

100 413079

Form 5
Submission on publicly notified Plan Change
Selwyn District Plan

Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991



To Selwyn District Council
2 Norman Kirk Drive
PO Box 90
Rolleston
Christchurch 7614
FAX: 03-347-2799

1. Full name of submitter: DONALD, STRANACK, COTTLE, WRIGHT

This is a submission on the following proposed Plan Change:

Plan change 7 & Plan change 23 (name and number of Plan Change)

2. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are: (Attached)
The zoning time-line along the Springston -
Rolleston Road corridor (R.D.S. Page 41.)
(give details).

3. *My submission in SUPPORT / OPPOSITION is:
I strongly support Plan Change 23 Appendix 3.

I strongly reject the zoning timeline along
Springston - Rolleston Road (Attached)

*Include whether you SUPPORT or OPPOSE specific parts of the plan change or wish to have them amended; and the reasons for your views. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

4. †I seek the following decision from Selwyn District Council: a zoning change
(See Attached)

†Give precise details, including the nature of any change sought. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

5. I WISH / ~~DON'T WISH~~ to be heard in support of my submission (delete as applicable)

6. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing ☒ Yes.
(delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)

7. [Signature] 12 April 2010
Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on their behalf) Date

8. Address for service of submitter: 527 Springston-Rolleston Road,
R.D. 8 CHRISTCHURCH 7678

Telephone: (03) 3478 8440 Fax:

Email: DSCWright@extra.co.nz

Contact person: Title(if appropriate)

Attachment to Form 5

Submission on publicly notified, Plan Change 7. Selwyn District Plan.

Don Wright

◆ We have serious concerns about our position regarding Plan Change 7 and the proposed 'Living Z' zone. We would prefer that Springston-Rolleston Road be given immediate development and high density status (Stage 1). This could be done by adding the land on the southern side of the road to the proposed SR6 and SR7 zones. Or creating new sub-zones SR6A and SR7A with some different conditions, if necessary. It is realised that the existing population densities are different and that it is **easier** for planners and developers to deal with as few owners as possible, however, a glance at the map shows that the three areas are inextricably joined and are virtually one. Logic suggests that the whole area should be developed at the same time. The proposed upgrading of Springston-Rolleston Road to become a main leader road with a bus route, very close to the Recreational Precinct, High School and Neighborhood shopping centre as well as the SR6 and SR7 zones seems to suggest that S/R Road and SR'6s & 7 should be developed at approximately the same time..

◆ I question the absolute need for development to occur only along a narrow front, simply because a single owner has a relatively large area of unoccupied land for sale. It was only a short time ago that Rolleston was spreading like wildfire both north and south along State Highway 1.

◆ Long term residents of Springston-Rolleston Road have always considered themselves to be part of, and belonging to, the Rolleston community. We have served on committees and made constructive submissions to Consent Hearings over the 20 year period that has seen the town mushroom.(See attached appendices).

◆ The key to any future development, including the SR6 and SR7 zones, according to the Rolleston Draft Structure Plan, depends on installing the main sewerage line to the new Southern Pumping Station i.e. along Springston-Rolleston Road. It is planned to turn S/R Road into a tree-lined avenue with lateral and central tree-planting. According to the RDS Report this planting should be done sooner rather than later. With the existing water race on the north side of the road, widening might be expected to take place on the south side

◆ The notion that Springston-Rolleston Road is 'some' distance from the SR6 & SR7 zones, **must** be challenged. For **many** of us it is a nice easy walk which we do on a daily basis, just for exercise. (RDSP page 111)

◆ If the planned Recreational Precinct is going to attract hungry sports supporters as suggested, where better to go for sustenance than to the nearest Neighborhood Centre on S/R Road just a very short walk away.

◆ Many of us along Springston-Rolleston Road still have septic tanks, which in March 1995 was a **powerful reason** for getting Resource Consent for a central collection, treatment and disposal systems. We along S/R Road were all in the **headcount** for getting that consent granted.

◆ Upgrading and widening the road, planting the trees, putting in the sewer line, water reticulation and fibre optic cables, establishment of the necessary residential setbacks from the road. etc., might all be expected to be done at the same time. Now. Rather than in bits and pieces somewhere down the track. I believe in consultation with the locals affected, and perhaps some financial input from them, it could be done now. **I would like to see Springston-Rolleston Road, developed early and as the perfect example of what the new ROLLESTON concept is really all about.** (See the RSP)