

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

Submitter #	Submitter	Township Submitting On	Submission Points	Relief Sought	Staff/Technical Comments & Recommendations
1	Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB)	Malvern	<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>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 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. T</p> <p>1.5 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>1.6 That any upgraded public toilet facilities comply with NZS4121 to ensure that they are fully accessible</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.7 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>1.8 The CDHB recommends that Council investigate the potential for using the rail corridor for public transport in the medium to long term.</p> <p>1.9 Kirwee - The CDHB recommends that school parking is assessed to ensure that the risk of accidents are minimised.</p> <p>1.10 Rolleston - The CDHB recommends that Council Consider a park-and-ride facility at a centralised location</p>	<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><i>Onsite wastewater treatment and disposal is appropriate in many areas. Environment Canterbury are the consenting agencies. Darfield and Kirwee are Councils largest township services by on-site wastewater systems. The Area Plan has an identified Implementation step of ‘Continue with the Darfield & Kirwee Wastewater Working Party...’ this is believed to be appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>Currently section sizes below 450m3 are being granted consent by Environment Canterbury.</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 Malvern area unless a full user pays service is provided by a third party (like Red Bus does now). 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>The rail corridor, related infrastructure and rolling stock is owned and manged by KiwiRail on commercial basis and is primarily for freight. There would not be the demand to justify the very high costs to provide passenger rail services on a commercial basis.</i></p> <p><i>Schools should be providing parking on site and not relying on road side parking for pick up and drop off. MoE/Schools are encouraged/required by Council to develop Transport Management Plan to assess traffic effects and mitigation measures.</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</i></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 It is positive to note the Darfield and Kirwee Wastewater working party will be consulting with the community on the issue of reticulated sewerage systems. It is noted on site waste water disposal cannot be sustained should higher density housing typologies be considered.</p> <p>1.10 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 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>1.11 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>1.12 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>1.13 In the long term, health services may be further integrated within the Selwyn district and this may result in IFHCs.</p> <p>1.14 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>1.15 Community facilities such as halls, playgrounds and sports fields are important assets for people for both physical and mental wellbeing.</p> <p>1.16 Arthurs Pass - The CDHB supports mechanisms to generate funds for the community centre improvements</p> <p>1.17 Castle Hill - The CDHB supports playground renewal, upgrading of the community centre and development of a new reserve areas with green linkages.</p> <p>1.18 Coalgate - The CDHB supports upgrading the sports facilities at the recreation reserve and redeveloping the reserve for passive recreation.</p> <p>1.19 Darfield - The CDHB supports investigation of accessibility of community facilities, upgrading swimming pool and neighbourhood playground.</p> <p>1.20 Hororata - The CDHB supports a review of community facilities with the local community, as well as the development of a walking track, and the upgrading of the playground.</p>		<p><i>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>Local Facilities & Community Development <i>The Council is currently developing a Community Spaces Plan and although focused on eastern Selwyn will provide some direction on provision of community facilities in the wider district including accessibility. A Disability Strategy is also being prepared which promotes improved accessibility measures.</i></p> <p><i>All new or upgraded toilet blocks provided by Council comply with NZS4121 except where these are in very remote locations.</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <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 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:<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Add an implementation step where Council is to consider the appropriateness of providing for a consenting pathway for Integrated Family Health
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>1.21 Lake Coleridge - The CDHB supports the upgrading of the playground.</p> <p>1.22 Sheffield - The CDHB supports an upgrade of the swimming pool.</p> <p>1.23 Springfield - The CDHB supports the walking and cycling track.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.24 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>1.25 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>1.26 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.• 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>1.27 The CDHB supports investment into Footpath Extension Forward Works and investment and implementation of Walking and Cycling Strategies for all towns.</p> <p>1.28 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>1.29 Safer crossing points across key transport routes are important to ensure that fewer accidents occur.</p>		Centres (Short Term – Selwyn District Council Planning Department & Strategy & Policy Work Programme)
--	--	---	--	---

			<p>1.30 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> <p>1.31 Darfield - The CDHB is pleased to see the Council plans to liaise with public transport planners at Environment Canterbury to investigate ongoing opportunities to provide public transport into Rolleston and Christchurch.</p> <p>1.32 Darfield - The CDHB supports the Town Centre Study that would look closely at the provision of parking on the Main Street. It is important to ensure that accidents with large vehicles are minimized and pedestrians are able to use the Town Centre safely.</p>		
3	Virginia Askin	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Think about families living in cars – How do we address this?</p> <p>1.2 Covenants are bad news for the poor</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Should allow simple homes on smaller sections What's wrong with legalising garages and making them seriously liveable? Allowing more cabin/sleep-out options for families Allow re-location of homes – must be of a certain standard for sure. But don't ban them! <p>1.3 Rent to buy options – does that need to be legislated? Need more of them. People more likely to care for the property if they own it, than if just renting.</p> <p>1.4 Compliance re multiple units on one title. Currently maximum of 2. Why not 3?</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.5 Septic tank costs are a killer to development for the poor. \$20,000.00 just for fancy septic tank system!!! And issues when there are power cuts!</p> <p>1.6 Composting toilets?? Subsidised by Council??Rules for housing development need to be relaxed</p> <p>1.7 Cost of introducing reticulated sewage too expensive</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Should allow simple homes on smaller sections</p> <p>1.2 Legalising garages and making them seriously liveable</p> <p>1.3 Allowing more cabin/sleep-out options for families</p> <p>1.4 Allow re-location of homes – must be of a certain standard</p> <p>1.5 Need more rent to buy options</p> <p>1.6 Council to become a developer so they can control an area of land that becomes totally zoned for affordable housing</p> <p>1.7 Rent to buy options</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.8 Cost of composting toilets to be subsidised by Council</p>	<p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>The recommendation to subsidise 'composting toilets' is not supported by staff.</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The current District Plan makes provision, through the resource consent process, to provide for a 2nd dwelling on an allotment, subject to various matters being addressed. This matter, along with points 1.2 to 1.4, will be addressed as part of the District Plan Review, or alternatively, are matters best addressed as part of a building consent process..</i></p> <p><i>Points 1.5 and 1.7 These matters would need to be considered by the private sector or the Government. At this point in time Council is not intending to have further involvement in the rental or social housing provision at this point in time</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.6 – As I understand it Council has no plans to become a developer of land – further direction around this point would need to come from the Council if they thought it was an idea they wanted to pursue.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
4	Marj White	Darfield	<p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.1 Restoration of the historic Malvern country council chambers.</p>	<p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.1 For Council to purchase the building and land back and to use as a Museum and display house and protect as heritage building for use as a 'Mens Shed'.</p>	<p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p><i>There are no Council funds available for this proposal and local funding would need to be sought if it received support. The idea could be explored and check support from the Darfield Township Committee.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
5	Neale Todd	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Support Darfield Area 7 development plan.</p>		<p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil

6	Jennifer Todd	Darfield	Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.1 Support Darfield Area 7 development plan.		Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">Nil
7	Jessica Glossey	Darfield	Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.1 Support Darfield Area 7 development plan.		Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">Nil
8	Rebecca Todd	Darfield	Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.1Support Darfield Area 7 development plan		Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none">Nil
9	Brian Knopp	Darfield	5 Waters 1.1 Opposes the need for reticulated wastewater system Wants more affordable housing options, including elderly housing.	5 Waters 1.1 Suggests shared septic tanks or alternative technology.	5 Waters <i>Disposal of wastewater in all of the Malvern townships is managed directly by Environment Canterbury through the resource consent process. It is therefore difficult to provide any definitive direction or answers in the Draft Malvern Area Plan in respect to how the e future management of wastewater discharges, presents a constraint or an opportunity to growth over the next 15 years, Shared septic tanks, would, on the face of it, seem to be a potential option and one that seems to be considered appropriate by ECan (see below)</i> <i>Currently section sizes below 450m3 are being granted consent by Environment Canterbury although it would seem, on the balance of probabilities, that opportunities for comprehensive and integrated provision of medium density development in Darfield, as promoted by the Draft Malvern Area Plan, may be compromised. However, the continued ad hoc provision of higher density development maybe able to occur through individual consenting of on-site wastewater systems, although how long this is likely to continue is not clear.</i> <i>Additionally, Table 2 – Implementation Steps – Darfield (page 30 of the MAP) notes that the Darfield and Kirwee Wastewater Working Party shall be continued. The issues raised in this submission are better able to be resolved through this forum.</i> ECan Response (Summary) ECan would prefer that on-site systems were not needed in Darfield and would prefer that SDC installs reticulated sewage, especially for the centre of town where sections are smaller. This would solve amenity problems and maintenance concerns. There have been huge technical advances in wastewater treatment and disposal options since the days of the Transitional Regional Plan (TRP). Under the LWRP, rule 5.8 requires that new on-site treatment and disposal systems are designed and installed in accordance with sections 5 and 6 of New Zealand Standard AS/NZS 1547:2012. There is no mention of soak pits in this Standard.

					<p>Policy 4.14A in the Land and Water Regional Plan (LWRP) states “<i>The disposal of domestic effluent and wastewaterWhere residential density exceeds 1.5 dwellings per hectare and the total population is greater than 1000 persons, community reticulated systems should be promoted. Alternatively, other measures should be promoted to reduce adverse effects on water bodies from effluent disposal systems, including secondary treatment and septic tank warrants of fitness</i>”.</p> <p>Therefore under the LWRP we have more ability to require better treatment and disposal systems than previously.</p> <p><i>If there is no reticulation:</i> The best option for an on-site system is a secondary recirculating aerated treatment system discharging to subsurface drippers. However often section sizes are too small to allow for a drip field. For example a small 3 bedroom house would require 200 square metres of available space for a drip field to be installed.</p> <p>The next best option when section sizes are small is a secondary recirculating aerated wastewater treatment system discharging to a 2A sand trench. But even in this case, a 3 bedroom house would require 20 square metres of land to install the trench.</p> <p>Durations given for either of the above on-site systems in Darfield are now generally 15 years.</p> <p>Some applicants apply for primary septic tanks (very little or no nitrogen treatment) discharging to 2A sand trenches. In this case it is likely they will be granted a shorter duration than 15 years.</p> <p>For all the above options, there can be problems associated with maintenance .</p> <p>Membrane Bio Reactors or Packed Bed Reactors are commonly used for community systems and these would provide the best treatment currently available.</p> <p>A less preferred option would be for developers of subdivisions to install smaller community systems for their subdivision and add the cost of this onto section prices. This would solve the problem of small section sizes as there would then be no need for on-site systems and the cost could well be less for each resident. But there could still be problems of ongoing maintenance and who would provide this.</p> <p>It has been mentioned there is anecdotal feedback (from Area Plan drop in session attendees) that ECan does not want a single package plant to service all lots in a development over on-site systems. ECan are not sure where this advice came from – for a subdivision we would likely prefer a single package plant discharging to an off-site disposal area as long as a good maintenance regime could be established. But again, if reticulation is subsequently installed, what would happen to these package plants?</p>
--	--	--	--	--	---

					<p>Concerns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• There are concerns about maintenance. For treatment and disposal to work properly, regular maintenance is needed. The greater the number of on-site systems, the greater the likelihood that some will not be maintained. If not, this could lead to blocking, ponding etc – a public health risk.• On-site systems are not monitored by ECan.• With section sizes becoming smaller and housing density greater, the disposal systems can be very close to neighbours. There may not be the space for even sand trenches to be installed.• Inadequacy of data on effects of nitrates on groundwater. Though there is evidence that nitrate readings in groundwater under Darfield are starting to become a concern.• The longer there is no reticulation the greater the problem becomes because as more residents install expensive on-site systems, more will be reluctant to contribute to reticulation. <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil:
10	Carolyne Jones	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Wants more affordable housing options, including elderly housing</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.2 Cost of septic tanks</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Suggests SDC purchases land in Darfield suitable for elderly and close to town amenities.</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.2 Suggests lobbying ECAN to amend rules</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The MAP currently identifies the central part of Darfield as an area for increased density, parts of which could be developed for elderly (and social housing). Council’s role at this stage however is not that of a developer but rather as an advocate and enabling for this to occur in the most suitable location. Such proposal are subject to the District Plan consenting process – the MAP signals that the DPR will consider how to give effect to the various matters identified in the MAP, including providing for higher density development in identified areas.</i></p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Consents are granted based on an assessment of effects by ECan. Table 2 – Implementation Steps – Darfield (page 30 of the MAP) notes that the Darfield and Kirwee Wastewater Working Party shall be continued. The issues raised in this submission are better able to be resolved through this forum.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil
11	Denise Reynolds	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Wants more affordable housing options, including elderly housing, add more social housing</p> <p>Transportation</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Council should be proactive in buying social housing.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.2Angled parking near bakery and on adjacent streets.</p>	<p>Transportation</p> <p><i>The main street of Darfield (South Terrace) is a state highway managed by NZTA. They are unlikely to fund the installation of any parking citing that this is the responsibility of the adjoining land uses that have created the “problem”.</i></p>

			1.2 Not enough parking on main street		<p><i>To this end off street parking opportunities should be investigated as the most pragmatic solution first as part of a wider strategy</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>Council's role at this stage is not that of a developer but rather to act as an advocate for social and elderly persons housing and to provide the suitable statutory framework for such proposals to proceed in the most suitable location. Such proposal would be subject to the District Plan consenting process – the MAP signals that the DPR will consider how to give effect to the various matters identified in the MAP, including providing for higher density development and elderly persons housing. It is also anticipated that the DPR will consider the provision of affordable housing.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
15	Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd (Lizzie Thomson)	Springfield	<p>Other</p> <p>1.1 Consultation between SDC and Te Ngai Tuahuriri Runanga and Te Taumutu Runanga.</p>	<p>Other</p> <p>1.1 Wants a “Natural Environment and Cultural Heritage” section in the Springfield implementation table in the Malvern Area Plan.</p>	<p><i>There are no Springfield specific implementation steps identified for the township, and the submitter has not identified any.</i></p> <p><i>Table 1 – Implementation Steps – All townships, includes various initiatives across the Malvern area that relate to this issue.</i></p> <p><i>In lieu of any additional information, it is considered that this addresses the submitters concerns.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
16	Judith Pascoe	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Strongly support a town centre study to identify areas suitable for intensification.</p> <p>1.2 While I agree that elderly persons housing is important it is better positioned in 'greenfield' developments by encouraging developers to include a mix of section sizes in their development and allowing the construction of elderly persons villages as a controlled activity.</p> <p>1.3 Darfield is a country town and large areas of houses on very small sections will destroy the character of the town.</p> <p>1.4 Infill housing is intrusive in areas of older housing and should be discouraged. Palmerston North is an example of how indiscriminate infill housing can destroy the amenity value of an area.</p> <p>1.5 Agreed that there is adequate zoned business land in the medium term. However to preserve this area of Business zoned land any requests to rezone to residential should be discouraged.</p> <p>1.6 The zoning of land in the Bangor Road, Cridges Road and SH 73 area around Mitchells Sawmill should be considered for rezoning as Business 1 or 2 to both ensure a supply of business zoned land and to avoid any reverse sensitivity issues.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Areas of existing housing should not be allowed to subdivide into smaller lots unless the existing house is removed and the area becomes 'greenfield' or the new lot created is not under a certain size e.g. 600m2.</p> <p>1.2 Any requests to rezone Business 1 land to residential should be discouraged.</p> <p>1.3 Consider land in the Bangor Road, Cridges Road and SH 73 area around Mitchells Sawmill(DAR A3) for rezoning as Business 1 or 2</p> <p>1.4 Consider Area DAR A6 for a future business park development</p> <p>1.5 Intensification of some of the undeveloped L2A and L2A1 zone should be considered.</p> <p>1.6 A Living 1B zone with an average Lot size of 1,500m2 should be considered</p> <p>1.7 Intensify development in Area DAR A4</p> <p>1.8 Rezone the land zoned L2A Def north of Creyke Road and Wards Road and west of Telegraph Road to a mixture of L2 zoning closer to the LX Deferred boundary and L2A closer to Creyke Road. The LX zoned land could be a mixture of L1 and L1A and L1B (as in</p>	<p>Transportation</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. Funding has been provided to expand the footpath network along Horndon St to the planation as the first response pending more complex and expensive routes</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>Points 1.1, 1.2, 1.5, 1.6 and 1.7, The MAP includes implementation steps that consider these matters. These matters will be addressed through the District Plan Review process.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.3 – The MAP already notes this area may be suitable for either business 2 purposes, or alternatively, a mixed density residential zone.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.4 – The MAP already notes that this area may be suitable for business 2 purposes.</i></p>

		<p>1.7 DAR A6 should be considered for a future business park development.</p> <p>1.8 The loss of productive rural land needs to be avoided through defining the boundaries of the township as shown in the Malvern 2031 Draft Area Plan. Intensification of some of the undeveloped L2A and L2A1 zone should be considered.</p> <p>1.9 I agree that a Living 1B zone with an average Lot size of 1,500m2 should be considered and this should be done as soon as possible. This concentrates development around the town centre and allows the township to keep a spacious 'country' feel.</p> <p>1.10 Does not consider Area DAR 1 land suitable for rezoning to L2. This would result in the loss of some productive farmland and there is difficulty in supplying water. There is a large area of land between McLaughlins Road, Greendale Road and SH73 that is just as close to Darfield, if not closer and has no difficulties with water supply that is suitable for intensification.</p> <p>1.11 Support the suggestion that some of this land (DAR A3), particularly around Mitchell's Sawmill would be suitable for Business zoning.</p> <p>1.12 Agree that this area (DAR A4) would be suitable for further intensification in terms of location.</p> <p>1.13 In Area DAR A5, more intensive housing would need to be carefully managed. Infill housing can be intrusive and ugly in areas of older housing. A large area of small sections (<500 m2) would destroy the country feel/look of the township – the very reason so many people like to live in Darfield.</p> <p>1.14 Area DAR A6 is a logical area for a business park for commercial and industrial activities. While uptake of this may be some years away it is important to plan for 10-20 years in the future. Strongly recommend that this be zoned appropriately for this.</p> <p>1.15 Agree that Area DAR A7 could be suitable for future residential subdivision.</p> <p>1.16 Agree that Area DAR A8 could be suitable for Business 1 & 2 zoning.</p> <p>1.17 Land at the corner of Telegraph Road (to the East) and Creyke Road (to the North) has a plan change in process to change the zoning from all L2A to a mixture of L2A (1 hectare average) and L2 (5000 m2 average). This area of land borders onto existing L1 land and as such is in an ideal position to be considered for further intensification as identified in the plan change application.</p> <p>1.18 I would further suggest that the area of land zoned L2A Def north of Creyke Road and Wards Road and west of Telegraph Road be rezoned to a mixture of L2 zoning closer to the LX Deferred boundary and L2A closer to Creyke Road. The LX zoned land could be a mixture of L1 and L1A and L1B (as in Rolleston) to give a transition zone to the larger L2 and L2A lots. (see map below)</p> <p>Transportation</p>	<p>Rolleston) to give a transition zone to the larger L2 and L2A lots.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.9 Support an off-road cycling and pedestrian network between townships as well as both within townships and in McHughs Plantation</p> <p>1.10 Ensure provision of adequate car parking is addressed in the town centre study.</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.11 Consultation should be done on a wastewater system for Darfield.</p>	<p><i>Point 1.8, this area is currently subject to a private plan change request under the 1st Schedule of the RMA. It is not considered appropriate to make any recommendations as to the suitability or otherwise of this area while this process is underway.</i></p> <p><i>The LX zone already provides scope for mixed densities as promoted by this submitter. The extent to which this is the most suitable mechanism to achieve the suggested outcomes sought has already been identified in the MAP as an Implementation Step and shall be considered as part of the DPR process.</i></p> <p><i>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>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Staff agree, and this is included as one of the implementation steps.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil
--	--	--	--	---

			<p>1.19 Support an off-road cycling and pedestrian network between townships as well as both within townships and in McHughs Plantation.</p> <p>1.20 Ensure provision of adequate car parking is addressed in the town centre study.</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.21 Agree that consultation should be done on a wastewater system for Darfield.</p>		
17	Alistair Cameron	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Supports mixed use living zone and smaller lot sizes in Area DAR A3.</p> <p>1.2 Proposed subdivision Outline Plan enclosed for perusal.</p>		<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The Map already identifies that this area is a possible future development option that could include provision for mixed densities, similar to those proposed by the submitter. The specifics of this submission is better suited to consideration as part of the DPR process, as noted in the MAP Implementation Steps.</i></p> <p><i>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>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil
18	Rupert and Catherine Wright (John Ferguson)	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Support Council's identification of Possible Future Development Options, and in particular, support the inclusion of DAR A6.</p> <p>1.2 Council have identified that a significant oversupply of undeveloped low-density Living 2 zoned land exists, which gives rise to an under-utilisation of greenfield land.</p> <p>1.3 DAR A6 has been identified as an area for possible low-density residential development and possibly also Business 2 zoning.</p> <p>1.4 Council also identifies that there is an undersupply of Living 1B style of zoning and a 1-2 hectare shortfall of Business 1 zoning.</p> <p>1.5 It is considered that a combination of zoning is appropriate for DAR A6, and that this should be subject to an Outline Development Plan. The zoning should include Living 1B and business 1.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Zoning for DAR A6 should include Living 1B and business 1, and that this should be subject to an Outline Development Plan and should be considered further by Council for inclusion in the District plan.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The MAP already notes that this area (Area DAR A6) may be suitable for low density residential development. The MAP also notes that an alternative use could be for Business 2 purposes.</i></p> <p><i>The specific merits and details of the area (including the details of any proposed ODP) are more appropriately addressed as part of the DPR process.</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>

			<p>1.6 Overall it is considered that DAR A6 represents a sustainable development option for the township and this area should be considered further by Council for inclusion in the District plan.</p>		<p><i>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>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil
19	Jane Mulholland	Darfield	<p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 Two significant issues under transportation have not been addressed in the implementation steps and that pose a major safety and well being risk to Darfield residents and must therefore be resolved in the short term:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Near misses between vehicles and trains on railway level crossings; - Concerns that heavy vehicles are placing pressure on the local road network <p>1.2 Development of both DAR A8 & DAR A7 would require a fix to the dangerous railway level crossing because traffic here would increase.</p> <p>1.3 Given that residents have raised concerns about the impact of large trucks on the town, then why will the Darfield Town Centre Study address "the viability of providing truck stops in the town centre along the SH73"??? Trucks pose a significant risk in the town. They cause noise and air pollution - this will only increase through braking and accelerating if you encourage them to stop. They are also a major hazard to other road users and pedestrians. You should be looking at discouraging their presence in town by providing other arterial routes that bypass the centre.</p> <p>1.4 The Corridor Management Plan must be addressed in the SHORT, not medium, term. Traffic into Christchurch is growing fast and will only get worse as Darfield develops further. There are no passing sections en route so rush-hour traffic is becoming quite dangerous; this is exacerbated by the huge new sub-divisions in West Melton. I drive a school bus into town every day so I have witnessed the increase in traffic and the risks some drivers take in order to get past me.</p> <p>1.5 It is irresponsible of the Council to intensify residential opportunities in Darfield without a solid plan in place to deal with the commuter traffic into Christchurch that will inevitably also intensify as a result.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.6 Housing intensification should be confirmed to areas south of the SH73 in order to ease pedestrian and cycle</p>	<p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 Transport issues resolved in the short term e.g. vehicle and train crossing and heavy vehicle movement</p> <p>1.2 Fix the dangerous railway level crossing as Areas DAR A7 and A8 develop</p> <p>1.3 Discourage the presence of heavy vehicles in town by providing other arterial routes that bypass the centre</p> <p>1.4 The Corridor Management Plan must be addressed in the SHORT, not medium, term.</p> <p>1.5 Develop a plan to manage commuter traffic between Darfield and Christchurch</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.6 Keep housing intensification to areas DAR A3, A5 and A6</p> <p>1.7 Amend the Darfield Area Plan by showing DAR A8 as being "located west of Creyke Road and north of Horndon Street</p> <p>1.8 Council to consider setting aside some land for any new school building work that might come out of the MOE study</p> <p>1.9 For Area DAR A7, list additional disadvantages as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Adverse impact on existing residents who have become accustomed to the character of the area - It would require significant screening from any Business Areas. - It would require roading onto main route into and out of Darfield - ie Kimberley Road <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.10 Defer any investigation of residential infill/intensification until water issues have been resolved.</p> <p>1.11 The Council and new residents should pay for any reticulated waste water system!!</p> <p>Local Facilities and Community Development</p> <p>1.12 There is no need for "a feasibility study to provide a walking/cycling link between the town and McHugh's Forest Park along the rail corridor</p>	<p>Transportation</p> <p><i>Issues relating to Level Crossing Safety and any upgrades are the responsibility of KiwiRail who prioritise actions and funds accordingly. All crossings in Darfield (apart from Horndon St/SH73 have been upgraded in recent times.</i></p> <p><i>There are no viable detour routes and it is not clear why bypassing traffic off a state highway onto a local road would resolve matters</i></p> <p><i>.</i></p> <p><i>CMPS are for roads within a township. There is no problem relating to commuter traffic from Darfield on SH73 as it has plenty of capacity</i></p> <p>Local Facilities and Community Development</p> <p><i>The walkway/cycleway project is not a Council funded project but is being promoted by the Darfield Township Committee. The view outlined in this submission should be referred to them for comment.</i></p> <p><i>SDC will continue to advocate for ultrafast broadband though the Government initiated review forum as set out in the Draft Malvern 2031 Area Plan.</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Point 1.7 – Agree with the submitter</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.6 – This specifics of this matter are best addressed through a more detailed needs assessment as promoted by the MAP through the DPR.</i></p> <p><i>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>access to the schools - these are DAR A3, DAR A5 and DAR A6.</p> <p>1.7 DAR A8 is incorrectly identified as being "located at the intersection of Bangor Road and SH73" - it is actually on the opposite side of town to Bangor Road</p> <p>1.8 Residential zones must not be the top priority in the town's development plan. Housing initiatives cannot be allowed to dominate growth. Darfield is a very real community, with a rich mix of families, but traditionally based on the local economy. It is these strong local ties that are in danger of disappearing if it becomes a town of residents who see Christchurch as their focus rather than the surrounding areas.</p> <p>1.9 If Darfield is to be a successful service town for the wider Malvern ward, then it must concentrate on remaining a town for the locality, not for the city.</p> <p>1.10 Should the Council set aside some land for any new school building work that might come out of the MOE study?</p> <p>1.11 What are the Council's plans to ensure that the growth in local employment opportunities keeps pace with the growth in Darfield's population? This is a significant issue but the implementation steps appear to focus on building the capacity of our residential zones as the main priority.</p> <p>1.12 DAR A7 has additional disadvantages not currently listed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Adverse impact on existing residents who have become accustomed to the character of the area- It would require significant screening from any Business Areas.- It would require roading onto main route into and out of Darfield - ie Kimberley Road <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.13 Any investigation of residential infill/intensification must wait until water issues have been resolved.</p> <p>1.14 I would be strongly opposed to current residents having to pay for a reticulated waste water scheme - the current process works for us, there are no incentives for us to upgrade and we would not enjoy any benefits from a new, expensive system. If the Council wishes to develop Darfield then the Council and new residents should pay!!</p> <p>Local Facilities and Community Development</p> <p>1.15 There is no need for "a feasibility study to provide a walking/cycling link between the town and McHugh's Forest Park along the rail corridor". A well-used, well-maintained track already exists and is quite quite beautiful. It supports a rich and vibrant ecosystem; it is easily accessible for pedestrians, cyclists, push-chairs and runners. The experience of walking along a mown pathway with long grasses either side is one of the best things to do in Darfield! Please do not ruin this by 'developing' it any further. P.S. does anyone actually use the shingle path through the Plantation? I haven't found anyone who does - we all stick to the 'real' tracks!</p>	<p>1.13 Advocacy for ultrafast broadband should be given a Short timeframe in the implementation steps for Darfield</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>Point 1.8 - this issue is a matter for the Ministry of Education to resolve through the Notice of Requirement for Designation process (RMA process). Council's role is predominately that of a regulator, although the Council's Strategic Assets and Planning teams are often involved in early discussions at a strategic planning level, and also in discussions relating to site specific issues (such as for transport related issues).</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.9 – Agree in part – add the following to the list of disadvantages 'Adverse impact on existing residents who have become accustomed to the character of the area'</i></p> <p><i>Roading is not considered to be a significant disadvantage to this area and would be considered as part of any change or resource consent process.</i></p> <p><i>The MAP already identifies that suitable setbacks or interface treatments for Area DAR A7 will be required to avoid any reverse sensitivity effects in the event that a Business 2 area was established to the east, or vice versa in the event that a residential development was to establish in DAR A7 prior to any Business 2 zone establishing. .</i></p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Any funding and installation of a wastewater system would require specific public consultation.</i></p> <p><i>Onsite wastewater treatment and disposal is appropriate in many areas. Environment Canterbury are the consenting agencies. Darfield and Kirwee are Councils largest township services by on-site wastewater systems. The area plans has an identified Implementation step of 'Continue with the Darfield & Kirwee Wastewater Working Party...' this is believed to be appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>Currently section sizes below 450m3 are being granted consent by Environment Canterbury.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Amend the MAP so that a Corridor Management Plan in partnership with NZTA is developed in the short term• Amend the Darfield Area Plan by showing DAR A8 as being "located west of Creyke Road and north of Horndon Street• Add as a disadvantage for Area DAR A7 'Adverse impact on existing residents who have become accustomed to the character of the area
--	--	---	---	---

			<p>1.16 Why is the advocacy of ultrafast broadband given a Short/Medium timeframe in the implementation steps for all townships? This should be upgraded to SHORT for Darfield in its role as a service township and to encourage local business growth.</p>		
21	Kevin Mulholland	Darfield	<p>5 Waters 1.1 No to reticulated waste water system - no benefit.</p> <p>Local Facilities and Community Development 1.2 No to new link between town and McHugh's Forest Park - a good link already exists.</p> <p>Transportation 1.3 No to extra car parking - there are several parking areas already, people are just accustomed to stopping right outside where they want to go. You just need to change attitudes by making it more pleasant to walk around Darfield. 1.4 No to truck stops in town centre on SH73.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.5 Any town development must be predicated on business growth & more local employment opportunities. Without these, there can be no sustainable population growth. Therefore the Council should shelve further residential sub-divisions until the town grows its business and commercial platform. 1.6 Any town development must first address the nature and character of the town centre. How do we keep the town centre as a vibrant people-friendly area in the face of the increased heavy vehicles on the SH73 which cuts right through it. We want to encourage foot traffic (e.g. shoppers, elderly residents, young families, youth on scooters, bikes and skateboards)- this simply cannot be achieved while so many heavy trucks continue to pass through the town. 1.7 Is it possible to promote Darfield as a tourist destination unless we can offer a pleasant town centre that can be walked around?</p>	<p>5 Waters 1.1 Do not install a reticulated waste water system in Darfield.</p> <p>Transportation 1.2 Do not put a new link between town and McHugh's Forest Park. 1.3 Change people's attitudes by making Darfield a more pleasant place to walk around. 1.4 Do not allow truck stops in the town centre of Darfield. 1.5 Encourage foot traffic (e.g. shoppers, elderly residents, young families, youth on scooters, bikes and skateboards).</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.6 The council should shelve further residential sub-divisions until the town grows its business and commercial platform</p>	<p>5 Waters <i>Onsite wastewater treatment and disposal is appropriate in many areas. Environment Canterbury are the consenting agencies. Darfield and Kirwee are Councils largest township services by on-site wastewater systems. The area plans has an identified Implementation step of 'Continue with the Darfield & Kirwee Wastewater Working Party...' this is believed to be appropriate.</i></p> <p>Transportation <i>Funding has been provided to expand the footpath network along Horndon St to McHugh's Planation as the first response pending more complex and expensive routes</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>This is not considered appropriate. An increase in population from residential development within a town would seem to provide a greater opportunity for additional services and business to locate in a town.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
22	Arthurs Pass Association (Richard Holyoake)	Arthurs Pass	<p>1.1 The submitters note that SDC intend to actively promote Arthur's Pass Village as a tourist destination through SDC's tourism advisor. We note that tourism is already increasing in the Village and along SH73, and this is applying pressure to the natural environment and to businesses. Clearly, tourism requires appropriate infrastructure, and our view is that there are some deficiencies in this area now, as set out below</p> <p>5 Waters 1.2 The submitters are supportive of a review of the infrastructure and natural hazards constraints, and agree that this review should inform development restrictions and rules. 1.3 The submitters are supportive of SDC reviewing the stormwater disposal systems in the Village and implementing appropriate stormwater management plans.</p>		<p>Transportation <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</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>The MAP 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 though intensification and gives rise to reverse sensitivity effects with surrounding land uses through</i></p>

			<p>Transportation</p> <p>1.4 Footpaths should extend from the commercial centre to the village walks to increase safety for pedestrians, particularly tourists who are not familiar with New Zealand traffic conditions.</p> <p>Local Facilities and Community Development</p> <p>1.5 The submitters are supportive of the inclusion of significant heritage and cultural sites when preparing township brochures or information pamphlets</p> <p>1.6 Appropriate signage is required in the Village and surrounds to inform people of the location of toilets and rubbish bins – the submitters are very concerned at a significant increase in evidence of people toileting in public places, and an increase in litter alongside the road and in other public places</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.7 The submitters note the intention to review the Alpine Village rules and whether additional heritage buildings qualify for inclusion – we do not understand the potential implications of this review. Please provide more clarity.</p> <p>1.8 The submitters note that Bealey Spur and Cass are not mentioned in the Draft Plan, and query whether SDC have put any thought into the future look and feel of these settlements.</p>		<p><i>incremental development that is often difficult to proactively manage. The District Plan Review is better placed to address the issue of growth outside of established urban areas 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><i>Council staff have provide the submitters with the relevant provisions of the District plan relating to Alpine Villages. It is anticipated the relevant township committees would be a key stakeholder when reviewing these provisions, and the Council would welcome ongoing dialogue with the submitters on this matter.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
25	Robert Logan	Springfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>5 waters</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 This submission is in respect of the property Lot 2 DP 400509 (having an area of 30.32 ha) that is partly subject to being identified as a potential Low-density Residential Development Area being ‘SPR A2’.</p> <p>1.2 Whereas only the more south eastern portion of this property is identified as being subject to this potential development notation, this submission is for the entire property to be subject to this notation, for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Annavale Road and the unnamed legal road provides a continuous road frontage to the subject property along its southern and western boundaries. These two roads in combination will allow for this entire portion of the subject property to be adequately provided with vehicular access and the provision of other urban-related services. It will allow for the most optimum use of the subject property in terms of being developed in an effective and efficient way; The remaining rural zoned portion of the subject property is considered too small in order for it to be utilised in any effective or efficient productive way. This is also on the basis that Ballymena Holdings Ltd does not own any other nearby rural land holdings in the Springfield area that could otherwise supplement this balance land. While the north west portion of the subject property is further removed from the existing Springfield urban area than the balance of it, it is however no further removed than the westernmost portion of ‘SPR A3’, 	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>5 waters</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.1 The entire area of Lot 2 DP 400509 be located within the Low-density Residential Development Area ‘SPR A2’.</p>	<p>Transportation</p> <p><i>Any new developments are responsible for mitigating any transport issues (and other adverse environmental effects)– including providing new and upgraded roads</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The extent of the SPR A2 area is intended to be indicative only. Any definite boundaries will be determined as part of the DPR should this area be rezoned.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the site is subject to a consent notice (# 7809984.1) restricting future development on the property to only 1 dwelling</i></p> <p><i>Subject to clarification as to the purpose of the consent notice, and how the submitters intend to overcome this encumbrance in the event development does occur, I agree in principle to the submitters request</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Subject to clarification involving any encumbrances on the area subject to this site, identify all of Lot 2 DP 400509 be located within the Low-density Residential Development Area ‘SPR A2’

			<p>or the south easternmost portion of ‘SPR A4’. Accordingly, the overall potential extent, shape and form of the potential urban area of Springfield will not be unduly compromised with the entire area of the subject property being included within ‘SPR A2’.</p>		
27	Christine Anderson	Malvern – All Areas	<p>1.1 The Draft Plan talks about “<i>preferred approach to develop and apply intensification criteria</i> To facilitate elderly persons housing and/or medium density development options”. This is very admirable.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form 5 Waters</p> <p>1.2 I feel the Council should be identifying sections close to local amenities with the intention of either purchasing them for on-selling or encouraging developers to build smaller and affordable houses.</p> <p>1.3 The main drawback is the size of the section required – under ECan rules, in order to accommodate a septic tank.</p> <p>1.4 It is imperative that the Council and ECan become closely involved in re-zoning some areas for infill housing with collective use of septic tanks. Some areas could be totally rezoned for that use so that if developers/landowners wish to build smaller units they can proceed without lengthy and costly negotiations.</p> <p>1.5 If Council does not take immediate steps to work closer with ECan on these problems then the Council is hamstrung and any talk of infill housing and providing for the older generation is only lip service and very misleading to the local population.</p> <p>1.6 I fully agree that the outer limits as per the Malvern Plan for Darfield should not be extended and that all efforts should be made to re-zone some areas to make building for young and old a much more enjoyable experience.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form 5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 The Council should be identifying sections close to local amenities with the intention of either purchasing them for on-selling or encouraging developers to build smaller and affordable houses.</p> <p>1.2 The Council needs to take immediate steps to work closer with ECan on wastewater and intensification of housing problems.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>The MAP identifies the central area of Darfield as suitable for higher density development (Area DAR A5), subject to suitable resolution of a number of matters, principally wastewater disposal. Furthermore, the MAP has implementation steps that will look at what mechanisms could be used to encourage developers to provide for smaller and/or more affordable homes. This will be considered through the DPR process.</i></p> <p>5 Waters <i>The MAP includes an implementation Step that will continue the Darfield Kirwee wastewater working party, which includes representatives from ECan.</i></p> <p><i>Disposal of wastewater in all of the Malvern townships is managed directly by Environment Canterbury through the resource consent process. It is therefore difficult to provide any definitive direction or answers in the Draft Malvern Area Plan in respect to how the e future management of wastewater discharges, presents a constraint or an opportunity to growth over the next 15 years, although it would seem, on the balance of probabilities, that opportunities for comprehensive and integrated provision of medium density development in Darfield, as promoted by the Draft Malvern Area Plan, may be compromised. However, ad hoc provision of higher density development maybe able to occur through individual consenting of on-site wastewater systems, as is currently the case. Additionally, Table 2 – Implementation Steps – Darfield (page 30 of the MAP) notes that the Darfield and Kirwee Wastewater Working Party shall be continued. The issues raised in this submission are better able to be resolved through this forum</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil
28	Rural Women New Zealand (Darfield Branch)	Darfield	<p>1.1 Darfield is a pleasant place to live in 2016. We all want to see it develop and be affordable for all age groups to enjoy as it is today.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form;</p> <p>1.2 The submitters would like to see more provision for affordable housing for retirees from both Darfield and surrounding townships and farmland in the Malvern area.</p> <p>1.3 Developers could be encouraged to have some land set aside for smaller sections or a number of smaller houses or units at a more affordable price. This type of housing needs to be close to the commercial area of the township.</p> <p>1.4 Is there provision in the Area Plan for areas of existing housing in the older part of Darfield to be converted easily to having units or two smaller houses replace the</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form;</p> <p>1.1 More provision for affordable housing for retirees from both Darfield and surrounding townships and farmland in the Malvern area.</p> <p>1.2 Developers to be encouraged to have some land set aside for smaller sections or a number of smaller houses or units at a more affordable price. This type of housing needs to be close to the commercial area of the township.</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.3 Council and ECan need to work together to make septic tank/sewerage requirement easier to get consent for.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider the issues raised in this submission along with 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.</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>

			<p>older house? These units would then be within walking distance of the commercial area</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.5 Restrictions that septic tanks are placing on development for denser types of development</p> <p>1.6 Council and ECan need to work together to make septic tank/sewerage requirement easier to get consent for.</p>		<p><i>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>5 Waters</p> <p><i>The MAP includes an implementation Step that will continue the Darfield Kirwee wastewater working party, which includes representatives from ECan.</i></p> <p><i>Disposal of wastewater in all of the Malvern townships is managed directly by Environment Canterbury through the resource consent process. It is therefore difficult to provide any definitive direction or answers in the Draft Malvern Area Plan in respect to how the e future management of wastewater discharges, presents a constraint or an opportunity to growth over the next 15 years, although it would seem, on the balance of probabilities, that opportunities for comprehensive and integrated provision of medium density development in Darfield, as promoted by the Draft Malvern Area Plan, may be compromised. However, ad hoc provision of higher density development maybe able to occur through individual consenting of on-site wastewater systems, as is currently the case. Additionally, Table 2 – Implementation Steps – Darfield (page 30 of the MAP) notes that the Darfield and Kirwee Wastewater Working Party shall be continued. The issues raised in this submission are better able to be resolved through this forum</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil
29	Sally Brown	Darfield	<p>1.1 I hope Darfield continues to develop and retain the pleasant feel that it has today.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form;</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.2 I would like to see more encouragement given to the developers of a new subdivision to have a variety of section sizes.</p> <p>1.3 As houses age in the existing township section owners are going to look at replacing these. Some may wish to add another home to the section – maybe a granny flat for an ageing parent or a younger member of the family to live in. It would be ideal for these developers/home owners to easily be able to get their consent through for all aspects including waste water.</p> <p>1.4 Smaller sections/units may be able to share a wastewater/septic tank facility.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.5 Is there any thought for the provision of a reliable regular transport system to link up with Christchurch and Rolleston?</p> <p>1.6 Are there any plans to upgrade the roading link from the Malvern Area to Rolleston? Traffic build up can occur at</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form;</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 More encouragement given to the developers of a new subdivision to have a variety of section sizes.</p> <p>1.2 Make it easier for developers/homeowners to get consent for all aspects of any granny flat type proposals, including waste water.</p> <p>1.3 Make provision for smaller sections/units to be able to share a wastewater/septic tank facility.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.4 Make provision for a reliable regular transport system to link up with Christchurch and Rolleston.</p> <p>1.5 Upgrade the roading link from the Malvern Area to Rolleston.</p>	<p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>The MAP includes an implementation Step that will continue the Darfield Kirwee wastewater working party, which includes representatives from ECan.</i></p> <p><i>Disposal of wastewater in all of the Malvern townships is managed directly by Environment Canterbury through the resource consent process. It is therefore difficult to provide any definitive direction or answers in the Draft Malvern Area Plan in respect to how the e future management of wastewater discharges, presents a constraint or an opportunity to growth over the next 15 years, although it would seem, on the balance of probabilities, that opportunities for comprehensive and integrated provision of medium density development in Darfield, as promoted by the Draft Malvern Area Plan, may be compromised. However, ad hoc provision of higher density development maybe able to occur through individual consenting of on-site wastewater systems, as is currently the case. Additionally, Table 2 – Implementation Steps – Darfield (page 30 of the MAP) notes that the Darfield and Kirwee Wastewater Working Party shall be continued. The issues raised in this submission are better able to be resolved through this forum</i></p>

			<p>the Hoskyns Road/Jones-Ward Road intersection ffor traffic from the Malvern area trying to turn right towards the traffic lights on SH1 to reach Rolleston.</p>		<p>Transportation <i>Improvements at Hoskyns Rd/Jones intersection are in the design stage. Further improvements in the area are planned pending CSM2 which will provide an interchange at Weedons Ross Rd while Council is continues investigations into a flyover from Hoskyns/Jones Rd over SH1 to Rolleston Town Centre. State Highway H73 provides the main link to Christchurch.</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>The current District Plan provides for ‘granny flats’ as a permitted activity (no resource consent required) provided such units are no larger than 70m2. Units larger than this are subject to the standard resource consent process. The District Plan also provides for a 2nd dwelling to be established on an allotment, but is subject to a resource consent process. .</i></p> <p><i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider the issues raised in this submission along with 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.</i></p> <p><i>Further consideration of these matters is also closely linked to resolution of the wastewater issues for Darfield and other townships in the Malvern Area.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil
31	Frederick Bull	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Affordable housing for elderly was addressed a year ago, and councillors agreed it was needed, but no actual positive proposal is in the draft plan.</p> <p>1.2 The outlying areas are rated for new amenities in Rolleston which the majority of rural ratepayers will never use, it must be time to consider new facilities in Darfield.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The council should be ‘proactive’ and see that the land on North Terrace would be deal for elderly housing.</p> <p>1.2 SDC do not need to put money into a housing program, but they should encourage and regulate and take action now.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>The MAP has identified the central area of Darfield south of SH73 as an area suitable for higher density development. This could include development for ‘elderly housing’. Based on the analysis carried out by Council as part of the MAP it is considered that his is the most appropriate location for such development to occur.</i></p> <p><i>However, additional areas may also be appropriate, including in the area identified by the submitter. This could be addressed either by a developer establishing the activity via the resource consent process (as was recently the case for a site in Rolleston in a similar zone), or alternatively through a Plan Change request under the 1st schedule of the RMA.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider the issues raised in this submission along with 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.</i></p>

					Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
32	Reg Anderson	Glentunnel	Local Facilities & Community Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Consider laying powerlines underground (only half have been done) 1.2 Town Hall needs extending (wedding, funeral, school venue) 1.3 Pole Light is needed, and has been asked for a number of years, it effects 5 residents on Phillips St (all rate payers) 1.4 Millennium Walkway and the keepers referred to as ‘the last of the summer wine’ Population, Growth & Urban Form; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.5 Railway Terrace has room for extending, to allow for more sections on its North side 	Local Facilities & Community Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Make underground laying of power lines a priority in Glentunnel 1.2 Extend town hall 1.3 Install pole light on Phillips Street 1.4 Help protect the walkway (Darfield has the Historic Plantation, Glentunnel has the historic Millennium walkway). Help the keepers, and save the walkway, a little advise and help goes a long way Population, Growth & Urban Form; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.5 Allow for more sections on the North Side of Railway Terrace, but only one row deep 	Local Facilities & Community Development <p><i>Council is aware of a proposal to extend the hall but the rationale for this is unclear and it has not been included in any Annual Plan or LTP process.</i></p> <p><i>Some funds (\$5,000) have been set aside in the budget to assist with the walkway maintenance.</i></p> Population, Growth & Urban Form <p><i>The MAP already identifies this area as a possible future development option (Area GTA1). The specific details of any development in the area would be subject to further assessment under a plan change, either through the DPR or as a privately initiated plan change. It is not considered appropriate for the MAP to consider the specifics of such proposals as no higher level assessment have been carried out.</i></p> Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
33	Lorraine Sheen	Darfield	Population, Growth & Urban Form; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Supports the urgent investigation of infill/intensification and the study of issues in suggested town centre study. 1.2 Smaller house provisions for the elderly 5 Waters <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.3 The current expansion boom is requiring waste water management to be double-charged on households who now have to provide their own solutions and will later be required to join a collective system. Transport <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.4 Pedestrian accessibility into the town should be mandatory for all new subdivisions 	5 Waters <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Would like to see this study linked to the development of the reticulated waste water management system to facilitate intensification (the longer this is left the more expensive it will become). Local Facilities & Community Development <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.2 Provisions for smaller houses on smaller sections, this will be aided by the reticulated waste water system (relief sought for above). These smaller sections would be located within walking distance to shops, community activities, medical centre and library. Transport <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.3 More off-road, direct pedestrian routes into the town, and this made mandatory in all new subdivisions. 	5 Waters <p><i>The area plans has an identified Implementation step of ‘Continue with the Darfield & Kirwee Wastewater Working Party...’ this is believed to be appropriate.</i></p> Local Facilities & Community Development <p><i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider the issues raised in this submission along with 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.</i></p> Transportation <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. Developers are required to put in linkages were possible and practicable.</i></p> Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
34	Catherine Barnett	Springfield	Population, Growth & Urban Form <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Should be zones for future business, could have a commercial zone along both sides of SH73 from 	Population, Growth & Urban Form <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.1 Zone commercial on both sides of SH73 from Shirley's backpacker accommodation to the far eastern town, Drovers Café, to the far west of the town 	Population, Growth & Urban Form <p><i>Agree in part with the submitter. Many of the matters raised by the submitter have already been identified as implementation steps in the MAP.</i></p>

			<p>backpackers to drovers café. This is a strategic growth plan</p> <p>1.2 Lack of light industry zones available in Springfield, need for contractors yards, roading, yards, workshops etc. truck stops.</p> <p>1.3 Agrees that; the bulk of maroon area is low density residential (SPR A2)</p> <p>1.4 Agrees that; the green area fig 27 (SPR A3) is returned back to low density. Living 2 development to reflect the true character of this sector of land bounded by SH73, Pococks Road and Annarcle Road</p> <p>1.5 Agrees that the orange area fig 27 (SPR A1) is zoned residential Living 1 that compliments the surrounding township</p> <p>1.6 Springfield has exceeded its predicted 1-2 year growth in houses a year.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>1.7 Need for a footpath/cycle lane along Tramway Road, the school is currently having to teach children how to walk along a road, which is against health and safety. It would also connect future development from western fringes of township to the township itself.</p> <p>1.8 There are no requirements for recent residential subdivision in the township to have footpaths – this was a surprise to the community</p> <p>1.9 During winter and summer peak seasons the road speed of ‘50’ is not followed.</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.10 The Springfield public toilets are the most commonly used in the whole district because it is the last stop before the mountains.</p>	<p>1.2 Land that could be rezoned for light industrial include; the bound by the rail line such as Blue Area on figure 27, white city or maroon area on figure 27 – a section of it adjacent to the rail line</p> <p>1.3 Implement marron area to low density, return green area to low density, zone orange to Living 1 (DAP’s Malvern Figure 27 – Springfield)</p> <p>1.4 The township does not have to get larger, just allowed to service its visitors more adequately and a few more jobs in the process. SDC should have a clearly though out planning approach with planning tools, to make it easier for future business owners and residents to build what is required to service visitors. Stop being short sighted and look to the future and develop a plan that allows strategic growth.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>1.5 Put in a walkway/cycle way along Tramway Road between Pocock Road and the Springfield School.</p> <p>1.6 Install a flashing speed sign as they enter the township, installed on the eastern side of approach to the township. This should be a permanent fixture.</p>	<p><i>With regard to the submitters request that the MAP zone these areas, the MAP neither has the scope, or more importantly, the statutory weight to provide the submitters relief. Such a proposal will be required to go through a formal RMA process.</i></p> <p><i>With respect to identifying land for light industrial in the ‘Blue Area’ on Figure 27, in principle this seems a logical location for such an activity. The MAP already identifies that further investigation to identify business (1 and 2) needs will be carried out as part of the DPR process. Further assessment through the MAP in the first instance (and at a high level) may be required to determine if there are suitable areas for such activities (and on the face of it there appear to be several, including but not limited to the ‘Blue Area’) This will need to be followed by more detailed assessment through a formal RMA process.</i></p> <p><i>The Council has recently initiated the Selwyn District Plan Review (DPR). The DPR will further consider the issues raised in this submission along with 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.</i></p> <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>Council has approved a \$500,000 budget for rapidly advancing its 2016/17 footpath extension programme. It includes the Tramway Road project 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. Council has a number of these signs that it can rotate around the district for such situations.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the Springfield Area Plan with a view to identifying suitable areas for light industrial uses. Any consequential amendments to the MAP to give effect to the above recommendation.
36	Castle Hill Adventure Tours Ltd	Castle Hill	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>Local Facilities and Community Development</p> <p>1.1 Inclusion of the Castle Hill Adventure Tours Ltd consented concept plan to supplement the notation ‘Castle Hill Camping Ground and Golf Course’ on the MAP Castle Hill Village Context Map (Figure 12 - P40).</p> <p>1.2 Add the following at the end of the last paragraph after the words ‘business greenfield land’:</p> <p>“..., other than comprising the approved golf club and camping ground site”.</p> <p>1.3 Inclusion of the Castle Hill Adventure Tours Ltd consented activity on the MAP Castle Hill Village: Opportunities and Issues Plan (Figure 13 - P43) and</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Inclusion of the Castle Hill Adventure Tours Ltd consented concept plan to supplement the notation ‘Castle Hill Camping Ground and Golf Course’ on the MAP Castle Hill Village Context Map (Figure 12 - P40).</p> <p>1.2 To make the necessary suggested amendments to the Castle Hill Village MAP section to better recognise the consented camping ground and golf course</p> <p>1.3 Amend the first paragraph in the section entitled ‘Castle Hill: Business Land Capacity (P42) by adding the following sentence after the words ‘State Highway 73’:</p> <p>“Both the golf course and camping ground proposals, together with their ancillary services, will when established provide for potential</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Agree in part with the submitters as set out below:</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.1 – The level of detail provided in the ODP is not required nor considered suitable for the MAP (see project brief)</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.2 The MAP sufficiently identifies and labels the golf course and camping ground area for recreation purposes. However, further clarification through other mapping techniques may be appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.3 The MAP already notes that the camp ground and golf course have been consented. Additional commentary seems to be superfluous and is in my view unnecessary.</i></p>

			<p>for the following text to be inserted in the Key of this Plan:</p> <p><i>“CH A2: Potential for further recreation, tourist/visitor accommodation and ancillary activities to supplement that already approved in the granted resource consent”.</i></p> <p>1.4 Add the following additional bullet point to the section entitled ‘Opportunity: Natural Environment and Cultural Heritage’ (P44):</p> <p><i>“ – Encourage the opportunity for a range of differing recreation, accommodation and ancillary facilities to be established within the approved golf course and camping ground area that will nestle into, and complement, the surrounding natural environment”.</i></p> <p>1.5 Amend the 4th bullet point in the section entitled ‘Issue: Population, Growth Capacity and Urban Form’ to make reference to the golf course and delete the second sentence so that this bullet point reads as follows:</p> <p><i>“ – The consenting of the golf course and camping ground in the High Country zone has effectively doubled the size of the township area which now (sic) separated from Castle Hill Village by State Highway 73.”</i></p> <p>1.6 Greater clarity around the context of the 5th bullet point, which references mana whenua concerns relating to further development east of the State Highway may encroach on culturally significant sites, is required as it is currently ambiguous and provides no meaningful guidance.</p> <p>1.7 Amend the first bullet point in the section entitled ‘Issue: Transport to replace the word ‘poor’ in the second sentence with ‘<i>limited</i>’ in reference to the connectivity between the proposed camping ground and golf course and the village.</p> <p>1.8 Add the following to the section entitled ‘Possible Future Development Options (P46):</p> <p>“Castle Hill Area 2 – CH A2 (being the site of the approved camping ground and golf course)</p> <p><i>A potential future area for further development that could be undertaken in conjunction with the already approved camping ground and golf course proposal. This would be contingent on future demands for such facilities and ensuring that environmental standards associated with this high country setting can be maintained.</i></p> <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Only a very small portion of the site (being adjacent to the SH73) is located within an Outstanding natural Landscape Area while the balance is within a Forestry Exclusion Area as identified in the District Plan.</i> - <i>Is adjacent to the existing Castle Hill Village.</i> - <i>Has good visibility in both directions along SH73 to ensure traffic safety.</i> 	<p><i>future employment opportunities for Castle Hill residents. This is in terms of the range of accommodation types able to be provided, the provision of associated hospitality facilities, and the hire of recreation equipment”.</i></p> <p>1.4 Add the following additional bullet point to the section entitled ‘Opportunity: Natural Environment and Cultural Heritage’ (P44):</p> <p>1.5 “ – <i>Encourage the opportunity for a range of differing recreation, accommodation and ancillary facilities to be established within the approved golf course and camping ground area that will nestle into, and complement, the surrounding natural environment”.</i></p> <p>1.6 Amend the 4th bullet point in the section entitled ‘Issue: Population, Growth Capacity and Urban Form’ to make reference to the golf course and delete the second sentence so that this bullet point reads as follows:</p> <p><i>“ – The consenting of the golf course and camping ground in the High Country zone has effectively doubled the size of the township area which now (sic) separated from Castle Hill Village by State Highway 73.”</i></p> <p>1.7 Greater clarity around the context of the 5th bullet point, which references mana whenua concerns relating to further development east of the State Highway may encroach on culturally significant sites, is required as it is currently ambiguous and provides no meaningful guidance.</p> <p>1.8 Amend the first bullet point in the section entitled ‘Issue: Transport to replace the word ‘poor’ in the second sentence with ‘<i>limited</i>’ in reference to the connectivity between the proposed camping ground and golf course and the village.</p> <p>1.9 Add the following to the section entitled ‘Possible Future Development Options (P46):</p> <p>“Castle Hill Area 2 – CH A2 (being the site of the approved camping ground and golf course)</p> <p><i>A potential future area for further development that could be undertaken in conjunction with the already approved camping ground and golf course proposal. This would be contingent on future demands for such facilities and ensuring that environmental standards associated with this high country setting can be maintained.</i></p> <p>Advantages</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - <i>Only a very small portion of the site (being adjacent to the SH73) is located within an Outstanding natural Landscape Area while the balance is within a Forestry Exclusion Area as identified in the District Plan.</i> - <i>Is adjacent to the existing Castle Hill Village.</i> - <i>Has good visibility in both directions along SH73 to ensure traffic safety.</i> - <i>Offers panoramic views and receives extensive amounts of sunshine.</i> 	<p><i>Points 1.4 & 1.5 It is not considered appropriate at this point to add such commentary. The MAP notes a number of issues associated with development across SH73 (including encroachment on culturally significant areas, effects on rural amenity etc. see page 45) and is inconsistent with the Area Plan principles. In addition, an expert retail assessment confirms that there is no demand identified for additional business or industrial land in the township within the planning horizon of the area plan. Under the current District Plan such activities would not be anticipated, although they may be able to be established via resource consent. Any proposals to expand in this area requires a more detailed assessment, either through the resource consent process or through a plan change to the District Plan. The MAP already contains Implementation Steps that will consider such matters raised by the submitters.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.6 This is not considered appropriate. The campground and golf course are recreation areas and in my view do not double the size of the township. They have significantly increased the active recreation facilities available in the area, but I do not consider this sufficient cause to say the township has doubled in size.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.7 Mana whenua have advised, through hui in the development of the MAP, that the cultural significance of Castle Hill extends significant beyond the area already identified in the District Plan in and around Kura Tawhiti (Statutory Acknowledgement Area 1 – noted in the District Plan – Appendix 8) Further clarification on this matter was anticipated to be provided through the submissions and hearings phase of the MAP process. It is anticipated that there will be further opportunities to seek clarification on this matter through the DPR process. It is anticipated that relevant stakeholders, including the submitters would be involved in this process.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.8 –Further clarification as to whether such an amendment is appropriate from Council’s Asset Manager – Transport is required</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.9. It is not considered appropriate to identify further areas for development. Development of the MAP shows projected growth does not require additional areas to be identified, there is sufficient zoned and undeveloped land in the existing township. Growth areas within the MAP refer to areas of built form within the township boundaries. The aim is to retain a compact urban form with the least impact, especially in a culturally and environmentally sensitive area such as the Caste Hill area. The camping ground and golf course are situated on High Country zoned land outside the village and do not provide permanent built form. Other examples in the District are the Hororata Golf course (page 60), which is situated adjacent to the town centre and outside the township boundary. In addition, the MAP includes a number of Implementation steps that provide an opportunity to review whether further areas are required. It is considered the DPR is the most appropriate mechanisms to give effect to this aspect of the submission.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.10 – Disagree for the reasons set out above.</i></p>
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Offers panoramic views and receives extensive amounts of sunshine. - Gentle terrain. - Readily available servicing connections. <p><i>Disadvantages</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing requirements to ensure traffic safety associated with SH73. <p>1.9 Amend the following paragraph within the ‘Conclusion’ section to give effect to this submission:</p> <p><i>“The retention of the current township boundary through to 2031, together with the inclusion of the site for the approved golf course and camping ground development, is consistent with the principles contained in Chapter 5 of the CRPS, the District Growth Strategy Directions and Area Plan Principles, which reinforce the need to manage growth in an integrated and consolidated manner while avoiding the social, economic and environmental impacts associated with dispersed settlement patterns”.</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Gentle terrain. - Readily available servicing connections. <p><i>Disadvantages</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ongoing requirements to ensure traffic safety associated with SH73. <p>1.10 Amend the following paragraph within the ‘Conclusion’ section to give effect to this submission:</p> <p><i>“The retention of the current township boundary through to 2031, together with the inclusion of the site for the approved golf course and camping ground development, is consistent with the principles contained in Chapter 5 of the CRPS, the District Growth Strategy Directions and Area Plan Principles, which reinforce the need to manage growth in an integrated and consolidated manner while avoiding the social, economic and environmental impacts associated with dispersed settlement patterns”.</i></p>	<p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider alternative mapping techniques to more clearly identify that the golf course and camping ground area are for recreation purposes.
37	New Zealand Defence Force (Rebecca Davies)	Malvern Area	<p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.1 NZDF owns and operates the Glentunnel Ammunitions Depot (the depot), located near Glentunnel. The NZDF purchased the 301 ha lot back in 1991, and the location is used as a site for storage of ammunition and as a demolition range for purpose of detonating expired ammunition, for NZDF and public.</p> <p>Reverse sensitivity is a major consideration for all Defence facilities across NZ, due to the activity status, is a concern for future residential growth of Glentunnel</p> <p>Other</p> <p>1.2 NZDF would like to identify itself as a stakeholder in the area and wishes to be part of the Area Plan Process.</p>	<p>Other</p> <p>1.1 NZDF would like to identify itself as a stakeholder in the area and wishes to be part of the Area Plan Process</p> <p>1.2 The area plan should recognise and provide for the Depot, it is defined as ‘strategic infrastructure’ and ‘regionally significant infrastructure’ CRPS, and recognised as nationally significant infrastructure.</p> <p>1.3 Include the Depot and necessary infrastructure for its ongoing and efficient operation in both the introduction section and opportunities and issues section of the Glentunnel Chapter. NZDF has provided the following suggested wording;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Introduction: the Glentunnel ammunition Depot is 301 hectare site on Turnbells Road. It is designated in the Selwyn District Plan. The site is used by the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) for both the storage of ammunition and as a demolitions range for detonating expired ammunition for NZDF and the public. - Opportunities: The Glentunnel Ammunitions Depot is an important asset for NZDF and the wider community. - Issues: The current and future operation of the site should therefore be enabled through provision of appropriate transport networks and by managing future development in the surrounding area so as to avoid reverse sensitivity issues. <p>1.4 Appropriate recognition is needed for the activities undertaken on site, to ensure they can continue without vulnerability of complaint from new land users (reverse sensitivity). Any plans for Glentunnel should have appropriate consideration of the Depot</p>	<p>Other</p> <p><i>Agree with the submitters to the extent as set out below</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recognise and provide for the NZDF Glentunnel Ammunition Depot in the Area Plan as noted by the submitter and as set out below: <p>Introduction: The Glentunnel ammunition Depot is 301 hectare site on Turnbells Road and is located approximately 4kms from Glentunnel township. It is designated in the Selwyn District Plan with designation notation DE2 and for the purpose of “Defence Purpose – Ammunition Storage Depot”. The site is used by the New Zealand Defence Force (NZDF) for both the storage of ammunition and as a demolitions range for detonating expired ammunition for NZDF and the public.</p> <p>Opportunities (<i>Population, Growth Capacity & Urban Form</i>): The Glentunnel Ammunitions Depot is an important asset for NZDF and the wider community.</p> <p>Issues (<i>Population, Growth Capacity & Urban Form</i>): Reverse sensitivity issues on the NZDF Glentunnel Ammunition Depot on Turnbells Road.: The current and future operation of the site should be enabled through provision of appropriate transport networks and by managing future development in the surrounding area so as to avoid reverse sensitivity issues.</p>
38	Two Rivers Community Trust	Glentunnel	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p>

	(Paul Cossey, chairsperson)		<div>1.1 Social housing goal, provide affordable housing appropriate to the people’s needs. The housing development looks like it shuts out lower incomes, or low equity people out of the home ownership market due to costs of sections and restrictive covenants from developers.</div> <div>1.2 There is a lack of providing/managing social housing in Darfield, for people who need to be supported and resourced to get back on their feet. Due to this there are a lot of people who live in lower standard housing rentals sharing with others. The cost has shifted above what is affordable due to influx of people moving to Selwyn post-earthquakes.</div> <div>1.3 A number of Two Rivers Community Trust volunteers and trustees have experience and relations with Vision West in Auckland, Habitat for humanity, Haunui Trust and Archer Memorial Rest Home (other trusts and retirement village). These types of services are best in cities, but Darfield has good social structures, schools and employment opportunities to maintain and develop community. Residents feel they have to leave small rural communities to access services they need, instead of providing Darfield with amenities needed.</div> <div>1.4 Elderly people cannot access appropriate housing or care needed and find they have to relocate to Christchurch or where there family are. Darfield is an excellent sized town with easy access to groceries, Postshop, Library and a host of recreational activities. It seems prudent to us, to ensure people who have spent considerable years working, living and serving in the District have some choice about accessing housing or care in the District appropriate to their needs in their senior years.</div>	<div>1.1 SDC should ensure developers provide a range of section sizes, house size and material costs to reflect a broad range of affordable housing options.</div> <div>1.2 Approach central government for the provision of social housing in the service centres across Selwyn. We would support the council in making a submission to Central Government about providing social housing not only for Darfield, but also other service centres across Selwyn. We have a broad range of volunteers who are willing to engage and support others in crisis or who are putting their hand up for help.</div> <div>1.3 A moratorium on selling Council owned housing stock in order to properly assess the social housing needs in the Malvern District</div> <div>Local Facilities & Community Development</div> <div>1.4 To actively support or encourage the development of a residential senior care facility to meet the demand of the Malvern District</div>	<div>Points 1.1 and 1.2 are already addressed as Implementation Steps in the MAP.</div> <div>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.</div> <div>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.</div> <div>The Council has resolved to sell existing housing that is no longer required for Council purposes and is not investing in social housing. The three elderly persons units in Darfield are being retained.</div> <div>Local Facilities & Community Development</div> <div>The council are willing to support a district Social Housing advocacy group to make collective submissions to government for the provision of social housing.</div> <div>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</div> <div>1. Add implementation step to ‘Implementation Steps – All Townships (page 15) noting that “Council are willing to support a district Social Housing advocacy group to make collective submissions to government for the provision of social housing”. (or words to that effect)</div>
--	-----------------------------	--	--	---	--

39	Coalgate Properties (Peter Bond)	Coalgate	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 This is in relation to one property, 133 Bridge Street, it was purchased between 4 people when it was zoned Urban. It is now zoned Rural. This has caused financial loss to the submitter and associated group. The Draft area plan is suggesting to change the land to business zone.</p> <p>1.2 The Council has expressed development constraints at this site, with the main issue being reverse sensitivity from neighbouring Bentonite Plant. Speaking with a neighbour of the Bentonite Plant he said he did not have noise, odour or truck movement issues.</p> <p>1.3 The site can be readily serviced by power, water, and telephone communication and has sealed road access. This site is serviced by nearby reserves and sporting facilities. The site is fronted with the SH but access to the subdivision would be made off Briggs Street onto a small cul-de-sac.</p> <p>1.4 There is no demand for additional business zoned land in Coalgate, as the property has been on the market for 7 months and no interest.</p> <p>1.5 By zoning the land back to Living zone, they will landscape and enhance the entrance to the proud and vibrant township.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Rezone the land at 133 Bridge Street back to Living Zone</p> <p>1.2 Address the inconsistency between the zoning of the two adjacent property sites, where construction of new building have been approved. Particularly because the approved property is closer to the plant.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>This area has been identified as a possible (preferred) future development option suitable for future business development beyond the MAP planning horizon. In addition, the MAP notes that there is sufficient zoned capacity for residential purposes within the MAP planning horizon. As such it is considered rezoning, or identifying the area as suitable for residential development is not appropriate.</i></p> <p><i>However the has recently initiated Selwyn District Plan Review (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>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
44	Rob Lawerance	Darfield	<p>Other</p> <p>1.1 I urge the council planning process to keep Objective B1 for both township and rural (retain natural flora and vexation to assure wildlife corridors can be preserved).</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.2 Seek to improve water quality standards through a balanced approach to economic activities.</p> <p>1.3 Dairy issues must be addressed.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>1.4 Encourage policy B2.1.10 is a primary focus continued support for road safety initiatives i.e. Dan Harker stop signs alerts</p> <p>1.5 Issues 3 and 6 I urge consideration of railway transport options for the public. Selwyn has use features with existing rail infrastructure that could enable effective transport options (it is never cheaper than now)</p> <p>1.6 The District needs to prepare for increased tourism and the future trends of electric cars (self-driving charging stations)</p>	<p>Other</p> <p>1.1 Maintain objectives in B1 (Natural Environment Chapter in the District Plan) for both township and rural</p> <p>1.2 All planners should consider attending November 2016 Singularity University Event please check http://www.singularityunz.com</p> <p>1.3 Do not consolidate CCC</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>1.4 Look into railway for public transport</p> <p>1.5 Prepare for increases in tourism by looking at electric cars, and charging stations.</p> <p>1.6 Encourage Policy B2.1.10 (“ensure vehicle crossings, intersections, pathways, roadside signs and noticeboards are designed and positioned to ensure good visibility for all road users, and to allow safe passage, access and egress”)</p>	<p>Other</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>The rail corridor, related infrastructure and rolling stock is owned and manged by KiwiRail on commercial basis and is primarily for freight. There would not be the demand to justify the very high costs to provide passenger rail services on a commercial basis</i></p> <p><i>It is not Councils responsibility to provide vehicle refuelling facilities.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
45	Helen Loe	Darfield	<p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 Darfield currently serviced by septic tanks, and the town lacks sewer and waste water system. Until the</p>	<p>5 Waters</p>	<p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Onsite wastewater treatment and disposal is appropriate in many areas. Environment Canterbury are the consenting</i></p>

			development of a sewerage scheme takes place development of smaller lot sections will be limited, there is already currently a shortage of smaller homes	1.1 With the shortage of smaller homes, there should be alarm bells ringing at the importance of developing the sewerage scheme. 1.2 Council should publish information on the progress of plans for sewerage scheme for fairness of future development/developers	<i>agencies. Darfield and Kirwee are Councils largest township services by on-site wastewater systems. The area plans has an identified Implementation step of ‘Continue with the Darfield & Kirwee Wastewater Working Party...’ this is believed to be appropriate.</i> <i>The costs of constructing this sort of system sits with the developer and/or existing residents.</i> Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
46	Rob Lawerance	Darfield	<p>Local Facilities & Community Development</p> <p>1.1 Support the expansion and maintenance of native vegetation in this area to assure corridors for wildlife so they can move freely between areas of Canterbury</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.2 Darfield has unique geological features so septic tanks would be good in long term development</p> <p>Other</p> <p>1.3 Council should consider attendance in the November 2016 Singularity University Summit</p>	<p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 Use of septic tanks or small consolidated septic or biological treatment systems should be considered for long term developments in Darfield.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>1.2 Consider the use of rail and electric vehicle infrastructure as an important priority</p> <p>Other</p> <p>1.3 Council should consider attendance in the November 2016 Singularity University Summit to inform staff on the changes coming with exponential growth in technology and commerce</p>	<p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Shared septic tanks is a potential option. Environment Canterbury is the consenting organisation.</i></p> <p>Transportation</p> <p><i>The rail corridor, related infrastructure and rolling stock is owned and manged by KiwiRail on commercial basis and is primarily for freight. There would not be the demand to justify the very high costs to provide passenger rail services on a commercial basis</i></p> <p><i>It is not Councils responsibility to provide vehicle refuelling facilities. It doesn't provide petrol stations so why for the very small number of electric vehicles?</i></p> <p>Other</p> <p><i>Noted</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil </p>
49	Joanne Frecker	Springfield	<p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 constraints on Springfield’s growth are local water supply, lack of town sewerage system</p> <p>1.2 The recent development of 124 Annavale Road, an acceptable solution to the sewerage problem was an on-site effluent irrigation system, however this takes up a significant percentage for land and better solutions needed</p> <p>1.3 Residential development within the existing town boundaries will be constrained by sewerage problems.</p> <p>Transport</p> <p>1.4 Shortage of car parking off highway in the centre of town, for commercial development</p> <p>1.5 Further subdivisions and more sections with entrances on Annavale Road may be considered undesirable, as it would create more traffic (currently unsealed), and the intersection is with SH73, dangerously situated on the curve of SH</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.6 Strip development along SH73 for commercial or residential is undesirable</p>	<p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 The acceptable solution to not having reticulated sewerage was on-site effluent irrigation system, this takes up to much land, better solutions need to be explored</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.2 Residential growth could occur along western side of Pocock Road and Greenings Road reserve joining Pocock Road.</p> <p>1.3 Rezoning to allow for smaller section sizes and further subdivisions is necessary to promote development in the Pocoak Road – Greenings Road precinct (SPR A3 Fig 27)</p> <p>1.4 Support growth commercial in town and residential development in selected areas along the fringe</p> <p>1.5 Commercial development land in the centre of town needs to be re-classified as Business 1 or 2</p> <p>1.6 Residential development alternatives would be within the area bounded by SH73, Annavale Road and pocock Road because there’s more space to have individual sewerage systems.</p>	<p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Environment Canterbury is the consenting organisation. Consents are granted based on applications of individuals. There is potential for alternative solutions to be consented by Environment Canterbury.</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>A number of Implementation Steps in the MAP already address this submission.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil </p>

			<p>1.7 Shortage of car parking off highway in the centre of town, for commercial development</p> <p>1.8 Residential growth could occur in Pocock Road-Greenings road precinct through rezoning for smaller lots.</p> <p>1.9 Further subdivisions and more sections with entrances on Annavale Road may be considered undesirable, as it would create more traffic (currently unsealed), and the intersection is with SH73, dangerously situated on the curve of SH</p> <p>1.10 Support commercial development within the town centre, and residential development on the selected areas of the fringe</p>		
50	Don Gillanders	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Satisfied with the status quo regarding our (yet to be developed) land holding in the Telegraph Road/Creyke road and Greendale Road area (currently zoned Living 1, Living X Deferred, L2A Deferred)</p> <p>1.2 We may look favourably on a zoning change to business for land we own on Cridges Road (Area DAR A3) and to allow smaller sections</p> <p>1.3 While some areas of Darfield are undeveloped there seems to be adequate supply of zoned land for the near future, with the exception of section sizes between 600m2 and 5000m2</p> <p>1.4 No need for more 4 hectare subdivisions as it is wasted land</p> <p>1.5 Encourage infill of existing large sections</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.6 Township parking is a concern</p> <p>1.7 Heavy traffic through the town centre is a concern</p>	Not clear what relief is sought.	<p>The Submission is noted</p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Nil
51	Operation Homer (Submitted by Aston Consultants)	Springfield	<p>Background</p> <p>1.1 The submitter has an interest in Springfield Area 2 (west of Pocock Road and north of Annavale Road). Operation Homer applied for consent in 2006 to subdivide the site adjoining land to the west into 21 lots. An appeal by the applicant against SDC was rejected by Environment Court in 2007. The principal reason being that the proposal would not maintain the rural character of the site and locality, due to Outer Plains Rural Zoning anticipating a minimum dwelling density of 1 per 20ha. Therefore under the current plan the application calls for a plan change, not a resource consent. Therefore the DPR will indicate and implement the most relevant zoning for the site.</p> <p>Other</p> <p>1.2 In accordance with Clause 25 4(b) of Schedule 2 of the RMA, a local authority may reject a private plan change request if within the last 2 years, the substance of the request or part of the request has been considered and given effect to, or rejected by, the local authority or the Environment Court; or the District Plan has been operative for less than 2 years. This means private plan change rezoning requests relating to any land within the</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Amend 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 Consistent with the above, identify SPR A2 and balance of block to west (i.e. the 39ha site shown on the 2006 concept plan attached in Appendix A and legally described as RS 39367 and Pt RS 9817 & 14416 for a mixed density residential area, with potential for higher densities closer to Pocock Road and lower density on the Rural Outer Plains boundaries. Suggest zone L1 with minimum average lot size of 800m2and requirement for minimum average lot size of 1 ha for sites sharing a boundary with a rural zone</p> <p>1.3 Any consequential amendments to the MAP to give effect to the intent of this submission</p> <p>1.4 The district plan review should rezone the areas for urban development identified in MAP.</p> <p>1.5 If applicants want to progress rezoning more quickly than the DPR process, then it should be possible through a private plan change (Both options are available under the Christchurch Replacement District Plan Review Process)</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Point 1.1 Agree in part with the submission</i></p> <p><i>Points 1.2, 1.3, 1.6 – Agree with the submission, subject to further clarification.</i></p> <p><i>The extent of the SPR A2 area is intended to be indicative only. Any definite boundaries will be determined as part of the DPR should this area be rezoned. In addition, the site is subject to a consent notice (# 7809984.1) restricting future development on the property to only 1 dwelling. Subject to clarification as to the purpose of the consent notice, and how the submitters intend to overcome this encumbrance in the event development does occur, I agree in principle to the submitters request</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.4 –The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. However, there are already specific MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p>

			<p>Malvern and Ellesmere area may be rejected by the Council for the period from notification of the DPR up to 2 years after the Selwyn District Plan is made operative. This will in effect, 'preclude' rezoning and prevent further urban development for several years (up to 2020 and beyond, depending on the length of the DP Review process). It creates a high degree of uncertainty Aston Consultants Resource Management & Planning for applicants who are simply unlikely to proceed with the costs of preparation of a private plan change in such an uncertain planning framework.</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.3 It is considered that the Malvern Area Plan and District Plan Review are the appropriate methods for indicating and implementing the most appropriate zoning for the site.</p> <p>1.4 The MAP is providing anticipated urban development, it is not appropriate and is contrary to the RMA (Part 2, s31, s32 and s72-76) to rely on private plan changes to implement zoning of development areas identified in MAP. The district plan review should rezone these.</p> <p>1.5 The area plan justification for relying on private plan changes is that Springfield Township has sufficient capacity to accommodate growth until 2031. This fails to recognise;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Reliance on intensification of existing low density zoned L1 is not adequate to address future growth needs. There are multiple landowners with different aspirations and timelines for redevelopment. The fact that this land has been zoned L1 since the Operative DP was notified in 1995 and intensification has not occur red indicates that landowners over a substantial time period have not wished to intensify. In any case, this should not be encouraged given the location on the vast majority of existing L1 land with further development potential is on the southern side of the SH-growth is to be focussed on the north side to avoid potential SH severance effects. - An analysis of Quick map information indicated land potential to intensify is limited. The scope for intensification is located south of SH1, where an additional 47 lots has been calculated as being able to be developed. The location adjoining agricultural land means further intensification could lead to reverse sensitivity with adjoining farm land, and servicing with transport issues. The location of the submitters land is considered to be a logical extension of the urban boundary. - Development opportunities should be provided in different landownership to avoid potential ownership 'monopolies' and owners potentially developing and 'drip feeding' sections to the market to create a scarcity and maintain high section prices, SPR A3 possible low density residential area in draft MAP was zoned rural residential in former plan and is largely developed for Rural residential purposes i.e. there is limited capacity here for further RR development. 	<p>1.6 The submitters land is the most logical extension of urban boundary as it is located North of the SH, adjoining the existing township, and opposite existing residential development on the east side of Pococks Road, and existing rural residential development on opposite side of Annavale Road, proposed as low density residential SPR A3.</p> <p>1.7 The higher density L1 zoning could just extend as far North of Regent Street on the opposite side of Pocock Rd.</p> <p>1.8 Have appropriate minimum setbacks from midland rail line so stop reverse sensitivity issues</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.9 Other potential methods which require further investigation is the reallocation of water supply to the township to accommodate growing demands until 2031</p>	<p><i>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>Point 1.5 – I agree with the submitters. Until the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP) is notified the RMA provides an avenue for private plan change requests to be considered under that Act. At this stage it is not clear when the pSDP will be notified, although an indicative timeframe of September 2017 has been discussed. However, MAP has no Implementation Step which seeks to take this fundamental right away from landowners.</i></p> <p><i>Points 1.7 and 1.8 – Do not agree. The MAP notes that Area SPR A3 is suited for low density rural residential development. Detailed analysis of the density is more appropriately resolved through the DPR process, while detailed site planning is not within the scope of the MAP, is not required at this level of planning and is also more appropriately addressed through the DPR process.</i></p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>New water abstraction consents now granted to allow for growth. The compromise is that water demand is a key consent condition during times of low river flow.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA) • Subject to clarification involving any encumbrances on the area subject to this site, identify all of Lot 2 DP 400509 be located within the Low-density Residential Development Area 'SPR A2'
--	--	--	--	---	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none">- The site offers excellent north and west facing views to the mountains and would provide very attractive outlook for residential sections- The site is in the general area of future growth paths in the current district plan growth of township policies and will provide a variation in section sizes and housing typologies to meet the wider community needs.- The site provides clear defined boundaries to further urban development being contained by Annavale Road, Tramway Road and the Midland Railway line.- Disadvantages noted in MAP SPR 2, development in this area would need to overcome infrastructure servicing capacity issues (i.e. water and integration into the community network); adverse reverse sensitivity effects with midland line. And the site is comprised of Class III versatile soils. So should include;<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The site is contiguous to the existing township and represents a logical form of development. MAP acknowledges graduated density could be appropriate. It is logical reflecting the subdivision pattern of existing developed L1 zone opposite. The higher density L1 zoning could just extend as far North of Regent Street on the opposite side of Pocock Rd.• Reverse sensitivity with railway can be overcome with imposition of appropriate setbacks.• The proposed mixed density development would result in appropriate pattern of development in terms of visual integration with adjoining land uses and provide appropriate visual 'transition' at rural/urban boundary.• Springfield Township historically had capacity issues with respect to water allocation, which have now been resolved. Further development of Springfield could result in additional water capacity issues, it is agreed that integration into wider community with respect to water capacity is an issue to potentially address.• The site is not prime agricultural land, it is 'landlocked' block bounded by existing roads and railway line. Mixed density is a more efficient use of land, given the ideal location on the existing boundary of Springfield.		
52	Charlie Buttle	Darfield	Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.1 Support in principle the Draft MAP and in particular identification of Darfield Area 2 (DAR A2), as an 'area for	Population, Growth & Urban Form 1.1 Amend the overall MAP approach to identify preferred development areas rather than possible future	Population, Growth & Urban Form <i>Point 1.1 –Agree in part. Areas identified as Possible \Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas.</i>

			<p>residential intensification, subject to the amendments referenced in the relief sought, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing DAR A2 as a 'preferred development area' Removal the SDP L2A Deferred status that applies to the land The MAP to identify the land as an intensification area provision for densities of 5,000m² <p>1.2 The identification of development areas on the Darfield 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 the MAP.</p> <p>1.3 There are no physical constraints to densities of 5,000m², which are compatible with the character of the surrounding area.</p> <p>1.4 There is an anticipated demand for sections in Darfield resulting from economic activity in the area, including the Dairy factory and Central Plains Irrigation Scheme.</p> <p>1.5 The 5,000m² section size provides for a greater variety of lot sizes, is more efficient land use than the current 1ha densities and better satisfies market demand.</p> <p>1.6 The staged development and consequential reduction of available farm land on site will not diminish the long term viability of existing farming practices or versatile soils.</p> <p>1.7 The current L2A zoning, single ownership and proximity to the town centre presents the site as the most likely block to be developed first on the southern side of Darfield.</p> <p>1.8 The subject land is a logical area for intensification that can be comprehensively planned to achieve a high level of connectivity and integration with the existing township and its northwards growth direction. Standard density development in Area 7 is also strongly supported on this basis.</p>	<p>development options, with urban zoning to be implemented through the District Plan Review.</p> <p>1.2 Removal of the Deferred status of the current L2A zone for Area 2 as a potable water supply is now available that is capable of serving the subdivision and there is an existing ODP in the District Plan covering the land (ODP Area 4 – Darfield).</p> <p>1.3 Identify the land in the MAP as an area for intensification to 5,000m² densities</p> <p>1.4 Any consequential amendments to the MAP to give effect to the intent of the submission.</p>	<p><i>However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference through the DPR process</i></p> <p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p> <p><i>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>Point 1.2 I do not agree. The MAP is not appropriate to lift the deferred status from zoned land. This requires a formal plan change process.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.3 – The MAP already identifies area DAR A2 as an area suitable for development to the densities as suggested by this submission.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.4 – Agree in part for the reasons set out above</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA)
54	Cliff and Beryl Hatton (Submitted by Aston Consultants)	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 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. The MAP does not preclude any additional greenfield land from being considered for zoning through privately –initiated plan change requests under the RMA</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 the zoning to be implemented through the District Plan Review</p> <p>1.2 Consistent with the above, include Darfield Area 1 in the MAP as a preferred Residential 2A zone (minimum average lot size not less than 1 ha)</p> <p>1.3 Any consequential amendments to the MAP to give effect to the intent of this submission</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Points 1.1-1.5 –Agree in part.</i></p> <p><i>Areas identified as Possible Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas. However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference (i.e. rezone) through the DPR process</i></p> <p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The</i></p>

			<p>1.2 The quantum assessment of land supply and needs does not take into account the many factors which determine whether existing zoned land is actually 'development ready'. The MAP and subsequent DPR should identify methods for addressing potential development constraints, particularly where they relate to Council planning e.g. infrastructure.</p> <p>1.3 Private plan change 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>1.4 Private plan change requests will effectively be precluded for two years following the DPR being made operative under Clause 25 of the First Schedule, which creates a high degree of uncertainty for applicants who are unlikely to proceed with the costs of preparing a private plan change.</p> <p>1.5 The MAP justification for relying on private plan change requests to implement rezoning is on the basis that there is sufficient capacity within Darfield to accommodate growth through to 2031 without the need to actively zone additional land through the DPR, which fails to recognise the matters listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of greenfield development areas in different ownership to provide choice to the market • Area 1 is an area consisting of 4ha blocks zoned rural A under the former Malvern District plan (allowed 0.5ha to 4ha as a condition when there was an existing dwelling). Allow for 1ha lot minimums for mixed use. Horse Grazing is the current predominant existing activity on these lots. • R2A zoning with minimum average 1 ha lots will complement the zoning of land adjoining to the east. Alternative access is available from Clintons Road, and a more organic form of intensification. • Intensification of Area 1 will enhance a concentric growth pattern around Darfield. It is more efficient use of land, as it is essentially used for rural lifestyle purposes as the blocks are too small for economic farming, other than small-scale part time basis. Located next to Darfield School. And close to the township centre. It is a logical area for rezoning. • There is anticipated growing demand for sections at Darfield resulting from economic activity on the area, including the new dairy factory and CPW, and retiring farmers. • The only issue could be management of the boundary, with rural land to the north (Fonterra). The land is class III versatile soils. 	<p>1.4 Provide for some 1 ha minimum average lots for development of mixed character and mixed aged neighbourhoods with a more 'mature' character at the outset than Greenfield areas.</p> <p>1.5 To manage the rural/urban boundary, appropriate 'transitional' lower density residential zoning. Lots adjoining Fonterra have minimum 2ha lots, and zone L2 for Area 1 with minimum 1ha lots.</p>	<p><i>MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p> <p><i>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 MAP already notes that Area DAR A1 is an appropriate location for lower density residential development. However, no detailed assessment as to the densities or housing typologies, along with the specific needs for further zoned land (among other matters) has been carried out. The DPR is the most appropriate process for this assessment to occur. The alternative is the private plan change process.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA)
--	--	--	---	---	--

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • L2 (minimum 1ha lot size) would provide the appropriate transitional residential zoning to the rural. Urban. As with PC46 areas, lots adjoining Fonterra can be subject to minimum lot size of 2ha. • Area 1 has multiple ownership, so the respective size is not economic for intensive farming. Irrespective of Class III soils, it is not considered feasible for Area 1 to be utilised for more intensive farming purposes than currently. There are a number community facilities are walking/cycling distance. • Servicing and infrastructure issues can be managed through the DPR. Given the depth to ground water, reticulated waste water services are not needed. 		
55	H Faulkner	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.5 I support in principal. Identification of Springfield Area 4 (SPR A4) for low density residential development subject to relief sought including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify preferred development areas, with urban zoning to be implemented through the District Plan Review • Identify SPR A4 as preferred low density residential development <p>1.6 The identification of development areas on the MAP Map provides direction and certainty to the community, development sector, service providers and land owners in respect to urban development is anticipated within the MAP.</p> <p>1.7 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>1.8 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>1.9 Private plan change requests will effectively be precluded for two years following the DPR being made operative under Clause 25 of the First Schedule, which creates a high degree of uncertainty for applicants who are unlikely to proceed with the costs of preparing a private plan change.</p> <p>1.10 The MAP justification for relying on private plan change requests to implement rezoning is on the basis that there is sufficient capacity within Darfield to accommodate growth through to 2031 without the need to actively zone additional land through the DPR, which fails to recognise the matters listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reliance on intensification of existing lower density lots zoned L1 is not adequate to address future growth needs. It has been zoned L1 since 1995 and intensification has not occurred, indicates that landowners do not wish to intensify. 	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Amend the overall MAP 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 Identify land SPR A4 as a preferred location for low density residential development</p> <p>1.3 Any consequential amendments to the MAP to give effect to the intent of the submission.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Points 1.1- 1.3 –Agree in part.</i></p> <p><i>Areas identified as Possible Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas. However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference (i.e. rezone) through the DPR process</i></p> <p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p> <p><i>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 MAP already notes that Area Area SPR A4 is an appropriate location for lower density residential development. However, no detailed assessment as to the densities or housing typologies, along with the specific needs for further zoned land (among other matters) has been carried out. The DPR is the most appropriate process for this assessment to occur. The alternative is the private plan change process. In addition, other submitters have noted that this area may be more appropriate for light industrial use.</i></p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Land potential to intensify North of SH is limited. South of SH1 has been calculate for an additional 47 lots. Due to location by SH could lead to severance. The current capacity provides for low-density options, where there is a shortage of standard or medium density residential development opportunities to cater for the needs of the ageing population and trends towards smaller household sizes <p>1.11 Disadvantages noted in MAP for low density in SPR A4 would give rise to ribbon effect and reverse sensitivity associated to SH73 and midland railway. In response to this the following matters are considered;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location is contiguous to the existing town ship. The site could be accessed from Tawera Lane or Domain/Springfield and Tramway road, avoiding potentially reverse sensitivity effects with SH73 Connectivity with existing community facilities and services, close to primary school, furthermore the submitter has gifted a 3m strip along SH73 for pedestrian cycle way. Residential development would not result in a dispersed settlement pattern, there is existing residential development opposite SH73 and the Springfield cemetery. Overcome reverse sensitivity from midland rail and SH through the imposition of a 40m building setback and noise abatement. Site has limited productive capacity due to severance created by railway and elongated triangular shape boundary with SH. Low density residential development is considered to be the only practical use of site. 		<p><i>Resolution of this could, in part, be addressed as part of a further assessment through the MAP and more formally through the DPR process. The alternative is that a private plan change request resolves the issue.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA)
56	Masnutton Trust	Sheffield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Support in principle the Draft MAP and in particular but not limited to Sheffield, subject to the amendments referenced in the relief sought, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Referencing SHF A2 as a 'preferred development area' Facilitating a range of minimum average lot sizes ranging from 800m² to 2,000m² in size <p>1.2 The identification of development areas on the MAP Map provides direction and certainty to the community, development sector, service providers and land owners in respect to urban development is anticipated within the MAP.</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 MAP 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</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Amend the overall MAP approach to identify preferred development areas rather than possible future development options, with urban zoning to be implemented through the District Plan Review – Specifically Sheffield Area 2 (SHF A2).</p> <p>1.2 Identify the Sheffield Area 2 (SHF A2) in the MAP as a preferred standard residential area with minimum average lot sizes ranging from 800m² to 2,000m² on the lots sharing a boundary with the adjoining Rural zoned land.</p> <p>1.3 Any consequential amendments to the MAP to give effect to the intent of the submission.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Agree in part.</i></p> <p><i>Areas identified as Possible Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas. However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference (i.e. rezone) through the DPR process</i></p> <p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p> <p><i>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>zoning through privately-initiated plan change requests under the RMA.</p> <p>1.5 The quantum assessment of land supply and needs does not take into account the many factors which determine whether existing zoned land is actually 'development ready'. The MAP and subsequent DPR should identify methods for addressing potential development constraints, particularly where they relate to Council planning e.g. infrastructure.</p> <p>1.6 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>1.7 Private plan change requests will effectively be precluded for two years following the DPR being made operative under Clause 25 of the First Schedule, which creates a high degree of uncertainty for applicants who are unlikely to proceed with the costs of preparing a private plan change.</p> <p>1.8 The MAP justification for relying on private plan change requests to implement rezoning is on the basis that there is sufficient capacity within Sheffield to accommodate growth through to 2031 without the need to actively zone additional land through the DPR, which fails to recognise the matters listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is currently only one section for sale in Sheffield township • The L1A zone is in single ownership and is used by an engineering contractor, which is unlikely to be developed to deliver sections to the market in the short/medium terms • There is an ongoing demand for sections in Sheffield as a consequence of affordability, access to the high country and proximity to Darfield and Christchurch City <p>1.9 The following responses are provided to the disadvantages identified in the MAP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Intensification would further elongate the form of the township and contribute to a more dispersed settlement pattern and ribbon development</u> – The existing dwellings create a residential character at the northern end of SHF A2 so development is infill in nature • <u>There is less water pressure north of Sheffield</u> – There are engineering solutions available that can be funded through development contributions • <u>Some areas are identified as being potentially contaminated</u> – The land owner is not aware of any contamination issues, with Preliminary Site Investigation potentially required at the time of rezoning under the DPR and Detailed Sited Investigations to be undertaken at subdivision stage 		<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 MAP already notes that Area SHF A1 is an appropriate location for standard density residential development. However, no detailed assessment as to the densities or housing typologies, along with the specific needs for further zoned land (among other matters) has been carried out. The DPR is the most appropriate process for this assessment to occur. The alternative is the private plan change process.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA)
--	--	--	---	--	---

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transpower's National Grid dissects the land and <u>may give rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects</u> – Transpower will be required to be consulted as an affected party when application for development are received by Council. Any effects can be addressed through minimum setbacks and District Plan subdivision assessment matters The land is comprised of Class II versatile soils that <u>are valued for their productive capacity</u> – The land is too small to be farmed economically and is used for low intensity grazing purposes <p>1.10 SHF A2 is suitable for residential purposes because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The land was zoned Rural Residential in the former Malvern Transitional District Plan and clearly has been identified as suitable for residential use over a long period of time It is a small land holding that is not economic to farm It adjoins the current township boundary and is a logical area for growth The land owner wishes to develop the land in the short to medium term and they have consulted with the only other land owner in the block who support the rezoning The land is a greenfield block with on key owner so can be developed in a comprehensive manner without the complication of multiple ownership 		
57	Phil Thomas	Kirwee	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The submitters partly support the Malvern Area Plan, and in particular but not limited to the Kirwee township</p> <p>1.2 The identification of preferred development areas in the MAP provides direction and certainty to the community, development sector, service providers and land owners with respect to urban development anticipated and planned for 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 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>1.5 Private plan change requests will effectively be precluded for two years following the DPR being made operative under Clause 25 of the First Schedule, which creates a high degree of uncertainty for applicants who are unlikely to proceed with the costs of preparing a private plan change.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Amend the overall Area Plan approach to identify preferred development areas and future residential/business growth paths rather than possible future development options, with the zoning to be implemented through the District Plan Review .</p> <p>1.2 Include Kirwee Area 2 (extended to include land adjoining to the north) as a Preferred Standard Residential Development Area</p> <p>1.3 Identify the existing zoned area north of Hoskyns Rd and west of Courtenay Road as a Standard Residential Development area, and re-zone that part of this area currently Living 2 to Living 1 in the DPR. The Living 1 zoning should extend north as far as an existing east-west shelter belt, which provides a natural boundary and buffer between the residential and rural zones I seek under the 2017 DPR.</p> <p>1.4 Identify the rural land to the north of this shelter belt as a 'future residential growth path.' This would logically be zoned as part of the next District Plan Review (DPR) given that it is unlikely to required for residential growth within the planning period of the 2017 DPR (i.e. the next 10-15 years, to 2031):</p> <p>1.5 Any consequential amendments to the MAP to give effect to the intent of this submission.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Agree in part.</i></p> <p><i>Areas identified as Possible Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas. However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference (i.e. rezone) through the DPR process</i></p> <p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>

			<p>1.6 The MAP justification for relying on private plan change requests to implement rezoning is on the basis that there is sufficient capacity within Kirwee to accommodate growth through to 2031 without the need to actively zone additional land through the DPR, which fails to recognise the matters listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The need to recognise the short, medium and longer term growth needs of the township and to identify and zone land accordingly, including replacing existing low density residential zoning with standard residential zoning for my property because this would preclude/complicate future residential growth given the position within the township's residential growth path.• The only remaining area of undeveloped zoned residential land, apart from my land, is all in single ownership. It is important to provide zoned land in a mix of ownerships to avoid a monopoly situation where developers/land owners 'drip feed' sections to the market and create scarcity and maintain high section prices; and for market choice. <p>1.7 In response to the disadvantages detailed in the Kirwee documentation for the KIR A2 land we note the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Intensive farming activities:</i> the adjoining farmland is farmed by myself, and therefore I can control how any reverse sensitivity effects are managed. In any case, I do not undertake any potentially noxious intensive farming activity on adjoining farmland. The land is used for grazing and cropping. The intensive farming activity shown on the MAP adjoining SH is separated from my land by Kirwee Area 1, proposed for standard residential development. The buffer distances are such that there should be no adverse reverse sensitivity effects with the areas I propose for residential development.• <i>Ribbon development:</i> The zoning will not give rise to ribbon development as it is 'squaring' off the township form with Ansons• <i>Reverse Sensitivity Effects:</i> The land that is the subject of this submission does not have a boundary with either the State highway, or the Midland Railway Line, and is in fact well setback from both.• <i>Potentially Contaminated Land:</i> We are unaware of any contamination issues on site, and consider I would have known about any as I have been farming here for nearly 30 years. But, in saying that, a Preliminary Site Contamination Assessment (PSI) may be required at time of rezoning under the DPR and will identify any potential areas of contamination which can be remediated as necessary.• <i>Class III Versatile Soils:</i> The balance of the farm (approximately 800ha) will continue to be farmed. The area of land I would like to be rezoned L1 forms only a portion of the overall farming operation (approximately 70ha). The balance farmland will continue to be a viable farming unit.		<p><i>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">• Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA)• Amend in correct commentary noted in the MAP, as it relates to Kirwee and as noted in the submitters point 1.7 of this summary.
--	--	--	---	--	--

			1.8 Certainty regarding short and medium/long term township growth is important for farm planning.		
58	Alan Rhodes	Hororata	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Support in principle the Draft MAP but not the provisions relating to Hororata, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Issues and Options: Possible Future Development Options that do not identify the land on the western boundary of the township bounded by Hawkins Road, Bealy Road and Cotons Road <p>1.2 The identification of development areas on the MAP Map provides direction and certainty to the community, development sector, service providers and land owners in respect to urban development is anticipated within the MAP.</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 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>1.5 Private plan change requests will effectively be precluded for two years following the DPR being made operative under Clause 25 of the First Schedule, which creates a high degree of uncertainty for applicants who are unlikely to proceed with the costs of preparing a private plan change.</p> <p>1.6 The MAP justification for relying on private plan change requests to implement rezoning is on the basis that there is sufficient capacity within Hororata to accommodate growth through to 2031 without the need to actively zone additional land through the DPR, which fails to recognise the matters listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is no existing low density residential zoning at Hororata, the provision of which would widen housing choice and meet a gap in current demand The possible future low-density development area identified as HOR A2 is owned by the Council. It is generally preferable to provide development opportunities beyond single owned blocks to provide market choice and avoid monopoly situations. This land is not necessarily 'development ready', which necessitates the need for alternative sites to respond to land owner aspirations and market needs. <p>1.7 The identified area is suitable for residential purposes because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site is ideally located adjoining the township boundary, in proximity to Hororata School and within a block that already contains L1 zoned land 	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Amend the overall MAP approach to identify preferred development areas rather than possible future development options, with urban zoning to be implemented through the District Plan Review – Specifically the inclusion of the land on the western boundary of the township bounded by Hawkins Road, Bealy Road and Cotons Road as a Preferred Development Area</p> <p>1.2 Identify this area in the MAP as a preferred low-density residential area with minimum average lot size of 3,000m².</p> <p>1.3 Any consequential amendments to the MAP to give effect to the intent of the submission.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Agree in part.</i></p> <p><i>Areas identified as Possible Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas. However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference (i.e. rezone) through the DPR process</i></p> <p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p> <p><i>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>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA) Review the appropriateness of identifying additional areas for development in Hororata, in accordance with MAP Principles and Growth Assumptions

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The submitter as a proven track record in developing land for residential purposes • The MAP recognises that this site is well contained. Cotons Road is a strong, logical and definitive township containment boundary to the east that is currently not well defined • The site is generally suitable for development from an infrastructure servicing perspective • The site does not have the potential flooding/inundation constraints identified for land closer to the Hawkins River, including HOR A2. <p>1.8 The following responses are provided to the disadvantages identified in the MAP, which are that development may give rise to ribbon development, dilute the rural/urban contrast, contribute to a loss of rural productive land and is partially affected by an Intensive Farming Activity:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not prime agricultural land and is too small for economic farming purposes • There are no Intensive farming Activity in the vicinity that could result in adverse reverse sensitivity effects • Lower density residential development will provide an appropriate transition at the urban/rural interface, which will be retained through the 3,000m² densities • The site is well contained by roads, which avoids the need for larger sections along these boundaries • Development is consistent with the existing development pattern and form of the township 		
59	Merv Todd	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The submitters support the Draft Malvern Area Plan and in particular the identification of Area DAR A7 as a potential future growth path for residential purposes, subject to various amendments.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Amend the overall Area plan approach to identify preferred development areas, with zoning to be implemented through the District Plan Review</p> <p>1.2 Include Area DAR A7 as a preferred standard residential development area in the MAP and identify land adjoining to the north as the preferred standard residential growth path for Darfield</p> <p>1.3 Remove Area DAR A8 'potential future growth path for Business 2 purposes; or retain as a possible future B2 area given that there is not understood to be any landowner interest in such zoning and development (other suitable Business 2 areas are available (Areas DAR A 3 and DAR A6)</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>Agree in part.</i></p> <p><i>Areas identified as Possible Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas. However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference (i.e. rezone) through the DPR process</i></p> <p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p> <p><i>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</i></p>

					<p><i>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">• Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA)
60	Matthew Reed	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.6 Support in principle the Draft MAP and in particular but not limited to Darfield, subject to the amendments referenced in the relief sought, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Identify preferred development areas, with urban zoning to be implemented through the District Plan Review• Identify Darfield Area 7 (DAR A7) and the area identified in Appendix D as a ‘Preferred Standard Residential Density Growth Path’.• Remove DAR A8 ‘Potential Future Growth Path’ <p>1.7 The identification of development areas on the MAP Map provides direction and certainty to the community, development sector, service providers and land owners in respect to urban development is anticipated within the MAP.</p> <p>1.8 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>1.9 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>1.10 Private plan change requests will effectively be precluded for two years following the DPR being made operative under Clause 25 of the First Schedule, which creates a high degree of uncertainty for applicants who are unlikely to proceed with the costs of preparing a private plan change.</p> <p>1.11 The MAP justification for relying on private plan change requests to implement rezoning is on the basis that there is sufficient capacity within Darfield to accommodate growth through to 2031 without the need</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Amend the overall MAP 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 Identify Darfield Area 7 (DAR A7) and the area identified in Appendix D of the submission as a ‘Preferred Standard Residential Density Growth Path’.</p> <p>1.3 Remove DAR A8 ‘Potential Future Growth Path’ or retain it as a ‘Possible Future B2 Area’ on the basis that it is understood that there is no land owner interest in such zoning or development and because there are more appropriate alternative B2 locations.</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>Agree in part.</i></p> <p><i>Areas identified as Possible Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas. However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference (i.e. rezone) through the DPR process</i></p> <p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p> <p><i>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>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for

			<p>to actively zone additional land through the DPR, which fails to recognise the matters listed below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be a range of greenfield development areas in different ownership to provide choice to the market • The existing zoned areas are not necessarily 'development ready' • The current capacity provides for low-density options, where there is a shortage of standard or medium density residential development opportunities to cater for the needs of the ageing population and trends towards smaller household sizes <p>1.12 The inclusion of DAR A7 will enable the Reed family to reduce debt as a result of irrigation investment.</p> <p>1.13 The adjoining Broadgate subdivision was designed for future road connections to the adjoining land to the north, which establishes the Reed and adjoining Todd land as the logical and preferred growth direction of the township to realise a more concentric urban form.</p> <p>1.14 Darfield is identified as a Key Activity Centre in S2031, making it essential that the MAP focuses on the strategic growth needs of the township.</p> <p>1.15 The site is in close proximity to the existing Darfield town centre that will enable a high level of connectivity and integration to be realised.</p> <p>1.16 There is an anticipated growing demand for sections in Darfield resulting from economic activity in the area, including the Dairy factory and Central Plains Water Scheme.</p> <p>1.17 The land owners are committed to working collaboratively and the Reed family have a proven track record of developing their surplus farmland for residential purposes.</p> <p>1.18 Any disadvantages through proximity to the existing B2 zone and loss of productive soils can be addressed through appropriate densities and because the development of a portion of the farm will enable capital to be reinvested in Central plains Water, which in turn will enable the balance of the farm to be more productive.</p>		further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA)
61	Brian Redfern	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The Draft Malvern Area Plan needs to be amended to recognise existing low density residential areas (generally existing lot sizes in the 2hectare – 6 hectare range) around Darfield as a preferred development area for low density residential intensification, with minimum average lot sizes of 2 hectares, including on the west side of Clintons Road, and including Lot 1 DP 50891</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Recognise existing low density residential areas (generally existing lot sizes in the 2hectare – 6 hectare range) around Darfield as a preferred development area for low density residential intensification, with minimum average lot sizes of 2 hectares.</p> <p>1.2 Recognise Lot 1 DP 50891 as a preferred development area for low density residential intensification, with minimum average lot sizes of 2 hectares</p> <p>1.3 Alternatively, amend the Area Plan so as to recognise only Lot 1 DP 50891 as a preferred development area for low density residential intensification, with minimum average lot sizes of 2 hectares</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Do not agree.</i> <i>This site has recently been the subject of a resource consent, resulting in that consent being declined. The decision on that consent noted that the proposal was contrary to the existing District Plan provisions, has the potential to create a precedent for other similar sites throughout the District. It is my view that the reasons for declining the proposal were sound and are still relevant. In addition, development of additional residential development in this location is not considered to be in accordance with MAP Principles, specifically those associated with Urban Form, Growth & Intensification. This site has previously been 'tested' against the relevant MAP Principles.</i></p>

					<p>However, and as noted throughout this summary, the MAP already includes Implementation Steps which will consider whether further areas for residential (and commercial/retail/industrial) development are required, This will be through the DPR process. That process 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.</p> <p>However, I do not believe it is neither appropriate nor required to specifically identify all possible sites where development may occur, including this specific site. In the first instance, I believe there is sufficient available land now and over the planning timeframe that the MAP is subject to such that additional areas are not required (although areas options for growth post 2031or in the event that further land is required is identified). In addition, one of the stages of the MAP included ‘testing’ various options against agreed to MAP Principles, with a view to indicating the preferred sites. I also believe the various Implementation Steps provide sufficient scope for other areas that are not identified in the MAP as Possible (Preferred) Development Options to be considered in the DPR process. In the event additional sites are not assessed or identified, then those relevant landowners have the subsequent option of making submissions on the proposed Selwyn District Plan (pSDP) once that is notified. Landowners have further recourse through the private plan change process, until the point that the pSDP is publicly notified.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil
62	Survus Consultants (Hororata)	Hororata	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The MAP be amended to recognise the existing low-density residential areas west of Hororata Road and north of Duncan’s Road as a ‘preferred low density area’.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The MAP be amended to recognise the existing low-density residential areas west of Hororata Road and north of Duncan’s Road as a ‘preferred low density area’.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>Agree in part.</p> <p>Areas identified as Possible Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas. However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference (i.e. rezone) through the DPR process</p>

			<p>1.2 That this land is rezoned to L2 densities with a minimum average lot size of 5,000m² through the District Plan Review.</p> <p>1.3 This would recognise and be consistent with the existing development pattern and allow for some low density 'infill', which is consistent with MAP HOR A2 and recognises the previous Rural Residential zoning pattern under the previous Malvern District Plan.</p> <p>1.4 This pattern is consistent with the current form of Hororata, which is essentially ribbon development along the mains roads including Hororata Road as far north as Downs Road</p>	<p>1.2 That this land is rezoned to L2 densities with a minimum average lot size of 5,000m² through the District Plan Review.</p>	<p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (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.</i></p> <p><i>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 DPR is the most appropriate process for this assessment to occur. And to determine the site specific details such as densities and ODP requirements, such as roading networks, allotment location, reverse sensitivity buffers etc. The alternative is the private plan change process.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA)
63	Survus Consultants (Darfield)	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The MAP be amended to provide for some further residential intensification of the existing L2 areas in Darfield where the minimum average allotment size is 2ha (L2A1 zones).</p> <p>1.2 Intensification to 1ha minimum average allotment sizes would be a more efficient use of the land and allow for 'organic' gradual infill over time.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 The MAP be amended to provide for some further residential intensification of the existing L2 areas in Darfield where the minimum average allotment size is 2ha (L2A1 zones).</p> <p>1.2 Intensification to 1ha minimum average allotment sizes would be a more efficient use of the land and allow for 'organic' gradual infill over time.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Agree in part.</i></p> <p><i>Areas identified as Possible Future Development Options could be renamed as preferred areas. However I do not consider it appropriate to implement this preference (i.e. rezone) through the DPR process</i></p> <p><i>The MAP is not precluding rezoning of identified possible future development options through the DPR process. The MAP does state that there is considered to be sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth through to 2031. There are MAP Implementation Steps which clearly state that the option to rezone additional land will be considered, in accordance with the RMA (e.g. demand and supply,</i></p>

					<p><i>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.</i></p> <p><i>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 DPR is the most appropriate process for this assessment to occur. And to determine the site specific details such as densities and ODP requirements, such as roading networks, allotment location, reverse sensitivity buffers etc. The alternative is the private plan change process.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Rename Possible future Development Options as Preferred Development Options (Subject to a number of caveats, including the requirement for further detailed assessments in accordance with the RMA)
65	Dr David Askin		<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 Very considerable work and thought by planners and others. We thank them and note with appreciation their willingness to discuss concerns and suggestions in public meetings, including this submission process.</p> <p>1.2 I want to live in a community that values justice for all, and acknowledges basic human rights around shelter and homes that are owned by the occupiers</p> <p>1.3 Looking at our townships shows</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Those with money – eg retiring farmers – have been well catered for. Developers have chosen to provide large sections with restrictive covenants.• Large sections and restrictive covenants harm those on wages and salaries. I refer to workers in factories, farms and service industries etc. Their ability to live in their own homes is seriously compromised. Actually for many, ownership of a home is impossible. It is an injustice that we should take practical steps to overcome. <p>1.4 Allow existing, approx 1000 sq m sections, to be subdivided by owners to allow for a one or two bedroom</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Provide for infill housing. Allow existing, approx 1000 sq m sections, to be subdivided by owners to allow for a one or two bedroom cottage to be placed on their back section.</p> <p>1.2 Provide for approximately 700 sq m sections having 3-4 units housing single bedroom units, each owned by the occupier. (Our present model in new sub-divisions across Selwyn fails the tests of sustainability, of justice and of common sense).</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.3 Allow new units on smaller lots or on 'back sections' to share a new generation septic tank with the existing home or have a totally new septic – maybe hidden under a deck that allows all the access required for regular maintenance.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The current District Plan already provides for infill development, through the resource consent process.</i></p> <p><i>Individual development proposals such as the one proposed by the submitter under point 1.2 would be subject to the resource consent process. Among other matters that would need to be addressed would be management of wastewater disposal.</i></p> <p><i>In addition, the MAP has identified an area for further intensification in Darfield (Area DAR A5) along with a number of other Implementation Steps that address many of the matters set out in this submission.</i></p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Shared septic systems is a potential option. This is an activity consented by Environment Canterbury.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil

			<p>cottage to be placed on their back section. Those new units could share a new generation septic tank with the existing home or have a totally new septic – maybe hidden under a deck that allows all the access required for regular maintenance.</p> <p>1.5 The nonsense of only allowing family to live in additional dwellings on properties fails to address the reality described above – those on lower wages being deprived of housing options. This is an injustice that a generous community does not tolerate.</p> <p>1.6 Another practical step forward would be 700 sq m sections having 3-4 units housing single bedroom units, each owned by the occupier. (Our present model in new sub-divisions across Selwyn fails the tests of sustainability, of justice and of common sense).</p> <p>1.7 I'm told that Haunui Trust sought to develop further units, but it seems were stymied by rules around sewerage. If true I believe that technically there is no reason to allow sewerage issues to stop their provision of housing for the elderly.</p> <p>1.8 There seems to be a belief that we can't allow infill in existing sections because of a lack of town supplied, fully reticulated sewerage.</p>		
66	Bev Elder	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 There is a need for infill in the Living 1 Zone to enable a more coherent central core for the township</p> <p>1.2 There is sufficient zoned land to accommodate projected growth out to 2031</p> <p>1.3 No further low density land is required</p> <p>1.4 SDC report 'Housing needs in Selwyn District' identifies the need to assist elderly and first home buyers. Folks need small units, small sections and well designed but less expensive housing to meet their situation</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.5 The issue of reticulated sewage is in the too hard basket – alternative plans need to be explored and activated using the best of new technologies so progress can be made made now – Council needs to firmly and clearly counterthe perception that no progress can be made because of septic tank systems</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>5 Waters</p> <p>1.1 Can we get together around a table to agree and act on a plan that will in 5 years time give us a range of suitable housing, using a range of toilet technologies on the 87 sections the Area Plan identifies as available for development, and also those sections where a second dwelling could be added, within walking distance of the town centre.</p> <p>1.2 Can we plan together for the development of a more cohesive town centre – infilling between the recreation centre and the Library/Service Centre</p> <p>1.3 Could businesses needing drive in capacity be kept to side streets, so the main street is an attractive destination for pedestrians</p> <p>1.4 Can we enter into a dialogue with all parties interested in a staged development and expansion of the Haunui Trust, using land offered by the Catholic Church as one element in the solution. This could include several mixed model units and partnerships catering for both first time buyer families and elderly.</p> <p>1.5 Can we plan for duplex units for secure rent to be administered by a Trust where wrap around social services are an element of successful living. Habitat for Humanity offers a well tested model</p> <p>1.6 We need a clear message from Council that they are ready to engage with people who are not developers, but who hold an asset in the form of a large section, a spare section, or as creative different way of using resources to maximum effect. This could be in the form of a round table discussion from which a 5 year plan can emerge and we are sure we have a clear, shared commitment to act.</p>	<p>5 Waters</p> <p><i>Council does not see sewage as holding up development. Consents for onsite disposal are being granted by Environment Canterbury. Some section sizes are below 450m2.</i></p> <p><i>Sharing onsite disposal systems is a potential option.</i></p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The MAP has a number of Implementation Steps that address the matters outlined in this submission. Point 1.1 Disposal of wastewater in all of the Malvern townships is managed directly by Environment Canterbury through the resource consent process. It is therefore difficult to provide any definitive direction or answers in the Draft Malvern Area Plan in respect to how the e future management of wastewater discharges, presents a constraint or an opportunity to growth over the next 15 years, although it would seem, on the balance of probabilities, that opportunities for comprehensive and integrated provision of medium density development in Darfield, as promoted by the Draft Malvern Area Plan, may be compromised. However, ad hoc provision of higher density development maybe able to occur through individual consenting of on-site wastewater systems, as is currently the case. Additionally, Table 2 – Implementation Steps – Darfield (page 30 of the MAP) notes that the Darfield and Kirwee Wastewater Working Party shall be continued. The issues raised in this submission are better able to be resolved through this forum.</i></p>

					<p><i>Points 1.2 and 1.3 - An Implementation Step for Darfield includes the development of a Town Centre Study to consider these matters. This is anticipated to occur over the short term.</i></p> <p><i>Point 1.4 – 1.6 – Council staff are available to discuss specific development proposals with the relevant parties. It is arguable as to whether Council should be facilitating or promoting such proposals. Council has a role in advocating for the provision of social/elderly housing and this is recognised in the MAP Implementation Steps (page 17, Table 1 Implementation Steps – All townships). The Map also includes an Implementation Step to consult with the community regarding the provision (or otherwise) of a reticulated wastewater scheme. In the absence of such schemes developers of any scale will be required to secure a discharge consent from ECan.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil
68	Castle Hill Community Association	Castle Hill	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Castle Hill Area 1 is suggested as a potential area for expansion of the village. Apart from the flat area in the vicinity of the current homestead the balance has a number of challenges. A large part of the area is native beech forest which forms the backdrop to the village and should be retained. In addition, there is a pond and a significant gully running down from it that would be unsuitable for development.</p> <p>1.2 The retention of the current township boundary is inconsistent with the consented extension to the village for the camping ground and golf course. The increase in size of the township area is acknowledged elsewhere in the review. The township boundary denoted by a blue dotted line should be extended to include the consented area and the wording altered accordingly.</p> <p>1.3 The Opportunities and Issues Map should also be amended to include the consented camping ground and golf course area as shown on the amended Context Map and should then recognise that there are green areas offering opportunities for future expansion of the consented activities.</p> <p>Transportation</p> <p>1.4 Cross highway severance issues. Now that the NZTA have approved a new highway entrance to cater for the traffic movements between the village and the consented camping ground which will provide visitor accommodation, a store and licensed restaurant facilities, the Association believes this is no longer a significant issue. Cross traffic issues are further referenced as a problem under transport. The NZ Transport Agency did not make a submission at the time of the hearing of the Resource Consent application for the Camping Ground as the plans</p>	<p><i>Population, Growth & Urban Form</i></p> <p><i>Transportation</i></p> <p>1.1 Amend the Context Map extending the village boundaries to include the consented camping ground and golf course area.</p> <p>1.2 The Opportunities and Issues Map should be amended to include the consented camping ground and golf course area to recognise that there are green areas offering opportunities for future expansion of the consented activities.</p> <p><i>Natural Environment & Cultural Heritage</i></p> <p><i>Local Facilities and Community Development</i></p> <p>1.3 Include the Castle Hill Community Association in discussions relating to the incorporation of mana whenua history into building design, information boards and displays, plantings and other matters relating to the cultural landscape.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Agree in part with the submitter as set out below:</i></p> <p><i>The MAP sufficiently identifies and labels the golf course and camping ground area. However, further clarification through other mapping techniques may be appropriate to clearly identify the area is for recreation purposes.</i></p> <p>Natural Environment & Cultural Heritage</p> <p>Local Facilities and Community Development</p> <p><i>Agree with the submitters. Consultation on these matters is an operational and process issue and should occur as a matter of sound planning practice.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Consider alternative mapping techniques to more clearly identify that the golf course and camping ground area are for recreation purposes.

			<p>incorporate their entrance design and road widening. Good connectivity will result.</p> <p>Natural Environment & Cultural Heritage Local Facilities and Community Development</p> <p>1.5 The Association is interested to understand how the cultural significance of the area can be reflected in the building design standards. We note that there is to be consultation as the Plan is developed and so we note that we would welcome discussion on this and other matters relating to the cultural landscape and planting to support mahinga kai referred to in the Plan.</p> <p>1.6 Mana whenua history to be incorporated into the design of public and commercial facilities. Is this suggestion to take the form of information boards and/or displays? Again we record that we would welcome discussion at the appropriate time with interested parties.</p> <p>1.7 We note that the mana whenua have an interest in culturally significant areas that exist in the wider area and welcome advice from interested parties on their location and areas of interest.</p>		
70	Angela Cossey	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 We wish to highlight the closed thinking reflected by council about not allowing us to add a second dwelling on our 10 acre property from which we could gain an extra income by tenanting the second dwelling or operating a bed and breakfast/farm-stay. On a number of occasions we have been told "NO" and even if we applied for resource consent the answer would still be "No, don't waste your money".</p> <p>1.2 We believe that providing separate self contained tourist or visitor accommodation is of real benefit to the district and there is evidence of a shortage of this nature.</p> <p>1.3 We believe the council should encourage small business opportunities that will enable more people to visit and stay longer in the area.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Council should encourage small business opportunities that will enable more people to visit and stay longer in the area.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>Agree with the submitter. The MAP has a number of Implementation steps which address this submission, including</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Advocating for ultrafast broadband</i> • <i>Reviewing the scale, nature and location of various business zones in the Malvern Area</i> • <i>Considering additional areas for residential development</i> <p><i>In addition, the District Plan provides a consenting pathway for a 2nd dwelling, or to establish business activities outside of recognised business zones, subject to avoidance, mitigation of remediation of relevant environmental effects. These provisions are scheduled to be reviewed through the District Plan Review process to determine the extent to which they are 'fit for purpose'.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nil
72	Trevor Chapman	Darfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 I support Darfield Possible Future Development Options - Area 1 in orange. I suggest 1 hectare or less to utilize the finite land resource more efficiently.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 I suggest 1 hectare or less to utilize the finite land resource more efficiently.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</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 details of densities, location, roading layout and housing typologies will be addressed as part of this process.</i></p> <p><i>The Area Plans will be an important document, among others (e.g. RPS, Selwyn 2031, NPSUDC), to consider in providing</i></p>

					<p><i>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>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil
74	Lloyd Minchington	Springfield	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Change of zoning of land situated at 5681 main west coast rd (next door to the Springfield hotel).</p> <p>1.2 Change of zoning of land from residential to business, to allow for further development consisting of one and two bedroom units and some retail shops, at the front of the property. The property has an area that lends itself to setting up some of the units as over 60 retirement villas - a recognised need in the future.</p> <p>1.3 A recognised need for short term housing, to allow people to move into the area as their houses are been build.</p> <p>1.4 With the projected increase in tourist numbers and the lack of infrastructure to support them, it must be recognised that future accommodation needs must be met, Growth must be anticipated</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p>1.1 Change of zoning of land situated at 5681 main west coast rd (next door to the Springfield hotel).</p> <p>1.2 Change of zoning of land from residential to business, to allow for further development consisting of one and two bedroom units and□some retail shops, at the front of the property.</p>	<p>Population, Growth & Urban Form</p> <p><i>The MAP already has Implementation Steps that address this submission. A Springfield Town Centre Study is schedule to be initiated in the short term (2016-2020).</i></p> <p><i>The District Plan Review (DPR) will also consider the future business needs of all townships in the Malvern 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’. Such a review may also include consideration of whether spot zoning is appropriate for existing legally established ventures.</i></p> <p>Recommendation and Amendments To The Draft Area Plan</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Nil