table 1 – Implementation Steps – All Townships and Table 2 – Implementation Steps – Leeston both consider the provision of Business land in Leeston and the wider Ellesmere area.</i></p> <p><i>Table 1 notes that the District Plan Review is to consider ‘the appropriateness of growth of Township policies and methods to coordinate sustainable Business 1 and 2 growth and provide for community needs by taking into account the identified Area Plan Issues and Opportunities’.</i></p> <p><i>Table 2 notes that a Leeston Town Centre Study shall be initiated, which is to identify ‘the location and quantum of additional Business 1 and Business 2 land required to provide for Leeston’s future retail, commercial and industrial requirements out to 2031’.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider growth requirements (e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|-----------------|---------------------------------|---|--|---|
| | | | | | <p><i>provided, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</i></p> <p><i>Where a need is identified for additional residential development then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process. This review will be better able to consider the points raised in the submission.</i></p> <p><i>Identifying additional land outside of that already shown (if indeed that is what this submission is seeking) is not considered appropriate at this stage. Identifying other areas would be inconsistent with Area Plan Principles as set out on page 11 of the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan, specifically those relating to Urban Form, Growth and Intensification, although it is recognised that such proposals may be consistent with other Principles (such as Communities & Local Character).</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |
| 73 | Paula Roberts | Leeston, Doyleston, Southbridge | <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 I believe council should propose to ECan that a Park and Ride facility be built in Lincoln so that residents in Irwell, Leeston and Southbridge areas could travel to Lincoln and bus from there. Lincoln bus service is frequent and regular. Park and ride in Rolleston would be less convenient as being slightly further and has the negative impact of more traffic on Goulds road which is narrow and winding - and has multiple intersections with high crash potential.</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 That a Park and Ride facility be built in Lincoln so that residents in Irwell, Leeston and Southbridge areas could travel to Lincoln and bus from there.</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>Council has identified Park N Ride at Rolleston and Lincoln for some time and these are referenced in the respective Town Centre Upgrade Plans.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |
| 75 | Mary Nimmo | Southbridge | <p>Other</p> <p>1.1 I have asked for the Power lines in the High street to be placed underground. Every other village has had this done...even the Rakaia Huts!! We have old unattractive power poles and draped lines over the street. The view up this street to the mountains-- sometimes snow covered and with the cherry trees in flower could be spectacular if it were not for the messy lines. I could not find any mention that this would be done in your plans, and ask you to seriously consider doing so. After all Broadband cables get put underground everywhere no problem at all."</p> | <p>Other</p> <p>1.1 That the Power lines in the High street to be placed underground.</p> | <p>Other</p> <p><i>Council is not the agency responsible for the undergrounding of overhead power lines.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |
| 76 | Russell Dalzell | Dunsandel | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 There is no real direction with regard to the provision of an extended retail precinct in Dunsandel. I would like the area between the Township and the Hotel to be considered for this.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.2 I propose that a slip road to be put in parallel to SH1 between the Township and Hotel. This would allow a safety zone off the State Hwy that could be accessed from either the Hotel or off Hororata Rd. Between that slip road and SH1 could be landscaping and parking and on the northern side could be retail sites.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 That the area between the Township and the Hotel to be considered for additional business (retail) precinct.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.2 That a slip road, and associated infrastructure (landscaping & parking space) to be put in parallel to SH1 between the Township and Hotel.</p> <p>1.3 Close Hororata Rd to through traffic from Kanes Rd to Browns Rd.</p> | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>At this stage it is not considered appropriate to identify the land subject to this submission as an area for business growth. Identifying this area would be inconsistent with Area Plan Principles as set out on page 11 of the Draft Ellesmere Area Plan, specifically those relating to Urban Form, Growth and Intensification. A retail assessment commissioned by the Council to inform the Ellesmere Area Plan concludes there is sufficient zoned Business 1 capacity existing in Dunsandel to accommodate projected demand.</i></p> <p><i>However, the Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider growth requirements</i></p> |

| | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------|-----------|---|--|---|
| | | | <p>1.3 I would envisage Hororata Rd be closed to through traffic from Kanes Rd to Browns Rd. This is assuming traffic lights or similar be put on Browns Rd/SH1 intersection. I realize this entails the purchase of existing dwellings and all I am asking is that these properties be flagged as potential strategic assets for Dunsandel by the Council.</p> | <p>1.4 Properties in the Browns Road/SH1 area to be flagged as potential strategic assets for Dunsandel to be purchased by the Council (to provide space for traffic lights.</p> | <p>(e.g. demand and supply, typologies, densities) for each township within a formal RMA process, which will include more detailed technical assessments and the costs and benefits of particular options under section 32 of the RMA. The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing direction on where and how growth should be provided, and would include consideration of the Possible Future Development Option Areas identified in the Area Plans.</p> <p>Where a need is identified for additional development capacity (residential or commercial/industrial) then the location and type of growth will be considered through the DPR process in line with strategic growth objectives and policies of the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP). If additional growth areas are required then it is anticipated Council will work with relevant landowners to establish the extent to which the Area Plans opportunities for each identified area can be realised through the DPR process.</p> <p>As such, it is considered that the District Plan Review is better able to consider the points raised in the submission.</p> <p>Transportation NZTA are currently undertaking a business case process for SH1 south of the Selwyn River. Council staff have been highlighting such issues to the NZTA and severance that SH1 creates through the township.</p> <p>In addition, the Area Plans signal that a Corridor Management Plan in the medium term is envisaged to be developed as part of this. It is expected that the plan will consider such issues as highlighted by this and other submitters.</p> <p>A “slip road” in the manner suggested would not be practically or economically viable. In addition NZTA would not wish to see traffic signals installed as this is considered an impediment to state highway traffic flows.</p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil |
| 77 | Dunsandel Community Committee | Dunsandel | <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 We agree with the development options however we would like to have far more emphasis on the effect of traffic build-up on State Highway 1.</p> <p>Transportation We would like to see the following options considered immediately.</p> <p>1.2 The intersection with SH1 and Browns Rd. This intersection is the only recognised crossing point on SH1 between Rakaia and Burnham.</p> <p>1.3 Relocation of the Transit NZ sign outside the vets as this blocks vision South West along SH1 especially with Trucks, School Buses and Tractors.</p> <p>1.4 Extension of broken yellow no parking lines from Happers Honda to the corner.</p> <p>1.5 When vehicles park here it totally blocks vision from the same direction as above but this issue also includes cars, bikes and pedestrians. Users have to creep out onto the Highway to see.</p> | <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 Relocation of the Transit NZ sign outside the vets as this blocks vision South West along SH1 especially with Trucks, School Buses and Tractors.</p> <p>1.2 Extension of broken yellow no parking lines from Happers Honda to the corner.</p> <p>1.3 Access onto or across SH1 from the railway side is very dangerous as large vehicles parked by millennium shelter block vision to traffic from the North East. This is especially problematic if large vehicles park here. Speed should be reduced to 50km along SH1 through the township.</p> <p>1.4 An investigation into the provision of traffic lights at this intersection.</p> <p>1.5 The Speed Reduction signs on the North East of the Township should be relocated and we would like to see the provision of electronic ‘Slow Down’ signs at both ends of the township.</p> <p>1.6 Many Hotel patrons walk to the hotel from 2 directions. Firstly they use the footpath between the corner and the hotel. Widen</p> | <p>Transportation NZTA are currently undertaking a business case process for SH1 south of the Selwyn River. Council staff have been highlighting such issues to the NZTA and severance that SH1 creates through the township.</p> <p>In addition, the Area Plans signal that a Corridor Management Plan in the medium term is envisaged to be developed as part of this. It is expected that the plan will consider such issues as highlighted by this and other submitters.</p> <p>The NZTA manages the state highway through Dunsandel including the adjoining intersections. For routine operation issues the Community Committee should raise any concerns directly with the NZTA</p> <p>Council has approved a \$500,000 budget for rapidly advancing its 2016/17 footpath extension programme. Council has approved</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|---|
| | | <p>Especially problematic when large vehicles park here. Note here that the Traffic Safety Camera vehicle often parks here.</p> <p>1.6 Access onto or across SH1 from the railway side is very dangerous as large vehicles parked by millennium shelter block vision to traffic from the North East. This is especially problematic if large vehicles park here. Speed should be reduced to 50km.</p> <p>1.7 We would like to see an investigation into the provision of traffic lights at this intersection.</p> <p>1.8 The Speed Reduction signs on the North East of the Township. These signs block vision from the Hotel Car park. These should be relocated and we would like to see the provision of electronic ‘Slow Down’ signs at both ends of the township.</p> <p>1.9 Many Hotel patrons walk to the hotel from 2 directions. Firstly they use the footpath between the corner and the hotel. This path needs to be widened to facilitate more users especially wheelchair/ mobility scooters as at present they cannot pass oncoming users. Secondly they walk across the railway line from Railway Rd. This is a good option for those living on the South side of the township however this crossing is totally undeveloped and has many trip hazards. We would like to see the development of a footpath along Railway Rd and then for a more controlled crossing of the Railway Line.</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.10 Currently there are no walking areas in Dunsandel. There is a provision in our 10 year plan to include some sort of exercise/walking area in the domain but there is a need for a path around the Irvines Rd, Leeston Rd, Tramway Rd block. This is extensively used now but along Tramway Rd users have to walk on the road.</p> | <p>the path from the Dunsandel Hotel to facilitate more users especially wheelchair/ mobility scooters as at present they cannot pass oncoming users. Secondly they walk across the railway line from Railway Rd. This is a good option for those living on the South side of the township however this crossing is totally undeveloped and has many trip hazards.</p> <p>1.7 The development of a footpath along Railway Rd and then for a more controlled crossing of the Railway Line.</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.8 There is a need for a path around the Irvines Rd, Leeston Rd, Tramway Rd block.</p> | <p><i>extensions on Irvines Rd as relating to school access as the most important project to be funded in Dunsandel.</i></p> <p><i>It is also underway with consulting with communities to establish walking and cycling township network plans as part of its update of its Walking and Cycling Strategy that can identify and include other projects</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil |
|--|--|--|---|---|