

Submission on The Draft Rural Residential Strategy  
3 March 2014

Submitter: Alastair Joyce  
184 Trices Road  
RD4 Christchurch, 7674  
[abj184@gmail.com](mailto:abj184@gmail.com)

I support the need for providing alternative zoning for those who want a lifestyle block smaller in size than the 4 hectare minimum Rural Inner Plains zone. However I oppose the proposal that Living 3 Rural Residential zones should be the sole method to provide this and as such oppose in part the draft rural residential strategy. My submission relates to the Prebbleton area only.

It is clear that a huge amount of time and ratepayer money has already been absorbed firstly with PC17 where Council initiated zones were provided (Land Owners were given the opportunity to submit areas for consideration) This should have resulted in a robust process to finalise what were to be the first living 3 zones. Proposed PC17 was withdrawn and replaced with proposed PC32, one of the reasons being that Chapter 12A limited the number of rural residential lots in the foreseeable future. Reverting back to a first in basis was the major difference. The submissions received included opposition to options offered.

This Draft Rural Residential Strategy includes possible initial Rural Residential zones and includes some of areas council initiated with PC17 where no privately requested plan changes have been received, but not all. The previously proposed zone in Prebbleton has not been included, if the original selection criteria were robust there seems no logical reason for any change and this should be reinstated as an initial possible Rural Residential zone. There was a weak southern boundary to this and my original submission to PC17 had asked for this to be extended using a strong road/stream boundary as the southern limit. There can be the option of deferral of part of this available. I objected to a complete move away from Council Initiated zones with PC32 as it is effectively going to revert back to what was never satisfactory before.

This area is already classified as TC2 land. This is no reason for this land not to be included as there are compelling reasons that this could be the most suitable for lower density rural residential or similar subdivision:

- a) Slower draining land which retains soil moisture most suitable for horticulture and residential gardens as less irrigation required, saving the water resource
- b) It is closer to the centre of Prebbleton than the two areas where private plan changes have been submitted
- c) There is a proposed reserve extension into this area and if this proceeds it would be logical to expect some form of rural/residential to surround this.
- d) Modified layout would overcome any possible conflict of interest with Transpower. The areas surrounding transmission towers would be ideal for storm water retention areas and/or the larger lot sizes
- e) There are already a high proportion of rural residential size properties along Trices Road (only two properties meet the present Rural Inner Plains zone minimum of 4 hectares.)
- f) There is certainty as to requirements for building foundations. TC2 and even TC3 land seems ideal for providing the best solution for cost effectiveness in lower density areas. It should ensure uptake is a considered choice rather than just because other areas are all that are available.

However there are many barriers to meeting the proposed desired objectives wanted from rural residential zones. My objection to Living 3 rural residential as being the sole means to provide smaller than the present Inner Plains four hectare minimum is based on the following:

- a) The strategy gives much emphasis on fencing. While this can be achieved with the initial presentation of area it is logical to accept that individuals will have reasons to alter this including the need for shelter, security, etc. On the open plains of Canterbury it is accepted that the open vista is the first to disappear as households are established via shelter belts, high barrier fencing, etc. We see many of these options even in Outer Plains zones areas. Individuals will have their own tastes on the result they want; this is clear from areas such as the Aberdeen, Kingcraft, Stonebridge, etc. The initial standards are changed to suit. In short planning will not control long term outcomes.
- b) There does not appear to have been any specific research done on whether the demand for smaller than 4 hectare rural use areas is best met within a mixture of residential area. Has the uptake of the larger 1-2 hectares lots in subdivisions such as Aberdeen been because that was all that was available?
- c) The 1-2 households per hectare average is very broad, this should more specific.
- d) There are considerable opportunities for reverse sensitivity or conflict by only providing rural residential zones for those who want to use the larger lots for farming activities. These include objection to animal noise & odour, dust & agricultural machinery noise.
- e) To achieve a better outcome the larger 2 hectare lots need to be separated from the smaller large residential purposes only lots. If this cannot be achieved within a rural residential zone then provision for subdivision of inner plains areas within a specified proximity to townships should be provided with another zone designation. The split between 2 households per hectare to one per 4 hectares is too large in these areas. It has been established that many of these within proximately to high growth areas such as Prebbleton are no longer utilised as intended for varying reasons including being tied closer to the urban proximity. A separate zone would assist in overcoming the issues around private plan change applications when there is no compromise for proximate areas not included.
- f) While a point has been raised that Subdivisions such as Kingcraft has impeded the possibility of infill to residential there it should be noted that within Christchurch City there are areas such as Fendalton where there are still very large lot sizes. Having this mix helps maintain a high socio-economic area, something Prebbleton needs to also retain.
- g) Urban sprawl is an issue and the LURP is addressing this with proposed infill around key activity centres. Prebbleton is not one of these but the desire to live there is high and this demand in and around Prebbleton has to both be met and managed to satisfy all interests.
- h) The requirement to provide reticulated sewerage and potable water to all lots within a rural residential is both restrictive as to the layout of these zones and uneconomic. I have already submitted on PC32 that onsite sewerage treatment is very cost effective for larger lots. The resulting clear water can be used for irrigation and/or pumped off site to the reticulated system. Shared potable water from a private well is already utilised without issues between households on rural subdivisions now.

**In summary I seek the following decision from the Selwyn District Council:**

- Include the area of land proposed as a rural residential zone in PC17, Prebbleton area including the amendment as proposed in my submission to extend the boundary to Trices Road to the south and Prebble Drain to the east,  
**or:** provide a separate zone designation to better provide the around 2 hectare requirement as the buffer between rural residential and rural inner plains,  
**or:** allow resource consent application to subdivide to around 2 hectares in the rural inner plains zone within a designated area around townships .
- Investigate if the rural element of a rural residential zone is actually meeting the requirements of all who desire around 2 hectares.
- Remove the inflexibility for sewerage & potable water provision within rural residential zones.

I would like to be heard in support of my submission.

Alastair Joyce

3 March 2014