

## Private Plan Change 3

### Summary of Decisions Sought

#### Introduction

The period for making submissions on Private Plan Change 3 to the District Plan closed on 3 March 2010. This is the second stage of the public submission process.

Further submissions give the opportunity to either support or oppose the submissions received. However, further submissions can only be made by a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest or by a person that has an interest in the council plan change that is greater than the interest of the general public. It is not an opportunity to make fresh submissions on the Plan Change itself, as a further submission must be limited to a matter in support of or in opposition to any submissions made to the Council.

The further submission Form 6 is available at all Council offices and online at [www.selwyn.govt.nz](http://www.selwyn.govt.nz)

| Submitter             | Submission No | Decision No | Request         | Decisions Sought  | Wishes to be heard |
|-----------------------|---------------|-------------|-----------------|---|--------------------|
| Darci Lynn Westergard | <b>S1</b>     | <b>D1</b>   | Oppose          | Deny the Plan Change request. Have the current Preston Downs subdivision wait until Gainsborough subdivision is completed and completely sold.  | No                 |
| Andrew James Trist    | <b>S2</b>     | <b>D1</b>   | Oppose          | Deny the Plan Change request. Have the current Preston Downs subdivision wait until Gainsborough subdivision is completed and completely sold.  | No                 |
| Greg Blair            | <b>S3</b>     | <b>D1</b>   | Support in part | Subject to following amendments:  | Yes                |
|                       |               | <b>D2</b>   | Amend           | Support connection to State Highway 73 as long as it does not interfere with community hall access.   | Yes                |
|                       |               | <b>D3</b>   | Amend           | There is safe passage made to cross State Highway for children travelling to and from the community hall i.e. pedestrian over bridge or tunnel.   | Yes                |
|                       |               | <b>D4</b>   | Amend           | That the design slows traffic or allows for a lower speed limit passing through West Melton.  | Yes                |
|                       |               | <b>D5</b>   | Amend           | Support the mixed density but with the proviso that the large allotments are kept to external site of the development so as to not unduly change the outlook from the existing properties on the western side of Westview Crescent. | Yes                |
|                       |               | <b>D6</b>   | Amend           | Smaller allotments are to be kept to the central area   | Yes                |

|  |           |           |                 |   |     |
|--|-----------|-----------|-----------------|---|-----|
|  |           | <b>D7</b> | Amend           | Non standard lighting is used to minimize light pollution affecting the West Melton Observatory.  | Yes |
|  |           | <b>D8</b> | Oppose          | Four connections to Halkett Road are too many. Request two or less entrances and no access to Halkett Road facing allotments.   | Yes |
| New Zealand Historic Places Trust Pouhere Taonga | <b>S4</b> | <b>D1</b> | Oppose          | An archaeological assessment should be undertaken by a professionally qualified archaeologist.  | Yes |
| Adam & Caroline Henderson                        | <b>S5</b> | <b>D1</b> | Oppose          | If the Council considers it necessary that existing neighboring properties connect to the Council sewer and water scheme then the developers or the Council must fund this requirement.   | Yes |
|  |           | <b>D2</b> | Oppose          | Minimum lot size of 500m2 to be changed to 800m2.   | Yes |
|  |           | <b>D3</b> | Oppose          | There should be a limit on the number of allotments in this zone.   | Yes |
|  |           | <b>D4</b> | Oppose          | Developers must fund any subdivision related upgrading of existing neighboring residents existing wells or water provision if needed within the next 25 years.  | Yes |
|  |           | <b>D5</b> | Oppose          | Developers provide a land package to West Melton School, fund a tunnel under SH73.  | Yes |
|  |           | <b>D6</b> | Oppose          | Halkett Road to be altered to meet the LTSA requirement of 7m width and the entry / exit points to the subdivision need to provide ample room and visibility for safety.  | Yes |
| Andrew & Diane Henderson                         | <b>S6</b> | <b>D1</b> | Support         | Support connection to State Highway 73 taking traffic away from Halkett Road and other intersections.   | No  |
|  |           | <b>D2</b> | Oppose          | Subdivision will provide a loop of roads which will be a good track for boy races.  | No  |
|  |           | <b>D3</b> | Oppose          | The village would then sandwiched between two busy roads creating an increase in traffic noise.   | No  |
| RD Hughes Developments Limited                   | <b>S7</b> | <b>D1</b> | Oppose          | Plan Change should be declined unless it can be modified so as to conform to the existing densities provided for within the District Plan as anticipated by the Urban Development Strategy and Proposed Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, and appropriate provision is made for any necessary upgrades to network infrastructure servicing West Melton. | Yes |
| Selwyn Central Community Board                   | <b>S8</b> | <b>D1</b> | Support in part | Subject to following amendments:  | Yes |
|  |           | <b>D2</b> | Amend           | No vehicular access to/from allotments along Halkett Road and that a new rule or other amendment to the Plan Change to give effect to this.   | Yes |

|  |            |           |                |   |               |
|--|------------|-----------|----------------|---|---------------|
|  |            | <b>D3</b> | Amend          | The new intersection on SH73 should be located an appropriate distance west of the West Melton Community Centre to allow safe vehicular access & egress to/from the car parks associated with the centre.   | Yes           |
| Grant Earl Baker                       | <b>S9</b>  | <b>D1</b> | Oppose         | No road connection to State Highway 73.   | Yes           |
| Edmund le Grelle                       | <b>S10</b> | <b>D1</b> | Oppose         | Development will affect quality of life due to urban environment proposed. Development of rural land wasn't anticipated by submitter. Not allow wooden fences along Halkett Road (vegetation / hedges would be suitable. May affect private water supplies.   | Yes           |
| NZ Transport Agency                    | <b>S11</b> | <b>D1</b> | Oppose in part | Subject to the following amendments:  | Yes           |
|  |            | <b>D2</b> | Amend          | The Outline Development Plan should be amended to include a reference that any connection to State Highway 73 will require the formal approval of the NZTA.   | Yes           |
|  |            | <b>D3</b> | Amend          | The ODP should show a connection to the adjoining Living 2 deferred zone  | Yes           |
|  |            | <b>D4</b> | Amend          | The ODP should identify that there is no direct property access to the State Highway  | Yes           |
| Margaret Longdale-Hunt & Bruce Russell | <b>S12</b> | <b>D1</b> | Support        | Progress forward the Preston Downs development in a timely manner   | No            |
| Gillman Wheelans Limited               | <b>S13</b> | <b>D1</b> | Support        | Subject to the following amendments:  | Yes           |
|  |            | <b>D2</b> | Amend          | That a new assessment matter is added to the subdivision section as follows:<br><br>Township Volume – Part C – Chapter 12 – Subdivision – 12.1<br><br><b>Utility Cables</b><br><br>12.1.4.5 Whether any utility cables shall be laid underground.<br><br><b>12.1.4.5A For the Living WM (West Melton) zone, whether street lighting options will assist with mitigating any adverse effects on the operation of West Melton observatory whilst not compromising the safe and efficient operation of the road network.</b> | Yes           |
| CL & DJ Kerr                           | <b>S14</b> | <b>D1</b> | Oppose         | Oppose urban development of West Melton   | Doesn't state |

|                          |            |           |         |  |     |
|--------------------------|------------|-----------|---------|--|-----|
| Richard Reeves Nesbitt   | <b>S15</b> | <b>D1</b> | Oppose  | No road connection to State Highway 73.  | Yes |
| Natalie Jayne Lombe      | <b>S16</b> | <b>D1</b> | Support | Generally support plan change.   | No  |
|                          |            | <b>D2</b> | Support | Support road link and intersection onto SH73 with sufficient separation between intersection and West Melton Community Centre.   | No  |
|                          |            | <b>D3</b> | Support | Support 500m2 minimum lot size as this allows a range of lots and choice for residents   | No  |
|                          |            | <b>D3</b> | Support | Support flexibility in lighting plan to ensure that the night sky's of West Melton and the observatory are protected   | No  |
|                          |            | <b>D4</b> | Oppose  | Multiple access onto Halkett Road - would support two or fewer access points   | No  |
| Murray Rollison Greta    | <b>S17</b> | <b>D1</b> | Oppose  | To arrive at a development design (that may not even need a Plan Change) that fits with current zoning densities while allowing for a proper interface with rural surroundings | Yes |
|                          |            | <b>D2</b> | Oppose  | A Council controlled outcome with the biggest possible lot sizes. Town sized lot sizes have no place in rural surroundings   | Yes |
|                          |            | <b>D3</b> | Oppose  | A ODP should be specific & final   | Yes |
| Rolleston Square Limited | <b>S18</b> | <b>D1</b> | Support | Proposed Plan Change 3 is adopted  | Yes |