

**Selwyn District Council
Rural Residential Strategy**

Recommendations of the Hearings Commissioners

Commissioners

David Mountfort Chairman

Debra Hasson

Michael Garland

Selwyn District Council

Rural Residential Strategy

Recommendations of the Hearings Commissioners

Introduction

1. The Selwyn District Council has prepared a draft Rural Residential Strategy for the purpose of managing the development of rural residential properties in its district. It has done this in response to a requirement of the Land Use Recovery Plan (the LURP) that it do so. The LURP was developed under the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011 (the CER Act). The Council is required under Action 18 of the LURP to change its district plan to implement the Strategy. It is our understanding that the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, which was amended by the LURP, will prevent any rural residential development that is not in accordance with the Council's Strategy.¹
2. The draft Strategy has been developed under the Local Government Act 2002, and has been subject to the consultation requirements of that Act, including public notification, submissions, a hearing in front of Commissioners and a recommendation to the Council on those submissions. Unusually for an LGA process, the outcome is to lead to changes to the Selwyn District Plan, a document prepared under the Resource Management Act 1991, without following the RMA's own processes for a plan change.
3. It therefore has become critical for landowners seeking to develop their properties for rural residential activities to ensure that the Strategy enables their properties to be developed that way, as the usual RMA process for applying for a district plan change to allow such development has effectively been suspended by the combined effect of the CER Act, the LURP and the RPS. Many submissions were received seeking inclusion of properties in the Strategy, along with other requests for amendments to other provisions of the Strategy.
4. We were appointed as Commissioners by the Selwyn District Council to hear and consider the submissions and make recommendations to the Council concerning them. We conducted a hearing at Lincoln and Rolleston on April 7-11 2014. Many of the submitters either appeared at the hearing in person or through representatives. We record that we have also carefully considered all the submissions from people who did not attend the hearing.

Abbreviations

5. In this report we use the following abbreviations

LGA	the Local Government Act 2002
RMA	the Resource Management Act 1991
LURP	the Land Use Recovery Plan
CER Act	the Canterbury Earthquake Recovery Act 2011
RPS	the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 2013
RRS	the Selwyn District Council Rural Residential Strategy (also "the Strategy")
6. In this report, we first set out our conclusions and recommendations on some generic issues that are fundamental to the contents of the Strategy. Then we discuss in a general way all the sites which were nominated for inclusion, either by the Council in the original draft or through the submissions. The sites are grouped by the town they adjoin or are nearest to. Attachment 1 contains our specific recommendations on all the submissions, grouped by the number allocated

¹ See Policy 6.3.9 of the RPS

to them by the Council. Attachment 2 contains our recommendations for amendments to the text of the Strategy.

PART 1 GENERIC RECOMMENDATIONS

What is the effect of inclusion in the Rural Residential Strategy?

7. Throughout the hearing process we have had to continually remind ourselves that, despite the specific outcomes in terms of site selection, the strategy is a high level (policy) document prepared under the Local Government Act rather than the Resource Management Act. The strategy is intended to give guidance and policy direction as to how best to manage rural residential development in terms of its form, function, character and where it might best be located. Potential rural residential locations have been selected on terms that are more general than would be the case for a document prepared under the Resource Management Act.
8. The reader should be aware, therefore, that selection of a location for rural residential development in this strategy is not an indication that it will be found to be suitable when subject to the more particular scrutiny required by the Resource Management Act. At best it will have been selected as a potential candidate on face value.
9. It should be borne in mind also that the consultation and submission process undertaken under the Local Government Act is more general than the Resource Management Act process which must follow if a location or site is to be given status under the District Plan. In particular, it has given no submission or further submission rights to affected parties and input in terms of infrastructure and natural hazards has not been very specific. Subsequent Plan Changes may well lead to rejection of any of the sites in the strategy for legitimate environmental reasons. This strong precaution is expressed concurrently with our recommendations and should be clearly apparent to any party seeking to progress with a private plan change application. Selection of a site in this strategy does little to lighten the burdens of proof required for a Plan Change to succeed.

Urban Form and Rural Residential Types

10. The draft Strategy describes a number of different types of rural residential development which occur in New Zealand and around the world, including “New Ruralism”, Farm Park Developments, Hamlets and Clusters and Peri-urban Rural-residential development.² It prefers the peri-urban type, because the others are likely to be located in the midst of traditional rural activities, subject to reverse sensitivity, difficult to provide with appropriate utility services particularly water supply and sewerage, and likely to promote reliance on and inefficient use of motor vehicles because of distance from community and commercial services, employment and public transport. We note these are all adverse effects described in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement³, and that policy 6.3.9 of the RPS specifically requires that all rural-residential sites must be located so that they can be economically provided with connections to publicly-owned water supply and sewerage reticulation. Minimising these effects is the reason that the RPS requires that rural residential development be both managed and limited in its extent. Therefore all the sites recommended for inclusion in the draft strategy occur on the fringes of the various towns in the study area. Collectively these affects are easiest to avoid in close proximity to towns, making the selection of the peri-urban form. We agree that the peri-urban form of rural-residential development is the most likely type to promote sustainable management of rural resources and recommend that the selection of sites for inclusion in the Strategy continue to be based on this. In fact all of the sites recommended for inclusion in the draft strategy, and most of the sites nominated by submitters were of this type.

Urban Growth Paths

11. A potential difficulty with the peri-urban form of growth is that because of its location on the fringes of towns it has the potential to constrain future growth of those towns. Lincoln, Rolleston and Prebbleton are the 3 largest towns. All have sites identified in the Canterbury Regional

² Paragraphs 5.2-5.21

³ See principal reasons and explanation for Policy 6.3.9.

Policy Statement (the RPS) as priority greenfields growth areas for full urban growth, and all are subject to Structure Plans which have been prepared by the Selwyn District Council which identify growth opportunities beyond the 2028 period covered by the RPS greenfields areas. The structure plans indicate future urban growth, and also the necessary support services such as transport, underground service networks, stormwater management and recreational and open space facilities. As well as the RPS and the Structure Plans, the Council has also informally identified likely future growth paths in some areas where the Structure Plans have possibly not looked out far enough, particularly at Prebbleton. Growth prospects at Prebbleton also have been the subject of commentary by the Environment Court, which has indicated a preference for avoiding ribbon development to the north and south along Springs Rd, and pointed to development opportunities east and west of the town. In his officer's report, Mr Craig Friedel has pointed out some likely growth paths that have not yet been formally identified and recommended we avoid including sites in those locations. Past experience has been it can be extremely difficult to successfully intensify rural residential areas into full urban development because the layout of buildings, and the multiple ownership often precludes satisfactory layouts at full urban densities from being established. Mr Friedel described this effect as "ring fencing".

12. Somewhat to the contrary, Ms Nicole Lauenstein, an urban designer who gave evidence for a number of the submitters was strongly of the opinion that peri-urban rural residential development can provide an opportunity to complete a satisfactory urban form for a town, blending it into the surrounding countryside in a way that is visually pleasing and functionally effective. Acknowledging the potential that this could have to cause the ring fencing effect, Ms Lauenstein recommends that sites within future growth paths should be "future proofed" by a combination of design layouts that would enable quality intensification at a later date, along with a package of legal mechanisms such as covenants and consent notices on titles to ensure owners were not able to block such development.
13. This subject of future growth paths and "future proofing" became one of the more difficult and contentious issues we have to resolve. On the one hand, "future proofing" offers an obvious method of avoiding the effect of ring fencing and blocking future growth paths. On the other hand, there is a serious question as to whether or not it would be legally possible to adopt.
14. One of the location criteria in the draft Strategy is to "Avoid locations that are obvious residential growth paths". This is presumably to avoid the ring fencing effect and to ensure that there are no barriers to full residential development when and if the time comes. This statement is not a serious legal problem, because we are able to recommend that it be amended or deleted. However, a much more serious problem is presented by the wording of the RPS.
15. Objective 6.2.2 (6) of the RPS *requires managing rural residential development outside of existing urban and priority areas.*
16. Future proofing is a form of management, but is it to be interpreted as a statement that all rural residential areas are to be outside of existing urban and priority areas? If so what are these areas?
17. Policy 6.3.9(2) states that *The location must be outside the greenfield priority areas for development and existing urban areas;*
18. Policy 6.3.9 (6) requires the long-term maintenance of rural residential character.
19. Policy 6.3.9 (7) states that *a rural residential development area shall not be regarded as in transition to full urban development.*
20. We received three legal opinions on the meaning and intention of the RPS, containing three different interpretations.
21. Firstly, for the Council, the position taken is that the RPS, particularly clause 6.3.9 (7) means that if areas are included in the strategy on a future proofed basis that must mean that they are being regarded as in transition to full urban development⁴.
22. Secondly, counsel for the submitter Trents Rd Development Ltd, Mr Andrew Schulte said that future proofing in itself would not bring about further transition to further intensification. His clients do not seek it and would not be in a position to bring it about, as the property would by then have

⁴ Legal opinion by Mr Paul Rodgers, of Adderley Head.

been sold. Transition would not begin until there were positive moves to bring about further intensification, an obvious trigger being rezoning for full urban development. He submitted that under Policy 6.3.9 such a rezoning would be precluded because at that point the area would enter the transition stage. Therefore such transition cannot occur under the policy as it stands and would not be possible unless and until the policy changes, thus removing the problem.

23. Counsel for the Dryden Trust, Ms Jen Crawford went further, stating that future proofing merely enabled future intensification. It would not specifically provide for it and it may or may not occur. She did not accept Mr Schulte's opinion that future rezoning would be precluded by the wording of the policy. In her view future proofing at the stage of development to rural residential densities is not motivated by any intention to bring it about, it is simply a sensible precaution so that later intensification is not ruled out or hampered if anybody wants to do it at the time.
24. Mr Friedel, in his planning report adopts the advice of Mr Rodgers and considers that the clause is effectively a ban on locating rural residential areas in likely future growth paths. For the Canterbury Regional Council, in his planning evidence, Mr Michael Rachlin offered a view that was similar to that of Mr Schulte.
25. Our attention was drawn to a Commissioner's decision on a substantially similar earlier version of this clause for the Waimakariri District Council that the clause is "virtually meaningless"⁵. We respectfully disagree. The problem seems to be that there too many possible meanings. All of the positions taken in the three opinions are possible in our opinion. We can think of a fourth, which is simply a directive not to be concerned about any potential for transition to full urban development. In other words just because an area is listed for rural residential development, we should not have regard to any potential for later redevelopment to full urban densities. Although that is a possible interpretation, we do not favour it because it seems inconsistent with the purposes of the RPS, as set out below but it serves to illustrate how ambiguous the subclause is.
26. As with all interpretation of statutory documents, we consider that we should adopt a purposive approach, seeking to establish the purposes of the provision to assist in its interpretation. We have therefore turned to the objectives and policies of the RPS.
27. Objective 6.2.2 seeks that *The urban form and settlement pattern in Greater Christchurch is managed to provide sufficient land for rebuilding and recovery needs and set a foundation for future growth, with an urban form that achieves consolidation and intensification of urban areas, and avoids unplanned expansion of urban areas, by(a range of techniques not relevant here) and.....*
(6) Managing rural residential development outside of existing urban and priority areas;
(Emphasis added)
28. We consider that relevant purposes include achieving urban consolidation, avoiding unplanned expansion of settlements, and managing rural residential growth. The relevant explanation is largely about intensification and so not particularly helpful for present purposes. However we do not consider that future proofed residential development would inevitably be contrary to these purposes and in fact it would conform to the purpose of avoiding unplanned expansion, because it is planned by definition.
29. Turning to the critical clause 6.3.9, firstly we do not consider subclause (2) is relevant. The priority greenfield areas mentioned there are those identified on the Map in Appendix 1 to the RPS. None of the candidate sites are within one of those. Nor are they within any existing urban area. Most of them are in the Rural Inner Plains zone and have no more than low density rural or rural residential development on them.
30. Clause (6) is relevant. We consider that a rural residential development that enables ultimate full urban development through future proofing is not inconsistent with it. Such a development would maintain long term rural residential character until a change became appropriate and possible, after which it would no longer be necessary.
31. Subclause (7) is highly relevant.

⁵ Decision on Plan Change 10 to the Waimakariri District Plan. We note that this was an earlier version with slightly different wording and that the comment was not an essential part of the decision in any case.

32. We consider that the Council's legal opinion was influenced by an assumption that the landowners concerned must have been motivated by an intention to achieve ultimate full urban development. Otherwise, it asks, why would they bother? However all the parties concerned gave evidence that this was not their intention and that they would not be in a position to achieve it once a rural residential development had been achieved as all the land would have been sold and they would no longer be involved. We accept that all the submitters were seeking to achieve was rural residential development, and the future proofing for them is no more than a sensible precaution to avoid future difficulties that might occur for the Council and later owners at some future time. It is also of course a necessary device to enable them to achieve the RPS purposes.
33. We consider that future proofing would achieve the purposes of achieving urban consolidation and avoiding unplanned expansion, both now and in the future. All concerned seemed to accept this, and to agree that if rural residential development was to occur in future growth areas then future proofing would be a wise precaution. The debate was about whether future proofing was legally permissible.
34. We consider that the critical phrase is "in transition". When would the transition commence? We think it would need some positive action to bring it about, such as an application for rezoning. A future proofed rural residential development would not in our opinion be in transition because nobody would at that stage be intending to bring it about. If Mr Schulte and Mr Rachlin are correct it would not even be possible to bring about until the policy settings change.
35. We find the view of Mr Schulte very persuasive, firstly because it achieves the purposes of the RPS as we understand them and secondly because we accept that for transition to occur, some activity must be going on to generate it. We do not have to go so far as saying that he is correct and Ms Crawford is wrong about the need for a future policy change, because either view is sufficient to achieve what they are both seeking for their clients. We accept that at a future date policy settings may change in view of circumstance prevailing at the time. At that time transition may or may not start to occur. We do not need to address that now. The important planning purpose as we see it now is not to preclude urban consolidation and the protection of future growth paths.
36. Therefore we consider that identification of rural residential areas in the Strategy, even where they are located in future growth paths does not mean they are therefore in transition to full urban development. Transition implies change, and something must occur to start the process of change.
37. Until transition occurs, the intent of subclause (6) which is the maintenance of long term rural residential character would be achieved. We consider that a rural residential development that enables ultimate full urban development through future proofing is not inconsistent with this. It would maintain long term rural residential character until a change became appropriate and possible, after which it would no longer be necessary.
38. We have considered which exactly are the future growth paths that we should be concerned about. Obviously any areas that are identified in the RPS and in the three structure plans should be included. This includes the Dryden Trust and the Sole properties which are within the Rolleston Structure Plan. The difficulty that occurs is with a number of sites that are not officially defined as growth paths anywhere, but clearly would be obvious candidates for long term urban growth. This occurs particularly at Prebbleton, to the west and to some extent the east, with sites that are not within the Structure Plan at present but have been identified as lying within obvious growth paths, both by the Environment Court, and by the Council officers. We accept that these areas are the most likely paths for urban growth if there is to be any at Prebbleton, and so if included should be subject to future proofing. This includes some of the sites already nominated by the Council for inclusion in the Strategy. There may be some other sites around the other towns which we will consider further later in this report.
39. There are other sites, such as those to the south of Prebbleton which we do not consider to be within future growth paths in the foreseeable future.
40. We are aware that the future proofing concept is not fully defined anywhere. It includes design techniques relating to the physical layout, and also legal and planning techniques. A roading, underground services and open space layout is crucial because this will also provide the basis both for initial development for rural residential and later more intensive redevelopment. Location of future facilities, such as further roads and other facilities need to be shown, and protected from

incompatible development. Building sites need to be defined that will be clear of future roads and other facilities, Legal and planning techniques would need to be found to ensure future landowners do not refuse to make land available for future facilities, including district plan rules, covenants and consent notices on titles. We consider that if future proofing is to be adopted as a technique then suitable statements to this effect should be included in the Strategy.

41. The advantages of allowing future-proofed rural residential development include that it allows an economic land use in the interim while preventing interim uses such as unplanned 4ha developments which could make future full urban development difficult to achieve. The disadvantages include premature expenditure on infrastructure and possible maintenance and depreciation costs for Council, although we accept that with good design and planning these could be minimised. There could also be complications at the eventual full development stage to ensure the necessary participation at that stage due to greater numbers of owners and the concept is critical upon excellent legal arrangements being made.
42. We consider that if the peri urban type is to be adopted as the only form of rural residential development, as we have recommended, then this is likely to set up an inherent conflict between providing for sufficient rural residential allotments and allowing for eventual expansion of townships. Future proofing is a technique which will assist to resolve this conflict. Having closely examined each of the townships, we have concluded it would not be possible to provide for more than a very small number of rural residential lots while also allowing for growth of those towns unless the future proofing concept is applied in some locations.

Rural Residential Character

43. At face value, the term rural residential character seems to imply that an area should reflect both rural and conventional residential characteristics. This is to provide a high quality landscape and amenity which demonstrates a connection to the rural countryside, and provides greater amounts of open space, peace and quiet and longer views than standard residential development. Rural residential development is not the same as large lot suburban development. There needs to be something that defines it as rural. For this reason a preferred layout was described in the Council's Rural Residential Background Report, which preceded and informed the Strategy. This was for relatively small blocks of no more than about 50 lots, preferably in a rectangular form which enabled most or all lots to have views into and out of the adjacent rural countryside and the activities, structures and landscapes there. Some of the blocks nominated by submitters did not seem to fit this preferred layout at all, being much larger and consequently with a lot of interior space which would be unlikely to ever achieve views to the rural landscape. For this reason we discussed this issue extensively with the two design witnesses, Mr Andrew Craig for the Council and Ms Nicole Lauenstein who appeared for a number of the submitters. Their consensus is that although direct exposure to the countryside would be ideal, even without it there are a range of techniques that can be used to create an impression of ruralness. These include lot size and layout, the juxtaposition of larger and smaller lots, planning, the use of open space areas such as waterways, planting and shelter belts, avoiding "urban motifs" such as kerb and channelling, footpaths and stylised entrance walls, minimising street lighting, using only rural fencing styles, large building setbacks etc. After hearing from these witnesses we were persuaded that maintenance of rural residential character is possible through the use of such techniques, even in the absence of direct connection to the countryside. It is one of the matters to be provided for in the design exercise that have to would accompany an application for rural residential zoning.

4 ha subdivision - the controlled status of 4ha subdivisions

44. In its current form the Rural (Inner Plains) zone provides for subdivision as a controlled activity to a low threshold of 4 hectares per lot. Many, if not all, peri-urban areas within that zone are pepper potted with 4 hectare subdivisions as a result. Those that are not are considered in many quarters to be destined for such partition unless there is intervention.
45. The growth paths for urban expansion over the Rural Inner Plains area are affected by the same provision. The more owners of the land required the more difficult it is to plan comprehensively for such growth particularly if some land owners are not co-operative. Thus, the smaller the lots

that are allowed to exist in these growth paths the more difficult it is to plan for and to exercise urban development. Hence the concern expressed in the Strategy that provision for Rural Residential development in an area selected for urban growth would hinder the ability to develop for urban expansion. In that sense, Rural Residential zoning would be seen as a barrier to urban development. A plethora of 4 hectare lots is seen as bad enough, but a multitude of half hectare lots would present something of a terminus.

46. For these reasons the areas nominated in the draft strategy have kept clear of growth paths. Inevitably, a number of owners have justified a form of intervention termed “future proofing” to enable rural residential zoning within future growth paths. One of the reasons given for such a technique is that it would result in a better situation than the inevitable partition into 4 hectare lots because by design it would not hinder future urban development. We discuss future proofing elsewhere: We believe it is a technique that has its place. On the other hand, however, we do not think it can be justified by comparing it favourably with 4 hectare subdivisions. Urban expansion in the past has not been hindered greatly by the presence of 4 hectare lots and we do not think it will be in the future. In many cases the subdivision into 4 hectare lots has already occurred and it seems the horse has bolted.

Natural Hazards – What are significant natural hazard areas?

47. In selecting areas to identify for rural residential development, Policy 6.3.9(5) (h) of the RPS directs us to avoid significant natural hazard areas including steep or unstable land.
48. None of the sites nominated are steep and unstable. They are all flat lands on the Selwyn plains. The natural hazards with potential to affect them are flood inundation, and seismic effects, particularly liquefaction, earthquake shaking and lateral spreading. The question to consider is what is significant? To answer this question we have considered chapter 11 of the RPS which has a number of relevant objectives and policies.
49. Firstly, Objective 11.2.1 requires that *new subdivision, use and development of land which increases the risk of natural hazards to people, property and infrastructure is avoided or, where avoidance is not possible, mitigation measures minimise such risks.*
50. Any development which puts increased numbers of people at risk in such circumstances would be contrary to this objective. The issue to be determined is when areas should be avoided completely or where mitigation of risk would be appropriate.
51. Policy 11.3.1 – Avoidance of inappropriate development in high hazard areas is;
To avoid new subdivision, use and development (except as provided for in Policy 11.3.4) of land in high hazard areas, unless the subdivision, use or development:
(1) is not likely to result in loss of life or serious injuries in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and
(2) is not likely to suffer significant damage or loss in the event of a natural hazard occurrence; and
(3) is not likely to require new or upgraded hazard mitigation works to mitigate or avoid the natural hazard; and
(4) is not likely to exacerbate the effects of the natural hazard; or
(5) is proposed to be located in an area zoned or identified in a district plan or Chapter 6 of the CRPS for urban residential, industrial or commercial use, at the date of notification of the CRPS, in which case the effects of the natural hazard must be mitigated.
52. The term “high hazard area is defined. The only relevant category in the definition is;
flood hazard areas subject to inundation events where the water depth (metres) x velocity (metres per second) is greater than or equal to 1, or where depths are greater than 1 metre, in a 0.2% annual exceedence probability flood event;
53. This would obviously be a very considerable flood. We were not given enough evidence to determine whether or not any of the nominated sites would fall into this category, so conclude that no sites should be excluded on that basis, but this should be carefully assessed when any

site that is included is the subject of an application for rezoning. Most if not all nominated sites would not be high hazard areas, so this policy would usually not apply.

54. The next relevant RPS policy is;

Policy 11.3.2 – Avoid development in areas subject to inundation

In areas not subject to Policy 11.3.1 that are subject to inundation by a 0.5% AEP flood event; any new subdivision, use and development (excluding critical infrastructure) shall be avoided unless there is no increased risk to life, and the subdivision, use or development:

(1) is of a type that is not likely to suffer material damage in an inundation event; or

(2) is ancillary or incidental to the main development; or

(3) meets all of the following criteria:

(a) new buildings have an appropriate floor level above the 0.5% AEP design flood level; and

(b) hazardous substances will not be inundated during a 0.5% AEP flood event.

provided that a higher standard of management of inundation hazard events may be adopted where local catchment conditions warrant (as determined by a cost/benefit assessment.)

When determining areas subject to inundation, climate change projections including sea level rise are to be taken into account.

55. Again, this would be a considerable flood. It is possible that lesser levels of flooding could have considerable impacts on rural residential areas and we took the opportunity to view aerial photographs that were taken after an event in June 2013 which showed some of the nominated areas holding what appears to be substantial amounts of surface water. Such areas would require mitigation such as raised building platforms in order to be developed, and this raises the potential for diversion of water onto other land or excessive discharge into already flooded drains or rivers. We think that these might also be significant natural hazard areas within the meaning of Policy 6.3.9 which should be avoided unless the mitigation was appropriate.
56. It is quite possible that some of the nominated sites would fall into this category. Some of them are close to the Halswell River at Prebbleton and Lincoln, or the L2 and L1 rivers system at Lincoln. Some of the sites are within the Lower Plains Flood Area at Prebbleton, Lincoln and Tai Tapu, or the recorded flood areas, as shown on the Blue Network maps which are included in Appendix 2 of the Strategy. In such circumstances the policy is to avoid development there unless the criteria in the policy apply, including no increased risk to life and the ability to provide raised floor levels. A 0.5%AEP (200) year) flood event would be a considerable event, but we do not know the criteria on which the Appendix 2 maps are based. Again, we were given insufficient information to decide if any of the sites should be excluded for this reason and it is a matter for assessment at the time of any plan change application. Policy 11.3.5 of the RPS requires application of formal risk management approaches in such situations, and Method 3 requires Councils to ensure that areas are properly assessed before any rezoning for development occurs, and to require applicants for private plan changes to provide appropriate information and undertake research if necessary.
57. The Selwyn District Plan also contains objectives and policies relating to natural hazards, which would be applied at the time of any rezoning process. These include;
- providing floor levels above a 2% AEP (50 year flood,
 - not exacerbating flooding on other land by displacing or diverting floodwaters, and
 - not adversely affecting the efficiency of the District's land drainage system, or increasing the rate of stormwater runoff into waterbodies.⁶

58. With regard to seismic risk the relevant RPS policy is;

Policy 11.3.3 – Earthquake hazards

⁶ See Rural Volume policies B3.1.2, B3.1.3, B3.1.4 and B3.1.5

New subdivision, use and development of land on or close to an active earthquake fault trace, or in areas susceptible to liquefaction and lateral spreading, shall be managed in order to avoid or mitigate the adverse effects of fault rupture, liquefaction and lateral spreading.

59. The policy speaks of managing the risk rather than avoiding development and we are aware this can sometimes be achieved by engineering techniques such as compaction, ground stabilisation and foundation design. Having said that we would be very reluctant to see rural residential development take place on any sites known to have been affected in the Canterbury earthquakes, simply because the impact on people would be so great and there are better sites available that would not be affected in this way. At least one of the nominated sites is shown as having been affected by liquefaction. We expect that detailed geotechnical assessments would be carried out as part of any rezoning application.

Conclusion on natural hazards

60. Therefore our overall conclusion on natural hazards is that we do not have the information to exclude any of the nominated sites, or to determine what a significant hazard area would be, so this is a matter for further detailed assessment of any site that is included in the Strategy at the district plan change stage. There is a substantial body of objectives and policies in the RPS and the District Plan to aid this assessment.

Quantity of Rural Residential Allotments

61. The LURP places a strong reliance on the Rural Residential Strategy to ensure that this form of development does not undermine the primary outcomes related to achieving consolidated residential growth. The responsibility in terms of quantum and locations however, is left to the local authority. Policy 5.3.1 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement refers to “limited rural residential households that must be attached to urban areas to achieve consolidated settlement patterns”. Earlier policy iterations (in the case Change No 1 to the Regional Policy Statement) prescribed 600 households up to 2041. The LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement are not so particular. We observe in any case that even if a quite generous allocation of those sites sought in the process of this strategy is made, a very “limited” number of rural residential sites could result.
62. In the draft RSS the Council nominated a total of 155.44ha which if fully developed could have provided up to rural residential 287.8 lots. Additional land nominated through the submissions process amounted to 572.5ha, or up to 1145 potential lots. We have recommended 267 ha be included in the Strategy, potentially 534.5 lots. We regard this as a limited number considering the size of the district, the anticipated population growth and the apparent market demand.

Contaminated Sites

63. All of the proposed sites have been in use for rural purposes in the past. This means that there is the possibility of contaminated soils being present on any of them. This is undesirable on sites that are to be developed primarily for people to live on although of course contamination levels may vary. Therefore all sites would need to be investigated for this during the rezoning process and decisions made about whether the site should be rejected, or the contamination remediated. That is now an inevitable part of any land development process, not just rural residential. However our attention was drawn to one small site at Prebbleton, (part of the Pandora Trust and Others submission) which appears to have been significantly contaminated by the activities of a recent tenant unsuccessfully operating a waste management business. We do not consider significantly contaminated sites should be included in the Strategy, at least without careful investigation and if necessary remediation. Should that occur, then such sites may be able to be considered again in future.

Versatile Soils

64. A number of the sites were opposed by Mr Friedel on the basis that they are sited on versatile soils and therefore should be retained for productive use. There has been a long history of

controversy about this topic over many years in New Zealand. We note that rural production can resemble industrial activities in terms of adverse effects, such as noise, dust, spraying, and traffic generation at peak times, and that it is often difficult to farm land close to urban and lifestyle areas for this reason. In addition, stock are often disturbed by the activities of urban residents. This seems to apply particularly in peri-urban areas in the Selwyn Rural Inner Plains zone. We would therefore not have excluded any sites on the basis of this factor alone.

Outline Development Plans – Comprehensive Areas or site by site?

65. Prior to the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement, the Regional Council had prepared Change No1 which, among other things, sought to apply an integrated approach to consolidate the settlement pattern. Among the actions sought was the introduction of urban design elements into all aspects of planning. These themes have continued through to the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement. Rural Residential forms of development are seen as raising a number of issues, many of them adverse. The peri-urban form is seen as more appropriate largely because it can integrate with urban areas and their services. Very often a significant number of land holdings is involved and achieving the required level of integration requires a degree of management.
66. Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement (in Policy 6.3.3) advocates a management regime requiring development of rural residential areas to occur in accord with the provisions set out in an outline development plan. Subdivision must not proceed unless an outline development plan for the area together with rules is already incorporated in the district plan. Furthermore, such an outline development plan is to be prepared “as a single plan for the whole of a rural residential area”. The methods advocated for implementing the policy include the following duties to be undertaken by the Selwyn District Council:
 - Require an outline development plan to be developed and incorporated into (the) District Plan prior to or at the same time as rezoning land for urban use in Greenfield priority areas (there is no mention of rural residential zoning);
 - Include in the District Plan objectives, policies and rules (if any) to give effect to Policy 6.3.3, and
 - Ensure that financial provision is made for delivering of infrastructure to priority areas for development.
67. Policy 6.3.9 of the Regional Policy Statement relates directly to rural residential development. This policy requires rural residential development to be provided in accord with an adopted rural residential strategy prepared in accord with the Local Government Act 2002. A number of criteria are specified relating to location, servicing and access among them being the following:
68. “(b) An outline development plan is prepared which sets out an integrated design for subdivision and land use and provides for the long-term maintenance of rural residential character”.
69. This is followed by the dictum that “a rural residential development area shall not be regarded as in transition to full urban development”. The significance of these provisions are discussed elsewhere in relation to the technique of “future proofing” but from them emerges a clear picture of what is involved with outline development plans. Such plans must accompany any private plan change application for the zoning of any area included in the strategy and must be incorporated into the District Plan to accompany and complement the zoning. Any discrete area of residential zoning must be accompanied by an outline development plan covering its entire area. The matters to be included are set out comprehensively in Policies 6.3.2 and 6.3.3 of the Regional Policy Statement. Thus, the District Plan will have to contain a comprehensive plan, together with possible rules to which any rural residential development will have to adhere.
70. The effect of this provision might well create difficulty for larger areas of rural residential development with multiple ownerships. Areas will have to be set aside for community facilities, roads, parks and recreation, storm water treatment or landscape protection and land so selected will not realise the sort of financial returns that would stem from land for residences. Agreements will have to be reached to ensure a degree of equity is achieved. Sites in single ownership would clearly be favoured and this in itself may limit practically the amount of land available.

71. A number of exemplars of such outline development plans have been put to us and it is clear that they will not present an insurmountable barrier in some locations. One effect may be that nearly all rural residential zones will be the product of private plan changes unless the council is prepared to undertake such designs. It will be difficult to achieve any degree of uniformity between such outline development plans unless the Council is prepared to create an exemplar. We think that some consideration should be given to this issue.
72. The requirement for a single plan to be developed for the whole of a rural residential area is something to which we have given particular consideration. We are not sure what is meant by the “whole” of a rural residential area and we have concluded that the term is not particularly apt. While an area of land suitable for rural residential development may comprise proximate parcels it may well be appropriate to treat them separately because they comprise different catchments for some other reason. An outline development plan need not necessarily cover the whole of such an area. We think it is more important to cover an area sufficient enough to be treated as a whole in terms of servicing and connectivity for instance.

Infrastructure

73. Central to the preference for peri-urban locations for Rural Residential Development is the need for connection to the road network, community water supply and wastewater schemes. A compact urban form is of significant advantage and since no Rural Residential Development is to be contemplated without such connections their availability in terms of proximity and capacity is important. Sufficient capacity within such developments also must be provided to connect with future development and stages or deferrals may have to be incorporated into outline development plans. It is clear that no Rural Residential Development location can be contemplated unless such connectivity to existing systems, and safe connection to the road network, is or will be available. It is possible that some of the sites included in the Strategy will not have immediate access to the Council's infrastructure to enable them to be connected to it economically. In such cases development may have to wait its opportunity. In the case of a number of sites nominated by submitters for inclusion, Mr Friedel in his officers report stated that development of such sites could not take place until major upgrading of infrastructure had taken place, but we were given no indication of whether this was intended or when. Often however we were given evidence by engineering consultants that such connection was in fact possible. The evidence was therefore rather inconclusive and we decided in some cases that this aspect could be left to the plan change stage.
74. One of the constraints cited in the draft strategy stemming from Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement relates to the avoidance of direct access to arterial or strategic roads. While this may not be prohibitive because internal public roads can be developed with properly engineered connections to these roads, we are mindful that a number of these roads may be strategic or arterial for reasons that pre-date the southern motorway project and in particular the decision to include. It may well be that there should be a review of the schedule.
75. The New Zealand Fire Service made a submission requesting that adequate water supply (quantity and pressure) be made available in all new areas allocated for rural residential RPS and Strategy requirement for all new allotments to be connected to a publicly-owned reticulated system. We are confident that details of this can be achieved satisfactorily at the district plan change and subdivision consent stages.

Reverse Sensitivity

76. During the hearing process a number of examples of reverse sensitivity at the urban/rural interface were cited as justification for Rural Residential Development. The adverse effects of living close to an intensive farming operation are real enough, hence the need to apply separation distances. We believe that the issue of reverse sensitivity is just as significant for Rural Residential Development as it is for regular Residential Development. For that reason, we would not contemplate Rural Residential Development as some sort of buffer between residential and purely rural activity. Among other things, this has implications for proposals on the boundary of West Melton. Likewise locations for Rural Residential Development should not be chosen

where it is apparent that reverse sensitivity issues may well arise such as it has in North Rolleston in the vicinity of the railway and the industrial area.

Use of Accelerated Process

77. A number of submitters among those who have clearly spent time, money and effort in developing the documentation for plan changes to achieve rural residential zoning have sought the sort of accelerated process used in the earthquake recovery mechanisms. This involves shortening the public process for a change to the district plan by eliminating or restricting the rights of participation normally available under the Resource Management Act. There may be cases when a plan change has been through public notification without opposing submissions or where such submissions have been dealt with amicably. In a case of this nature where some fine tuning is required to create an appropriate outline development plan, incorporation in the District Plan without further formality may be justified.
78. We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.

PART 2 - SITE SPECIFIC SUBMISSIONS REQUESTING INCLUSION OF SITES

ROLLESTON AREA -NORTH OF STATE HIGHWAY 1

Submission 41 Pinedale Holdings and Kintyre Pacific Holdings, Submission 31 R Paton, Submission 55 J Paton

79. This submission was supported by Mr Paton, Ms Fiona Aston and Ms Nicole Lauenstein on 9 April. The site is a large wedge-shaped land, bounded by State Highway 1/ South Island Main Trunk Railway, to the south, Walkers Rd to the west, rural land off Railway Rd to the east and Two Chain Rd to the north. Most but not all of this land is nominated for inclusion in the RSS by these submissions. Excluded are a block on the corner of Two Chain Rd and Walkers Rd, and some rural properties to the west off Railway Rd. Some land in the centre of the block was included although the owners do not appear to be participants in the submission and we were not told if they wished to have their land included. Nearby to the west across Walkers Rd is the Rolleston Prison, while the large Business Park known as the Izone is nearby to the east across Railway Rd and the West Coast Railway line. Access to the bulk of the town of Rolleston is restricted to two intersections across State Highway 1, at Walkers Rd to the south-west and Hoskyns Rd to the north-east through the Izone. The latter is scheduled to be upgraded at some unspecified future time.
80. The RSS as a whole adopts as a key location principle that rural residential areas should be located on the peri-urban fringes of a number of towns and townships close to Christchurch, including Rolleston. This is primarily to enable residents to have good access to the facilities the towns provide, to reduce the length of vehicle journeys and to encourage alternative transport such as walking and cycling. We heard evidence from Ms Nicole Lauenstein, an urban designer, who considered the site suitable as part of a peri-urban area for Rolleston. Throughout the RSS process Ms Lauenstein gave us evidence in support of peri-urban rural development, considering that this provides an opportunity to develop an excellent urban form with a clear edge to the town. Ms Lauenstein prepared some conceptual layouts for the block, including approximately 50

rural residential sites, open space and an attractive off-road walking and cycling route along the railway corridor.

Comment

81. We do not disagree with the peri-urban concept in general terms or doubt its ability to provide an attractive edge to the urban form of towns in appropriate locations. On many of the sites Ms Lauenstein gave evidence about, we found her opinions helpful and persuasive. However we do not agree that this is an appropriate location to apply these ideas. Our primary concern is with the road rail corridor and the lack of access into Rolleston. This corridor provides a very hard edge to the north of Rolleston, which has been deliberately planned to be almost entirely to the south of it. The only exception to this is the Izone, which is a large industrial and business zone. This intention to confine Rolleston except for the Business zones to south of the SH1/SIMT corridor is clearly expressed in the District Plan.⁷ It is also specifically referred to in the location criteria for Rolleston in the RSS. We could no doubt recommend these provisions be amended as part of the Action 18 process but we are not prepared to do so. These are fundamentally important and very directive policies arrived at through a due process and we would need a great deal more evidence than we have heard to recommend changing or departing from them just to enable the establishment of a single rural residential area.
82. Despite being very close to Rolleston when viewed by maps, parts of the subject site are actually nearly 4 km away by road, which we judge to be too far to be regarded as convenient or realistic for walking and cycling access. Proximity to Rolleston is more apparent than real.
83. The two intersections are also a concern. They are heavily trafficked intersections onto a major State Highway. The northern one is controlled by traffic lights and is to be upgraded at some time in the future. Ms Lauenstein considered that most residents of the area would use this intersection to access Rolleston. Walkers Rd is a 4-way rural intersection, the fourth leg being Dunns Crossing Rd, which forms the western edge of Rolleston, which is a higher-speed rural intersection. A new primary school for the area is to be built off Dunns Crossing Rd, and new residential subdivision is occurring in Dunns Crossing Rd which will provide alternative access into the town. This increases our concern that this intersection would play a greater role in providing access to Rolleston than the submitters anticipate. We think it is likely that the NZ Transport Agency would have concerns about this, but the Strategy process has given them no opportunity to comment on this to date.
84. Other concerns we have with this site are about the practicality of providing infrastructure reticulation which would have to be programmed into the Council's programme, and with reverse sensitivity issues with the Izone Business Park. Finally, we note that all the roads required to provide access to the site, including Walkers Rd, Two Chain Rd, Railway Rd, Jones Rd and Hoskyns Rd are listed in the District Plan as arterial road, because they all provide access to the Izone. Policy 6.3.9 of the RPS states that rural residential areas should not have access to such roads, and while we assume this does not prevent them having access to an internal roading system with properly formed and approved intersections onto arterial roads, however the linear nature of the site with its very long frontage to Two Chain Rd could make this difficult to achieve, particularly as there are sites within the block whose owners do not appear to be engaged with the process.

Recommendation

85. For all these reasons we do not believe this site has the potential to integrate well with Rolleston or for its residents to easily access the facilities there, both prime requirements of the RPS and the Strategy itself. We therefore do not recommend the inclusion of this site in the RSS.

NORTH EAST ROLLESTON

Submission 12 Coles Family Trust – Main South Rd Rolleston

86. This submission was presented by Anna McKenzie, planning consultant on 9 April. The site is subject to a privately requested plan change and was included in the draft Strategy by the

⁷ See Policies B2.1.22 and B4.1.71.

Council as Preliminary Area 1. It is adjacent to the eastern edge of the urban limit at Rolleston and close to the anticipated eventual limit of the town under the Rolleston Structure Plan. Further development beyond the site would be precluded by the airport noise contours and by proximity to a future motorway interchange to be constructed.

Comment

87. The Council continues to support the inclusion of the site in the RSS. It meets all of the Strategy's location criteria. In particular we note that it will have good connectivity into the town through the adjacent residential subdivision and that no access onto State Highway 1 is intended. It appears to offer the potential for a satisfactory peri urban edge to the town in this locality. We see no reason not to include the site. There are a number of matters to be resolved through the plan change process which is already underway.

Recommendation

88. We recommend that this site continue be included in the RSS.

SOUTH-WEST ROLLESTON

Submission 22 D&D Tyson and A Smith – Selwyn Rd and Dunns Crossing Rd,

89. The Submission was supported on 9 April by Alison Smith and Sheila Anstiss. This 36 ha property is at the north-west corner of Selwyn Rd and Dunns Crossing Rd. It is directly to the south of a Living 3 property in Dunns Crossing Rd which was zoned for rural residential purposes as a result of Plan Change 9 to the District Plan, but deferred pending the installation of underground services in the road to service residentially-zoned land opposite. To the east over Dunns Crossing Rd is Rural zoned land which is included in the Rolleston Structure Plan for eventual urbanisation.

Comment

90. We acknowledge the proximity of the site to land that is likely to eventually be developed for full or rural residential purposes. However the key word here is eventually. At this stage there is no short or even medium term prospect of reticulated water or sewer services being available at this site, and we note that the adjoining Skellerup land, which is zoned Living 3 for rural residential purposes has recently been developed for dairy farming so is unlikely to be redeveloped in the short term.. As well, this end of Dunns Crossing Rd is unsealed. Access to publicly owned reticulation and a sealed road are both matters are included in the suitability criteria and Policy 6.3.9 of the RPS. We consider that these sites may be suitable for rural residential development at some stage in the future. However there is no prospect that these sites, if included in the RSS could be developed for a number of years until these matters are attended to, probably by the development of the other sites described above.

Recommendation

91. We think this sites should not be included in the RSS for now.

Submission 26 G Weakley

92. The 15ha Weakley property is nearby to the east of Tyson and Smith property at the corner of Selwyn and Edwards Rd, near the previous site but further from Rolleston.

Comment

93. The site would be disconnected from Rolleston until nearby lands are developed and there is little prospect of reticulated services being available until these other lands are developed. Once further development occurs in this south west corner of Rolleston this site may be suitable as a peri-urban rural residential site. However this may not be for a number of years. We are concerned that it might be adversely affected by activities in the adjacent Rural Outer Plains zone.

Recommendation

94. We think this site should not be included in the RSS for now.

SOUTH ROLLESTON

Submission 36 Dryden Trust

95. This submission was supported on 10 April by Ms Jen Crawford, legal counsel, Ms Nicole Lauenstein, urban designer, Ms Fiona Aston, planner and Mr Russell Benge, engineer. This 36 ha site is in Springston-Rolleston Rd immediately to the south of a large block identified as a priority Greenfields residential area in the RPS and under development as the Farringdon subdivision. To the north-west across the road is living 2A zone. The site is identified in the Rolleston Structure plan as a future residential growth path. The site therefore is clearly within the preferred peri-urban fringe of Rolleston. It has good connectivity to Rolleston via the roading system and could also be linked into Farringdon.

Comment

96. The only real difficulty about this site is that it sits in a priority future urban growth path. It is therefore inconsistent with the location criterion in Appendix 1 to the RSS which requires avoidance of obvious growth parts, and is arguably inconsistent with Policy 6.3.9 (7) of the RPS which requires that rural residential areas shall not be regarded as in transition to full urban development. We discussed these issues above under the heading of Growth Paths. There we concluded that if rural residential development is appropriately “future proofed” would not be inconsistent with the RPS. We think it would also be consistent with the intention of the RSS location criteria but would recommend an amendment to this clause to this effect in any case.
97. We received evidence from Ms Lauenstein and Ms Fiona Aston to this effect, as well as legal submissions. Future proofing as presented would be a combination of design and legal techniques. The design aspect consists of designing a layout in two stages, firstly the rural residential layout and then the ultimate development overlaid on this. Initial layouts must not preclude a high standard of ultimate development. Therefore the spatial requirements for ultimate large facilities such as roads, open space and the surface water must be identified and set aside at the outset so that initial rural residential development, and in particular the siting of houses does not prevent the ultimate availability of land for these facilities. The initial roading pattern and underground services would have to be installed in such a way as to avoid the need for complete replacement later. This applies particularly to sewerage, which may have to be oversized at first. This can cause problems of its own, e.g. low flows, but the evidence discussed techniques such as laying smaller pipes within larger ones, and the use of flush tanks to avoid such problems. The legal techniques would be conditions of subdivision consent, consent notices on titles and perhaps covenants in favour of the Council ensuring that at the time of conversion to full urban development the then owners of rural residential lots would not be able to oppose the intensification or withhold the necessary land. Ms Lauenstein presented concept plans showing the land required for such future infrastructure being held within the titles of the initial lots and protected by the legal mechanisms. We think it would be desirable for such land to be actually vested with the Council as road or utility reserves at the time of the initial rural residential development and perhaps leased back at a peppercorn rental to the rural residential owners for interim use and maintenance.
98. We recognise that when the time comes for the ultimate development, not all owners would want to be part of this initially and it may be a little slower to commence than might otherwise be the case. That is why we suggest that it would be better if the Council actually owns the necessary land from the outset, both to ensure that nobody could actively obstruct the process but also to send a clear signal to all purchasers of rural residential lots about what would be expected. However, the costs of developing the necessary facilities would fall on those wishing to develop land in the normal way. We are not concerned that there might be a mixture of smaller residential and larger rural-residential lots for a time. Ms Lauenstein described this as a type of “organic development” that might be preferable to the rawness and uniformity which can result when large areas of land are developed to full urban densities at once.
99. Until the land is required for ultimate full urban development, it could form part of an attractive peri-urban edge to the town. We therefore concluded that it would be appropriate to include this site in the RSS, and would also recommend that an additional chapter be added to the RSS

dealing with implementation. The details of how this might be achieved can be worked out during the plan change process and at subdivision stage. As we noted earlier inclusion in the RSS does no more than make a site a candidate at face value for rezoning. If satisfactory future proofing cannot be worked out then the development would not proceed.

Recommendation

100. We recommend that this site be included in the Strategy subject to a requirement that it be made subject to appropriate future proofing.

Submission 24 N Sole

101. Ms Nadia Sole supported this submission on 10 April. The 9.3ha property is at Selwyn Rd. not far from the previous case. It is also included within the Rolleston Structure Plan for eventual residential development. The submitter told us that a number of her neighbours would also be interested in pursuing rural residential development.

Comment

102. Unlike the Dryden case this site is not adjacent to the current urban boundary and it is unclear when the intervening land may be developed. It would therefore be a little isolated and disconnected if developed at this stage. The public sewer is in Selwyn Rd but we were not told if this has adequate capacity. There is no available water reticulation. Mr Friedel did not raise servicing as a reason for opposing the inclusion of this property.
103. Inclusion of the neighbours' sites would probably assist to create a better peri-urban development, although we are not prepared to consider these other properties without much clearer intention from these owners being displayed.
104. We have included that this property may have some potential for rural residential development on a future proofed basis, but not on a standalone basis and not while it remains isolated from the urban boundary. It may be suitable for inclusion at the next or some later review of the RSS.

Recommendation

105. We think this site should not be included in the RSS for now.

PREBBLETON AREA

106. Of all the towns involved in the RSS, Prebbleton has the greatest number of sites and the greatest area of land near it nominated for inclusion. This is probably because of its proximity to Christchurch, its attractive setting, general popularity and the number of rural residential properties already existing in and around Prebbleton. Two sites had already been included in the draft RSS by the Council and one other has been recommended for inclusion following the submissions process. A number of other sites have been nominated by submitters.
107. Prebbleton has been intensively examined for growth in a series of decisions by the Environment Court in recent years and the Court prepared some maps of areas it considered Prebbleton may be able to expand into in future. These have been included by the Council in the District Plan and are a relevant factor as they may indicate how the Court might view future plan changes. We therefore reviewed the Courts conclusions. Generally, the Court considers there is a need to preserve a band of rural land to the north and east of Prebbleton between the town and the nearby boundary with Christchurch City to keep it as a distinct town, but considered there could be opportunities for growth the west part of the way towards Shands Rd and towards the south-east as far as the electricity transmission lines. It did not wish to see growth continue to the south along Springs Rd as this would be ribbon development. We are mostly agree with the Court's conclusions, although we do have some reservations about whether electricity transmission lines are necessarily a barrier to growth, noting that they have been incorporated into many urban developments around Christchurch in recent years with effective spacing. We also note that these observations were made pre-earthquakes and the development of the LURP, so more growth, both of conventional residential and rural residential may now be appropriate at Prebbleton than was the case when the Court was considering those cases. Mr Friedel identified that the logical path for further such growth would be westwards toward Shands Rd and we agree.

108. In the South east corner the Court relied on Trices Rd as the urban limit. We note however that there are numerous small lifestyle properties immediately south of Trices Rd. In other cases before us Ms Lauenstein suggested a peri-urban boundary of rural residential properties could establish a pleasing urban form here.

PREBBLETON SOUTH

Submission 52 E and G Smith – Springs Rd and Hamptons Rd

109. Mr Graham Fowler presented this submission on 11 April. This is a large 43 ha site on the southwestern side of the Springs Rd and Hamptons Rd boundary. It adjoins the present urban limit across Hamptons Rd and is close to other sites in Hamptons Rd that have been recommended for inclusion in the Strategy.

Comment

110. We accept that this site would be able to integrate reasonably well into the township and would be regarded as peri-urban. We received evidence that reticulated services are likely to be available once further development takes place north of Hamptons Rd. However it is south of the preferred Hamptons Rd limit. There is no obvious boundary or delineating feature south of the site, so that it may set a precedent for further growth to the south in future years.
111. Mr Friedel identified Hamptons Rd as a reasonably strong southern boundary to the town, keeping it compact and with good connections with the surrounding countryside. The Council is also concerned about the traffic safety implications for Hamptons Rd as it leads directly to Shands Rd and the next stage of the Southern Motorway.
112. We note that part of the property was affected by liquefaction in the recent earthquakes, and that all of it would require geotechnical assessment and possible land remediation before it could be developed. This is not necessarily fatal for its development prospects but is a limitation.
113. Although we noted that the property could be within the urban fringe of Prebbleton, it would be a in the form of a large rectangular intrusion into the rural zone and we doubt if it would be easy to develop a satisfying urban form or prevent further development to the south and west once Hamptons Rd has been crossed.

Recommendation

114. For all these reasons we have decided not to recommend this block for inclusion into the RSS.

Submission 5 E and K Dixon - 144 Birchs Rd And 57 Hamptons Rd

115. This submission was presented to us on 7 April by Kenneth Dixon. The site lies just across Hamptons Rd from the Conifer Grove Site to the north which has been included in the draft RSS by the Council.

Comment

116. We accept that this site could has good connectivity to Prebbleton. However like the previous case it lies south of Hamptons Rd, which has been identified by the Council as a strong southern boundary to the town, and there is no other strong feature south of this. It is an irregularly shaped block which by itself would not create a satisfactory peri-urban edge to the town, and its development would probably create an expectation of further growth by other landowners. The site is outside the Environment Court's preferred southern boundary at Trices Rd and Ms Lauenstein's suggested peri-urban fringe between Trices and Hamptons Rd.

RECOMMENDATION

117. For the above reasons we have decided not to recommend the inclusion of this site.

SUBMISSION 18 CRABBE PARTNERSHIP-341 TRICES RD

118. This submission was presented to us on 11 April by Mr Andrew Schulte, legal counsel, Ms Lauenstein and Ms Aston, and Mr Rhys Chesterman. The site contains 2.02 ha. The site was

presented in two ways, both on its own and as a potential stage in a larger rural residential block including also the larger Submission 51 George and Jeff sites which it adjoins.

Comment

119. We noted that Trices Rd is an arterial road under the District Plan. This seemed a little perplexing to us as it does not carry the volumes of traffic normally to be expected on an arterial road, nor is it likely to in the foreseeable future. Mr Chesterman was of the same view. He said that the classification probably reflects earlier proposals for stage 2 of the Christchurch Southern Motorway project, under which Springs Rd would cease to have any connection to the motorway, and which have now been superseded, so the classification should probably be reviewed. He considers that, arterial or not, the proposal would not cause any traffic related difficulties at all. The problem is that Policy 6.3.9 of the RPS requires that sites not have direct access to an arterial road, but the site is far too small to justify creating its own internal road. This is a technical difficulty with no easy solution except to ignore the policy. We therefore decided to consider this site at the same time as the larger Submission 51 site to see if there was even a need to consider it on its own.

Submission 51 A & B George & E and B Jeffs 32 & 42 Hamptons Rd and 273-341 Trices Rd (Including Submission 18 Crabbe Partnership Site).

120. This 27.3 ha site lies to the immediate south of the Prebbleton urban limit, between Trices, Birchs and Hamptons Rd. It is already divided into a number of smaller blocks, and is not in use for any particular agricultural purposes. There are 9 dwellings on the site and it is well planted in trees. We were shown a concept development plan under which it might be developed for an additional 22 lots, including the Crabbe Site. This plan also showed a conceptual peri-urban fringe for Prebbleton, sweeping around from Hamptons Rd through this site and eventually linking up with other proposed sites along Tosswill Rd.

Comment

121. In his officer's report, Mr Friedel, while preferring to establish the township boundary at Trices Rd, conceded that the blocks already have a "semi-rural domesticated appearance" and that the urban form recommended by Ms Lauenstein is supportable. It would require strict design controls at the next stage to achieve this to avoid simply creating a large lot residential appearance. We agree, but this is no different from any larger site in this regard. We discussed this closely with Ms Lauenstein and Mr Andrew Craig, the landscape architect assisting the Council, as recorded earlier in this decision. We also note that the site would require geotechnical assessment, and that the availability of services would have to be confirmed. We are satisfied that the partly formed blind end of Hamptons Rd can be made to provide a satisfactory township edge, and that the site would relate well to the other rural residential sites to the east of Birchs Rd and potentially to sites to the north east at Tosswill Rd, although at present there appears to be a gap in that direction. All these issues would require to be examined in more depth at the plan stage.

Recommendation

122. For all the above reasons we recommend the Crabbe partnership, and the George and Jeffs sites be included jointly in the Strategy. They will pose some challenges, but this can be considered in more depth at the plan change stage.

Submission 20 Conifer Grove Trustees & Others, Submission 35 Prebbleton Residents Association- Birchs and Hamptons Rd

123. This is one of the 5 sites nominated by the Council in the Draft RSS. The submission was presented to us on 11 April by Anna McKenzie, planning consultant. The 12.3ha site is the subject of Private Plan Change 36 which has been lodged with the Council and is on hold pending the resolution of the RSS.

Comment

124. The site lies within the preferred Hamptons Rd southern limit to Prebbleton as discussed by Ms Lauenstein and Mr Friedel in other cases. It is adjacent to the present urban limit across Trices

Rd and along with the George and Jeffs and Crabbe Partnership sites to the east could contribute to a satisfying peri-urban edge to the town in this location.

Recommendation

125. We recommend that this site be confirmed within the RSS.

PREBBLETON WEST

Submission 36 D & S Anderson, Shands Rd

126. This is one of the 5 sites nominated by the Council in the Draft RSS. It was presented to us on 7 April by Patricia Harte, planning consultant. The 9.2ha site lies on the north-east corner of the intersection of Trents Rd and Shands Rd., immediately to the west of the Kingcraft existing Development Area (EDA), also a rural residential type of development. A private plan change for the site (PC 41) has been lodged with the Council.

127. Road access would be via a proposed new road off Trents Rd to avoid traffic conflicts with the busy and high speed Shands Rd. Sewerage reticulation is proposed under PC41 to be extended along Trents Rd from the existing service in the town.

COMMENT

128. The site lies within the preferred growth direction for Prebbleton, although at the outer edge of it which is Shands Rd. We therefore considered, if it is to proceed, whether it should be “future-proofed” to enable eventual redevelopment to full residential densities as Prebbleton grows. We have discussed future proofing elsewhere, see especially our discussion earlier of Urban Growth, and also our discussion of Submission 36 by the Dryden Trust at Rolleston. We considered there would be a case for future proofing this site. On the other hand, we note it is at the outer edge of the growth path, separated from the living zones by the Kingcraft EDA, and could be part of a peri-urban edge to the town if left at rural residential density. We decided to leave this question for the Council to resolve through the plan change and subdivision process.

Recommendation

129. We recommend that the site be confirmed in the RSS.

Submission 54 M Stratford and Others – Blakes and Shands Rd

130. This submission was presented to us by Mr Graham Fowler, surveyor, on 11 April. The 43 ha site lies immediately to the north of the Anderson site, along Shands Rd up to Blakes Rd and along that road to the western boundary of the Kingcraft EDA. At the hearing Mr Fowler reduced this to a lesser area of 15.99 ha lying along Shands Rd immediately to the north of the Anderson Site. He considered the rest of the land in the original submission could be reconsidered in a subsequent review of the RSS. He presented a concept plan for a 12 lot development of sites of between 0.9 ha and 1.9ha, but agreed at the hearing that this could easily be adapted to comply with the higher density required by the RPS. Plan Change 41 for the Anderson site allows for a roading connection through to the subject site.

Comment

131. It would be necessary to avoid direct access to Shands Rd as this is an arterial road, but this appears to be feasible via the proposed connection to Trents Rd. We were not told how sewerage reticulation would be provided, but presume this would be by an extension to the service for the PC41 site.

132. When we considered this site, we could not see how it differed materially from the Anderson site to the south which has been recommended by the Council for inclusion. If that site is suitable to provide for a peri urban fringe, then we consider this would be similar, and a logical extension of it. It might however be necessary for the proposed road to be extended out to a new intersection at Shands Rd, as it would be long for a cul de sac. However this level of detail is more appropriate for consideration if a plan change is prepared.

133. If the balance of the land up to Blakes Rd is to be considered we would observe that issues of urban form might arise. We note that in another case Ms Lauenstein did not favour extending rural residential development all the way along the Shands Rd edge of the town.

Recommendation

134. We recommend that this amended site be included in the RSS, and that this issue of future proofing be considered by the Council at plan change stage.

Submission 38 Trents Rd Developments- Trents Rd

135. This submission was presented to us on 10 April by a team including Mr Andrew Schulte, solicitor, Ms Lauenstein, urban designer, and Anna McKenzie, planner. The site lies between Trents and Hamptons Rd, and is separated from the present urban limit of Prebbleton by a narrow band of rural zoned land. It is however very close to both the PC 41 site and the Kingcraft EDA just to the north on Trents Rd.

Comment

136. At the outset we observe that this site lies in a logical growth path for Prebbleton. Growth would occur westward along Hamptons Rd from the existing urban limit, across intervening rural land to reach the site and we can envisage it eventually proceeding further as far as Shands Rd. In this regard the site is very similar to the Dryden Trust site at Rolleston discussed earlier. We do not intend to repeat any of the earlier comments we have made about rural residential development in future growth paths, but merely observe that if it permitted to occur here it should also be subject to future proofing.
137. Servicing is possible to the town services along Hamptons or Trents Rd. The Council has identified that significant network upgrades would be required which would have to be factored into Council's works programme. This would not be possible until agreement about this has been reached. These are matters to be resolved at the district plan change or subdivision stage. Integration into the town through walking, cycling etc. is important and the site is approximately 1km from the town centre, less than the Anderson site which has been recommended by Council. We are not concerned about the slight separation along Hamptons Rd and consider this will largely infill in the short to medium term.

Recommendation

138. Although the site is not without its complications, especially in regard to infrastructure future proofing, we recommend that it be included in the RSS and be subject to future proofing.

Submission 38 Servus Consultants – Trents Shands and Hamptons Rd

139. This submission was presented on 10 April by Fiona Aston. The site is a large 31 ha one at the corner of Hamptons and Shands Roads.

Comment

140. Unlike other sites of this size and magnitude, when we had detailed planning, urban design and engineering evidence, we received only very brief comments about this site. It is potentially in the same future growth path as the previous sites discussed on the western side of Prebbleton. We heard nothing about the roading or servicing implications, or urban design comments. In fact, when discussing the previous case Ms Lauenstein did not favour the inclusion of this site in the RSS, for reasons of desirable urban form. We make no finding on that however as it was not answered by the submitter.
141. We consider there may be a case for development of this site in the future. However we simply did not hear enough about it to have any confidence that it should be included at this time. If it was to be developed, it would probably not be until intervening site such as Trents Developments

and the undeveloped rural and Living Z sites along Hamptons Rd towards the present urban limit are developed. This may be able to be reconsidered at a review of the RSS.

Recommendation

142. That the site not be included in the RSS at this time, and that it be reconsidered at a later review of the Strategy.

Submission 1 A Aitcheson – 254 Trents Rd

143. This is a 4 ha rear site off Trents Rd about 0.5ha to the west of Shands Rd

Comment

144. Although not far from Prebbleton, the site is not in the peri-urban fringe. We regard Shands Rd as the outer limit that should be considered for the establishment of such a fringe in the foreseeable future, because of the heavy traffic usage there and because it provides such a strong boundary. Although not far from Prebbleton, this site could not provide satisfactory connection and integration, and probably could not be connected to urban reticulation as required by the RPS policy.

Recommendation

145. For the above reasons we have decided not to recommend the inclusion of this site.

PREBBLETON EAST

Submission 7 G Burgess, Supported by Submission 28 Pandora Trust, S 45 A Joyce and s35 Prebbleton Community Association. – 59-98 Toss will Rd

146. Mr Burgess presented this submission on 7 April. The site contains 22 ha on the north-eastern side of Toss will Rd and is adjacent to the existing edge of the Living Z zone. Electricity transmission lines pass close to the eastern boundaries of the site. The site had previously been included in Plan Change 17 to the District Plan, which proposed to rezone a number of sites for rural residential purposes. However this plan change, which had been prepared by the Council, was withdrawn.

Comment

147. Mr Friedel recommended the inclusion of this site in the RSS following receipt of submissions. He thought that infill of this sort from the edge of the living zone out to the power lines would be appropriate while noting that the Council may have aspirations to acquire some of the land for stormwater engagement and extensions to the Prebbleton Domain. Mr Burgess did not appear to be in favour of that, wishing to develop the land independently, but we do not need to resolve that. We do not see any reason to exclude the land from the Strategy. It is not without complications, especially in relation to surface water management, geotechnical issues, proximity to the electricity pylons and the Council's aspirations, but these are matters for more detailed investigation and decisions at the plan change and subdivision stages.

Recommendation

148. We recommend that the site be included in the RSS.

Submission 28 Pandora Trust (Supported By S45 A Joyce and S35 Prebbleton Community Association – 93, 105 And 153 Toss will Rd)

149. This submission was presented to us on 11 April by Anna McKenzie and John Fergusson, planning consultants. The 52 ha site is to the north east of Toss will Rd and is adjacent to the previous Burgess site. It is partly affected by the transmission lines. It contains a number of springs which are of cultural significance, is affected by a high water table and is subject to geotechnical constraints including liquefaction potential. Part of the site is contaminated by a recent unsuccessful waste management business which has been cleaned up to some extent.

Comment

150. Mr Friedel opposed the inclusion of the site, citing the number of constraints it is subject to. We agree. We are especially concerned about the site contamination and the water-related issues. It may be possible to deal with all these issues but we were left with no confidence about that.

Recommendation

151. That the site not be included in the RSS, and that it be reconsidered at a subsequent review if the various constraints are able to be resolved.

Submission 45 A Joyce – Tosswill Rd

152. Mr Joyce presented this submission on 7 April. This site adjoins the previous Pandora Trust land to the east, wrapping around it to the Burgess land also discussed previously. It is subject to the same constraints as the Pandora land except for the site contamination. Mr Joyce acknowledged that it is probably not realistic to include the site at this stage. He was also challenging the requirement for connection to reticulated services and arguing the case for an intermediate type of rural residential development, larger than the RPS prescribes but less than 4ha.

Comment

153. This site is similar to the Pandora Trust land described previously. We agree that there may ultimately be some potential for rural residential development subject to resolution of the various constraints. We acknowledge the desire for another, slightly larger type of rural residential development, but both that, and the challenge to the reticulation requirement are beyond our jurisdiction in this process.

Recommendation

154. That the site not be included in the RSS, and that it be reconsidered at a subsequent review if the various constraints are able to be resolved.

Submission 21 I Court – 304-342 Birchs Rd

155. Mr Ivan Court presented his submission on 9 April. This is an “outlier” site about half way between Prebbleton and Lincoln. It is a large site at 53.4ha. Mr Court described his preference for there to be some larger rural residential sites away from the townships where people can raise a few animals and enjoy a more rural atmosphere.

Comment

156. We understand Mr Court’s preference. The difficulty for us is that it does not conform to the RPS prescription we are operating under, i.e. that rural residential sites are to be between 0.3 and 2.0ha with an average of between 1 and 2 households per hectare. Nor does it comply with the desirability of good access to the services available in townships, reducing travel distances, alternative transport forms and connecting to publicly owned reticulation, all of which has influenced the Council’s choice of the peri-urban form for future rural residential developments. We would also be concerned that this property is no different from many others in the Rural Inner Plains zone, leading to expectations of similar treatment for others if this property was included. What is proposed resembles the “hamlet” style of rural residential development, which has not found favour with either the Regional or District Council, both of whom favour the peri-urban approach. This proposal could not succeed at the District Plan change stage because it would be contrary to the RPS definition of rural residential development and also to many of the criteria in Policy 6.3.9.

Recommendation

157. For the above reasons we have decided not to recommend the inclusion of this site in the Strategy.

LINCOLN

Submission No 43 R Cullen

1221 Shands Road

158. Mr Robin Cullen spoke to his submission on Thursday 10th April. His property in Shands Road is some two kilometres north of Lincoln in the Inner Plains Zone. He did not believe the proposals in the Strategy provided sufficient opportunity for a broad range of rural lifestyle opportunities. Firstly, he considered that his area should be able to be subdivided down to two hectare parcels and should be given a zoning different from the Inner Plains Zone. Secondly, he believed that existing 4 hectare titles should be able to contain a second dwelling. Mr Cullen considered that the draft strategy contained many anomalies and misconceptions in regard to rural subdivision down to two hectares. He pointed out that many small blocks can be highly productive and the land was usually well cared for. In his area, power and telecommunications were readily available and it was just a short distance to some of the large industrial areas of Christchurch. Storm water was not an issue and there was adequate ground water.
159. Mr Cullen did not believe it was necessary to connect to public water supply or waste water systems. In particular, he pointed out that the latest designs of wastewater systems adequately support households on areas as small as one hectare.

Comment

160. Mr Cullen did not specifically seek Rural Residential zoning for his block of land which, in any case, would be an isolated parcel in an area having Class 11 versatile soils which the District Plan (Rural Volume Policy B1.1.8) seeks to protect. Rather, he sought a more general change to the philosophy behind the strategy. The process is intended to provide the opportunity for interested land owners to nominate their land for inclusion as a potential Rural Residential area. The council must remain consistent with the detailing set down in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement. Among other things, these policy documents require Rural Residential development to be located so that they can be economically provided with a reticulated sewer and water supply integrated with a publicly owned system. Rural Residential areas are expected to be integrated with existing townships and this requires a location proximate to urban areas.
161. Much of Mr Cullen's submissions require changes that are beyond the scope of the exercise. While we make no particular judgement on their merits they are really directed at higher level policy in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement which the Selwyn District Council has no power to change through this process.

Recommendation

162. For the above reasons we are not able to support Mr Cullen's submission.

Submission No 30 D.P. And J Hann

608 Ellesmere Road

163. Mr Derek Hann appeared in support of his family's submission on Monday 7th April. The Hann property lies close to and north-east of Lincoln. Mr Hann pointed to a growing demand for small rural residential properties close to existing townships. His land, located close to the township could support a rural residential node that could integrate well with a consolidated urban form. It was not subject to hazards and satisfied many of the criteria set down in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement. He sought the inclusion of the land in the Rural Residential Strategy.

Comment

164. The property is already a small holding and is separated from the urban boundary by an existing 4 ha allotment. There would be some difficulty in servicing land in this vicinity with reticulated water and waste water services until these utilities are extended to the western boundary of Lincoln and that is not likely in the near future. While these factors on their own, do not auger well for inclusion of land, in this location in the short term, we think that in the longer term (at least 5 years away) the situation should be re-examined. As Mr Friedel observes, this direction could become a logical growth area and we think the Hann family land could logically become part of a future peri-urban band around the north-east edge of Lincoln between Ellesmere Road and the intersection of Birchs and Tancreds Roads.

Recommendation

165. For these reasons we do not support the inclusion of the Hann land in the short term but we believe the situation should be revisited after five years.

Submission No 10 Denwoods Trustee Ltd

166. This submission was supported by Ms Fiona Aston on Monday 7th April. Denwoods Trustee Ltd owns the land in the Area 5 (Lincoln) preliminary residential location in the Draft Rural Residential Strategy. The land (54.7 hectares) lies to the west of and adjoining Lincoln Township and is the subject of Plan Change 28 which has been notified for submissions and further submissions. It is currently on hold, pending the outcome of the Rural Residential Strategy process. Plan change 38 proposes that the land be rezoned to Living 3 (Rural Residential) to provide for a maximum of 115 lots – now reduced to 110 lots in an amended outline development plan. Although it is just over two kilometres from the town centre the land is bound to the north by Lincoln University and to the east by the Living Z and Business 2 B zones. To the south and west of the site, landscape buffers containing native plantings and wetlands provide separation from adjoining rural activities.

Comment

167. This land is one of five preliminary locations nominated in the Rural Residential Strategy and we note that no submissions opposing its inclusion have been received. The distance from the town centre means the site is not suitable as a future growth path for full residential development but on the other hand its relative proximity makes it suitable for peri-urban rural residential development that can integrate with the Lincoln public infrastructure. We note that the majority of the work required in terms of the land's suitability has been undertaken for Plan Change 28 and the officer's report supports retention of the land in the strategy. We agree with the report. We understand that this plan change application is on hold awaiting a hearing and our recommendation is not to use fast track mechanisms for rural residential zoning. In this case the applicant will have to address matters raised in submission through the plan change process.

Recommendation

168. For the above reasons we support the inclusion of the Denwoods Trustee land.

Submission No 33 R Barker and Others Ellesmere Road

169. On Thursday 10th April Mr Alistair King represented the Barker Group of properties which are located in the south-east sector of the intersection of Ellesmere Road and Lincoln Tai Tapu Road. The officer report did not support the inclusion of the land because the land has a high water table and is prone to flooding. There is uncertainty as to whether there is sufficient capacity in the existing drainage network to manage the additional flow associated with rural residential densities east of Ellesmere Road. This strategically important road severs the area from the future urban form of Lincoln and makes it difficult to establish connectivity and integration with the township. In any case, it would be a number of years before that part of Lincoln nearest the site could be developed.
170. Mr King had a contrary view. He did not believe that potential flooding was a negative aspect and he indicated that many of the sites in the block were of sufficient elevation to avoid floodwater. The owners were restoring wetland areas with riparian planting and there would be adequate capacity for onsite storm water storage. He had included professional advice in his submission indicating that flooding would not be a problem for development and that there was capacity in the local network. The land contained a number of springs and these needed to be protected along with the wetlands. Mr King made the point that the restoration work was being undertaken at significant cost and that the ability to further develop would enable further protection. He considered that together with the Maginness block on the north-east sector of the intersection an appropriate gateway to the township could be created.

Comment

171. We observe that the four lots comprising the block are host to five dwellings (one of the properties contains a “granny flat”). It already exhibits many of the characteristics of a rural residential development even though it has Inner Plains zoning. Although the land is just over the road from what is expected to be the future urban area of Lincoln, we remain uncertain about crossing the threshold of Ellesmere Road, which could form a strong edge to the future town at least in the short term. With the sites we recommend for inclusion in the strategy at this stage there will be sufficient land aligning with the criteria in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement to satisfy short term demand.

Recommendation

172. As a consequence we do not support the inclusion of the land in the strategy at this stage.

Submission No 53 G. Maginness Ellesmere Road / Perrymans Road

173. This submission was represented by Mr Graham Fowler on Thursday 11th April. The land lies in the north east sector of the intersection of Lincoln Tai Tapu Road with Ellesmere Road and it comprises just over 11 hectares. It abuts a 0.5 hectare property located at the actual road intersection.
174. In a well-balanced presentation Mr Fowler acknowledged that the LURP was intended to provide for displaced property owners requiring land to be immediately available. Because rural residential land was required to be in a position that did not restrict urban growth but still to be on the fringes of township boundaries there was a dilemma in the sense that to connect to urban services many potential rural residential areas could not do so in the immediate future. They would have to wait until interim development occurred.
175. The Maginness property is 1.8km from the business zone in Lincoln and is peri-urban in character being adjacent to the Living Z zone to the west of Ellesmere Road. Development of that land would facilitate connection to urban services. The Maginness land is more elevated than the rural land on the opposite side of the intersection and thus is less prone to flood ponding events and it has the potential to contribute fourteen rural residential allotments averaging 0, 73 hectares. It could incorporate storm water retention and geotechnical indications are favourable.

Comment

176. There are preliminary indications that the Maginness land is physically suited to some rural residential development but, as with the Barker land, we are uncertain about crossing the threshold of Ellesmere Road which could form a strong edge to the future town, at least in the short term. It would be a number of years before urban services could be accessed.

Recommendation

177. For the above reasons we are not prepared to support the inclusion of the Maginness land at this stage.

Submission No's 16 Apton Developments Ltd, Submission 32, Submission R Paton and Submission 48 A.Cartridge Allendale Lane

178. These submissions are for adjoining parcels of land with each submission nominating the other two submissions. They were supported by Ms Fiona Aston on Monday 7th April. The land is currently accessed via Allendale Lane from which a right of way services some six low density residential sections and two rural balance lots. The area is contained between extensive land development to the west and that to the east is zoned for residential purposes. Although it is zoned Rural (Inner Plains) it is bordered by current or future urban densities on its eastern, northern and western boundaries. It is contained by the proposed Lincoln by pass road to the south. The Lincoln wastewater treatment plant is located on the western boundary of Allendale Lane and a 150m reverse sensitivity buffer reduces the number of rural residential lots that could be created. The land is one of five preliminary locations nominated in the Rural Residential Strategy and we note that no submissions opposing its inclusion have been received.

Comment

179. Any development of this land would need to demonstrate that no adverse reverse sensitivity effects would be likely in relation to the wastewater treatment facility. However, we note that the Selwyn District Plan (Policy B 4.3.3 of The Township Volume) seeks to avoid rural land being surrounded by land zoned for living purposes. On the face of it, provided the issues of access and reverse sensitivity are resolved the land is a suitable candidate for rural residential development. Access may well be critical for these properties and public linkage through them to Moir land could well be found to be necessary.

Recommendation

180. In the light of the above we recommend retention of these properties in the strategy. We emphasise that selection of these properties simply means that at face value they are potential candidates for a plan change application. Unless the issues outlined above are adequately addressed successful outcome may not be achievable.

Submission No's 27 and 40

B Harrington Moirs Lane

181. Mr Harrington was supported by Ms Aston on Monday 7th April. He owns a small parcel of land to the south-east of and almost adjoining the Apton, Paton and Cartridge land (the subject of submissions 16, 32 and 48). He supports their submission and seeks the inclusion of his own land as a rural residential location. His site is separated from the former land by the L2 and is accessed via a bridge over the L1 from Moirs Lane which links with Ellesmere Road. The site exists in two parcels split by the legal alignment of Moirs Lane and it is an undersized lot in the Rural (Outer Plains) zone. Moirs Lane could become part of the future Lincoln bypass but that route has not been confirmed. As an undersized lot of 9734m² in that zone, its development is precluded by the LURP which requires densities below 1 household per 20 hectares to be avoided. If the site is included in the Living 3 (rural residential zone) it will still be undersized but, as opposed to the outer Plains area such a resource consent would not have to be "avoided". The site already contains a large shed and at the time of the LURP Mr Harrington was about to apply for consent for a dwelling. He already has consent from the Regional Council for discharge of effluent and a flood risk assessment has been undertaken (ECAN Dec10, 2013) indicating that for flooding associated with the catchment the proposed building site is not classified as "High Hazard". In areas subject to inundation in a 0.5% AEP flood event (0.2m flood depth) a range of conditions are required including a floor level above that level and a freeboard of 300mm is advised. Our understanding from the information we have is that potential flooding does not preclude the establishment of a dwelling but that attention will need to be given to stability issues and potential lateral spread.

Comment

182. The inclusion of this land is practicable if it can be included in an outline development plan for either the Apton, Paton and Cartridge block or the Moir land (immediately to the east) which is subject to submission No 14. Connectivity by public access through to the town centre rather than through Ellesmere Road is important and this will require a cooperative arrangement with adjoining properties. The draft strategy sets out five pre-requisites for rural residential development of which can be met.

- It can be economically serviced with public water and waste water reticulation;
- It is able to be integrated with Lincoln township;
- It meets the requirement for urban consolidation
- It is not affected by any significant constraints and
- Its owner has aspirations to rezone the land

Recommendation

183. In the light of the above and as long as the site can be integrated in one outline development plan with either the Apton, Paton and Cartridge or Moir land we support the inclusion of Mr Harrington's land as a potential candidate for rural residential zoning. Again we emphasise that there are significant issues to be overcome before this property could become a successful candidate for rural residential zoning.

184. Mr Barry Moir appeared in support of his submission on Wednesday 9th April. It obtains its access from Moirs Lane which might well be upgraded to become part of the Lincoln bypass. It was not included in the Rural Residential Strategy because significant work might be required to address flooding inundation and drainage issues. If the issues can be overcome and the land remains on the Lincoln side of the bypass the land could contribute to a compact urban form. It lies on the path of the developing rail trail which could assist with convenient cycle access to Lincoln.

Comment

185. Although this site faces some considerable obstacles, if they can be overcome it is a potential candidate for rural residential development in the strategy. It would not be appropriate for it to take its access from Ellesmere Road. However, it may well be that public access can be developed from Liffey Springs Drive or that public pedestrian/cycle access (more directly to the town centre) could be obtained through to Allendale Lane or through the esplanade provisions of the L1 or L2. One or other of these must be available or the land would not be suitable as it could not integrate well with the town. Its prospects would significantly improve if it were to be included in one comprehensive outline Development Plan with the Harrington, Apton, Paton and Cartridge lands and particularly if Allendale Lane was developed as a public road through to Moirs Lane.

Recommendation

186. While we acknowledge there are difficulties we are prepared to recommend the Moir land as a potential candidate for rural residential development in the Rural Residential Strategy.

TAI TAPU

Submission No 29 Tai Tapu Trust Christchurch – Akaroa Road

187. Mr Gerald Carter appeared in support of the Tai Tapu Trust submission on Monday 7th April. The Trusts land of just over 4 hectares lies on the Christchurch – Akaroa Road south of Tai Tapu adjacent to the 50kph speed restriction sign. In 2010 the Trust applied to subdivide the land to create two new lots, each of about one hectare, with the balance land containing the existing buildings. The Trust already had obtained consents for onsite effluent disposal and storm water disposal for the proposed new lots. The application was notified but was put on hold when the Trust became aware that the Council was preparing Plan Change 17. However, this was withdrawn following the earthquakes and substituted with Plan Change 32 which provided for a limited number of sites on a first in first served basis- it did not specifically zone land. This will now have to be amended following the LURP which has generated the strategy and the Trust, still with a resource consent application on hold, has sought inclusion of its property.
188. Mr Carter made the point that the land between that of the Trust and Tai Tapu is largely urban in character. The proposed new lots were in a high spot relative to Tai Tapu and there had been no lateral spreading. The Trust proposed to use the existing access to the Christchurch – Akaroa Road to service any development.

Comment

189. While this property does show some potential, it is physically separated from the Tai Tapu boundary and would result in some ribbon development along the Christchurch – Akaroa Road. We have given some thought as to how to overcome this but that would require internal access possibly over an unformed section of Hauschilds Road which, we understand, has a narrow 10 metre wide road reserve. The land would require a geotechnical assessment and along with other properties it is within the Lower Plains Flood Area. We understand that the water supply to the property would require to be upgraded and there would be some difficulty in connecting to public sewerage reticulation. These are the sort of obstacles that can be overcome but our main concern is that development of this land would allow a ribbon of development to occur along the main road outside the settlement.

Recommendation

190. As a consequence, we do not recommend inclusion of this land in the strategy. There will be an opportunity to review the strategy after the elapse of 5 years.

Submission No 46 S & Z Crofts and J. Williams Hauschilds Road

191. This submission was supported by Ms Fiona Aston, Mr Russell Bengé and Ms Nicole Lauenstein on Wednesday 9th April. The 8 hectare parcel of land lies at the western edge of Tai Tapu on the Lincoln – Tai Tapu Road. It is able to obtain its access internally through Hauschilds and Schools Roads. The submission was supported by an indicative Master Plan to illustrate how a small carefully conceived peri-urban development could achieve the desired outcomes of the Rural Residential Strategy. A development of three clusters was envisaged each of four dwellings. Storm water ponds were shown at naturally occurring low points. A significant amount of evidence was produced at the hearing to illustrate possible solutions to the significant constraints and much of this detail would be more appropriately considered in support of a change to the District Plan.

Comment

192. If this land is to be developed for rural residential use, a number of significant obstacles must be overcome. It does have a critical advantage in that it need not constitute ribbon development and it has direct internal access to the village centre via School Road. With proper attention to urban design principles it could provide a subtle contribution to the discrete nature of Tai Tapu and maintain its compact form. It could seamlessly integrate with the township, but it faces some difficulty. The most significant constraint is the inability to connect to a reticulated wastewater scheme. Mr Bengé's solution of a low pressure sewer system incorporating storage tanks and pumping at off peak times into a rising main may provide the solution but as yet that is uncertain. A geotechnical investigation will be required and there is already a risk identified over an area 150 metres from the Halswell River where liquefaction and/or lateral spreading could occur. In

addition, the disposal of storm water from the developed site will need careful assessment with adequate storage and appropriate discharge to adjoining land.

193. If these considerable constraints can be overcome, we believe rural residential development of the land could complement the periphery of Tai Tapu.

Recommendation

194. Although these are considerable uncertainties which would have to be addressed at the plan change stage process, the submitters have shown that rural residential development of this land could complement the township. It is with these significant reservations that we are prepared to recommend that the land be included in the Strategy.

WEST MELTON

Submission No 39 V Cullen

216 Lawford Road

195. This site is located about three kilometres by road from the centre of West Melton. The submission was not supported at the hearing. The submission promotes the land for inclusion in the strategy on the basis that it is close to West Melton, Hornby, Christchurch International Airport, Rolleston and Lincoln, the property can be serviced and stormwater management is not an issue.

Comment

196. This land is well separated from the West Melton Township and for that reason could not be integrated with West Melton services or its settlement pattern in the short to medium term. Its selection therefore would be inconsistent with Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement.

Recommendation

197. For this reason we do not support the inclusion of the property in the Strategy.

Submission No 13 M and J Austin Halkett Road / State Highway 73

198. This submitter was represented by Ms Fiona Aston and Ms Nicole Lauenstein on Wednesday 9th April. The submission nominates land in three ownerships totalling 37 hectares adjacent to the western boundary of West Melton. A preliminary concept showing how the land could be developed for rural residential use was presented.

Comment

199. There is little doubt that inclusion of this land would not inhibit a future growth path – the adjoining urban area is fenced between Halkett road and State Highway 73 with no through connections. However, this means that integration with the township could not be achieved unless some undeveloped sections are purchased or stormwater land is used to provide the necessary through links. The alternative is to use the State Highway and Halkett Road which would compromise their efficiency and discourage walking and cycling. Currently, there is very limited capacity in the local waste water network and a significant upgrade would be required. There are also issues with the quality of the local water supply and there is currently a restriction on the ability to provide a new well in this area. While we do not dismiss the possibility of development in the long term we believe the land faces very difficult problems with its inability to provide access into the township other than through the two main roads.

Recommendation

200. For this reason we do not recommend inclusion of this land in the Strategy.

Submission No 23 M and R Ringland**163 Halkett Road**

201. Mrs Heather Ringland appeared in support of this submission on Monday 7th April. The submission nominates the land which lies adjacent to the eastern boundary of West Melton. From her we heard that people from the adjacent Gainsborough subdivision are creating conflict and disrupting horses. Some people have even placed gates in the boundary fence, giving access to the Ringland property and in some cases rubbish is being disposed of onto the farmland. Mrs Ringland considered that rural residential zoning would provide a more cohesive environment that reduces these reverse sensitivity conflicts. Interestingly she recalled signing a document in 1974 acknowledging the potential growth of West Melton through to Wylies Road.

Comment

202. This property is similar to the Austin property (Submission No 13) in that, while there is little doubt that some of the rural residential criteria in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement can be met there seems to be little possibility of integration with the township other than through the main roads which would be compromised in terms of their efficiency. This would discourage cycling and walking. Currently, there is very limited capacity in the local wastewater network and these are quality issues with the local water supply. While we do not dismiss the possibility of development in the long term we believe the land faces very difficult problems with its inability to provide access into the township other than through the two main roads.

Recommendation

203. For this reason we do not recommend inclusion of the land in the Strategy.

Submission No 25 K. Dunn**1066 Main West Coast Road**

204. Ms Kathleen Dunn appeared in support of this submission on Monday 7th April.

205. The Dunns land is immediately adjacent to and on the east side of the Ringland property (Submission No 23). She supported the Ringland's submission and sought inclusion of the Dunn property which borders onto both Halkett road and State Highway 73. She indicated that since the Gainsborough submission was established there have been problems of a reverse sensitivity nature with gates being opened and dogs wandering onto the property. She considered that it was logical to include the property in the strategy.

Comment

206. Just as with the Austin (Submission 13) and Ringland (Submission No 23) properties in that while some of the rural residential criteria in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement can be met, there seems to be little possibility of integration with the township other than through the main roads. Also currently there is limited capacity in the local wastewater network. While we do not dismiss development in the long term we believe that in these circumstances the land faces very difficult problems with its inability to integrate with the internal road network of the township.

Recommendation

207. Consequently we do not recommend inclusion of this land in the Strategy.

Submission No 47 R and J Marshall**664 Weedons Ross Road**

208. Mrs Jillian and Mr Roger Marshall appeared in support of the selection of this site on Monday 7th April as a preliminary location in the Rural Residential Strategy. This was selected to be included in the Strategy together with land at the corner of Weedons Ross Road and State Highway 73.

Comment

209. Both these parcels are surrounded by Living 2A or Living Z land and in those terms as rural lots they are somewhat landlocked. We note that no submission has been received opposing the inclusion of these sites.

The Land at No 708 Weedons Ross Road

210. This land, together with that at 664 Weedons Ross Road was selected as one of the five preliminary locations in the Rural Residential Strategy. It was not supported by a submission. Its situation is much the same as the Marshall land (Submission No 47) and we recommend its retention in the strategy for the same reasons.

Recommendation

211. We recommend retention of this parcel of land in the Strategy.

Non-site specific submissions

212. As well as all the submissions seeking inclusion of additional sites in the Strategy, a number of submitters made request for other changes to the text of the Strategy. We have dealt with many of these points in our opening comments above. Our specific recommendations on each point raised is contained in Attachment 1, the Recommendations on Submissions.

OVERALL RECOMMENDATIONS

We recommend

1. That the submissions on the Draft Rural Residential Strategy be accepted or rejected as set out in Attachment 1.
2. That the Strategy be amended as set out in Attachment 2, together with the addition of new Section 7 Implementation as set out in Attachment 3 and new Section 8 as set out in Attachment 4.



David Mountfort (Chairman)

Debra Hassan



Michael Garland

14 May 2014

Attachment 1

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS AND HEARINGS PANEL RECOMMENDATIONS BY CATEGORY

1. STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OF RURAL RESIDENTIAL ACTIVITIES		
Submitter	Summary of relief sought	Panel recommendation
S01 A AITCHESON	Supports the RRS13	Accept - provides confirmation that the principles contained within the RRS13 and the methodologies developed to manage rural residential activities in the context of the LURP and Chapter 6 are appropriate.
S02 I & B COURT	Supports the Strategy as it provides for section sizes that will replace the rural residential land that has recently been rezoned residential	Accept – provides confirmation that the principles contained within the RRS13 and the methodologies developed to manage rural residential activities in the context of the LURP and Chapter 6 are appropriate.
S03 PIANZ & EPFNZ	Supports the Strategy as it: (1) provides some rural residential land that will reduce the pressure for residential development on 4ha sites in the Inner Plains zone; (2) Poultry farms have been correctly included in the locations criteria (Appendix 1) and constraints maps (Appendix 2); and (3) The future timeframe of the Strategy (10-15years) provides the poultry industry with some medium term certainty that new Living 3 zones will not be approved in any locations adjacent to existing poultry farms.	Accept – provides confirmation that the principles contained within the RRS13 and the methodologies developed to manage rural residential activities in the context of the LURP and Chapter 6 are appropriate.
	Requests that the 4ha minimum lot size is increased within the Rural Inner Plains zone to discourage further subdivision of productive rural land for residential purposes, which should be signalled in the RRS13.	Reject - this relief is beyond the scope of the RRS13 process and requires a full and comprehensive assessment under the RMA 1st Schedule
S04 A McCULLY	Requests that the minimum lot size for rural properties in the Inner Plains zone within 3km of existing towns, or the Southern Motorway corridor, is reduced from the current 4ha minimum to 2ha. This will not contribute to urban sprawl, conflict with urban consolidation principles, alter the rural landscape, create additional pressure on public infrastructure/facilities, or have a negative impact on the southern motorway or wider road network. It will also cater for people's needs and address demand.	Reject - this relief is beyond the scope of the RRS13 process and requires a full and comprehensive assessment under the RMA 1st Schedule. Granting the submitters relief would be contrary to the guiding principles and criteria of the RSS and fail to achieve the sustainable management purposes and principles of the RMA.
S11 R & M BEIGHT	Support the subdivision of rural residential sections between 0.5 to 2ha in size	Accept in part - generally reflects the section size analysis identified in Section 3 of the RRS13, although the minimum size is 0.3 ha and has been reduced to 0.2 ha in limited circumstances.
S13 M & J AUSTIN	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S14 B & S MOIR	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Accept – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S15 K & P VAN	Requests that the minimum lot size for rural	Reject - this relief is beyond the scope of the RRS13

DER MOLAN	properties in the Inner Plains zone within 3km of existing towns is reduced from the current 4ha minimum to 2ha.	process and requires a full and comprehensive assessment under the RMA 1st Schedule. Granting the submitters relief would be RRS13 contrary to guiding principles and criteria and fail to achieve the sustainable management purposes and principles of the RMA.
S16 APTON DEVELOPMENTS LTD	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Accept – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S17 ECAN	Support the RRS13 as it will: (1) help inform the extent of rural residential development to manage its cumulative adverse effects; (2) it provides a robust framework for the identification of preferred sites; (3) will assist in establishing a framework that 'gives effect' to Chapter 6	Accept – provides confirmation that the principles contained within the RRS13 and the methodologies developed to manage rural residential activities in the context of the LURP and Chapter 6 are appropriate.
S18 CRABBE PARTNERSHIP	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Accept – provides confirmation that the principles contained within the RRS13 and the methodologies developed to manage rural residential activities in the context of the LURP and Chapter 6 are appropriate. Land owners' property has been included for the reasons given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S20 CONIFER GROVE TRUSTEES	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Accept – provides confirmation that the principles contained within the RRS13 and the methodologies developed to manage rural residential activities in the context of the LURP and Chapter 6 are appropriate. Land owners' property has been included for the reasons given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S21 I COURT	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S22 D&D TYSON & A SMITH	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S23 M & H RINGLAND	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S24 N SOLE	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S26 G WEAKLEY	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S27 B HARRINGTON	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Accept – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S28 PANDORA TRUST	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S31 R PATON	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S32 R PATON	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Accept – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations.
S33 R BARKER & ORS	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S34 MINISTRY OF EDUCATION	Support in principle the overall intent and methodology the Council has used to develop an initial policy position and guiding principles in the RRS13	Accept – because it provides confirmation that the principles contained within the RRS 13 and the methodologies developed to manage rural residential activities in the context of the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement are appropriate.
S35 PREBBLETON COMMUNITY	Support the RRS13 in principle, including specifically: (1) seeks to achieve consolidated township forms, including preserving the greenbelt north of Prebbleton to avoid the township	Accept in part – provides confirmation that the principles contained within the RRS13 and the methodologies developed to manage rural residential activities in the context of the LURP and Chapter 6 are appropriate.

ASSOCIATION	connecting with Christchurch City; (2) enables rural residential development while utilising appropriate discernible boundaries; (3) takes into account the need to provide efficient and cost effective connections to critical infrastructure; and (4) seeks to avoid ribbon development along roads and infrastructure lines	However several additional sites have been included in Prebbleton.
	Support of the criteria is conditional on the inclusion of land to the east of Prebbleton and the extension of the reserve across Tosswill Road	Accept in part – Some of the nominated land to the east of Prebbleton on Tosswill Road has been supported as it satisfies the criteria. Development of this land may facilitate the domain extension identified in the Prebbleton Structure Plan and referenced in the SDP ODP, but this is beyond the scope of this process
S36 DRYDEN TRUST	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Accept - Land owners' property has been included for the reasons given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
	Provide for "future proofed" rural residential development pending intensification to residential densities	Accept – 'future proofing' is not considered to be interim development in terms of Policy 6.3.9 of the regional policy Statement for the reasons that are discussed in Section 1. "Future proofed" development would give rise to a number of issues, but also provides the opportunity for the desirable peri-urban form of rural residential development without precluding future growth.
S37 TRENTS ROAD DEVELOPMENTS	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners property	Accept - Land owners' property has been included for the reasons given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
	Provide for "future proofed" rural residential development pending intensification to residential densities	Accept – 'future proofing' is not considered to be interim development in terms of Policy 6.3.9 of the regional policy Statement for the reasons that are discussed in Section 1. "Future proofed" development would give rise to a number of issues, but also provides the opportunity for the desirable peri-urban form of rural residential development without precluding future growth.
S38 SURVUS CONSULTANTS	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners nominated properties	Reject – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S39 V CULLEN	Oppose the RRS13 in principle as it does not go far enough in facilitating rural residential development	Reject – the scope of RRS 13 is determined to a significant extent by the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement. Among other things this means that it is not open for the Selwyn District Council to consider land which cannot efficiently connect to community owned sewerage and water supply. Nor is it able to consider areas that cannot efficiently integrate with existing urban areas.
	Request that Council enable two dwellings on single parcels within the Rural Inner Plains zone	Reject – this is beyond the scope of RRS 13; it would have to be considered as a change to the District Plan.
S40 B HARRINGTON	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners nominated properties	Accept – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S41 PINEDALE ENTERPRISES & KINTRYE HOLDINGS	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners nominated properties	Accept in part – identifies support for the criteria and principles contained in the RRS13 for sustainably managing rural residential development. However submitters' property has not been included for the reasons given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations.
S43 R CULLEN	Oppose the RRS13 in principle as it does not go far enough in facilitating rural residential development	Reject – the scope of RRS 13 is determined to a significant extent by the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement. Among other things this means that it is not open for the Selwyn District Council to consider land which cannot efficiently connect to community owned sewerage and water supply. Nor is it able to consider areas that cannot efficiently integrate with existing urban areas.
	Request that Council enable two dwellings on single parcels within the Rural Inner Plains zone	Reject – this is beyond the scope of RRS 13; it would have to be considered as a change to the District Plan.

S45 A JOYCE	Provide for subdivision and zoning of 2ha within a designated area around townships	Reject - this relief is beyond the scope of the RRS13 process and requires a full and comprehensive assessment under the RMA 1st Schedule
S46 S & Z CROFTS & J WILLIAMS	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners nominated properties	Accept – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations
S49 A CARTRIDGE	Support the RRS13 subject to the inclusion of the land owners nominated properties	Accept – for the reason given in section 7 Additional Nominated Locations

2. HOUSEHOLDS ALLOCATIONS AND DEMAND		
Submitter	Summary of relief sought	Panel recommendation
S08 M LARSON & ORS	Rezoning the identified 'future growth path in Prebbleton to Living densities via the LURP and Chapter 6 to satisfy demand for residential sections	Reject - Consideration of residential 'Greenfield' areas is beyond the scope of this process. However there is sufficient 'Greenfield' residential land rezoned recently through the LURP to accommodate the short to medium term needs of the Township. Any additional residential land will need to be determined through the monitoring of housing uptake and reviews of the SDP/LURP/Chapter 6.
S13 M & J AUSTIN	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in Part – to the extent that as a result of this exercise provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost.
S15 VAN DER MOLEN	Allow properties within a 3 km distance of the Southern Motorway corridor to be reduced to 2 ha. The creation of an additional 10 sub-4ha parcels along Hamptons Road would not undermine the 'village' character of Prebbleton	Reject – Subdivision to 2 ha minimum is not the type of rural residential development intended by the Regional Policy Statement and would be contrary to it. This request is also outside the scope of the current process.
S20 CONIFER GROVE TRUSTEES	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in part - there needs to be some provision made for rural residential households to provide choice in what is a relatively exclusive area of the property market. Provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost. The development and uptake of zoned land should be monitored and reviewed prior to allocating additional land for this purpose to ensure that the primary goals of the LURP and Chapter 6 are not hindered by rural residential development
S28 PANDORA TRUST	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in part - there needs to be some provision made for rural residential households to provide choice in what is a relatively exclusive area of the property market. Provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost. The development and uptake of zoned land should be monitored and reviewed prior to allocating additional land for this purpose to ensure that the primary goals of the LURP and Chapter 6 are not hindered by rural residential development
S30 P, D & J HANN	Highlight household demand as a reason why the land should be included in the adopted Strategy	Reject – while limited provision is to be made for rural residential households the extent to which the Selwyn District Council is able to do so for this exercise is constrained by LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement. The primary goals of these documents are to do with replacement of urban dwellings lost in the

		earthquakes and the limited provision for rural residential properties is to be managed so that it does not hinder this primary purpose.
S33 R BARKER & ORS	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in part - there needs to be some provision made for rural residential households to provide choice in what is a relatively exclusive area of the property market. Provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost. The development and uptake of zoned land should be monitored and reviewed prior to allocating additional land for this purpose to ensure that the primary goals of the LURP and Chapter 6 are not hindered by rural residential development
S36 DRYDEN TRUST	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in part - there needs to be some provision made for rural residential households to provide choice in what is a relatively exclusive area of the property market. Provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost. The development and uptake of zoned land should be monitored and reviewed prior to allocating additional land for this purpose to ensure that the primary goals of the LURP and Chapter 6 are not hindered by rural residential development
S37 TRENTS ROAD DEVELOPMENTS	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in part - there needs to be some provision made for rural residential households to provide choice in what is a relatively exclusive area of the property market. Provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost. The development and uptake of zoned land should be monitored and reviewed prior to allocating additional land for this purpose to ensure that the primary goals of the LURP and Chapter 6 are not hindered by rural residential development
S38 SURVUS CONSULTANTS	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in part - there needs to be some provision made for rural residential households to provide choice in what is a relatively exclusive area of the property market. Provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost. The development and uptake of zoned land should be monitored and reviewed prior to allocating additional land for this purpose to ensure that the primary goals of the LURP and Chapter 6 are not hindered by rural residential development
S39 V CULLEN	There is strong demand for rural residential sections, but there are no more blocks available on the market	Accept in Part – to the extent that as a result of this exercise provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost.
S40 B HARRINGTON	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in Part – to the extent that as a result of this exercise provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost.
S41 PINEDALE ENTERPRISES & KINTYRE PACIFIC HOLDINGS	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in part - there needs to be some provision made for rural residential households to provide choice in what is a relatively exclusive area of the property market. Provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement

		housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost. The development and uptake of zoned land should be monitored and reviewed prior to allocating additional land for this purpose to ensure that the primary goals of the LURP and Chapter 6 are not hindered by rural residential development
S43 R CULLEN	There is strong demand for rural residential sections, but there are no more blocks available on the market	Accept in Part – to the extent that as a result of this exercise provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost.
S46 S & Z CROFTS & J WILLIAMS	There is an urgent need for additional rural residential sections to provide for earthquake recovery housing needs that need to cover the full spectrum of housing types.	Accept in Part – to the extent that as a result of this exercise provision is to be made for limited rural residential development. This, however is not to provide like for like replacement housing for that lost in the earthquake because very little rural residential stock was so lost.

3. INFRASTRUCTURE		
Submitter	Summary of relief sought	Panel recommendation
S19 NZ FIRE SERVICE COMMISSION	Support the RRS13 as it requires the water supplying rural residential nodes to satisfy the NZ Fire Service Code of Practice	Accept – a reticulated water supply is stipulated in Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement and followed through in this exercise.
S39 V CULLEN	Oppose the requirement for rural residential developments to connect to a community owned reticulated wastewater system	Reject – it is a requirement and under Policy 9.3.9 of Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement that rural residential development be serviced by a community owned reticulated sewer system.
S43 R CULLEN	Oppose the requirement for rural residential developments to connect to a community owned reticulated wastewater system	Reject – it is a requirement and under Policy 9.3.9 of Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement that rural residential development be serviced by a community owned reticulated sewer system.
S45 A JOYCE	Oppose the requirement for rural residential developments to connect to a community owned reticulated wastewater and water system	Reject – It is a requirement of the LURP under Policy 9.3.9 of Chapter 6 that rural residential development is serviced by a community owned reticulated sewer and water system.

4. STRATEGIC ASSETS		
Submitter	Summary of relief sought	Officer recommendation
S34 MINISTRY OF EDUCATION	Support in principle the overall intent and methodology the Council has used to develop an initial policy position and guiding principles in the RRS13, which recognise and respond to the priorities of the Ministry of Education	Accept – because it supports the criteria and principles for sustainably managing rural residential development to avoid adverse effects on strategic assets upon which the RRS 13 exercise is based.
S42 NZ DEFENCE FORCE	Support the following aspects of the RRS13: (1) the approach outlined in Paragraphs 6.1 to 6.8 of Section 6 of the RRS13 regarding the requirements for land to be rezoned under the RMA; (2) the certainty an adopted Strategy will provide land owners outlined in Paragraphs 1.16 & 6.9 of the RRS13; (3) Supports the Location Criteria in Appendix 1 that directly reference the Burnham Military Camp & West Melton Rifle Range; (4) the current five locations as they avoid the strategic assets the NZ Defence Force operate within the study area	Accept – because it supports the criteria and principles for sustainably managing rural residential development to avoid adverse effects on strategic assets upon which the RRS 13 exercise is based.
S43 TRANSPOWER	Endorse the identification of the National Grid as a constraint within the RRS13, which is consistent with	Accept – because it supports the criteria and principles for sustainably managing rural residential development to avoid

	<p>the Regional Policy Statement (acknowledging that Council must prepare a plan change to ensure the SDP gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Electricity Transmission 2008).</p> <p>Support in principle preliminary Area 2, which is dissected by the National Grid, on the basis that all potential adverse effects are managed appropriately</p>	adverse effects on strategic assets upon which the RRS 13 exercise is based.
S49 LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, NZ INSTITUTE OF PLANT & FOOD & AGRESEARCH	Support in principle the overall intent and methodology the Council has used to develop an initial policy position and guiding principles in the RRS13, which recognise the potential for reverse sensitivity effects and how they may impact on rural industry	Accept – because it supports the criteria and principles for sustainably managing rural residential development to avoid adverse effects on strategic assets upon which the RRS 13 exercise is based.

6. PRELIMINARY LOCATIONS		
Submitter	Summary of relief sought	Officer recommendation
03 PIANZ & EPFNZ	Support the preliminary locations as they are not located adjacent to any intensive poultry farming activities or within the buffer areas around those activities	Accept based on the locations assessment contained in Section 6 of the RRS13
06 D & S ANDERSON	Support the retention of preliminary Area 3 (refer to submissions for specific reasons provided in support)	Accept – Confirms general accordance with the locations assessment contained in Section 6 of the RRS13 and inclusion of the land was supported through submissions and for the reasons set out in Section 7.
S20 CONIFER GROVE TRUSTESS	Support the retention of Area 4 (refer to submissions for specific reasons provided in support)	Support – Confirms general accordance with the locations assessment contained in Section 6 of the RRS13 and inclusion of the land was supported through submissions and for the reasons set out in Section 7.
S35 PREBBLETON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION	Support the retention of preliminary Area 3 and Area 4 in Prebbleton (refer to submissions for specific reasons provided in support)	Support – Confirms general accordance with the locations assessment contained in Section 6 of the RRS13 and inclusion of the land was supported through submissions and for the reasons set out in Section 7.
S47 J & R MARSHALL	Support for retaining preliminary location Area 2 in the adopted Strategy (refer to submissions for specific reasons provided in support)	Support – Confirms general accordance with the locations assessment contained in Section 6 of the RRS13 and inclusion of the land was supported through submissions and for the reasons set out in Section 7.

7. ADDITIONAL NOMINATED LOCATIONS		
Submitter	Summary of relief sought	Panel recommendation
S01 AITCHESON A	To include the property at 254 Trents Road (Lot 5 DP 81331) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission.	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site would unable to be integrated into the existing urban settlement pattern in the short to medium term. The location is therefore inconsistent with the preferred peri-urban rural residential development typology. As a consequence, the node will be unable to be consolidated into an established self-sustaining township for a significant period of time. The location therefore fails to 'give effect' to Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 that requires rural residential development to be able to integrated into, or consolidated with, existing settlements (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 - Chapter 6 Locations Criteria) The provision of cost effective and efficient infrastructure servicing, including specifically reticulated water and wastewater services, is unlikely. The relative isolation of the nominated site establishes that development is unable to support existing or upgraded community infrastructure or provide good access to emergency services. It also exacerbates the risk that rural residential development could give rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent rural activities or

		<p>strategic infrastructure. The location is therefore unable to 'give effect' to Chapter 6 Policy 6.3.9 criteria (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 Locations Criteria)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the node would be severed from the social, economic, employment and recreational services provided in townships without a greater reliance being placed on private motor vehicles (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character Locations Criteria) the land is identified as having Class II versatile soils (LUC (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 –Prebbleton Environmental, Cultural & Heritage Values Location Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 21) the Transpower national grid runs along the eastern boundary of the property, with intensification potentially giving rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects with this nationally important strategic infrastructure (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 8) the location presents a greater risk to the rural amenity values attributed to the open rural landscape through the 'domestication' of productive rural land, the consolidated management of townships and the visual distinction between urban settlements and the rural periphery (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character Locations Criteria) there is an absence of definitive discernible boundaries to manage growth and reduce the risk of sprawling rural residential development (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character Locations Criteria) there is nothing to distinguish this location with any other properties in the Rural (Inner Plains) zone, which have been identified in the SDP as a rural zone that provides for rural activities and housing densities no greater than 1hh/4ha. There are limited geographical or landscape features to contain rural residential growth within the commuter belt of the district with Christchurch City, with there being a risk of rural residential 'sprawl' and an erosion of rural amenity values and productive capacity will arise if the nominated locations are included in the adopted Strategy (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Township Rural Character & Productivity and Landscape Values Locations Criteria)
S05 E & K DIXON	To include the property at 144 & 57 Hamptons Road (Lot 2 DP 29035 & Lot 2 DP 43993) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission.	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Council's Strategic Asset Manager Utilities has identified that significant network upgrades for water and wastewater would be required to service the land to the south of Hamptons and Trices Roads Precluding development to the south of these roads will go some way to protecting the southern gateways to the Township and avoid elongating Prebbleton further south along Springs Road. It will also achieve a strong demarcation between rural and urban forms of development, and in doing so, will protect the rural amenity contrast and outlook valued by the community and expressed in the Prebbleton Structure Plan. Rural residential densities could be utilised as a means to restrict residential sprawl south of Hamptons and Trents Road, to avoid the long term coalescence of Prebbleton with Lincoln to the south. However, there are few limits to growth in the southerly direction, with there being a risk that rural residential densities could significantly undermine the rural amenity contrast and distinction between rural and urban forms, while compromising the productive capacity of rural zoned land (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character and Landscape Values and Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 24) Trices and Hamptons Road form a relatively strong limit to contain residential and rural residential growth from elongating the urban form further south; with the SDP identifying a need to achieve a concentric consolidated urban form under Policy B4.3.65. The Panel believe further rural residential growth south of Hamptons and Trices Road to be inconsistent with this policy and the "Preferred growth area" included in Appendix 31 of the SDP, with the Conifer Grove block being supported on a preliminary basis for inclusion Strategy as it already

		<p>comprising a portion of Living 2 zoned land and being contained by Hamptons Road to the south (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria Appendix 2 – Map 24)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Prebbleton has a discrete character and rural outlook, with significant numbers of rural residential development on the southern periphery of the town placing pressure on existing community and infrastructure services and potentially undermining the character of the Township identified in the Prebbleton Structure Plan (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management & Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria) Council's Asset Manager Transportation has identified a preference that rural residential development does not extend to the south of Hamptons and Trices Roads to avoid any reduction in the safety and efficiency of these roads, which are of strategic importance under the Christchurch Rolleston Environs Transportation Study and will be upgraded to improve local road access onto Stage 2 of the Christchurch Southern Motorway. Anticipated local road upgrades include the formation of roundabouts at the Springs Road and Shands Road intersections of Hamptons Road (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character and Prebbleton Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 24) the nominated land directly adjoins a property that accommodates an Intensive Farming Activity, with the land being wholly contained within the associated reverse sensitivity buffer (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Prebbleton Rural Character & Productivity Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 8) The northern portion of the nominated land is comprised of Class II versatile soils (LUC) (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 21). The nominated land would require geotechnical assessments to determine the appropriateness of development and to determine what level of foundation design is required (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 20).
S07 G & L BURGESS	<p>To include the property at 59 to 98 Tosswill Road (Lot 1 & Part Lot 2 DP 5464) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission.</p> <p><u>(NB: this land was also nominated by S28 Pandora Trust & further supported by S35 Prebbleton Community Association & S45 A Joyce)</u></p>	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inclusion of the nominated land is consistent with Policy B43.648 and the "Preferred Growth Area" in Appendix 31 as it aligns with the east-west infill between the township and the electricity pylons and transmission lines (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria Appendix 2 – Map 24). the nominated land would require geotechnical assessments to determine the appropriateness of development and to determine what level of foundation design is required (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Natural Hazards Location Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 20) While we acknowledge this issue we are prepared to recommend the land as a potential candidate for rural residential development in the Rural Residential Strategy. Again, we emphasise that selection of this land for the strategy does not assume a successful outcome through the plan change process. it is recommended that the nominated land is included in the adopted Strategy as it is consistent with a number of the criteria and avoids the majority of constraints identified to the east of Prebbleton (as identified in the PC17 analysis). The inclusion of the land has the potential to facilitate the co-ordinated development of the balance of the land to the west, which has a Living Z zone following the Gazetting of the LURP, and the realisation of the Domain extension and integrated stormwater scheme identified in the Structure Plan and Living Z zone outline development plans (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria).

S13 M & J AUSTIN	To include the property at 12252 & 1234 West Coast Road & 88 Jowers Road (Lot 4 DP 66217, RS 9448 & RS 9448) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission.	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is little doubt that inclusion of this land would not inhibit a future growth path – the adjoining urban area is fenced between Halkett road and State Highway 73 with no through connections. However, this means that integration with the township could not be achieved unless some undeveloped sections are purchased or stormwater land is used to provide the necessary through links. The alternative is to use the State Highway and Halkett Road which would compromise their efficiency and discourage walking and cycling. Currently, there is very limited capacity in the local waste water network and a significant upgrade would be required. There are also issues with the quality of the local water supply and there is currently a restriction on the ability to provide a new well in this area. While we do not dismiss the possibility of development in the long term we believe the land faces very difficult problems with its inability to provide access into the township other than through the two main roads.
S14 B & A MOIR	To include the property at 828 Ellesmere Road (Pt RS 10644) in the adopted Strategy for the following reasons stated in the submission.	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although this site faces some considerable obstacles, if they can be overcome it is a potential candidate for rural residential development in the strategy. It would not be appropriate for it to take its access from Ellesmere Road. However, it may well be that public access can be developed from Liffey Springs Drive or that public pedestrian/cycle access (more directly to the town centre) could be obtained through to Allendale Lane or through the esplanade provisions of the L1 or L2. One or other of these must be available or the land would not be suitable as it could not integrate well with the town. Its prospects would significantly improve if it were to be included in one comprehensive outline Development Plan with the Harrington, Apton, Paton and Cartridge lands and particularly if Allendale Lane was developed as a public road through to Moirs Lane. While we acknowledge there are difficulties we are prepared to recommend the Moir land as a potential candidate for rural residential development in the Rural Residential Strategy. Again, we emphasise that selection of this land for the strategy does not assume a successful outcome through the plan change process.
S16 APTON DEVELOPMENTS LTD	<p>To include the properties that utilise Allendale Lane (various titles) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission.</p> <p><u>(NB: this land was also nominated by S32 R Paton & 48 A Cartridge)</u></p>	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development of this land would need to demonstrate that no adverse reverse sensitivity effects would be likely in relation to the wastewater treatment facility. However, we note that the Selwyn District Plan (Policy B 4.3.3 of The Township Volume) seeks to avoid rural land being surrounded by land zoned for living purposes. On the face of it, provided the issues of access and reverse sensitivity are resolved the land is a suitable candidate for rural residential development. Access may well be critical for these properties and public linkage through them to Moir land could well be found to be necessary. In the light of the above we recommend retention of these properties in the strategy. We emphasise that selection of these properties simply means that at face value they are potential candidates for a plan change application. Unless the issues outlined above are adequately addressed successful outcome may not be achievable.
S18 CRABBE PARTNERSHIP	<p>To include the properties at 341 Trices Road (Lot 1 DP 73583) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p><u>(NB: this land was also nominated by S51 A & B George & E & B Jeffs)</u></p>	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> These blocks along with the properties to the south extending as far as Hamptons Rd already have a “semi-rural domesticated appearance” which contribute to a satisfying peri urban edge to Prebbleton. It would require strict design controls at the next stage to achieve this to avoid simply creating a large lot residential appearance. We also note that the site would require geotechnical assessment, and that the availability of services would have to be confirmed. We are satisfied that the partly formed blind end of Hamptons Rd can be made

		<p>to provide a satisfactory township edge, and that the site would relate well to the other rural residential sites to the east of Birchs Rd and potentially to sites to the north east at Tosswill Rd, although at present there appears to be a gap in that direction. All these issues would require to be examined in more depth at the plan stage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council's Strategic Asset Manager Utilities has identified that significant network upgrades for water and wastewater would be required to service the land to the south of Hamptons and Trices Roads. This is a constraint which may affect the timing of this development and should be considered in more depth at the district plan stage.
S21 I COURT	To include the properties at the corner of Robinsons & Birchs Roads (Lot 1 DP 377265, Lot 1 DP 2516, Lot 1 DP 58463 & Lot 2 DP 58463) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The distance of the site from township boundaries establishes that it would be unable to be integrated into the existing urban settlement pattern in the short to medium term. The location is therefore inconsistent with the preferred peri-urban rural residential development typology. As a consequence, the node will be unable to be consolidated into established self-sustaining townships for a significant period of time. The location therefore fails to 'give effect' to Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 that requires rural residential development to be able to integrated into, or consolidated with, existing settlements (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 - Chapter 6 Locations Criteria) ▪ The provision of cost effective and efficient infrastructure servicing, including specifically reticulated water and wastewater services, is unlikely. The relative isolation of the nominated area establishes that development is unable to support existing or upgraded community infrastructure or provide good access to emergency services. It also exacerbates the risk that rural residential development could give rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects with adjacent rural activities or strategic infrastructure. The location is therefore unable to 'give effect' to Chapter 6 Policy 6.3.9 criteria (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 Locations Criteria) ▪ the node would be severed from the social, economic, employment and recreational services provided in townships without a greater reliance being placed on private motor vehicles (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character Locations Criteria) ▪ the location presents a greater risk to the rural amenity values attributed to the open rural landscape through the 'domestication' of productive rural land, the consolidated management of townships and the visual distinction between urban settlements and the rural periphery (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character Locations Criteria) ▪ there is an absence of definitive discernible boundaries to manage growth and reduce the risk of sprawling rural residential development (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character Locations Criteria) ▪ there is nothing to distinguish this location with other properties in the Rural (Inner Plains) zone, which have been identified in the SDP as a rural zone that provides for rural activities and housing densities no greater than 1hh/4ha. There are limited geographical or landscape features to contain rural residential growth within the commuter belt of the district with Christchurch City, with there being a risk of rural residential 'sprawl' and an erosion of rural amenity values and productive capacity will arise if the nominated locations are included in the adopted Strategy (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Township Rural Character & Productivity and Landscape Values Locations Criteria)
S22 D & D TYSON & A SMITH	To include the properties at Selwyn Rd and Dunns Crossing Rd (RS 25807 & RS 23614)) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The uptake and development of the Living 3 zoned land located on Dunns Crossing Road should be monitored prior to including additional sites in this general location. Additional allocations in the area could contribute to 'ribbon' development along Dunns Crossing Road when combined with the adjoining Living 3 zoned land, which may further erode the rural/urban contrast along this boundary of Rolleston where

		<p>large land holdings to the south of Rolleston are valued for its rural productive capacity, rural outlook and visual contrast with the built form of the township (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 - Rural Residential Form, Function & Character, Rolleston Urban Form & Growth Management and Rural Character & Productivity Locations Criteria , Appendix 2 – Map 28)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ access to cost effective reticulated water and wastewater services would be limited until either the adjoining Living 3 zone to the north-west, or future residential areas to the north, are developed (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character, Rolleston Urban Form & Growth Management and Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria) ▪ The nominated locations currently do not directly adjoin residential priority areas or Living zoned land other than the undeveloped Living 3 zone. The land to the north is identified in Chapter 6 as being within the 'projected infrastructure boundary' of Rolleston. It is therefore anticipated to urbanise at some point in time in the future, but is not identified as a 'greenfield priority area. At this point in time the nominated locations fail to accord with the Chapter 6 - Policy 6.3.9 criteria requiring development to integrate into, or consolidate with, existing settlements in the immediate timeframe (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6, Rural Residential Form, Function & Character and Rolleston Urban Form & Growth management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 28) ▪ the portion of Dunns Crossing Road that services the land is not sealed, which is a development requirement of Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter, although the site has alternative access onto Selwyn Road ▪ Inclusion of the nominated land may give rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects with productive rural land holdings taking place in the Rural (Outer Plains) zone. It would also fail to protect the rural character and productive capacity of large rural land holdings in the Rural Outer Plains zone to the south of Rolleston (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Landscape Values and Rolleston Rural Character & Productivity Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Maps 4 & 28) ▪ It is unlikely that the sites would be able to be economically serviced with reticulated water and wastewater until these utilities are extended to the adjoining Living 3 zone to the north-west or future residential development to the east, which is likely to be several years away yet. Any extensions in advance of this could be costly and does not accord with Council's infrastructure programme of works (refer to RRS Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character and Rolleston Urban Form & Growth management & Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Maps 4 & 28) ▪ there is sufficient Living 3 zoned land and land supported for inclusion in the Strategy within Rolleston that better aligns with the Locations Criteria to provide housing choice in the short term than the nominated sites, with on-going monitoring and reviews determining the necessity and appropriateness of additional sites within the suggested 5 year timeframe
S23 M & H RINGLAND	To include the properties at 163 Halkett road (lot 1 dp 34902) in the adopted strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This property is similar to the Austin property (Submission No 13) in that, while there is little doubt that some of the rural residential criteria in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement can be met there seems to be little possibility of integration with the township other than through the main roads which would be compromised in terms of their efficiency. This would discourage cycling and walking. Currently, there is very limited capacity in the local wastewater network and these are quality issues with the local water supply. While we do not dismiss the possibility of development in the long term we believe the land faces very difficult problems with its inability to provide access into the township other than through the two main roads. ▪ For this reason we do not recommend inclusion of the land in the strategy.

S24 N SOLE	To include the properties at 708 Selwyn Road (Lot 2 DP 441634) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The inclusion of the land could eventually define the south-eastern edge of the township as a transition to the rural land holdings between Rolleston and Lincoln townships. The site sits within the longer term residential growth path of Rolleston, with rural residential development creating a relatively isolated node that would not be integrated with the township for some time into the future as residential development is not anticipated to extend to Selwyn Road for some time. This isolation would not be remedied until the sequencing of development proposed for Rolleston extends down to Selwyn Road (refer to RRS13 Appendix – Chapter 6, Rural Residential Form, Function & Character and Rolleston Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 28).
S25 K DUNN	To include the properties at 1066 West Coast Road in the adopted Strategy (Lot 2 DP 34902) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Just as with the Austin (Submission 13) and Ringland (Submission No 23) properties in that while some of the rural residential criteria in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement can be met, there seems to be little possibility of integration with the township other than through the main roads. Also currently there is limited capacity in the local wastewater network. While we do not dismiss development in the long term we believe that in these circumstances the land faces very difficult problems with its inability to integrate with the internal road network of the township. <p>Consequently we do not recommend inclusion of this land in the Strategy.</p>
S26 G WEAKLEY	To include the properties at 986 Selwyn Road (LOT 2 DP 74061 & LOT 1 DP 333531) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The uptake and development of the Living 3 zoned land located on Dunns Crossing Road should be monitored prior to including additional sites in this general location. Additional allocations in the area could contribute to 'ribbon' development along Dunns Crossing Road when combined with the adjoining Living 3 zoned land, which may further erode the rural/urban contrast along this boundary of Rolleston where large land holdings to the south of Rolleston are valued for its rural productive capacity, rural outlook and visual contrast with the built form of the township (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 - Rural Residential Form, Function & Character, Rolleston Urban Form & Growth Management and Rural Character & Productivity Locations Criteria , Appendix 2 – Map 28) ▪ access to cost effective reticulated water and wastewater services would be limited until either the adjoining Living 3 zone to the north-west, or future residential areas to the north, are developed (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character, Rolleston Urban Form & Growth Management and Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria) ▪ The nominated locations currently do not directly adjoin residential priority areas or Living zoned land other than the undeveloped Living 3 zone. The land to the north is identified in Chapter 6 as being within the 'projected infrastructure boundary' of Rolleston. It is therefore anticipated to urbanise at some point in time in the future, but is not identified as a 'greenfield priority area'. At this point in time the nominated locations fail to accord with the Chapter 6 - Policy 6.3.9 criteria requiring development to integrate into, or consolidate with, existing settlements in the immediate timeframe (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6, Rural Residential Form, Function & Character and Rolleston Urban Form & Growth management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 28) ▪ the portion of Dunns Crossing Road that services the land is not sealed, which is a development requirement of Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter, although both locations have alternative access onto Selwyn Road ▪ Inclusion of the nominated land may give rise to adverse reverse sensitivity effects with productive rural land holdings taking place in the Rural (Outer Plains) zone. It would also fail to protect the rural

		<p>character and productive capacity of large rural land holdings in the Rural Outer Plains zone to the south of Rolleston (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Landscape Values and Rolleston Rural Character & Productivity Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Maps 4 & 28)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is unlikely that the sites would be able to be economically serviced with reticulated water and wastewater until these utilities are extended to the adjoining Living 3 zone to the north-west or future residential development to the east, which is likely to be several years away yet. Any extensions in advance of this could be costly and does not accord with Council's infrastructure programme of works (refer to RRS Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character and Rolleston Urban Form & Growth management & Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Maps 4 & 28) there is sufficient Living 3 zoned land and land supported for inclusion in the Strategy within Rolleston that better aligns with the Locations Criteria to provide housing choice in the short term than the nominated sites, with on-going monitoring and reviews determining the necessity and appropriateness of additional sites within the suggested 5 year timeframe
S27 HARRINGTON	<p>B</p> <p>To include the properties at Edward Street/Moirs Lane (Lots 1 & 2 DP 445316) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p><u>(NB: this land was also nominated by S40 B Harrington)</u></p>	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inclusion of this land is practicable if it can be included in an outline development plan for either the Apton, Paton and Cartridge block or the Moir land (immediately to the east) which is subject to submission No 14. Connectivity by public access through to the town centre rather than through Ellesmere Road is important and this will require a cooperative arrangement with adjoining properties. The draft strategy sets out five pre-requisites for rural residential development of which can be met. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> It can be economically serviced with public water and waste water reticulation; It is able to be integrated with Lincoln township; It meets the requirement for urban consolidation It is not affected by any significant constraints and Its owner has aspirations to rezone the land In the light of the above and as long as the site can be integrated in one outline development plan with either the Apton, Paton and Cartridge or Moir land we support the inclusion of Mr Harrington's land as a potential candidate for rural residential zoning. Again we emphasise that there are significant issues to be overcome before this property could become a successful candidate for rural residential zoning.
S28 PANDORA TRUST	<p>To include the properties at 93, 105 & 153 Tosswill Road (Lot 1 & Pt Lot 2 DP 5464, Lot 1 DP 34032 & Lot 2 DP 34032) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p><u>(NB: this land was also nominated by S07 G & L Burgess & further supported by S35 Prebbleton Community Association & S45 A Joyce)</u></p>	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the land nominated extends beneath the pylons and transmission lines further to the east so is arguably not as consistent with this Policy B43.64 and the "Preferred Growth Area" in Appendix 31 that identifies east-west infill between the township and the electricity pylons and transmission lines (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 24) a portion of the nominated land is an identified contaminated site (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Environmental, Cultural & Heritage Values Location Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 8) there are springs located on the nominated land nominated that are of significant value to local Runanga, with land on the adjoining eastern boundary having a high groundwater table (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Prebbleton Natural Hazards and Environmental, Cultural and Heritage Values Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 15) the nominated land would require geotechnical assessments to determine the appropriateness of development and to determine what level of foundation design is required (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 20) and the eastern portion of the land is located within the

		<p>identified 'Liquefaction zone buffer' and there was liquefaction observed in close proximity to the site (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Natural Hazards Location Criteria)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The land is subject to a number of constraints, including the electricity transmission lines and pylons, contaminated land, susceptibility to liquefaction and stormwater management and drainage issues. An alternative that has been considered is that the portion of the land contained on the south-western side of the pylons and transmission lines could be included, but this would sever the land holdings and create undersized balance allotments. ▪ These are significant constraints. They may be able to be resolved, but we consider that there is sufficient land supported for inclusion in the Strategy within Prebbleton that better aligns with the Locations Criteria to provide housing choice in the short term. If these matters can be resolved then the site may be able to be considered in the next review of the Strategy ▪
S29 TAI TAPU TRUST	To include the properties at 766 Christchurch to Akaroa Road (Lot 1 DP 83800) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ While this property does show some potential, it is physically separated from the Tai Tapu boundary and would result in some ribbon development along the Christchurch – Akaroa Road. We have given some thought as to how to overcome this but that would require internal access possibly over an unformed section of Hauschields Road which, we understand, has a narrow 10 metre wide road reserve. The land would require a geotechnical assessment and along with other properties it is within the Lower Plains Flood Area. We understand that the water supply to the property would require to be upgraded and there would be some difficulty in connecting to public sewerage reticulation. These are the sort of obstacles that can be overcome but our main concern is that development of this land would allow a ribbon of development to occur along the main road outside the settlement. ▪ As a consequence, we do not recommend inclusion of this land in the strategy. There will be an opportunity to review the strategy after the elapse of 5 years.
S30 P, D & J HANN	To include the properties at 608 Ellesmere Road (Lot 2 DP 83562) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The property is already a small holding and is separated from the urban boundary by an existing 4 ha allotment. There would be some difficulty in servicing land in this vicinity with reticulated water and waste water services until these utilities are extended to the western boundary of Lincoln and that is not likely in the near future. While these factors on their own, do not auger well for inclusion of land, in this location in the short term, we think that in the longer term (at least 5 years away) the situation should be re-examined. As Mr Friedel observes, this direction could become a logical growth area and we think the Hann family land could logically become part of a future peri-urban band around the north-east edge of Lincoln between Ellesmere Road and the intersection of Birchs and Tancreds Roads. ▪ For these reasons we do not support the inclusion of the Hann land in the short term but we believe the situation should be revisited after five years.
S31 R PATON	To include the properties at 139 Two Chain Road (Lot 2 DP 33996) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission (NB: this land was also nominated by S41 Pinedale Holdings & Kintyre Holdings & S55 J Paton)	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ although the land is contained within a definitive road boundary, the extended length of this area may contribute to 'ribbon' development along SH1 south as far as Dunns Crossing Road, which is recognised as the southern gateway to Rolleston (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 28)

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Inclusion of the land may give rise to potentially adverse reverse sensitivity effects that could compromise strategic infrastructure and assets, including specifically the operation of SH1, the South Island Main Trunk Line (SIMTL), I-Zone Business Park and Rolleston Prison. This has occurred in Armack Drive, which is an established rural residential node on the southern periphery of the I-Zone business park, where complaints relating to nuisance effects associated with the railway siding and other activities taking place within I-Zone creating amenity conflicts and reverse sensitivity effects (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Maps 15 & 28) ▪ although the location appears close geographically it is relatively severed from Rolleston, with the SH1 and SIMTL corridor presenting a barrier to achieving an integrated and well-connected rural residential node when compared to alternative locations that directly adjoin the township boundary – future upgrades to the connection point at SH1 and Rolleston Drive are anticipated in the longer term, but are unlikely to reduce the distance having to be travelled between the site and the town centre. There are no alternative connection points in reasonably close proximity to the site other than Dunns Crossing Road, which would be no closer to the town centre or other community facilities (such as schools, libraries or open space reserves) than the Rolleston Drive connection. Increased vehicle numbers using this intersection is likely to reduce the safety and efficiency of SH1 (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2- Map 28). ▪ Inclusion of the land would be inconsistent with several of the Rural Residential Locations Criteria in Appendix 1 of the RRS13, including some of constraints listed in Chapter 6 – potential to adversely affect strategic infrastructure, fails to directly adjoin residential priority areas or Living zoned land as it is severed by SH 1 and is inconsistent with Policy B4.3.71 of the SDP in respect to avoiding Living zones (which include potential Living 3 zones) from establishing west of SH 1 and the SIMTL (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 28) ▪ Council's Asset Manager Transportation has also confirmed that the development of this block to rural residential densities could give rise to reverse sensitivity effects associated with the southern freight connection from SH1 and/or SIMTL to I-Zone business park, where Port of Tauranga and Port of Lyttelton have inland ports proposed that will require roading connections and railway sidings either through or in close proximity to the nominated land ▪ Council's Strategic Asset Manager Utilities has confirmed that there is limited wastewater infrastructure in place, with an upgraded sewer line and pumping station being required if the land is identified for inclusion in the Strategy ▪ there is sufficient Living 3 zoned land and land supported for inclusion in the Strategy within Rolleston that better aligns with the Locations Criteria to provide housing choice in the short term than the nominated sites, with on-going monitoring and reviews determining the necessity and appropriateness of additional sites within the suggested 5 year timeframe ▪
S32 R PATON	<p>To include Allendale Lane (various) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p><u>(NB: this land was also nominated by S16 Apton Developments & S468 A Cartridge)</u></p>	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Any development of this land would need to demonstrate that no adverse reverse sensitivity effects would be likely in relation to the wastewater treatment facility. However, we note that the Selwyn District Plan (Policy B 4.3.3 of The Township Volume) seeks to avoid rural land being surrounded by land zoned for living purposes. On the face of it, provided the issues of access and reverse sensitivity are resolved the land is a suitable candidate for rural residential development. Access may well be critical for these properties and

		<p>public linkage through them to Moir land could well be found to be necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> In the light of the above we recommend retention of these properties in the strategy. We emphasise that selection of these properties simply means that at face value they are potential candidates for a plan change application. Unless the issues outlined above are adequately addressed successful outcome may not be achievable.
S33 R BARKER & ORS	To include the properties at 1 to 3/731 Lincoln Tai Tapu Road & 187 Tancred's Road (Lots 1 to 3 DP 400131 & Lot 4 DP 391803) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We observe that the four lots comprising the block are host to five dwellings (one of the properties contains a "granny flat"). It already exhibits many of the characteristics of a rural residential development even though it has Inner Plains zoning. Although the land is just over the road from what is expected to be the future urban area of Lincoln, we remain uncertain about crossing the threshold of Ellesmere Road, which could form a strong edge to the future town at least in the short term. With the sites we recommend for inclusion in the strategy at this stage there will be sufficient land aligning with the criteria in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement to satisfy short term demand. <p>As a consequence we do not support the inclusion of the land in the strategy at this stage.</p>
S35 PREBBLETON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION	<p>Supports the inclusion of the land at 59 to 98 Tosswill Road (Lot 1 & Part Lot 2 DP 5464) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p><u>(NB: this was nominated by S07 G & L Burgess & S28 Pandora Trust & further supported by S45 A Joyce)</u></p>	<p>Accept in part. Reject the inclusion of the land nominated by Pandora Trust (S28) and support the inclusion of G & L Burgess (S07) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The inclusion of the G & L Burgess (S07) is generally consistent with Policy B43.649 and the "Preferred Growth Area" in Appendix 31 as it aligns with the east-west infill between the township and the electricity pylons and transmission lines (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 24). However, the land nominated by Pandora Trust (S28) extends beneath the pylons and transmission lines further to the east so is arguably not as consistent with this policy (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria). a portion of the land nominated by Pandora Trust (S28) is an identified contaminated site (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Environmental, Cultural & Heritage Values Location Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 8) there are springs located on the land nominated by Pandora Trust (S28) that are of significant value to local Runanga, with land on the adjoining eastern boundary having a high groundwater table (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Prebbleton Natural Hazards and Environmental, Cultural and Heritage Values Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 15) the majority of the land nominated by G & L Burgess (S07), and the western portion of the land nominated by Pandora Trust (S28), are comprised of Class I versatile soils (LUC) and the southern portion of the same land being comprised of Class II versatile soils (LUC)(refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Environmental, Cultural & Heritage Values Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 21) All of the nominated land to the east of Prebbleton would require geotechnical assessments to determine the appropriateness of development and to determine what level of foundation design is required (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 20). The eastern portion of the Pandora Trust (S28) land is located within the identified 'Liquefaction zone buffer' and there was liquefaction observed in close proximity to the site (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Natural Hazards Location Criteria) it is recommended that the G & L Burgess (S07) block be included in the adopted Strategy as it is consistent with a number of the criteria

		<p>and avoids the majority of constraints identified to the east of Prebbleton (as identified in the PC 17 analysis). The inclusion of the land has the potential to facilitate the co-ordinated development of the balance of the land to the west, which has a Living Z zone following the Gazetting of the LURP, and the realisation of the Domain extension and integrated stormwater scheme identified in the Structure Plan and Living Z zone outline development plans (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The Pandora Trust (S28) block is subject to a number of constraints, including the electricity transmission lines and pylons, contaminated land, susceptibility to liquefaction and stormwater management and drainage issues. An alternative that has been considered is that the portion of the land contained on the south-western side of the pylons and transmission lines could be included, but this would sever the land holdings and create undersized balance allotments. ▪ These are significant constraints. They may be able to be resolved, but we consider that there is sufficient land supported for inclusion in the Strategy within Prebbleton that better aligns with the Locations Criteria to provide housing choice in the short term. If these matters can be resolved then the site may be able to be considered in the next review of the Strategy ▪
S36 DRYDEN TRUST	To include the identified property on Springston-Rolleston Road (Lot 1 DP 305373) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although the land is within a future growth path for Rolleston, this is the only constraint that we are aware of. We consider that it would be able to be developed for rural residential purposes with a high standard of amenity and serve as part of the peri urban edge of Rolleston until full residential development becomes appropriate. With suitable future proofing it should eventually be able to be redeveloped without undue complication. For discussion of future proofing, see discussion in our observations under Urban Growth at the beginning of this report and in the recommended Chapter 7 on Implementation.
S37 TRENTS ROAD DEVELOPMENTS	To include the identified properties at 232 Hamptons Road and 340 Trents Road (Lot 2 DP 25129, Lot 2 DP 41505 & Lot 2 DP 42643) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Although the land is within a future growth path for Rolleston we consider that it may be able to be developed for rural residential purposes with a high standard of amenity and serve as part of the peri urban edge of Prebbleton until full residential development becomes appropriate. With suitable future proofing it should eventually be able to be redeveloped without undue complication. For discussion of future proofing, see discussion in our observations under Urban Growth at the beginning of this report and in the recommended Chapter 7 on Implementation ▪
S38 SURVUS CONSULTANTS	To include the identified properties at 330 Trents Road, 250 Hamptons Road & 681, 687, 701, 703, 713, 735 & 743 Shands Road (Lot 1 DP 42643, Pt RS 4495, Lot 2 DP 40826, Lot 1 DP 16799, Lot 1 DP 70490, Lot 2 DP 29158, Lot 1 DP 29158, Lot 2 DP 70490 & Lot 4 DP 25129) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council's Asset Manager Transportation has confirmed that access points onto Shands Road will need to be managed to avoid any reduction in the safety and efficiency of this road, which is of strategic importance under the Christchurch Rolleston Environs Transportation Study and will be upgraded to improve local road access onto Stage 2 of the Christchurch Southern Motorway (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management and Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 24) ▪ Council's Strategic Asset Manager Utilities has identified that significant network upgrades for water and wastewater would be required to service the land to the west of the existing township, which would have to be factored into Council's infrastructure works programme (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria) ▪ The nominated land would require geotechnical assessments to determine the appropriateness of development and to determine what

		<p>level of foundation design is required (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 20). The southern portion of the nominated land is located within the identified 'Liquefaction zone buffer' and there was liquefaction observed in close proximity to the site (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Natural Hazards Location Criteria)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Unlike other sites of this size and magnitude, when we had detailed planning, urban design and engineering evidence, we received only very brief comments about this site. It is potentially in the same future growth path as other sites considered on the western side of Prebbleton. We heard nothing about the roading or servicing or urban design implications. ▪ We consider there may be a case for development of this site in the future. However we simply did not hear enough about it to have any confidence that it should be included at this time. If it was to be developed, it would probably not be until intervening site such as Trents Developments and the undeveloped rural and Living Z sites along Hamptons Rd towards the present urban limit are developed. This may be able to be reconsidered at a review of the RSS.
S39 V CULLEN	To include the property at 216 Lawford Road (Lot 1 DP 82603) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ This land is well separated from the West Melton Township and for that reason could not be integrated with West Melton services or its settlement pattern in the short to medium term. Its selection therefore would be inconsistent with Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement. For this reason we do not support the inclusion of the property in the Rural Residential Strategy.
S41 PINEDALE ENTERPRISES & KINTYRE PACIFIC HOLDINGS	<p>To include the properties at 15, 25, 77, 93, 97 & 139 Two Chain Road (Lots 1 & 2 DP 27804, Lots 1, 2, 5 & 6 DP 33996, Lots 1 to 3 DP 305466 & Lot 2 DP 33396) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p><u>(NB: this land was also nominated by S31 R Paton & S55 J Paton)</u></p>	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ although the land is contained within a definitive road boundary, the extended length of this area may contribute to 'ribbon' development along SH1 south as far as Dunns Crossing Road, which is recognised as the southern gateway to Rolleston (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 28) ▪ Inclusion of the land may give rise to potentially adverse reverse sensitivity effects that could compromise strategic infrastructure and assets, including specifically the operation of SH1, the South Island Main Trunk Line (SIMTL), I-Zone Business Park and Rolleston Prison. This has occurred in Armack Drive, which is an established rural residential node on the southern periphery of the I-Zone business park, where complaints relating to nuisance effects associated with the railway siding and other activities taking place within I-Zone creating amenity conflicts and reverse sensitivity effects (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Maps 15 & 28) ▪ although the location appears close geographically it is relatively severed from Rolleston, with the SH1 and SIMTL corridor presenting a barrier to achieving an integrated and well-connected rural residential node when compared to alternative locations that directly adjoin the township boundary – future upgrades to the connection point at SH1 and Rolleston Drive are anticipated in the longer term, but are unlikely to reduce the distance having to be travelled between the site and the town centre. There are no alternative connection points in reasonably close proximity to the site other than Dunns Crossing Road, which would be no closer to the town centre or other community facilities (such as schools, libraries or open space reserves) than the Rolleston Drive connection. Increased vehicle numbers using this intersection is likely to reduce the safety and efficiency of SH1 (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2- Map 28). ▪ Inclusion of the land would be inconsistent with several of the Rural Residential Locations Criteria in Appendix 1 of the RRS13, including some of constraints listed in Chapter 6 – potential to adversely affect strategic infrastructure, fails to directly adjoin residential priority areas or Living zoned land as it is severed by SH 1 and is inconsistent with

		<p>Policy B4.3.71 of the SDP in respect to avoiding Living zones (which include potential Living 3 zones) from establishing west of SH 1 and the SIMTL (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 28</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council's Asset Manager Transportation has also confirmed that the development of this block to rural residential densities could give rise to reverse sensitivity effects associated with the southern freight connection from SH1 and/or SIMTL to I-Zone business park, where Port of Tauranga and Port of Lyttelton have inland ports proposed that will require roading connections and railway sidings either through or in close proximity to the nominated land ▪ Council's Strategic Asset Manager Utilities has confirmed that there is limited wastewater infrastructure in place, with an upgraded sewer line and pumping station being required if the land is identified for inclusion in the Strategy ▪ there is sufficient Living 3 zoned land and land supported for inclusion in the Strategy within Rolleston that better aligns with the Locations Criteria to provide housing choice in the short term than the nominated sites, with on-going monitoring and reviews determining the necessity and appropriateness of additional sites within the suggested 5 year timeframe
S43 R CULLEN	To include the property at 1221 Shands Road (Lot 2 DP 435361) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mr Cullen did not specifically seek Rural Residential zoning for his block of land which, in any case, would be an isolated parcel in an area having Class 11 versatile soils which the District Plan (Rural Volume Policy B1.1.8) seeks to protect. Rather, he sought a more general change to the philosophy behind the strategy. The process is intended to provide the opportunity for interested land owners to nominate their land for inclusion as a potential Rural Residential area. The council must remain consistent with the detailing set down in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement. Among other things, these policy documents require Rural Residential development to be located so that they can be economically provided with a reticulated sewer and water supply integrated with a publicly owned system. Rural Residential areas are expected to be integrated with existing townships and this requires a location proximate to urban areas. ▪ Much of Mr Cullen's submissions require changes that are beyond the scope of the exercise. While we make no particular judgement on their merits they are really directed at higher level policy in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement which the Selwyn District Council has no power to change through this process.
S45 A JOYCE	<p>Supports the inclusion of the land at 59 to 98 Tosswill Road (Lot 1 & Part Lot 2 DP 5464) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p>(NB: this was nominated by S07 G & L Burgess & S28 Pandora Trust & further supported by S35 Prebbleton Community Association)</p>	<p>Accept in par. Reject the inclusion of the land nominated by Pandora Trust (S28) and accept the inclusion of the land nominated by G & L Burgess (S07) for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ The inclusion of the G & L Burgess (S07) is generally consistent with Policy B43.6410 and the "Preferred Growth Area" in Appendix 31 as it aligns with the east-west infill between the township and the electricity pylons and transmission lines (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 24). However, the land nominated by Pandora Trust (S28) extends beneath the pylons and transmission lines further to the east so is arguably not as consistent with this policy (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria). ▪ a portion of the land nominated by Pandora Trust (S28) is an identified contaminated site (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Environmental, Cultural & Heritage Values Location Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 8) ▪ there are springs located on the land nominated by Pandora Trust (S28) that are of significant value to local Runanga, with land on the adjoining eastern boundary having a high groundwater table (refer to

		<p>RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Prebbleton Natural Hazards and Environmental, Cultural and Heritage Values Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 15)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> All of the nominated land to the east of Prebbleton would require geotechnical assessments to determine the appropriateness of development and to determine what level of foundation design is required (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 20). The eastern portion of the Pandora Trust (S28) land is located within the identified 'Liquefaction zone buffer' and there was liquefaction observed in close proximity to the site (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Natural Hazards Location Criteria) it is recommended that the G & L Burgess (S07) block be included in the adopted Strategy as it is consistent with a number of the criteria and avoids the majority of constraints identified to the east of Prebbleton (as identified in the PC 17 analysis). The inclusion of the land has the potential to facilitate the co-ordinated development of the balance of the land to the west, which has a Living Z zone following the Gazetting of the LURP, and the realisation of the Domain extension and integrated stormwater scheme identified in the Structure Plan and Living Z zone outline development plans (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria). The land is subject to a number of constraints, including the electricity transmission lines and pylons, contaminated land, susceptibility to liquefaction and stormwater management and drainage issues. An alternative that has been considered is that the portion of the land contained on the south-western side of the pylons and transmission lines could be included, but this would sever the land holdings and create undersized balance allotments. These are significant constraints. They may be able to be resolved, but we consider that there is sufficient land supported for inclusion in the Strategy within Prebbleton that better aligns with the Locations Criteria to provide housing choice in the short term. If these matters can be resolved then the site may be able to be considered in the next review of the Strategy .
S46 S & Z CROFTS & J WILLIAMS	Include the 4ha parcels at the corner of Hauschilts & Lincoln Tai Tapu Roads (Lots 1 & 2 DP 43671) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> If this land is to be developed for rural residential use a number of significant obstacles must be overcome. It does have a critical advantage in that it need not constitute ribbon development and it has direct internal access to the village centre via School Road. With proper attention to urban design principles it could provide a subtle contribution to the discrete nature of Tai Tapu and maintain its compact form. It could seamlessly integrate with the township, but it faces some difficulty. The most significant constraint is the inability to connect to a reticulated wastewater scheme. Mr Benges solution of a low pressure sewer system incorporating storage tanks and pumping at off peak times into a rising main may provide the solution but as yet that is uncertain. A geotechnical investigation will be required and there is already a risk identified over an area 150 metres from the Halswell River where liquefaction and/or lateral spreading could occur. In addition, the disposal of storm water from the developed site will need careful assessment with adequate storage and appropriate discharge to adjoining land. If these considerable constraints can be overcome, we believe rural residential development of the land could complement the periphery of Tai Tapu. Although these are considerable uncertainties which would have to be addressed at the Plan Stage process, the submitters have shown that rural residential development of this land could complement the township. It is with these significant reservations that we are prepared to recommend that the land be included in the Strategy.
S48 CARTRIDGE	A Include the 4ha parcels at 27 Allendale Lane (Lot 120 DP	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any development of this land would need to demonstrate that no

	<p>329124) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p><u>(NB: this land was also nominated by S32 R Paton & S16 Apton Developments)</u></p>	<p>adverse reverse sensitivity effects would be likely in relation to the wastewater treatment facility. However, we note that the Selwyn District Plan (Policy B 4.3.3 of The Township Volume) seeks to avoid rural land being surrounded by land zoned for living purposes. On the face of it, provided the issues of access and reverse sensitivity are resolved the land is a suitable candidate for rural residential development. Access may well be critical for these properties and public linkage through them to Moir land could well be found to be necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ In the light of the above we recommend retention of these properties in the strategy. We emphasise that selection of these properties simply means that at face value they are potential candidates for a plan change application. Unless the issues outlined above are adequately addressed successful outcome may not be achievable.
S51 A & B GEORGE & E & B JEFFS	<p>Include the 27.3ha of land at 32 & 42 Hamptons Road & 273, 311, 321, 327, 329 & 341 Trices Road (Lots 1 & 2 DP 73583, Pt RS 3122, Lot 1 DP 3896, Lot 1 DP 78905, Lot 1 DP 5284, Lots 1 & 2 DP 360577 & Pt RS 2423) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p><u>(NB: a portion of this land was nominated by S18 M. G & R Crabbe Partnership)</u></p>	<p>Accept the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ These blocks along with the properties to the south extending as far as Hamptons Rd already have a "semi-rural domesticated appearance" which contribute to a satisfying peri urban edge to Prebbleton. It would require strict design controls at the next stage to achieve this to avoid simply creating a large lot residential appearance. ▪ We also note that the site would require geotechnical assessment, and that the availability of services would have to be confirmed. We are satisfied that the partly formed blind end of Hamptons Rd can be made to provide a satisfactory township edge, and that the site would relate well to the other rural residential sites to the east of Birchs Rd and potentially to sites to the north east at Tosswill Rd, although at present there appears to be a gap in that direction. All these issues would require to be examined in more depth at the plan stage. ▪ Council's Strategic Asset Manager Utilities has identified that significant network upgrades for water and wastewater would be required to service the land to the south of Hamptons and Trices Roads. This is a constraint which may affect the timing of this development and should be considered in more depth at the district plan stage.
S52 E & G SMITH & ORS	<p>Include the 43.2ha parcels at 147 & 163 Hamptons Road & 798 Springs Road in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p>	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Council's Strategic Asset Manager Utilities has identified that significant network upgrades for water and wastewater would be required to service the land to the south of Hamptons and Trices Roads ▪ Precluding development to the south of these roads will go some way to protecting the southern gateways to the Township and avoid elongating Prebbleton further south along Springs Road. It will also achieve a strong demarcation between rural and urban forms of development, and in doing so, will protect the rural amenity contrast and outlook valued by the community and expressed in the Prebbleton Structure Plan. Rural residential densities could be utilised as a means to restrict residential sprawl south of Hamptons and Trents Road, to avoid the long term coalescence of Prebbleton with Lincoln to the south. However, there are few limits to growth in the southerly direction, with there being a risk that rural residential densities could significantly undermine the rural amenity contrast and distinction between rural and urban forms, while compromising the productive capacity of rural zoned land (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character and Landscape Values and Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 24) ▪ Trices and Hamptons Road form a relatively strong limit to contain residential and rural residential growth from elongating the urban form further south; with the SDP identifying a need to achieve a concentric consolidated urban form under Policy B4.3.65. I believe further rural residential growth south of Hamptons and Trices Road to be inconsistent with this policy and the "Preferred growth area" included in Appendix 31 of the SDP, with the Conifer Grove block being supported on a preliminary basis for inclusion Strategy as it already comprising a portion of Living 2 zoned land and being contained by Hamptons Road

		<p>to the south (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management Locations Criteria Appendix 2 – Map 24)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Prebbleton has a discrete character and rural outlook, with significant numbers of rural residential development on the southern periphery of the town placing pressure on existing community and infrastructure services and potentially undermining the character of the Township identified in the Prebbleton Structure Plan (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management & Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria) ▪ Council's Asset Manager Transportation has identified a preference that rural residential development does not extend to the south of Hamptons and Trices Roads to avoid any reduction in the safety and efficiency of these roads, which are of strategic importance under the Christchurch Rolleston Environs Transportation Study and will be upgraded to improve local road access onto Stage 2 of the Christchurch Southern Motorway. Anticipated local road upgrades include the formation of roundabouts at the Springs Road and Shands Road intersections of Hamptons Road (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rural Residential Form, Function & Character and Prebbleton Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 24) ▪ The nominated land would require geotechnical assessments to determine the appropriateness of development and to determine what level of foundation design is required (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 20).
S53 MAGINNESS	G	<p>Include the 11.1ha at 354 Perymans Road (Lot 2 DP 459061) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ There are preliminary indications that the Maginness land is physically suited to some rural residential development but, as with the Barker land, we are uncertain about crossing the threshold of Ellesmere Road which could form a strong edge to the future town, at least in the short term. It would be a number of years before urban services could be accessed. ▪ For the above reasons we are not prepared to support the inclusion of the Maginness land at this stage.

<p>S54 STRATFORD ORS</p>	<p>M &</p> <p>Include the 43.8ha parcels at 107, 121, 143 & 147 Blakes Road, 191 Hamptons Road & 631 Shands Road (Lots 1 to 4 DP 81701, RS 37687, Lot 1 DP 52527 & Lot 1 DP 53113) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p>	<p>Accept in part for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ . Accept the inclusion of the parcel of land at 631 Shands Rd only, noting that the submitter withdrew the balance of the land at the hearing. ▪ When we considered this site, we could not see how it differed materially from the Anderson site to the south which has been recommended by the Council for inclusion. If that site is suitable to provide for a peri urban fringe, then we consider this would be similar, and a logical extension of it. ▪ If the balance of the land up to Blakes Rd is to be considered we would observe that issues of urban form might arise. We note that in another case urban design evidence did not favour extending rural residential development all the way along the Shands Rd edge of the town. ▪ Inclusion of the nominated land holdings would be generally consistent with Policy B43.64 and the "Preferred Growth Area" in Appendix 31 as it aligns with the east-west infill between the township and Shands Road. Prebbleton has a discrete character and rural outlook, with significant numbers of rural residential development on the western periphery of the town placing pressure on existing community and infrastructure services and potentially undermining the character of the Township (refer to RRS13 Appendix – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management & Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria) ▪ Council's Asset Manager Transportation has confirmed that access points onto Shands Road will need to be managed to avoid any reduction in the safety and efficiency of this road, which is of strategic importance under the Christchurch Rolleston Environs Transportation Study and will be upgraded to improve local road access onto Stage 2 of the Christchurch Southern Motorway (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Urban Form & Growth Management and Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 24) ▪ Council's Strategic Asset Manager Utilities has identified that significant network upgrades for water and wastewater would be required to service the land to the west of the existing township, which would have to be factored into Council's infrastructure works programme (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Prebbleton Strategic Infrastructure Locations Criteria) ▪ The nominated land would require geotechnical assessments to determine the appropriateness of development and to determine what level of foundation design is required (refer to RRS13 Appendix 2 – Map 20). ▪ While we acknowledge there are difficulties we are prepared to recommend the Stratford land as a potential candidate for rural residential development in the Rural Residential Strategy alongside the Anderson block to the south of it. Again, we emphasise that selection of this land for the strategy does not assume a successful outcome through the plan change process.
<p>S55 J PATON</p>	<p>Include the 84.8ha parcels at 15, 25, 77, 93, 97 & 139 Two Chain Road (Lots 1 & 2 DP 27804, Lots 1, 2, 5 & 6 DP 33996, Lots 1 to 3 DP 305466 & Lot 2 DP 33396) in the adopted Strategy for the reasons stated in the submission</p> <p><u>NB: this land was also nominated by S31 R Paton & S42 Pinedale Holdings & Kintyre Holdings and S31 R Paton</u></p>	<p>Reject the inclusion of the nominated land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ although the land is contained within a definitive road boundary, the extended length of this area may contribute to 'ribbon' development along SH1 south as far as Dunns Crossing Road, which is recognised as the southern gateway to Rolleston (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 28) ▪ Inclusion of the land may give rise to potentially adverse reverse sensitivity effects that could compromise strategic infrastructure and assets, including specifically the operation of SH1, the South Island Main Trunk Line (SIMTL), I-Zone Business Park and Rolleston Prison. This has occurred in Armack Drive, which is an established rural residential node on the southern periphery of the I-Zone business park, where complaints relating to nuisance effects associated with the railway siding and other activities taking place within I-Zone creating amenity conflicts and reverse sensitivity effects (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Rolleston Urban Form and Growth

		<p>Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Maps 15 & 28)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> although the location appears close geographically it is relatively severed from Rolleston, with the SH1 and SIMTL corridor presenting a barrier to achieving an integrated and well-connected rural residential node when compared to alternative locations that directly adjoin the township boundary – future upgrades to the connection point at SH1 and Rolleston Drive are anticipated in the longer term, but are unlikely to reduce the distance having to be travelled between the site and the town centre. There are no alternative connection points in reasonably close proximity to the site other than Dunns Crossing Road, which would be no closer to the town centre or other community facilities (such as schools, libraries or open space reserves) than the Rolleston Drive connection. Increased vehicle numbers using this intersection is likely to reduce the safety and efficiency of SH1 (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2- Map 28). Inclusion of the land would be inconsistent with several of the Rural Residential Locations Criteria in Appendix 1 of the RRS13, including some of constraints listed in Chapter 6 – potential to adversely affect strategic infrastructure, fails to directly adjoin residential priority areas or Living zoned land as it is severed by SH 1 and is inconsistent with Policy B4.3.71 of the SDP in respect to avoiding Living zones (which include potential Living 3 zones) from establishing west of SH 1 and the SIMTL (refer to RRS13 Appendix 1 – Chapter 6 and Rolleston Urban Form and Growth Management Locations Criteria and Appendix 2 – Map 28) Council's Asset Manager Transportation has also confirmed that the development of this block to rural residential densities could give rise to reverse sensitivity effects associated with the southern freight connection from SH1 and/or SIMTL to I-Zone business park, where Port of Tauranga and Port of Lyttelton have inland ports proposed that will require roading connections and railway sidings either through or in close proximity to the nominated land Council's Strategic Asset Manager Utilities has confirmed that there is limited wastewater infrastructure in place, with an upgraded sewer line and pumping station being required if the land is identified for inclusion in the Strategy there is sufficient Living 3 zoned land and land supported for inclusion in the Strategy within Rolleston that better aligns with the Locations Criteria to provide housing choice in the short term than the nominated sites, with on-going monitoring and reviews determining the necessity and appropriateness of additional sites within the suggested 5 year timeframe
--	--	--

8. RURAL RESIDENTIAL STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION METHODS		
Submitter	Summary of relief sought	Panel recommendation
S06 D & S ANDERSON	The hearing and determination of PC41 should proceed immediately now that the site has been recognised in the RRS13	Reject This relief is no longer relevant. However we would not accept it in any case as we do not believe the matter is of such urgency that the normal RMA process should not apply. The connection to earthquake recovery is tenuous given that no rural residential land was lost.
S08 M LARSON & ORS	Rezone additional residential land in Prebbleton and amend the reference in Appendix 1 Map 24 from "Preferred urban form" to "Greenfield Priority Area –Residential" (<u>Amendment 1</u>).	Reject - The amended wording is misleading as the area is clearly not a "Greenfield Priority Area – Residential" as that term is defined in Chapter 6 of the RPS.
	Remove the reference to the obvious residential growth path being "long term" (<u>Amendment 2</u>)	Reject – the phrase 'long term' was purposefully chosen to reflect the 15 year planning period of the LURP. The removal of this reference reduces the strength and intent of the Map reference and related Locations criteria
	Request Council to initiate changes to Chapter 6	Reject - The ability to rezone of residential land is clearly

	and the SDP via the CER Act	beyond the scope of this process and while we could make a recommendation to this effect we are unwilling to do so as we heard no evidence analysing this matter. It would require a much more careful analysis under the RMA than we are in a position to carry out.
S09 M & B CLAXTON	Recommend amending the lot size range in the Rural residential form, function and character Locations Criteria in Appendix 1 of the RRS13 (<u>Amendment 13</u>)	Accept – Accept in part - generally reflects the section size analysis identified in Section 3 of the RRS13, although the minimum size is 0.3 ha and has been reduced to 0.2 ha in limited circumstances.
S10 DENWOODS TRUSTEE	Council recommend to the Minister that PC28 is made operative as part of Action 18 of the LURP.	Reject – We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
	Remove the Intensive Farming Activity and buffer west of RRS13 Area 5 (<u>Amendment 4</u>)	Accept – Evidence was given that the intensive farming activity on the adjoining site ceased in 2009.
	Amend Paragraphs 6.1 & 6.2 of the RRS13 (<u>Amendments 5 & 6</u>)	Accept – These changes are consistent with the submitters relief and officer recommendation to retain Area 5 in the adopted Strategy
	Various amendments to Section 6 of the RRS13 to update information relating to PC28 (<u>Amendments 7 to 10</u>)	Reject – These amendment will pre-empt the consideration of PC28. The level of information in the Strategy should be more general in nature with detailed design, mitigation measures and effects based assessments best considered under the plan change process.
S12 B & M COLES FAMILY TRUST	Amend the wording in the adopted Strategy in respect to all references to the locations to confirm that they are "preferred" rather than "preliminary" (<u>Amendment 11</u>)	Accept– These changes are be consistent with the status of the strategy document.
	Amend Paragraphs 6.1 & 6.2 of the RRS13 (<u>Amendments 5 & 6</u>)	Accept – These changes are consistent with the submitters relief and Officer recommendation to retain Area 5 in the adopted Strategy
	Various amendments to Section 6 of the RRS13 to update information relating to the private plan change attached as Annexure B of the submission (<u>Amendment 12</u>)	Reject – Inclusion of this information will pre-empt the consideration of PC 28. The level of information contained in the adopted Strategy should be general in nature, with detailed design, mitigation measures and effects based assessments best considered under the 1st schedule private plan change process
	Recommend amending the lot size range in the Rural residential form, function and character Locations Criteria in Appendix 1 of the RRS13 (<u>Amendment 13</u>)	Accept in part - generally reflects the section size analysis identified in Section 3 of the RRS13, although the minimum size is 0.3 ha has been reduced to 0.2 ha in limited circumstances.
	Council recommend to the Minister that PC28 is made operative as part of	Reject – We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim.

	Action 18 of the LURP.	The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
S13 M & J AUSTIN	SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13	Reject – The site is not recommended for inclusion in the Strategy. In any case we think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
S16 APTON DEVELOPMENTS LTD	SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action 18	Reject – We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
	Exempt proposals involving three or less properties from the rezoning process (to be considered via	Reject – The LURP does not allow sub-four hectare subdivisions in the Rural (Inner Plains) zone. Policy B 41.1

	subdivision processes only)	has amended the wording from “discourage” to “avoid” such subdivisions. Apart from that, a change to the District Plan would be required which is beyond the scope of this exercise.
S18 CRABBE PARTNERSHIP	SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action 18; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13	Reject – We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where ‘like’ is to be replaced with ‘like’. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
	Exempt proposals involving three or less properties from the rezoning process (to be considered via subdivision processes only)	Reject – The LURP does not allow sub-four hectare subdivisions in the Rural (Inner Plains) zone. Policy B 41.1 has amended the wording from “discourage” to “avoid” such subdivisions. Apart from that, a change to the District Plan would be required which is beyond the scope of this exercise.
S20 CONIFER GROVE TRUSTEES	SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action 18	Reject – We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where ‘like’ is to be replaced with ‘like’. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
	Context of the RRS13 needs changing, Area 4 should be referenced as a ‘preferred’ rather than ‘preliminary’ location (<u>Amendment 11</u>)	Accept in part – These changes would be consistent with the strategy document and our recommendation in relation to Area 4.
S28 PANDORA TRUST	SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13	Reject – The site is not recommended for inclusion in the Strategy. In any case we think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where ‘like’ is to be replaced with ‘like’. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy

		Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
S33 R BARKER & ORS	SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13	Reject – The site is not recommended for inclusion in the Strategy. In any case we think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
S34 MINISTRY OF EDUCATION	Reference all of the designated schools in the Rural Residential Location Criteria in Appendix 1 of the adopted Rural Residential Strategy (Amendment 14)	Accept – Identifying all designated schools is necessary as rural residential development may impact on urban as well as rural schools
S35 PREBBLETON COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION	Request that the title of Map 24 in Appendix 1 is amended to make a more definitive reference to the future growth path, which is a logical area for future expansion of the urban environment (<u>Amendment 3</u>)	Reject - Amended the reference could be misleading as the area is not a "Greenfield Priority Area – Residential" in Chapter 6, with future reviews (of the LURP/Chapter 6/ Prebbleton Structure Plan/SDP) determining if and when and it may be appropriate for urban development
	Council recommend to the Minister that Area 3 and 4 in Prebbleton are rezoned made operative as part of Action 18 of the LURP.	Reject – We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the

		strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
S36 DRYDEN TRUST	Recommend amending the lot size range in the Rural residential form, function and character Locations Criteria in Appendix 1 of the RRS13 (<u>Amendment 13</u>)	Accept in part - generally reflects the section size analysis identified in Section 3 of the RRS13, although the minimum size is 0.3 ha has been reduced to 0.2 ha in limited circumstances.
	Amend the 'Rural residential character elements' listed on P33 to reference 'future proofed' development and reduce the front building setback from 15m to 20m to 7m to 8m (<u>Amendment 15</u>). Amend the general criteria under 'Rural residential form, function and character' to facilitate 'future proofed' development in obvious future residential growth paths (<u>Amendment 16</u>).	Accept – The Amendment is consistent with recommendations we have made to accept future proofing and to allow for reduced setbacks where this is necessary to achieve a workable roading pattern.
	Insert a 'Monitoring and review' section into the adopted Strategy (<u>Amendment 17</u>)	Accept – It is important to establish the methods for monitoring the uptake and development of rural residential land to quantify when additional land may be needed via a Rural Residential Strategy review process
	SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13	Reject – The necessity for future proofing means that this case requires much more detailed preparation of provisions and assessment than simply rezoning the land. .In any case we think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
S37 TRENTS ROAD DEVELOPMENTS	Insert a 'Monitoring and review' section into the adopted Strategy (<u>Amendment 17</u>)	Accept – It is important to establish the methods for monitoring the uptake and development of rural residential land to quantify when additional land may be needed via a Rural Residential Strategy review process
	SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13	Reject – Reject – The necessity for future proofing means that this case requires much more detailed preparation of provisions and assessment than simply rezoning the land. We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very

		<p>little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.</p>
	<p>Rezone additional residential land in Prebbleton and amend the reference in Appendix 1 Map 24 from "Preferred urban form" to "Prebbleton preferred urban form – priority residential growth area" (Amendment 3).</p>	<p>Reject - Amended the wording could be misleading as the area is not a "Greenfield Priority Area – Residential" in Chapter 6, with future reviews (of the LURP/ Chapter 6/Prebbleton Structure Plan/SDP) determining if and when and it may be appropriate for urban development.</p>
	<p>Remove the reference to the obvious residential growth path being "long term" (Amendment 2)</p>	<p>Reject – the phrase 'long term' was purposefully chosen to reflect the 15 year planning period of the LURP. The removal of this reference reduces the strength and intent of the Map reference and related Locations criteria.</p>
	<p>Amend the general criteria under 'Rural residential form, function and character' to facilitate 'future proofed' development in obvious future residential growth paths (Amendment 16).</p>	<p>Accept – The Amendment is consistent with recommendations we have made to accept future proofing.</p>
S38 SURVUS CONSULTANTS	<p>SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13</p>	<p>Reject – We do not recommend the inclusion of this land in the Strategy at this time, nor do we recommend the use of an accelerated process.</p>
S40 B HARRINGTON	<p>SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13</p>	<p>Reject – We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.</p>
S41 PINEDALE ENTERPRISES & KINTYRE PACIFIC HOLDINGS	<p>SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13</p>	<p>Reject – We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement</p>

		<p>on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.</p>
	Insert a 'Monitoring and review' section into the adopted Strategy (Amendment 17)	Accept – It is important to establish a method of monitoring the uptake of rural residential land and its development in order determine when more land will be needed. It may then be found to be necessary to renew the Rural Residential Strategy.
S45 A JOYCE	Investigate if the rural elements of a rural residential zone is actually meeting the requirements of land owners	Accept – Monitoring needs to be undertaken to establish whether the expectations of land owners are being met and that the form, function and character of rural residential environments are appropriate and that this form of development is sustainable to inform future Rural Residential reviews
S46 S & Z CROFTS & J WILLIAMS	SDC recommend that the land identified in the submission is rezoned without further public process under Action; or a streamlined process be adopted that allows for public consultation on rural residential locations that were not included in the RRS13	Reject – We think that the justification for such measures in the case of Rural Residential Development is very slim. The purpose of an accelerated process is to provide a rapid solution to the destruction of the (largely) urban housing stock of Christchurch. It has been applied to a situation where 'like' is to be replaced with 'like'. While the provision of limited rural residential properties is included in the LURP and Chapter 6 of the Regional Policy Statement on the basis of providing some choice of living styles, very little if any of the present stock has been lost to earthquake damage. During the submission process, three sites were nominated for accelerated process but we received no supporting evidence for this. Additionally, although the process of the Rural Development Strategy under the local Government Act has involved some public submission, unlike the situation with Resource Management Act procedures, there is no provision for further submission and no appeal right. Many potentially affected parties will have had no opportunity to participate. If sites chosen in the strategy are to be put into the District Plan without further public process we think that would be unjust.
S49 LINCOLN UNIVERSITY, NZ PLANT & FOOD & AGRESEARCH	Insert additional wording in the body of the RRS13 and Appendix 1 to recognise the potential reverse sensitivity effects on agricultural research farms (Amendments 18 to 20)	Accept – the additional wording explicitly recognises potentially adverse reverse sensitivity effects on agricultural research farms. Specific references to the tertiary and research activities within the adopted Strategy would be consistent with the constraints criteria identified in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 and the SDP.
S50 TE TAUMUTU RŪNUNGA	That Council does not rely on private plan change to rezone rural residential land as it fails to provide Runanga with sufficient opportunity to inform the proposal, including the preparation of outline development plans (Amendment 21)	Accept in part - alternative processes should be progressed further to encourage private plan change proponents to actively engage with Runanga when preparing rezoning proposals so that cultural values can be identified, protected and/or enhanced. Methods to achieve this have been included in the new Implementation chapter which we have recommended be included. Council is unlikely to initiate the rezoning of land for rural residential development because it is not the same priority as facilitating the provision of residential land and the associated costs cannot be justified.

	Amend the Locations in Appendix 1 of the RRS13 entitled 'Chapter 6 of the CRPS (LURP)' to ensure there is explicit recognition of taonga and cultural associations in rural residential development to support the well-being of tangata whenua (<u>Amendments 22 & 23</u>)	Accept – the amendments explicitly recognise Runanga values that need to be considered when identifying appropriate sites for rural residential development and the matters that need to be addressed in any related rezoning proposals. These amendments also ensure that the references to Runanga values in the Strategy are consistent with other planning instruments, including the LURP and Chapter 6.
	Amend the Locations in Appendix 1 of the RRS13 entitled 'Landscape values' to ensure there is explicit recognition of taonga and cultural associations in rural residential development to support the well-being of tangata whenua (<u>Amendment 24</u>)	Accept – the amendment explicitly recognises Runanga values that need to be considered when identifying appropriate sites for rural residential development and the matters that need to be addressed in any related rezoning proposals. These amendments also ensure that the references to Runanga values in the Strategy are consistent with other planning instruments, including the LURP and Chapter 6.
	Amend the categorisation of the identified Locations Criteria in Appendix 1 to explicitly recognise taonga and cultural associations in rural residential development to support the well-being of tangata whenua (<u>Amendment 25</u>)	Accept – the amended categorisation better recognises the Runanga values that need to be considered when identifying appropriate sites for rural residential development and the matters that need to be addressed in any related rezoning proposals. These amendments also ensure that the references to Runanga values in the Strategy are consistent with other planning instruments, including the LURP and Chapter 6.

Attachment 2

Recommended Amendments to the text of the Strategy

Attachment 2

Recommended Amendments to the text of the Strategy

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
1	S10 Denwood Trustees	Clause 3.220 Amendment 4	Amend Appendix 2 Maps 5 and 26 to remove the Intensive Farming Activity and the Site Buffer West of RRS 13 Area 5. Note: This can be achieved by amending the Council's GIS to this effect which will result in these notations being removed automatically.
2	S10 Denwood Trustees S20 Conifer Grove Trustees	Clause 3.222 & 3.229 Amendment 5	Amend Clause 6.1 as follows; The following rural residential areas have been identified by Council on a preliminary basis as <u>suitable locations for rural residential subdivision, subject to the sites being confirmed through District Plan amendments under the Resource Management Act, as a starting point to inform the consultation and comments phase of the Rural Residential Strategy process. Comments on this consultation draft are likely to include the nomination of additional alternative locations from land owners who have aspirations to develop their land to a Living</u>
3	S10 Denwood Trustees S20 Conifer Grove Trustees	Amendment 6 Clause 3.222 & 3.229	Amend paragraph 6.2 as follows Council has identified seven <u>The identified</u> rural residential locations that satisfy the following pre-requisites: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ can be economically serviced with reticulated water and wastewater services ▪ is able to be integrated with established Townships ▪ does not significantly undermine the urban consolidation and intensification principles of the LURP, Chapter 6 of the CRPS, SDP or RRS14 ▪ is not affected by any significant constraints ▪ is owned by parties who have aspirations to rezone the land

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment										
4	S12 Coles Family Trust and S20 Conifer Grove Trustees	Clause 3.225 Amendment 11	Amend the context of the Strategy from a consultation draft to an adopted Strategy, wherever applicable.										
5	S12 Coles Family Trust S09 M 7 B Claxton S36 Dryden Trust	Clause 3.234 Amendment 13	Amend Appendix 1, Location Criteria, Rural Residential form, function and character, the lot size reference as follows; Support locations that can sustain a mixture of housing densities <u>generally</u> ranging from 0.3ha to 2ha in size whilst achieving an overall density of 1 to 2hh/ha, but where the overall area supports sustainable enclaves in respect to the overall number of households to enable the anticipated rural residential form, function and character to be achieved. <u>In some circumstances small numbers of lots in the 0.2-0.3 ha range may be appropriate having regard to the particular characteristics of the site and immediate environs, for example where clustering is appropriate or as a ‘transition’ at the boundary with urban residential development.</u>										
6	S34 Ministry of Education	Clause 3.236 Amendment 14	Amend each of the respective Study Area criteria in Appendix 1 to include all designated schools, as follows <table><tr><td>Rolleston Study Area:</td><td>Rolleston Primary School (ME10) and Clearview School ME11)</td></tr><tr><td>Lincoln Study Area:</td><td>Lincoln Primary & Secondary Schools (ME8) & Springston School (ME14)</td></tr><tr><td>Prebbleton Study Area:</td><td>Prebbleton School (ME 9)</td></tr><tr><td>West Melton Study Area</td><td>West Melton School (ME16)</td></tr><tr><td>Tai Tapu Study Area:</td><td>Tai Tapu School (Me 15)</td></tr></table>	Rolleston Study Area:	Rolleston Primary School (ME10) and Clearview School ME11)	Lincoln Study Area:	Lincoln Primary & Secondary Schools (ME8) & Springston School (ME14)	Prebbleton Study Area:	Prebbleton School (ME 9)	West Melton Study Area	West Melton School (ME16)	Tai Tapu Study Area:	Tai Tapu School (Me 15)
Rolleston Study Area:	Rolleston Primary School (ME10) and Clearview School ME11)												
Lincoln Study Area:	Lincoln Primary & Secondary Schools (ME8) & Springston School (ME14)												
Prebbleton Study Area:	Prebbleton School (ME 9)												
West Melton Study Area	West Melton School (ME16)												
Tai Tapu Study Area:	Tai Tapu School (Me 15)												

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment	
			Springston Study Area	Lincoln Primary & Secondary Schools (ME8) & Springston School (ME14)
7	S36 Dryden Trust and S37 Trents Rd Developments	Clause 3.240 Amendment 15	<p>Amend the second bullet point of the Rural Residential Character Elements discussion on Page 33 of the Strategy as follows</p> <p><u>“Buildings that are well set back from road frontages (15m to 20m) to provide a sense of open space and promote an open semi-rural street environment, except in cases where the area is ‘future proofed’ for possible future full urban development if and when rezoning permits this. In such cases, a lesser front yard of around 7-8m may be appropriate for some lots, taking into account the character of possible future urban development and the ability to achieve an open street environment through other means such as ‘open style’ fencing design and landscaping, and the overall higher level of certainty regarding the overall street scene due to identification of building platforms on the ODP.”</u></p>	
8	S36 Dryden Trust and S37 Trents Rd Developments	Clause 3.240 Amendment 16	<p>Amend the general criteria under “Rural residential form function and character (in Appendix 1) as follows:</p> <p><u>Avoid locations that are obvious growth paths except where legal mechanisms exist to ensure that rural residential development does not impede future development of such areas once rezoned to a living or other urban zone to achieve urban densities in accordance with an agreed ODP and to ensure that purchasers of rural residential lots are aware of this requirement.</u></p>	
9	N/A	N/A	Insert a new Implementation Section into the Strategy as set out in Attachment 3.	
10	S36 Dryden Trust, S37 Trents Rd Developments, and S41 Pinedale and Kintyre Pacific Holdings	Clause 3.244 Amendment 17	Insert a Monitoring and Review Section into the Strategy as set out in Attachment 4	

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
11	S49 Lincoln University	Clause 3.246 Amendment 18	Insert the term “ <u>Tertiary Education and Research Activities</u> ” after the words “rural industry” into the 2 nd bullet point of the table entitled “Issues Attributable to rural residential forms of development” on page 27.
12	S49 Lincoln University	Clause 3.246 Amendment 19	Insert the term “ <u>Tertiary Education and Research Activities</u> ” after the words “rural land uses” into the 9 th bullet point of the table entitled “Benefits of the peri urban rural form” on pages 30 and 31.
13	S49 Lincoln University	Clause 3.246 Amendment 20	Include an additional criteria in Appendix 1 Lincoln Environs Study Area Criteria under “Urban Form and growth management” as follows “ <u>Avoid locations which may result in reverse sensitivity effects on tertiary education and research activities</u> ”.
14	Te Taumutu Runanga	Clause 3.255 Amendment 22-24	Amend references to Ngai Tahu values in Appendix 1 entitled “Chapter 6 of the CRPS (LURP) as follows Not significantly adversely affect <u>Support the protection and enhancement of ancestral land....</u> Amend references to Ngai Tahu values in Appendix 1 entitled “Chapter 6 of the CRPS (LURP) as follows Avoid adverse effects on existing surface -water quality <u>and quantity</u> of surface water <u>including drains and water/stock races and groundwater</u> Amend references to Ngai Tahu values in Appendix 1 entitled “Landscape values” as follows “ <u>Protection, enhancement and restoration of indigenous flora and fauna, in particular mahinga kai species, cultural landscapes, natural features....</u> ”
15	Te Taumutu Runanga	Clause 3.257 Amendment 25	Amend categorization of issues of cultural importance from yellow to red as set out in Clause 3.257 of the officer’s Report.

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment		
16	N/A	N/A	Amend heading to Clause 6.20 on page 51 as follows <u>Preliminary-rural Rural -residential areas</u>		
17			Amend Figure 25 on page 51 to include the additional sites recommended in this report.		
18	Various		Amend Table 4 on page 52 to include the following additional sites		
			<u>Area</u> (note Council may substitute Area numbers for these names)	<u>Description</u>	<u>Possible yield</u>
			A. <u>Dryden Trust</u>	<u>rural land on the south-eastern boundary of Rolleston</u>	<u>72</u>
			B. <u>Trents Development</u>	<u>rural land on the western boundary of Prebbleton</u>	<u>44</u>
			C. <u>Stratford (part of submission area as reduced at hearing)</u>	<u>rural land on the western boundary of Prebbleton</u>	<u>31</u>
			D. <u>Crabbe Partnership & George and Jeffs</u>	<u>Rural residential land on the south eastern boundary of Prebbleton</u>	<u>54</u>
			E. <u>Burgess</u>	<u>Rural land on the eastern boundary of Prebbleton</u>	<u>44</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment		
			<u>F. Crofts and Williams</u>	<u>Rural land on the western boundary of Tai Tapu</u>	<u>16</u>
			<u>G. Moir</u>	<u>Rural residential land on the south eastern boundary of Prebbleton</u>	<u>26</u>
			<u>H. Harrington</u>	<u>Rural residential land on the south eastern boundary of Prebbleton</u>	<u>1</u>
			<u>I. Apton Developments and Cartridge</u>	<u>Rural residential land on the southern boundary of Prebbleton</u>	<u>12</u>
19	Various		Insert aerial photographs and zoning maps for each of the additional recommended sites in the appropriate place within Section 6.		
20	S36 Dryden Trust	Clause 3.129	<p>Insert the following after Paragraph 6.31 at page 55:</p> <p><u>Site description</u> <u>Area A encompasses a single parcel of land at Springston Rolleston Road. The property is legally described as Lot 1 DP 305373.</u></p> <p><u>The 36.22 ha land holding is currently utilised for agricultural purposes as a dairy 'run off' block. Area A is zoned Rural (Inner Plains) and is bordered by 4ha rural lifestyle blocks to the north (at the time of writing zoned Living Z Deferred with the deferment to be lifted as soon as an approved ODP is included in the District Plan), rural activities to the east made up of 4ha (approximate) landholdings, rural activities to the south and west with residential activities further to the west (Farrington development).</u></p> <p><u>The property accommodates a woolshed and associated yards. Area A is located within the Projected Infrastructure Boundary established</u></p>		

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>under the LURP, and is within the projected urban growth area in the Rolleston Structure Plan.</u></p> <p><u>Potential yield</u> <u>The land holding can sustain approximately 75 rural residential sections.</u> <u>Discussion</u></p> <p><u>The following efficiencies and benefits are considered relevant to the Area A:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Sub-regional guidance – LURP/Chapter 6 to the CRPS</u> <u>The land holding is outside the Township boundary, but adjoins the Living Z Deferred Zone to the north (the deferred status is to be removed as soon as an approved ODP for this area is included in the District Plan) and the Living Z zone across Springston Rolleston Road which ensures the rural residential node is consolidated with the existing Township.</u> ▪ <u>Avoids the majority of the sub-regional constraints outlined in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of CRPS.</u> ▪ <u>The site adjoins small rural lifestyle and rural residential blocks to the west and east, and appropriate treatment along the southern boundary with an existing dairy 'run off' block (larger sections, dwelling setbacks, buffer landscaping etc.) will avoid any potential for reverse sensitivity effects with adjoining land.</u> ▪ <u>Adjoins the Living Z Deferred Zone to the north (the deferment is not in relation to servicing constraints) and Living 2A (1 ha) and Living Z Farringdon residential areas to the west which ensures the site can be economically provided with reticulated water and wastewater.</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The Area is located within a future long term growth path identified in the Rolleston Structure Plan (for the period 2041-2075). A 'future proofed' rural residential subdivision design is required to protect the future growth path, ensuring that the site can be intensified to urban densities in an integrated and comprehensive as set out in the Rolleston Structure Plan, if this is required at some future date for the further expansion of Rolleston.</u> <p><u>Rural residential form, function and character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site enables rural residential development to be consolidated with the urban form of Rolleston, and can support a mix of housing densities, while achieving an overall density of 1-2 hh/ha.</u> ▪ <u>There is likely to be sufficient capacity within the Council's roading and community water and sewerage network to service the Area.</u> <p><u>Landscape values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site has discernible boundaries created by existing roads and living zonings to the west and north and boundary shelter belt planting to the east. The ODP and site design can ensure appropriate boundary treatments and strengthening of the rural/rural residential boundary with rural land to the east and south.</u> ▪ <u>The containment of rural residential activities within this area provides the opportunity to secure a demarcation between rural and urban forms of development. There is no risk of coalescence with other townships as the site is within the long term future growth path for Rolleston.</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The design and layout of the development block should include design elements which protect and build on existing landscape features viewshafts and existing shelterbelts and planting.</u> ▪ <u>The site location and characteristics enables site specific layouts, design controls and interface treatments to achieve the necessary degree of 'ruralness', 'openness' and rural residential character.</u> ▪ <u>The site can accommodate approximately 75 rural residential lots which is an appropriate sized rural residential 'node' for this location given the large scale of adjoining residential developments; and because Rolleston is a Key Activity Centre intended to be self- sustaining and become a substantial town over time.</u> <p><u>Rolleston environs study area guidance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site's location adjoining the Township boundary supports a rural residential node that is able to integrate with the existing settlement pattern.</u> ▪ <u>Rolleston has capacity to support an increased population base as it is an identified Key Activity Centre that has the community infrastructure, services and business areas to support a large self-sustaining community.</u> ▪ <u>This proximity presents an opportunity to achieve strong connections between the rural residential node and Rolleston, including the necessary access to education facilities, shopping centres, employment opportunities, community facilities, public transport connections and other services.</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site is not subject to any identified high groundwater, natural hazards, potentially contaminated sites, protected trees, cultural sites, heritage sites or sites of ecological value and there are no significant servicing constraints.</u> ▪ <u>Avoids any identified Significant Natural Areas, Intensive Farming Activities, strategic infrastructure and designated sites.</u> ▪ <u>Additional site specific assessments will be required to confirm the presence of any potentially contaminated soils associated with the historic farm use. In addition.</u> ▪ <u>The site is comprised of Class 2 and 3 versatile soils, but its location within the long term future growth path for Rolleston indicates this is not a constraint to residential development.</u>
21	S37 Trents Rd Developments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 	<p>Insert the following after Paragraph 6.58 at page 50</p> <p><u>Site description</u></p> <p><u>Area B is located to the west of Prebbleton. Area B encompasses three parcels of land that have a physical address of 232 Hamptons Road and 340 Trents Road, Prebbleton. The properties are legally described as Lot 2 DP 25129, Lot 2 DP 42643 and Lot 2 DP 4150512.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The 22.315ha land holding is currently utilised for small scale agricultural purposes. Area B is zoned Rural (Inner Plains) and is bordered by 1.5 - 8ha rural lifestyle blocks to the east and west, Kingcraft Development Area (10 lots with a minimum of 1ha lots) across Trent's Road to the north, and rural activities (zoned Rural Inner Plains) to the south.</u></p> <p><u>The property accommodates two residential dwellings and associated curtilage. Area B is located within the Preferred Urban Form identified on Map 24 of the RRS13.</u></p> <p><u>Potential yield</u></p> <p><u>The land holding can sustain approximately 35 rural residential sections.</u></p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p><u>The following efficiencies and benefits are considered relevant to the Area B:</u></p> <p><u>Sub-regional guidance – LURP/Chapter 6 to the CRPS</u></p> <p><u>The land holding is outside the Township boundary, and although not immediately adjoining a living zone, the Site is located within 200-300m of the Living Z Zone on the eastern side of Springs Road, and adjoins the Kingcraft EDA zone to the north (across Trices Road).</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>Avoids the sub-regional constraints outlined in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of CRPS.</u></p> <p><u>The Site is located outside any identified geotechnical or flooding zone.</u></p> <p><u>The Area is located within the Preferred Urban form identified on Map 24. A 'future proofed' rural residential subdivision design is proposed to protect the future growth path, ensuring that the site can be intensified to urban densities in an integrated and comprehensive manner, if this is required at some future date for the further expansion of Prebbleton.</u></p> <p><u>Rural residential form, function and character</u></p> <p><u>The site enables rural residential development to be consolidated with the urban form of Prebbleton.</u></p> <p><u>The risk of ribbon development occurring along Trents or Hamptons Roads is reduced as Area B is located on the eastern side of Shands Road. Shands Road provides a definitive boundary to residential or rural residential growth west of Prebbleton.</u></p> <p><u>The development block represents a small node with appropriate boundary treatments to be established.</u></p> <p><u>The Area avoids reverse sensitivity effects and the urban form of Prebbleton coalescing with Lincoln to the south and Christchurch City to the north.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The ability for Area B to integrate with the existing settlement pattern will assist in achieving the Preferred Urban Form as set out by Map 24. Area B is 1.5 km from the township centre.</u></p> <p><u>The Council's roading and community water and sewerage network may need to be upgraded to service the area, in which case development may need to be deferred until that has occurred.</u></p> <p><u>The Area avoids any strategic infrastructure established on the periphery of Prebbleton.</u></p> <p><u>Landscape values</u></p> <p><u>The site location and characteristics, including the small scale of the node, enables site specific layouts, design controls and interface treatments to achieve the necessary degree of 'ruralness', 'openness' and rural residential character.</u></p> <p><u>The site is contained by discernible boundaries, formed by existing roads and land use characteristics, which includes strategic roads and the Kingcraft Drive established low density living environment.</u></p> <p><u>District Plan Guidance</u></p> <p><u>The loss of rural character and amenity has been reduced as the area can be consolidated with the urban form of Prebbleton, which also reduces the potential for adverse reverse sensitivity effects with strategic infrastructure and productive rural land uses.</u></p> <p><u>Prebbleton environs study area guidance</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The site's location in close proximity to the Township boundary supports a rural residential node that is able to integrate with the existing settlement pattern.</u></p> <p><u>The site is within the Preferred Urban Form area for Prebbleton. The requirement for the site to be 'future proofed' to provide for intensification to urban densities for possible future expansion of Prebbleton will protect this future urban expansion option</u></p> <p><u>The location avoids the sensitive rural interface between Prebbleton and Christchurch City to the north</u></p> <p><u>The site is not subject to any identified natural hazard, potentially contaminated sites, Protected Trees, cultural sites, heritage sites or sites of ecological value and there are no significant servicing constraints.</u></p> <p><u>Area B assists in achieving the long term compact concentric urban form of the Township by supporting growth west of Springs Road.</u></p> <p><u>The Area avoids any identified Significant Natural Areas, intensive farming activities, designated sites or any other strategic infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>Part of the site is comprised of Class 2 versatile soils, but its location within the Preferred Urban Form for Prebbleton indicates this is not a constraint to rural residential development.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
22	S54 Stratford	Clause 3.166	<p>Insert the following after Paragraph 6.58 at page 50</p> <p><u>Site description</u> <u>Preliminary Area C is located to the west of Prebbleton. Area C encompasses has a physical address of 631 Shands Rd, Prebbleton. The property is legally described as Lot 1 DP 53115.</u></p> <p><u>The 15.99ha land holding is currently utilised for small scale agricultural purposes. Area C is zoned Rural (Inner Plains) and is bordered by Area 3 to the south, Kingcraft Development Area (10 lots with a minimum of 1ha lots) to the east, and rural activities (zoned Rural Inner Plains) to the north.</u></p> <p><u>The property accommodates a residential dwellings and associated curtilage. Area C is located within the Preferred Urban Form identified on Map 24 of the RRS13.</u></p> <p><u>Potential yield</u> <u>The land holding can sustain approximately 31 rural residential sections.</u></p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p><u>The following efficiencies and benefits are considered relevant to the Area C:</u></p> <p><u>Sub-regional guidance – LURP/Chapter 6 to the CRPS</u> <u>The land holding is outside the Township boundary, and although not immediately adjoining a living zone, the Site is located within 700-800m of the Living Z Zone on the western side of Springs Road, and adjoins the Kingcraft EDA zone to east and Area 3 to the south.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Avoids the sub-regional constraints outlined in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of CRPS.</u> ▪ <u>The Site can be economically provided with reticulated water and wastewater if developed together with or after Area 3.</u> ▪ <u>The Site is located outside any identified geotechnical or flooding zone.</u> ▪ <u>The Area is located at the edge of the Preferred Urban form identified on Map 24. A 'future proofed' rural residential subdivision design may be considered to protect the future growth path, ensuring that the site can be intensified to urban densities in an integrated and comprehensive manner, if this is required at some future date for the further expansion of Prebbleton. Alternatively, due to its location on Shands Rd the Area may be preferred to remain as part of a permanent peri urban fringe to Prebbleton.</u> <p><u>Rural residential form, function and character</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site enables rural residential development to be consolidated with the urban form of Prebbleton.</u> ▪ <u>The risk of ribbon development occurring along Trents or Hamptons Roads is reduced as Area C is located on the eastern side of Shands Road. Shands Road provides a definitive boundary to residential or rural residential growth west of Prebbleton.</u> ▪ <u>The development block represents a small node with appropriate boundary treatments to be established.</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The Area avoids reverse sensitivity effects and the urban form of Prebbleton coalescing with Lincoln to the south and Christchurch City to the north.</u> ▪ <u>The ability for Area C to integrate with the existing settlement pattern will assist in achieving the Preferred Urban Form as set out by Map 24. Area C is 1.5 km from the township centre.</u> ▪ <u>The Council's roading and community water and sewerage network may need to be upgraded to service the area, in which case development may need to be deferred until that has occurred.</u> ▪ <u>The Area avoids any strategic infrastructure established on the periphery of Prebbleton, but development needs to avoid direct property access onto Shands Rd. Alternative access can be provided through Area 3.</u> <p><u>Landscape values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site location and characteristics, including the small scale of the node, enables site specific layouts, design controls and interface treatments to achieve the necessary degree of 'ruralness', 'openness' and rural residential character.</u> ▪ <u>The site is contained by discernible boundaries, formed by existing roads and land use characteristics, which includes strategic roads and the Kingcraft Drive established low density living environment.</u> <p><u>District Plan Guidance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The loss of rural character and amenity has been reduced as the area can be consolidated with the urban form of Prebbleton, which also</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>reduces the potential for adverse reverse sensitivity effects with strategic infrastructure and productive rural land uses.</u></p> <p><u>Prebbleton environs study area guidance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site's location is in close proximity to the Township boundary and this supports a rural residential node that is able to integrate with the existing settlement pattern.</u> ▪ <u>The site is within the Preferred Urban Form area for Prebbleton. The desirability for the site to be 'future proofed' to provide for intensification to urban densities for possible future expansion of Prebbleton should be considered to protect this option.</u> ▪ <u>The location avoids the sensitive rural interface between Prebbleton and Christchurch City to the north</u> ▪ <u>The site is not subject to any identified natural hazard, potentially contaminated sites, Protected Trees, cultural sites, heritage sites or sites of ecological value and there are no significant servicing constraints.</u> ▪ <u>Area C assists in achieving the long term compact concentric urban form of the Township by supporting growth west of Springs Road rather than ribbon development along Springs Rd.</u> ▪ <u>The Area avoids any identified Significant Natural Areas, intensive farming activities, designated sites or any other strategic infrastructure.</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Part of the site is comprised of Class 1 and 2 versatile soils, but its location within the Preferred Urban Form for Prebbleton indicates this is not a constraint to rural residential development.
23	S51 A & B George and E & B Jeffs & S 18 Crabbe partnership	Clause 3.163	<p>Insert the following after Paragraph 6.58 at page 50</p> <p><u>Site description</u> <u>Preliminary Area D is located to the west of Prebbleton. Area D has a physical address of 341 Trices Rd, and 32 and 42 Hamptons Rd, Prebbleton. The properties are legally described as Lot 1 DP 73583, and Lots 1 and 2 DP 73583, Pt RS 3122, Lot 1 DP3896, Lot 1 DP78905, Lot 1 DP5284, Lots 1 & 2 DP 360577 & Pt RS 2423.</u> <u>The Crabbe partnership property has an area of 2.02 ha while the George and Jeffs block has an area of 27.3 ha.</u></p> <p><u>The properties currently utilised for mature lifestyle blocks. Area D is zoned Rural (Inner Plains) and is bordered by Living 1A zoned land to the north across Trices Rd, Rural Inner Plains land to the east, south and west.</u></p> <p><u>The land accommodates a number of residential dwellings and associated curtilage. Area D is located outside the Preferred Urban Form identified on Map 24 of the RRS13.</u></p> <p><u>Potential yield</u> <u>The land holding can sustain approximately 30 rural residential sections including those existing.</u></p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The following efficiencies and benefits are considered relevant to the Area D:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>Sub-regional guidance – LURP/Chapter 6 to the CRPS</u> ▪ <u>The site is outside the Township boundary, immediately adjoining a living zone, and within 1 km of the town centre and across Birchs Rd from Area 4.</u> ▪ <u>Avoids the sub-regional constraints outlined in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of CRPS.</u> ▪ <u>The site can be economically provided with reticulated water and wastewater.</u> ▪ <u>The Site is located outside any flooding zone but will require detailed geotechnical assessment as it is close to areas where liquefaction occurred during the Canterbury Earthquakes. .</u> ▪ <u>The Area is located outside the Preferred Urban form identified on Map 24 and has the potential to form part of a permanent peri urban fringe to Prebbleton.</u> ▪ <u>Rural residential form, function and character</u> ▪ <u>The site enables rural residential development to be consolidated with the urban form of Prebbleton.</u> ▪ <u>The risk of ribbon development occurring along Birchs Road is reduced as Area D is located on the northern side of Hamptons Rd which provides a strong boundary to residential or rural residential growth south of Prebbleton.</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The development block represents a small node with appropriate boundary treatments to be established.</u> ▪ <u>The Area avoids reverse sensitivity effects and the urban form of Prebbleton coalescing with Lincoln to the south and Christchurch City to the north.</u> ▪ <u>The ability for Area D to integrate with the existing settlement pattern will assist in achieving the Preferred Urban Form as set out by Map 24.</u> ▪ <u>The Area avoids any strategic infrastructure established on the periphery of Prebbleton, but development needs to avoid direct property access onto Shands Rd. Alternative access can be provided through Area 3.</u> <p><u>Landscape values</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site location and characteristics, including the small scale of the node, enables site specific layouts, design controls and interface treatments to achieve the necessary degree of 'ruralness', 'openness' and rural residential character.</u> ▪ <u>The site is contained by discernible boundaries, formed by existing roads and land use characteristics, which includes strategic roads and adjoining lifestyle blocks.</u> <p><u>District Plan Guidance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The loss of rural character and amenity has been reduced as the area can be consolidated with the urban form of Prebbleton, which also reduces the potential for adverse reverse sensitivity effects with strategic infrastructure and productive rural land uses.</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>Prebbleton environs study area guidance</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site's location is in close proximity to the Township boundary and supports a rural residential node that is able to integrate with the existing settlement pattern.</u> ▪ <u>The site is outside the Preferred Urban Form area for Prebbleton.</u> ▪ <u>The location avoids the sensitive rural interface between Prebbleton and Christchurch City to the north</u> ▪ <u>The site is not subject to any identified natural hazard, potentially contaminated sites, Protected Trees, cultural sites, heritage sites or sites of ecological value and there are no significant servicing constraints.</u> ▪ <u>Area D assists in achieving the long term compact concentric urban form of the Township by helping to establish a permanent peri urban edge to the township north of Hamptons Rd.</u> ▪ <u>The Area avoids any identified Significant Natural Areas, intensive farming activities, designated sites or any other strategic infrastructure.</u>
24	S07 G Burgess	Clause 3.174	<p>Insert the following after Paragraph 6.58 at page 50</p> <p><u>Site description</u> <u>Preliminary Area E is located to the east of Prebbleton. Area E has a physical address of 59 to 98 Tosswill Rd, Prebbleton. The property is legally described as Lot 1 and Part Lot 2 DP 5464 and has an area of 22.3 ha.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The property is currently utilised for farming. Area E is zoned Rural (Inner Plains) and is bordered by Living Z zoned land to the north, Living 1A land to the west, and Rural Inner Plains land to the east and south. The Christchurch City boundary lies nearby to the north east.</u></p> <p><u>Area D is located outside the Preferred Urban Form identified on Map 24 of the RRS13.</u></p> <p><u>Potential yield</u> <u>The land holding can sustain approximately 44 rural residential sections including those existing.</u></p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p><u>The following efficiencies and benefits are considered relevant to the Area E:</u></p> <p><u>Sub-regional guidance – LURP/Chapter 6 to the CRPS</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The site is outside the Township boundary, immediately adjoining a living zone, and within 700-800 metres of the town centre.</u> ▪ <u>Avoids the sub-regional constraints outlined in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of CRPS.</u> ▪ <u>The site can be economically provided with reticulated water and wastewater.</u> ▪ <u>The Site is located outside any flooding zone but will require detailed geotechnical assessment as it is close to areas where liquefaction occurred during the Canterbury Earthquakes..</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The Area is located outside the Preferred Urban form identified on Map 24 and has the potential to form part of a permanent peri urban fringe to Prebbleton.</u> ▪ <u>Rural residential form, function and character</u> <u>The site enables rural residential development to be consolidated with the urban form of Prebbleton.</u> ▪ <u>The development block represents a relatively small node which will need appropriate boundary treatments to be established to the south and east.</u> ▪ <u>The Area avoids reverse sensitivity effects and the urban form of Prebbleton coalescing with Lincoln to the south and Christchurch City to the north.</u> ▪ <u>The ability for Area E to integrate with the existing settlement pattern will assist in achieving the Preferred Urban Form as set out by Map 24.</u> ▪ <u>The Area avoids any strategic infrastructure established on the periphery of Prebbleton.</u> ▪ <u>Landscape values</u> <u>The site location and characteristics enables site specific layouts, design controls and interface treatments to achieve the necessary degree of 'ruralness', 'openness' and rural residential character.</u> ▪ <u>The site is contained by discernible boundaries, formed by existing roads and land use characteristics, which includes roads, and electricity</u>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>transmission lines to the north east, as well as the buffer area to the Christchurch City boundary.</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ <u>The loss of rural character and amenity has been reduced as the area can be consolidated with the urban form of Prebbleton, which also reduces the potential for adverse reverse sensitivity effects with strategic infrastructure and productive rural land uses.</u> ▪ <u>Prebbleton environs study area guidance</u> ▪ <u>The site's location is in close proximity to the Township boundary and supports a rural residential node that is able to integrate with the existing settlement pattern.</u> ▪ <u>The site is outside the Preferred Urban Form area for Prebbleton.</u> ▪ <u>The location avoids the sensitive rural interface between Prebbleton and Christchurch City to the north</u> ▪ <u>The site is not subject to any identified natural hazard (although geotechnical assessment will be required), potentially contaminated sites, Protected Trees, cultural sites, heritage sites or sites of ecological value and there are no significant servicing constraints.</u> ▪ <u>Area E assists in achieving the long term compact concentric urban form of the Township by helping to establish a permanent peri urban edge to the township west of Toswill Rd.</u> ▪

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
25	S46 Crofts and Williams	Clause 3.196	<p>Amend location criteria under Urban Form and Growth, in Appendix 1, Page 15 to the following:</p> <p><u>“The existing Living 2A zone remains undeveloped and provides the opportunity for a range of low-density sections within Tai Tapu, which satisfies the need for significant areas of additional rural residential land in the short to medium term (refer to APPENDIX 2 – Map 5)”</u></p> <p>Amend the two location criteria under Natural Hazards in Appendix 1, Page 16:</p> <p><u>“Avoid locations that are constrained by the high groundwater table, SDC recorded flood sites, Lower Plains and Lake Ellesmere Flood Areas and associated land drainage issues (including drains, springs and waterways) (see APPENDIX 2 – Map 16) except where appropriate mitigation is proposed to manage the effects of the inundation including ensuring that all dwellings have appropriate floor levels above a 0.5% flood event and the development does not exacerbate the effects of inundation including ‘off site’ effects.”</u></p> <p><u>“Avoid locations where liquefaction and lateral spreading was observed during the Canterbury Earthquakes, in addition to areas made up of fine saturated soils and where there is a high groundwater that may be susceptible to significant damage during future earthquake events (see APPENDIX 2 – Map 20) except where appropriate mitigation is proposed which results in a subdivision and development design which protects people and property from unacceptable risk, such as</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>loss of life or serious injury or significant loss or damage of property as a result of an earthquake event ”</u></p> <p>Insert the following after Paragraph 6.67 at page 63:</p> <p><u>Tai Tapu Rural Residential Area</u></p> <p><u>Site description</u></p> <p><u>Area F encompasses two parcels of land that are physically located at the corner of Hauschlds and Lincoln Tai Tapu Roads, Tai Tapu. The properties are legally described as Lots 1 and 2 DP 43671.</u></p> <p><u>The 8ha block is currently in two 4 ha titles in different ownership, who lease the Sites to the adjoining neighbour for agricultural purposes. Area X is zoned Rural (Inner Plains) and is bordered by Living 1A zoning to the east and Rural Inner Plains zoning to the south, west and north.</u></p> <p><u>The property does not currently contain residential dwellings.</u></p> <p><u>Potential yield</u></p> <p><u>The land holding can sustain approximately 16 rural residential sections.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p><u>The following efficiencies and benefits are considered relevant to the Area F:</u></p> <p><u>Sub-regional guidance – LURP/Chapter 6 to the CRPS</u></p> <p><u>The land holding is outside the Township boundary, immediately adjoining a living zone.</u></p> <p><u>Avoids the sub-regional constraints outlined in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of CRPS.</u></p> <p><u>The site adjoins the Living 1A zone ensuring the Site can be economically provided with reticulated water and wastewater, noting specific engineering solutions with respect to wastewater will be required to ensure the capacity limits agreed with Christchurch City are not exceeded. A low pressure sewer system incorporating enlarged on site tanks, facilitating pumping during off peak times would achieve this requirement.</u></p> <p><u>The Site is located within identified geotechnical and flooding zones but is not in a high hazard flood area as defined in the RPS. Specific mitigation measures can be achieved to ensure any associated potential adverse effects are avoided or mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>The Area is not located within a future growth path for Tai Tapu. No future urban growth is planned or intended for Tai Tapu.</u></p> <p><u>Rural residential form, function and character</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The site enables rural residential development to be consolidated with the urban form of Tai Tapu.</u></p> <p><u>The risk of ribbon development occurring along Lincoln Tai Tapu Road is reduced as Area X provides a narrow road frontage along this road and provides a definitive township gateway at its western end, discouraging further development to the west.</u></p> <p><u>The development block represents a small node with appropriate boundary treatments to be established.</u></p> <p><u>The Area avoids reverse sensitivity effects and the urban form of Tai Tapu coalescing with Lincoln to the west and Christchurch City to the north east.</u></p> <p><u>Solutions will be required to be found to enable the Council's sewerage network to service the Area, and development of the site is contingent on this.</u></p> <p><u>The Area avoids any strategic infrastructure including State Highway 75 to Akaroa.</u></p> <p><u>Landscape values</u></p> <p><u>The site location and characteristics, including the small scale of the node, enables site specific layouts, design controls and interface treatments to achieve the necessary degree of 'ruralness', 'openness' and rural residential character.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The Site, through appropriate layout and design will be contained by discernible boundaries, including stormwater retention areas and landscaped buffers.</u></p> <p><u>Tai Tapu environs study area guidance</u></p> <p><u>The site's location in close proximity to the Township boundary supports a rural residential node that is able to integrate with the existing settlement pattern.</u></p> <p><u>The site is a small node which results in a low potential yield that can potentially be supported by current infrastructure services.</u></p> <p><u>The site avoids coalescence with Lincoln as it adjoins the township boundary and does not significantly extend towards Lincoln.</u></p> <p><u>The site makes up small landholdings and does not reduce the potential productive capacity of large landholdings in this area.</u></p> <p><u>While the site is subject to identified geotechnical and flooding zones, appropriate mitigation measures may ensure adverse effects are avoided or appropriately mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>The location of the site avoids any identified cultural, historical, ecological, protected tree, or outstanding natural landscape sites.</u></p> <p><u>The site contains high quality soils, but the small size of the site and location adjoining a township reduces the likelihood of these soils being appropriately utilised.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
26	S14 B & A Moir	Clause 3.138	<p>Insert the following after Paragraph 6.67 at page 63:</p> <p><u>Lincoln Rural Residential Area</u></p> <p><u>Site description</u></p> <p><u>Area G is at 828 Ellesmere Rd, Lincoln. The property is legally described as Part RS 10644.</u></p> <p><u>The 13.27 ha block currently takes access from Moirs Lane which connects to Ellesmere Rd. Area G is zoned Rural (Outer Plains) and is bordered by Living zoning to the east and Rural Outer Plains zoning to the south and north.</u></p> <p><u>Potential yield</u></p> <p><u>The land holding could sustain up to 26 rural residential allotments.</u></p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p><u>The following efficiencies and benefits are considered relevant to the Area G:</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>Sub-regional guidance – LURP/Chapter 6 to the CRPS</u></p> <p><u>The land holding is outside the Township boundary, immediately adjoining a living zone.</u></p> <p><u>Avoids the sub-regional constraints outlined in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of CRPS.</u></p> <p><u>The site is close to the Living 1A zone to the north, ensuring the Site can be provided with reticulated water and wastewater with appropriate extensions of servicing being required</u></p> <p><u>The Site has a high water table, but is not in a high hazard flood area as defined in the RPS. Specific mitigation measures are required to ensure any associated potential adverse effects are avoided or mitigated. Geotechnical assessment will be necessary to determine if any mitigation is required.</u></p> <p><u>The Area is not located within a future growth path for Lincoln</u></p> <p><u>Rural residential form, function and character</u></p> <p><u>The site has the potential to enable rural residential development to be consolidated with the urban form of Lincoln.</u></p> <p><u>The site is likely to enjoy good walking and cycling access into Lincoln.</u></p> <p><u>The development block represents a node where appropriate boundary treatments can be established.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The Area avoids reverse sensitivity issues with adjoining land.</u></p> <p><u>The Area avoids any strategic infrastructure.</u></p> <p><u>Landscape values</u></p> <p><u>The site location and characteristics, including the small scale of the node, enables site specific layouts, design controls and interface treatments to achieve the necessary degree of 'ruralness', 'openness' and rural residential character.</u></p> <p><u>The Site, through appropriate layout and design will be contained by discernible boundaries, including stormwater retention areas and landscaped buffers.</u></p> <p><u>Lincoln environs study area guidance</u></p> <p><u>The site's location in close proximity to the Township boundary supports a rural residential node that is able to integrate with the existing settlement pattern provided appropriate access for walking and cycling can be established and provided that alternative road access becomes available, for example to Liffey Springs Rd or via the proposed Lincoln bypass.</u></p> <p><u>The site avoids coalescence with Tai Tapu as it adjoins the township boundary and does not significantly extend towards Tai Tapu.</u></p> <p><u>The site is a small landholding and does not reduce the potential productive capacity of large landholdings in this area.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>While the site is subject to high water table, appropriate mitigation measures may ensure adverse effects are avoided or appropriately mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>The location of the site avoids any identified cultural, historical, ecological, protected tree, or outstanding natural landscape sites, although the proximity of the L1 and L2 river system requires to be taken into account when considering cultural effects.</u></p>
27	S27 & S40 B Harrington	Clause 3.3.141	<p>Insert the following after Paragraph 6.67 at page 63:</p> <p><u>Lincoln Rural Residential Area</u></p> <p><u>Site description</u></p> <p><u>Area H is at Moirs Lane. The legal description is Lots 1 and 2 DP 445316.</u></p> <p><u>The site contains 0.97 ha and has the potential for one rural residential dwelling. It is a small site that lies between the L1 and L2 rivers close to their confluence and adjacent to Areas G and I. Vehicle access is currently via Moirs Lane to Ellesmere Rd.</u></p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p><u>The following efficiencies and benefits are considered relevant to the Area H.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>Sub-regional guidance – LURP/Chapter 6 to the CRPS</u></p> <p><u>The land holding is outside the Township boundary, immediately adjoining other rural residential areas and close to the Liffey Springs residential development.</u></p> <p><u>Avoids the sub-regional constraints outlined in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of CRPS.</u></p> <p><u>The Site has a high water table and some potential flooding, but is not in a high hazard flood area as defined in the RPS. Specific mitigation measures are required to ensure any associated potential adverse effects are avoided or mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>The Area is not located within a future growth path for Lincoln</u></p> <p><u>Rural residential form, function and character</u></p> <p><u>The site enables rural residential development to be consolidated with the urban form of Tai Tapu provided that alternative road access becomes available, for example to Allandale Lane or via the proposed Lincoln bypass.</u></p> <p><u>The site is likely to enjoy good walking and cycling access into Lincoln via the extension of the Rail Trail which is to utilise Moirs lane.</u></p> <p><u>The development block represents a small node where appropriate boundary treatments can be established.</u></p> <p><u>The Area avoids reverse sensitivity effects and the urban form of Lincoln coalescing with Tai Tapu to the east.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The Area avoids any strategic infrastructure although is close to the Council stormwater management area across the L1 river.</u></p> <p><u>Landscape values</u></p> <p><u>The site location and characteristics, including the small scale of the node, enables site specific layouts, design controls and interface treatments to achieve the necessary degree of 'ruralness', 'openness' and rural residential character.</u></p> <p><u>The Site, through appropriate layout and design will be contained by discernible boundaries, including stormwater retention areas and landscaped buffers.</u></p> <p><u>Lincoln environs study area guidance</u></p> <p><u>The site's location in close proximity to the Township boundary supports a rural residential node that is able to integrate with the existing settlement pattern.</u></p> <p><u>The site avoids coalescence with Tai Tapu as it adjoins the township boundary and does not significantly extend towards Tai Tapu.</u></p> <p><u>The site makes up small landholdings and does not reduce the potential productive capacity of large landholdings in this area.</u></p> <p><u>While the site is subject to identified geotechnical and flooding zones, appropriate mitigation measures may ensure adverse effects are avoided or appropriately mitigated.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<u>The location of the site avoids any identified cultural, historical, ecological, protected tree, or outstanding natural landscape sites although the proximity of the L1 and L2 rivers will need to be taken into account when considering cultural values.</u>
	S16 Apton Developments, S32 R Paton and 48 A Cartridge	Clause 3.139	<p>Insert the following after Paragraph 6.67 at page 63:</p> <p><u>Lincoln Rural Residential Area</u></p> <p><u>Site description</u></p> <p><u>Area I is at Allandale Lane, Lincoln. The properties are legally described as Lots 120 and 121 DP 329124 & Lots 1 to 6 DP 371976.</u></p> <p><u>The 17.14 ha block is already partially developed in rural residential lots. It is well connected into Lincoln and adjoins Living 1A zoned land to the north and east. Area G is zoned Rural (Outer Plains) and is bordered by Living zoning to the east and Rural Outer Plains zoning to the south and north.</u></p> <p><u>Potential yield</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The land holding could sustain up to 12 rural residential lots as it is constrained by a 150 metre wide buffer area around the Lincoln sewage treatment plant which is to the west.</u></p> <p><u>Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Development of this site would be greatly assisted if it were contained in a single Outline Development Plan with either Area F or Area H.</u></p> <p><u>The following efficiencies and benefits are considered relevant to the Area G:</u></p> <p><u>Sub-regional guidance – LURP/Chapter 6 to the CRPS</u></p> <p><u>The land holding is outside the Township boundary, immediately adjoining a living zone.</u></p> <p><u>Avoids the sub-regional constraints outlined in Policy 6.3.9 of Chapter 6 of CRPS.</u></p> <p><u>The site is close to the Living 1A zone to the north, ensuring the Site can be provided with reticulated water and wastewater with appropriate extensions of servicing being required</u></p> <p><u>The Site has a high water table and some potential flooding, but is not in a high hazard flood area as defined in the RPS. Specific mitigation measures are required to ensure any associated potential adverse effects are avoided or mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>The Area is not located within a future growth path for Lincoln.</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>Rural residential form, function and character</u></p> <p><u>The site enables rural residential development to be consolidated with the urban form of Lincoln.</u></p> <p><u>The site is likely to enjoy good walking and cycling access into Lincoln via the extension of the Rail Trail which is to utilise Moirs lane.</u></p> <p><u>The development block represents a small node where appropriate boundary treatments can be established.</u></p> <p><u>The Area avoids reverse sensitivity effects and the urban form of Lincoln coalescing with Tai Tapu to the east</u></p> <p><u>The Area avoids any strategic infrastructure although is close to the Council stormwater management area across the L1 river.</u></p> <p><u>Landscape values</u></p> <p><u>The site location and characteristics, including the small scale of the node, enables site specific layouts, design controls and interface treatments to achieve the necessary degree of 'ruralness', 'openness' and rural residential character.</u></p> <p><u>The Site, through appropriate layout and design will be contained by discernible boundaries, including stormwater retention areas and landscaped buffers.</u></p> <p><u>Lincoln environs study area guidance</u></p>

Amendment No	Submission reference	Officers Report reference	Commissioners Recommended Amendment
			<p><u>The site's location in close proximity to the Township boundary supports a rural residential node that is able to integrate with the existing settlement pattern.</u></p> <p><u>The site avoids coalescence with Tai Tapu as it adjoins the township boundary and does not significantly extend towards Tai Tapu.</u></p> <p><u>The site is a small landholding and does not reduce the potential productive capacity of large landholdings in this area.</u></p> <p><u>While the site is subject to identified flooding zones, appropriate mitigation measures may ensure adverse effects are avoided or appropriately mitigated.</u></p> <p><u>The location of the site avoids any identified cultural, historical, ecological, protected tree, or outstanding natural landscape sites, although the proximity of the L1 and L2 river system requires to be taken into account when considering cultural effects.</u></p>

Attachment 3

Implementation

Attachment 3

Recommended Implementation Section

7.0 STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION

- 7.1. A number of sites have been identified in this Strategy as being potentially suitable for rural residential development. However none of these sites have been assessed to the level of detail necessary to establish whether or not they should ultimately proceed, or if they do what requirements should apply to them. Inclusion of sites in the Strategy simply establishes the sites as candidates for development at face value, subject to more detailed assessment and consideration under the Resource Management Act 1991. Inclusion of a site in the Strategy is not a guarantee that it will ultimately be approved.
- 7.2. To develop a site identified in this Strategy as a rural residential area, a change to the zoning in the district plan must first be undertaken. The Selwyn District Council does not intend to carry out such changes itself. Instead the Council expects that private plan change applications will be made under the Resource Management Act 1991. This process for this is set out in Part 2 of the First Schedule to the Act. The format for such a change should be the Living 3 Zone with its related objectives, policies, rules and performance standards.

Consultation with the Selwyn District Council

- 7.3. Prior to preparing an application, applicants should consult with the Selwyn District Council to discover its needs and intentions. This applies in particular to:
- **Process matters** The Council will provide advice on the process to be followed and its expectations about the information it will require to enable the application to be processed.
 - **Layout and planning** The Council may provide comment about appropriate design, layout and other development matters.
 - **Infrastructure** This includes roading, sewerage reticulation, water supply, land drainage and surface water management. It should not be assumed that sufficient infrastructure is in place to enable every site to be developed whenever the landowners wish to. Some sites will be dependent on development of adjoining sites for reticulation to become available at their sites, or there may be a requirement for improvements to major infrastructure away from the site to provide sufficient capacity to enable the development to proceed.

Consultation with tangata whenua

- 7.4. At an early stage in the development of a district plan change, applicants will be expected to consult with Te Taumutu Runanga so that cultural values relating to the site can be identified, protected or enhanced. This is essential to provide the information the Council will require to enable it to carry out its role under Part 2 of

the RMA. This duty is to recognise and provide for the relationship of Maori and their culture and traditions with their ancestral lands, water, sites, waahi tapu, and other taonga and to take into account the principles of the Treaty of Waitangi. If such information is not provided the Council may make a formal request for it and has the power to reject or decline the application if the information is not forthcoming.

Content of an application

- 7.5. A proposal for rural residential development will be expected to demonstrate how it complies with:
- the guiding principles in Section 5 of this Strategy
 - the requirements of Policies 6.3.3 (Outline Development Plans) and 6.3.9 (Rural Residential Areas) of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.
 - The objectives and policies of the Selwyn District Plan, particularly those applying to the relevant township where the site is located.

Outline Development Plans

- 7.6. The required contents of Outline Development Plans are set out in the Regional Policy Statement at policy 6.3.3. Because a number of the rural residential areas identified in this Strategy are relatively small and adjoin other rural residential areas, it is particularly important that any need for connectivity with adjacent is considered, and whether shared services would be appropriate. It may be appropriate for combined Outline Development Plans be prepared where sites are adjacent to each other.

Future Proofing

- 7.7. Some of the rural residential areas included in this Strategy are located in future growth paths for the towns concerned. Despite the lack of any intention by the current land owners to ever become fully urban, development of these sites should be undertaken in a way which enables eventual redevelopment at full urban densities to be readily achieved if this should be considered appropriate at some stage in the future.
- 7.8. Such future proofing would require a combination of design and legal techniques. The design aspect consists of designing a layout in two stages, firstly the rural residential layout and then the ultimate development overlaid on this. Initial layouts must not preclude a high standard of ultimate development. Therefore the spatial requirements for ultimate large facilities such as roads, open space and surface water management must be identified and set aside at the outset so that initial rural residential development, and in particular the siting of houses does not prevent the ultimate availability of land for these facilities. The initial roading pattern and underground services would have to be installed in such a way as to avoid the need for complete replacement later. This applies particularly to sewerage, which may have to be oversized at first. This can cause problems of its own, e.g. low flows. Techniques such as laying smaller pipes within larger ones, and the use of flush tanks may avoid such problems. The legal techniques would be conditions of subdivision consent, consent notices on titles and perhaps

covenants in favour of the Council ensuring that at the time of conversion to full urban development, the then owners of rural residential lots would not be able to oppose the intensification or withhold the necessary land. Consideration should be given for such land to be actually vested with the Council as road or utility reserves at the time of the initial rural residential development and perhaps leased back at a peppercorn rental to adjacent rural residential owners for interim use and maintenance.

7.9. Two sites which have been identified in this Strategy on the basis that they are required to be future proofed through the plan change and subdivision process. These are:

- A site at Rolleston on the Springston-Rolleston Rd, described as Lot 1 DP 305373 immediately to the south east of the Farringdon subdivision.¹
- A site at Prebbleton at 340 Trents Rd and 232 Hamptons Rd.²

7.10. There are two other sites at Prebbleton where the appropriateness of future proofing should be considered. These are

- A site at 631 Shands Rd.³
- A site at 311 Trents Rd. ⁴

7.11. These sites have been identified as lying within a probable growth path to the west of Prebbleton. However they are likely at the outer edge of this growth path at Shands Rd, so could either form part of a peri urban rural residential edge to the town or be developed for full urban densities. This is a matter to be considered during the plan change and subdivision processes.

¹As described in Submission 36 to the Draft Strategy by the Dryden Trust.

² As described in Submission 37 to the Draft Strategy by Trents Rd Developments.

³ As described in Submission A site at 311 Trents Rd⁴⁷ to the Draft Strategy by M Stratford.

⁴The site described as Preliminary Area 3 in the Draft rural residential Strategy 2013.

Attachment 4

Monitoring and Review Section

Attachment 4

Recommended Monitoring and Review Section

8.0 MONITORING AND REVIEW

Introduction

- 8.1 The purpose of monitoring in the RMA context is to improve planning processes and outcomes.
- 8.2 Monitoring is crucial to:
- Understand the condition or state of our environment, if and how it is changing (whether it is improving or deteriorating) and the reasons for that change (human induced or naturally occurring);
 - Assess whether the objectives, policies and rules of the District Plan are achieving the environmental outcomes identified by the community
 - Identify where improvements to the process are required to ensure Selwyn District Council is meeting its statutory obligations under the Resource Management Act
- 8.3 Components of an effective monitoring regime are:
- **Planned and repeated data collection** – Quantifying the number of locations within the adopted Strategy that have been rezoned to Rural Residential, commissioning technical reports and land owner surveys or environmental outcomes analysis.
 - **Analysis and Interpretation** - Assessing whether the anticipated environmental outcomes are being achieved, peoples expectations are being met and rural residential activities are sustainable
 - **Reporting** – Consistent and robust reporting of the data collection will ensure the information can appropriately inform the next review of the Strategy.
 - **Recommendations for further actions** – policy and review and development
 - **Implementation** – monitor and review the subsequent Strategy
- 8.4 Monitoring provides a feedback mechanism between policy formulation and evaluation as well as a quality control measure to test the efficiency and effectiveness of the planning process.

Monitoring and Review Tasks

Sub –regional review and monitoring requirements

8.5 The monitoring and review requirements of the LURP are contained in Section 5.0¹. To ensure an integrated effort by strategic partners and other government agencies in the rebuild of Christchurch after the earthquake CERA was tasked with preparing a Monitoring Plan within 3 months of the LURP being Gazetted. The components of this Monitoring Plan are:

- monitoring implementation of Recovery Plan Actions
- monitoring progress towards achievement of Recovery Plan outcomes
- a requirement that quarterly monitoring and an Annual LURP Monitoring Report is prepared

8.6 The Canterbury Regional Council must formally review the LURP in collaboration with its strategic partners by April 2015 or sooner if directed by the Minister. This review must contain the community views of Greater Christchurch and identify whether it is necessary to amend or add to the Recovery Plan to enable the recovery and rebuild.

8.7 Chapter 6 of the RPS Policy 6.3.11² prescribes the process for monitoring and reviewing the adopted Rural Residential Strategy. Policy 6.3.11 requires:

“The Canterbury Regional Council, in conjunction with the territorial authorities, shall undertake the monitoring of the supply, uptake and impacts of rural residential land use and development”

8.8 The Canterbury Regional Council is tasked with preparing a comprehensive monitoring report at least every 3 years, and make it publicly available.

8.9 The primary anticipated environmental result in relation to rural residential development is to ensure that:

“Rural residential development is appropriately managed”

Rural Residential Strategy review and monitoring requirements

8.10 The issues associated with rural residential development are broad ranging and have the potential to impact on the sustainability of settlement patterns, strategic infrastructure, rural amenity and productivity. There are limitations to the number of rural residential households that can be allocated at any given time before this form of development starts undermining the wider urban consolidation principles that are the focus of the LURP and Chapter 6 RPS in particular.

¹ LURP: Section 5.0 Implementation and monitoring, 6Dec2013[P43]

² LURP: Appendix 1: Amendments to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, Chapter 6 Policy 6.3.11 Dec2013[P23 to 25]

- 8.11 There is a mandatory requirement for Selwyn District Council to monitor and review rural residential housing uptake and the impacts it may have on the recovery and rebuild of Greater Christchurch under the LURP and Chapter 6 of the RPS. Regular reviews are necessary given the amount of residential and business growth that has occurred within the commuter belt of Selwyn District with Christchurch City over a sustained period of time, particularly given the trade-offs and risks that are attributed to rural residential development.
- 8.12 As a consequence, the Rural Residential Strategy is to be reviewed within 5 years of being adopted. Regular and robust monitoring shall be undertaken to inform this review. A 5 year review period will ensure that the effects of rural residential development and the rate of up-take of zoned blocks can be quantified.
- 8.13 The following aspects of rural residential development should be monitored to inform this 5 year review:
- quantifying the amount of land identified in the adopted Strategy that has been rezoned, subdivided and issued building permits
 - undertaking analysis to establish whether the anticipated outcomes within the rural residential development itself are being met, in addition to its impact on the consolidated management of residential growth, the rural amenity and productivity
 - providing updated information in respect to settlement patterns, infrastructure works programmes and constraints
 - confirming that the adopted Strategy to be consistent with current legislative requirements, community outcomes and policy initiatives
 - undertaking any monitoring tasks determined by the Canterbury Regional Council to assist that organisation in delivering its monitoring and review functions under Chapter 6 RPS and the LURP.
- 8.14 Selwyn District Council shall work collaboratively with the Canterbury Regional Council, in combination with other strategic partners to integrate this monitoring with other initiatives and processes being advance as a consequence of the LURP and Chapter 6 of the RPS.