

Points by Hearing Topic

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1362 Doug Sinclair	1362.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Amend

Summary:

Walkway leading to East Maddisons Road:

Submitter does not consider that the plan change demonstrates that the proposed route is the best route.

The walkway is unworkable. The properties that are on this walkway are unlikely to be subdivided in the foreseeable future. The only traffic on the walkway will be from Frame Crescent to the proposed school. If a walkway is important in the next twenty years then the Council should look for an alternative position.

The Hurunui District Plan states that "walking and cycling routes will only be required to be created on private land when that land is subdivided or a key linkage is required and the landowners agree". It seems that the Selwyn District Council puts less importance on the views of landowners.

Submitter considers that walkway traffic may cause a hazard to vehicles using the driveways at the head of the cul-de-sac.

Considers that there is a lack of clarity in what the walkways will look like (width and height of fences may be different from standard walkways).

States that there is a need to know what the cul-de-sac extensions will look like (how wide and what will the exact location be). Will Jozecom Place be widened and is this due to plan change 11?

Asks for clarification of who pays for the cul-de-sac extension and walkways.

Decision Requested:

Amend the plan change to remove requirement for a walkway leading to East Maddisons Road

Provide details of what walkways would look like (fencing, width and profile of surroundings).

Provide details of what shared walkways/driveways would look like (fencing, width and profile of surroundings).

Clarify details of who pays for the structure plan and compensation for roadways and walkway / cycleways.

That the Council clarifies how the cycleway / walkways will operate with pedestrians and cyclists sharing the one pathway. What rules will apply to cyclists?

That the Council clarifies what the extension of Jozecom Place will look like and what plans there are for the remainder of Jozecom Place in terms of any changes that are proposed.

1363 Colfield Trust	1363.01	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Oppose
---------------------	---------	--------	--------------------	--------

Summary:

Wishes to vary the proposal to allow for the subdivision of 33 Waterbridge Way into 3 lots (with an average size less than 2,000m²). The layout of the property due to its size and shape is compatible with this proposal.

Decision Requested:

Amend the proposal, to allow the subdivision of 33 Waterbridge Way into 3 lots.

1365 Bruce Alan McLeay	1365.01	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Unclear
------------------------	---------	--------	--------------------	---------

Summary:

Support front sections in Fairhurst Place being zoned as L1C but would like all sections to have this zoning, instead of L1B which will change the rural feel of the area.

Decision Requested:

Not Stated

1365 Bruce Alan McLeay	1365.02	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Unclear
------------------------	---------	--------	-----------------	---------

Summary:

Oppose the roads at the end of Fairhurst Place. Oppose the cutting down of the radiata hedges which would take place if they are put in.

Decision Requested:

Not Stated

Concerned about parents driving children to school via Fairhurst Place. The new school does not need three entrances. Concerned about walkway cycleways leading to and past the school and that new school will have inadequate land.

Money should be spent on the new road for the school and a parking area outside it.

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1366 Environment Canterbury	1366.01	PC0911	PC090011- All	Support

Summary:

Support the plan change in general but oppose specific wording, related to clauses 4.9.27, 4.9.29, 12.1.4.48, 12.1.4.49, 4.9.2.

Decision Requested:

Amend the wording based on the submission.

1367 Wei-Ker Lin & Yi-Ya Lai	1367.01	PC0911	PC090011- Roads...	Oppose...
------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------------	-----------

Summary:

Has recently purchased property at 145B Brookside Road. Asks that the new roads are not developed on this property land as was purchased to enjoy the lifestyle of a big section.

Decision Requested:

Amend such that roads are not developed on 145B Brookside Road.

1368 Corravally Ltd	1368.1	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Support
---------------------	--------	--------	--------------------	---------

Summary:

Supports proposed rezoning to 750m2 average north of Lowes Road. Considers that smaller allotment sizes mean better land use as the town infrastructure is already in place.

Decision Requested:

That the Council ensures that appropriate compensation is paid for land required for roads.

1369 Douglas and Susan Lawson	1369.01	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Support
-------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------------	---------

Summary:

Support policies to control intensification of the area. Pleased that there will be a park reserve on land occupied by the naturist club. We wish to have a front section on Lowes Road subdivided.

Decision Requested:

Not stated

1370 Baibensam Rentals	1370.01	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Oppose
------------------------	---------	--------	--------------------	--------

Summary:

Requests that the average lot size be dropped to 1000m2 with a minimum lot area of 500m2 to allow for more flexible development of the site.

Decision Requested:

Amend the plan change to reduce the average lot size to 1,000m2 in Living 1B areas with a 500m2 minimum.

1371 Stephen David and Sharon Louise Ben	1371.01	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Support
--	---------	--------	--------------------	---------

Summary:

Supports the average and minimum lot sizes for Living 1 and Living 1C but oppose the average and minimum lot sizes for Living 1B.

Decision Requested:

Amend the plan change to reduce the average lot size to 1,000m2 in Living 1B areas with a 500m2 minimum.

Supports the boundaries of the Living 1, 1B and 1C zones.

Considers that there is an increasing need for small lots sizes for the elderly population, which is increasing. This segment of the population tends to prefer smaller section sizes.

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1372 Annette Foster	1372.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Support

Summary:

Support roads and walkways to provide connectivity so that the transport network is efficient and convenient for a number of transport modes.

Supports the following links:

Fairhurst Place to Jozecom Place
Fairhurst Place to school and Goulds Road
Fairhurst Place to Manor Drive
Jozecom Place to Frame Crescent
Jozecom Place to East Maddisons Road

Support the weighting of the benefits of good urban design, especially in relation to roading and cycleway / walkways to the future population, compared to the existing landowners. Consideration should be given to the wider connectivity to the rest of the Rolleston community. The Council involvement is to provide the best long term outcome for the wider community not just for the existing landowner.

Decision Requested:

Requests that the policy is stronger in support of future residents and their ability to have improved connectivity to the Rolleston community.

1372 Annette Foster	1372.02	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Support
---------------------	---------	--------	-----------------	---------

Summary:

Support roads and walkways to provide connectivity so that the transport network is efficient and convenient for a number of transport modes.

Fairhurst Place to Jozecom Place support this being a road

Decision Requested:

Requests that the policy is stronger in support of future residents and their ability to have improved connectivity to the Rolleston community.

1373 Richard and Rachel Ireland	1373.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Oppose
---------------------------------	---------	--------	----------------------------------	--------

Summary:

Submitter bought house because it was away from through roads and through traffic.

Considers that a road would not improve the value of property. It would mean that we have to redevelop the new roadside frontage at our expense. Existing house would be very close to the road.

Considers that a road would make house more vulnerable and that they would have to improve security.

Considers that the Council has acted heavy handedly and that suggestions have been ignored or dismissed.

States that Connecting Fairhurst Place and Jozecom does not affect the 400m walking radius as suggested by Council as necessary for school. Considers it is taking advantage of developers.

Decision Requested:

Amend the plan change to omit the link between Fairhurst and Jozecom Place.

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1374 Selwyn Central Community Board	1374.01	PC0911	PC090011- All	Support

Summary:

Notes that Council has consulted residents and commends the Council on this consultation and the desire to manage the transition from a rural residential to an urban environment to achieve a quality outcome for residents, landowners and the community.

Supports the proposed zoning changes.

Requests an additional reserve [on part of 177 Brookside Road] and an additional link road [through Pineglades Naturist Club]

Notes that it is a policy of the Selwyn District Council that there should be a neighbourhood reserve within 400-500 metres of households in a Living 1 zone. The proposed additional reserve would meet this requirement on the block bounded by Brookside Road, East Maddisons Road and Lowes Road.

Considers that the additional link road from Brookside Road will increase the vehicle, cycle and pedestrian connectivity when this area is developed. The plan change will signal to any developer that a link road is required in this area.

Decision Requested:

Approve plan change 11 with amendments described.

1375 Tania R Foster and Michael H Crouche	1375.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Support
---	---------	--------	----------------------------------	---------

Summary:

Considers Rule 12.1.4.48 provides protection for adjoining landowners by ensuring that the necessary linkages will be created at the time of subdivision by neighbours.

Decision Requested:

Not Stated

1375 Tania R Foster and Michael H Crouche	1375.02	PC0911	PC090011- Reserves	Support
---	---------	--------	--------------------	---------

Summary:

Supports advantage being taken of unique characteristics of the area (ie water races).

Decision Requested:

Not Stated

1375 Tania R Foster and Michael H Crouche	1375.03	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Oppose
---	---------	--------	--------------------	--------

Summary:

Considers that the living 1B and 1C zone does not:

acknowledge the areas future central position in Rolleston
promote land use patterns that reduce the demand for transport
promote and encourage comprehensive development and
redevelopment to achieve good urban design outcomes

Decision Requested:

Amend to replace the Living 1B and Living 1C zoning with Living 1.

1375 Tania R Foster and Michael H Crouche	1375.04	PC0911	PC090011- Buildings and Street Scene	Oppose
---	---------	--------	--------------------------------------	--------

Summary:

Considers that rule 4.13.2 will be difficult to comply with. Sections are normally designed with the narrowest side facing the road. In order to comply with this rule you would need to have a minimum of 12m wide dwelling facing the road if the dwelling had a double garage (6m).

Decision Requested:

Amend the rule to allow a typical dwelling on a typical allotment with compliant setbacks.

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1376 Pineglades Naturist Club Inc	1376.01	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Oppose

Summary:

Notes that the road approaching and crossing Pineglades property will intersect at around 45 degrees. Considers that this will be dangerous as will need to be looking back and at 45 degrees for traffic. Believes that this is in conflict with the structure plan desire for safe roads.

Notes that direct access from Brookside Road will be lost to the submitter along with signage on the main road and that the ability of the submitter to develop this land will be lost (along with funds which could be derived from its sale).

Decision Requested:

Fair compensation for land [used for the connection with Brookside Road]

That the road built on land owned by Pineglades be named "Pineglades Drive".

1376 Pineglades Naturist Club Inc	1376.02	PC0911	PC090011- Reserves	Oppose
-----------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------------	--------

Summary:

Notes that the proposed reserve along Pineglades Lowes Road boundary is a greater contribution than landowners are required to make at the time of subdivision. Concerned that Council may make a compulsory purchase to provide reserves for other developments. Pineglades would then be deprived of the use of this area which we have spent many years creating. Has no plans to subdivide and considers it presumptuous of Council to allocate a reserve that is unlikely to eventuate.

Concerned that council may put tree preservation orders in place which would restrict our future development in this area.

Decision Requested:

That the plan is amended to delete the reserve

1376 Pineglades Naturist Club Inc	1376.03	PC0911	PC090011- Reverse Sensitivity	Oppose
-----------------------------------	---------	--------	-------------------------------	--------

Summary:

States that considerable time and expense has been put into creating shelterbelts on our boundaries. These are now well established and any restrictions would reduce their effectiveness. Notes that The Council mentions preservation of character as being important.

Decision Requested:

That this issue is removed from the documentation so we can maintain our Grounds Management Plan.

1376 Pineglades Naturist Club Inc	1376.04	PC0911	PC090011- Buildings and Street Scene	Oppose
-----------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------------------------------	--------

Summary:

Opposes controls on the erection of tall fencing next to roads and right of ways. Considers that this precludes Pineglades from fencing extensive road boundaries for privacy and security. Pineglades requires screening from roads for public sensitivity. States that the club has shown empathy with environmental conservation by our tree planting and would endeavour to make this unobtrusive.

Decision Requested:

That the plan is amended to allow Pineglades to erect 1.8m fencing on all boundaries.

1377 Steven Bruce Jones	1377.01	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Oppose
-------------------------	---------	--------	-----------------	--------

Summary:

Opposes the structure plan as the road that cuts through submitters property angle leaves a triangle of around 200m2 of waste ground which is of no use.

Suggests an alternative layout.

Decision Requested:

That the plan is amended to alter the route of the road through 141 Brookside Road.

Points by Hearing Topic

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1378 Andrew Palliser and Kathryn Winchest	1378.01	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Oppose

Summary:

Consider that Plan Change 11 is more restrictive than the status quo (L1B zoning). It would substantially restrict subdivision of their property, which would be zoned Living 1C. This allows subdivision into two allotments, which is significantly different than if the plan is unaltered. We acknowledge that Plan Change 11 allows subdivision of between 1,200 and 2,000m² but the restricted discretionary status of this means that gaining approval is less certain. Subdivision below 1,200m² will be non-complying thereby virtually eradicating any possibility of average lot sizes below the 1,200m².

Considers that it is unclear whether applications would be entertained for lots below 1,000m². If so, this is a significant departure from the 750m² minimum that would otherwise apply.

Decision Requested:

Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

1378 Andrew Palliser and Kathryn Winchest	1378.02	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Oppose
---	---------	--------	----------------------------------	--------

Summary:

The structure plan shows a walkway/cycleway crossing the north east corner of our property.

Regards this as unjustified restriction on land use. Concerned that they will not be able to build on parts of land even though may not subdivide. There is no guarantee that the road connection to the north of 31 Waterbridge Way will ever come to fruition and yet the connecting walkway is superfluous if it does not. Given this uncertainty, considers the walkway is an unjustified blight on our property.

Considers that there is insufficient detail regarding location and size. States that without the land being surveyed, they do not feel able to assess what impact the walkway would have on our ability to build or subdivide.

Considers that greater consultation about the size and position of these walkways is required and that binding assurances should be given to landowners about the maximum dimensions of and locations of the walkways.

Notes that the proposed walkway severs access to a portion of property and considers that it makes this chunk of land unusable.

Concerned that the walkway will change Waterbridge Way into a through route for cyclists and pedestrians where it is now a no exit street. This changes the nature of the street and presents social and safety issues which are not there now, including:

Privacy and security: There is a risk that it could be used as a congregating area, encouraging anti-social behaviour.

It is superfluous: The two roads proposed parallel to Waterbridge Way would provide ample access.

Safety Concerns: Waterbridge Way is not adequately designed for pedestrians and cyclists. Pedestrians and cyclists will be forced to jostle for space with cars in a poorly lit rural environment. Does not see how the rural environment can be maintained and an influx of pedestrians and cyclists be accommodated.

Concerned because there is no guarantee that the walkway would not be compulsorily acquired in future.

Decision Requested:

Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

Points by Hearing Topic

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1378 Andrew Palliser and Kathryn Winchest	1378.03	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Oppose

Summary:

Considers that having a pre-ordained pattern for future development may be sensible but that there are practical problems. Feels Council has not adequately dealt with these. Considers there is not enough detail in the section 32 report or in plan change 11 to evaluate how these issues will be dealt with:

Peacemeal implementation of the structure plan. Ownership is fragmented. The process and pace of development is likely to be piecemeal. Conversely, the provision of the infrastructure (roads and paths) requires a co-ordinated approach.

Problems accessing land during the interim phase

Where land is required to be set aside for roads, how will access be accommodated if they are not built?

Provision of new roads and walkways relies on a critical mass of people deciding to develop. What if this is never reached or takes decades to be reached? In the interim, peoples ability to develop their properties or build structures on them is severely curtailed. The leaders of the pack will need to either wait for critical mass before they implement their consents or make alternative provisions at extra cost.

Paying twice for the same road.

Considers that people will be charged twice for access: once in providing temporary access and again by way of development contributions for roads which may or may not be built.

Considers that the proposals amount to a de facto designation which adversely impacts on landowners.

Notes that there is no indication of how long it will take for development to reach a critical mass for and for roads to be built. Concerned that there is significant uncertainty about property values in the interim.

Decision Requested:

Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

1378 Andrew Palliser and Kathryn Winchest	1378.04	PC0911	PC090011- Development Contributions	Unclear
---	---------	--------	-------------------------------------	---------

Summary:

Notes that the mechanism for calculating development contributions is not addressed in this plan change. Raises these concerns:

If payment of a development contribution is triggered at the time of consent but the roadway never eventuates how will the payer be reimbursed and when.

How will the contributions be calculated?

Where land is to be yielded up to the Council for use as a new road or walkway will the valuation take account that some people will be able to create fewer allotments because a sizable portion of their land is now unusable as it has been allocated for a walkway?

Will the development contribution regime encourage landowners to hold out to the end when they can make the Council value their land more highly as a "ransom strip" in order to get the new road.

Decision Requested:

Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

Points by Hearing Topic

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1378 Andrew Palliser and Kathryn Winchest	1378.05	PC0911	PC090011- Buildings and Street Scene	Oppose

Summary:

Opposes maximum fence height (rule 4.13.1 and 4.13.4) of 1m as concerned about privacy and noise from foot traffic. Claims that Council typically asks commercial enterprises to erect 1.8m fences to attenuate noise which is the responsibility of private parties and that Council should take comparable steps here.

Opposes rule 12.1.4.5 (on crossing points). An additional crossing point would be required for subdivision of property. Does not want to have scope for subdivision limited and rejects the need to make additional crossings conform with the existing bridges as unnecessary, onerous and expensive.

Considers that new assessment criteria about the water race will further restrict land use. Questions why this concerns the Selwyn District Council as ecological impacts will be dealt with by the Regional Council. Concerned that the walkway is not merely to allow people to pass from one area to another but that some feature is to be made of the water race. Concerned that reverse sensitivity arguments could be brought to bear should we wish to develop our land in the future in a way that either impacts on the water race itself or which merely disrupts the public's view of it.

Decision Requested:

Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

1379 Darren Craig	1379.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Oppose
-------------------	---------	--------	----------------------------------	--------

Summary:

Submitter is concerned about the effect of walkway / cycleways on the character of 161 and 165 Brookside Road. These would no longer be quiet and secluded but surrounded by public through roads. Concerns include:

Increased noise
Anti-social behaviour
Less privacy
Increased potential for trespass and theft

Notes that two shelterbelts would be destroyed by the road. Considers that structure plan does not ameliorate or minimise impact on their properties. Concerned that spine road passes through an existing shed.

Submitter does not accept need for road and would prefer cul-de-sacs terminating on either side of their land.

Concerned about Uncertainty over compulsory acquisition. Notes that there is no guarantee that the roads or walkway would not be compulsorily acquired in future.

Decision Requested:

Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1379 Darren Craig	1379.02	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Oppose

Summary:

Considers that having a pre-ordained pattern for future development may be sensible but that there are practical problems. Feels Council has not adequately dealt with these. Considers there is not enough detail in the section 32 report or in plan change 11 to evaluate how these issues will be dealt with:

Peacemeal implementation of the structure plan. Ownership is fragmented. The process and pace of development is likely to be piecemeal. Conversely, the provision of the infrastructure (roads and paths) requires a co-ordinated approach.

Problems accessing land during the interim phase

Where land is required to be set aside for roads, how will access be accommodated if they are not built?

Provision of new roads and walkways relies on a critical mass of people deciding to develop. What if this is never reached or takes decades to be reached? In the interim, peoples ability to develop their properties or build structures on them is severely curtailed. The leaders of the pack will need to either wait for critical mass before they implement their consents or make alternative provisions at extra cost.

Paying twice for the same road

Considers that people will be charged twice for access: once in providing temporary access and again by way of development contributions for roads which may or may not be built.

Decision Requested:

Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Council to publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

1379 Darren Craig	1379.03	PC0911	PC090011- Development Contributions	Oppose
-------------------	---------	--------	-------------------------------------	--------

Summary:

Notes that the mechanism for calculating development contributions is not addressed in this plan change. Raises these concerns:

If payment of a development contribution is triggered at the time of consent but the roadway never eventuates how will the payer be reimbursed and when.

How will the contributions be calculated?

Where land is to be yielded up to the Council for use as a new road or walkway will the valuation take account that some people will be able to create fewer allotments because a sizable portion of their land is now unusable as it has been allocated for a walkway?

Will the development contribution regime encourage landowners to hold out to the end when they can make the Council value their land more highly as a "ransom strip" in order to get the new road.

Decision Requested:

Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Council to publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

Points by Hearing Topic

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1379 Darren Craig	1379.04	PC0911	PC090011- Buildings and Street Scene	Oppose
<p><u>Summary:</u> Considers that the indicative routes and setbacks are an unfair restriction on the use of land.</p> <p>Concerned that setbacks would also be applied to reserves.</p> <p>Concerned about "knock on" effects of Rule 12.1.4.49 (alterations to water-races on Waterbridge Way). Accepts own land not affected. Concerned that some reverse sensitivity argument could be brought to bear should they wish to develop land in a way which may disrupt the water race or the public's view of it. Notes that spine road would cover water-race.</p> <p>Considers rule stipulating that garage should occupy no more than 50% of frontage is an unfair design constraint.</p> <p>Considers that maximum fence height of 1m would compound privacy and security issues.</p>				
<p><u>Decision Requested:</u> Reject Plan Change 11</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.</p>				
1379 Darren Craig	1379.05	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Oppose
<p><u>Summary:</u> Considers that the subdivisibility of 161 and 165 Brookside Road is severely affected by the proposed rezoning even though the allotment size is reduced from 1,200m2 to 750m2.</p> <p>Considers that it restricts the number of allotments that could be achieved.</p>				
<p><u>Decision Requested:</u> Reject Plan Change 11</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.</p>				
1380 Diane Craig	1380.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Oppose
<p><u>Summary:</u> Refer 1379.01</p>				
<p><u>Decision Requested:</u> Reject Plan Change 11</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.</p>				
1380 Diane Craig	1380.02	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Oppose
<p><u>Summary:</u> Refer 1379.02</p>				
<p><u>Decision Requested:</u> Reject Plan Change 11</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.</p>				

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1380 Diane Craig	1380.03	PC0911	PC090011- Development Contributions	Oppose
Summary: Refer 1379.03			Decision Requested: Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Council to publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	
1380 Diane Craig	1380.04	PC0911	PC090011- Buildings and Street Scene	Oppose
Summary: Refer 1379.04			Decision Requested: Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	
1380 Diane Craig	1380.05	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Oppose
Summary: Refer 1379.05			Decision Requested: Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	
1381 Gary Craig	1381.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Oppose
Summary: Refer 1379.01			Decision Requested: Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	
1381 Gary Craig	1381.02	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Oppose
Summary: Refer 1379.02			Decision Requested: Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Council to publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1381 Gary Craig	1381.03	PC0911	PC090011- Development Contributions	Oppose
<u>Summary:</u> Refer 1379.03			<u>Decision Requested:</u> Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Council to publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	
1381 Gary Craig	1381.04	PC0911	PC090011- Buildings and Street Scene	Oppose
<u>Summary:</u> Refer 1379.04			<u>Decision Requested:</u> Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	
1381 Gary Craig	1381.05	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Oppose
<u>Summary:</u> Refer 1379.05			<u>Decision Requested:</u> Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	
1382 Michelle Craig	1382.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Oppose
<u>Summary:</u> Refer 1379.01			<u>Decision Requested:</u> Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	
1382 Michelle Craig	1382.02	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Oppose
<u>Summary:</u> Refer 1379.02			<u>Decision Requested:</u> Reject Plan Change 11 OR Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Council to publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.	

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1382 Michelle Craig	1382.03	PC0911	PC090011- Development Contributions	Oppose

Summary:
Refer 1379.03

Decision Requested:
Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Council to publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

1382 Michelle Craig	1382.04	PC0911	PC090011- Buildings and Street Scene	Oppose
---------------------	---------	--------	--------------------------------------	--------

Summary:
Refer 1379.04

Decision Requested:
Reject Plan Change 11

OR

Amend the plan change by deleting the roads, walkways and cycleways that pass through 161 and 165 Brookside Road and following further consultation to address concerns outlined. Selwyn District Council publish further information about the design guide and the development contributions.

1383 Western Reef Ltd	1383.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Oppose
-----------------------	---------	--------	----------------------------------	--------

Summary:
Submitter states that was assured that there were no town planning or other Council issues when bought property this year.

Decision Requested:
Amend the structure plan to re-route the footpath and use cul-de-sacs rather than a connected road through the submitters land.

Also assured that if we did not subdivide then the property would not be touched.

Submitters are concerned that a bridge over the water race would be lost and also 12 year old native trees which would compromise their privacy. Also concerned about loss of front lawn for new road.

Concerned about security. Asserts that measures including burglar alarms would be required at some expense, and that fencing would be required. Questions who would pay for this.

Concern over restrictions on fence height next to walkway.

Concern over loss of driveway (800 sq m).

1384 Correlia and Nicolaas van der Klei	1384.01	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Oppose
---	---------	--------	-----------------	--------

Summary:
Opposes the route of the proposed Spine Road over 137,141,143,145 Brookside Road and proposes alternative route.

Decision Requested:
Amend the route of the Spine Road

Plan Change 11 route favours 147 Brookside Road at the expense of 137,141,143 and 145 Brookside Road.

Submitters suggested alternative is more direct and divides the land more evenly with better subdivision potential

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1385 Sally Barbara Guyatt	1385.01	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Support

Summary:

Likes the idea of low density L1C zone away from Lowes Road.
Properties on Lowes Road can have Driveway access onto Lowes Road and will not affect tree-lined avenue (Fairhurst Place).

Decision Requested:

Approve Plan Change 11

Properties on Lowes Road / Fairhurst Place corner should be 750m2 with sympathetic planting.

1385 Sally Barbara Guyatt	1385.02	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Support
---------------------------	---------	--------	----------------------------------	---------

Summary:

States agreement with plan change

Decision Requested:

Approve Plan Change 11

1386 Stewart Leslie Haugh	1386.01	PC0911	PC090011- All	Support
---------------------------	---------	--------	---------------	---------

Summary:

States agreement with Plan Change

Decision Requested:

Approve Plan Change 11

1387 Lucie Ann and Kirk Warren Martin	1387.01	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Oppose
---------------------------------------	---------	--------	-----------------	--------

Summary:

Request that Brookside Road be upgraded as part of this rezoning. The road is in bad shape and the plan shows 4 additional feeds onto it (2 streets and 2 walkway / cycleways)

Decision Requested:

Not Stated

1387 Lucie Ann and Kirk Warren Martin	1387.02	PC0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Oppose
---------------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------------	--------

Summary:

Amend so that all sections facing onto East Maddisons Road are of a larger size than L1. New sections would then blend in with exiting properties on the western side of East Maddisons Road, which are between 1,200 and 5,000m2.

Decision Requested:

Amend to rezone sections fronting East Maddisons Road as L1B or L1C. "Inside" sections can remain L1.

1387 Lucie Ann and Kirk Warren Martin	1387.03	PC0911	PC090011- Buildings and Street Scene	Oppose
---------------------------------------	---------	--------	--------------------------------------	--------

Summary:

Requests that some trees be retained to retain the existing character

Decision Requested:

Amend to ensure trees are retained

Points by Hearing Topic

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1388 Cardno TCB	1388.01	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Support

Summary:

Notes that the plan change is aligned with Plan Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement and the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy and considers it is well suited for denser development as:

It encourage consolidated urban form.

Future Residents will be able to utilise the existing facilities in Rolleston (shopping, commercial, educational and recreational).

There is existing transport and other infrastructure

Considers that the use of a structure plan gives greater certainty when considering future urban form. Without it there is a risk of ad-hoc development. The structure plan will help development integrate with and complement its surroundings.

Decision Requested:

Approve Plan Change 11

1389 Newman Incorporation Ltd	1389.01	PC0911	PC090011- Development Contributions	Support
-------------------------------	---------	--------	-------------------------------------	---------

Summary:

Support the plan change

Decision Requested:

That landowners are awarded reasonable compensation for land acquired by Council

1390 Worthwhile (Rolleston) Ltd	1390.01	PC0911	PC090011- Development Contributions	Support
---------------------------------	---------	--------	-------------------------------------	---------

Summary:

Support the Plan Change

Decision Requested:

That landowners are awarded reasonable compensation for land acquired by Council

1391 Rodney Irvine Lee	1391.01	pc0911	PC090011- Rezoning	Oppose
------------------------	---------	--------	--------------------	--------

Summary:

Considers it unfair that sections in the proposed L1B area have a minimum average of 1,200m² when there are sections across the road that can be subdivided at L1 density.

Decision Requested:

Amend with a minimum lot size of 900-1000m² applying in the L1B areas.

1392 Crosbie Family Trust	1392.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Oppose
---------------------------	---------	--------	----------------------------------	--------

Summary:

Opposes the proposed walkway / cycleway across 26 Jozecom Place. Does not believe there is any need for this walkway and that it removes future options and privacy for the property.

Considers the walkway has been poorly designed and raises safety concerns with regard to conflicts between pedestrians and cars exiting from driveways.

Decision Requested:

That the proposed walkway through 26 Jozecom Place is removed and that better safer options be investigated.

Compensation be paid for loss of property value and inconvenience.

Points by Hearing Topic

SDC Operative District Plan - Summary of Submissions

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
1393 Kenneth William and Margaret Ruth Br	1393.01	PC0911	PC090011- Walkways and Cycleways	Oppose

Summary:

Oppose the roads at the end of Fairhurst Place. Oppose the cutting down of the radiata hedges which would take place if they are put in.

Concerned about parents driving children to school via Fairhurst Place. The new school does not need three entrances. Concerned about walkway cycleways leading to and past the school and that new school will have inadequate land.

Money should be spent on the new road for the school and a parking area outside it.

Decision Requested:

Not Stated

1394 Alisdair and Jeannie Hood	1394.01	PC0911	PC090011- Roads	Support
--------------------------------	---------	--------	-----------------	---------

Summary:

Submission relates specifically to the route of the spine road between East Maddisons Road and Campion Place.

Support is provided that:

The road is a secondary road (not a main through road)

That the design supports the nature and aesthetic of a secondary road (suitable extensive planting and permeable areas)

Boundary fencing be kept to a minimum and other methods of boundary definition are sought and stipulated within future guidelines.

That the rural character of the area is retained and that mature trees are preserved as much as possible.

Decision Requested:

That the considerations outlined are seriously addressed as part of development guidelines and attendant infrastructure.

Points by Hearing Topic

Topic: PC090011

Submitter	Point	Page	Provision	Type
-----------	-------	------	-----------	------

