

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

Attn: Ben Rhodes, Policy and Strategy Planner

1. Full name of submitter: STEWART ROGER COLLIE

This is a submission on the following proposed Plan Change: *PC 34 –Roxburgh Property Developers Limited  
- Southbridge*

2. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

a. THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO REZONE THE SUBJECT LAND TO  
A LIVING 1 ZONE;

b. THE TYPE OF SUBSEQUENT SUBDIVISION OF THE SUBJECT LAND. (give details).

3. \*My submission in ~~SUPPORT~~ / OPPOSITION is:

SEE ATTACHED SHEET

\*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: .....  
 THAT THE COUNCIL DECLINE THE PROPOSAL TO REZONE  
 THE SUBJECT LAND  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....  
 .....

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

5. I WISH / ~~DO NOT 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  
 (delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)

7. J. Collie ..... 12/11/14 .....  
 Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on their behalf) Date

8. Address for service of submitter: 131 HIGH STREET .....  
SOUTHBRIDGE 7602 .....

Telephone: (03) 324 2912 ..... Fax: .....

Email: jscollie@gmail.com .....

Contact person: THE SUBMITTER ..... Title ..... (if appropriate)

### 3. My submission in OPPOSITION is:

I oppose the proposed change of zoning for the following reasons:

**Excessive change of character to the township.** As the applicant notes, Southbridge is characterised by a spacious layout. Also, in their words, the proposed development that this zoning change would allow is “compact”. These two positions are contradictory – from the plans provided in Appendix E, it appears that the applicant’s purpose in seeking the change of zoning is to allow creation of a generic suburban development in a township that has, as they rightly note, a unique, spacious character. Furthermore, the proposed development would increase the number of households in Southbridge by 18%, concentrated in a small region of the town’s footprint. It is hard to imagine this could not drastically alter the character of the township. In a similar vein, the applicants acknowledge (Section 6.2.1) “...a loss of the rural character of this site as viewed from adjoining properties and the road...” but go on to arbitrarily dismiss this loss of character as “...not considered to be an adverse effect in the context of the Southbridge township.” Rural character is a defining characteristic of Southbridge, distinguishing it from other more heavily developed Selwyn townships, so I strongly disagree that the loss of this character is not an adverse effect.

**Wastewater issues inadequately addressed.** The Opus engineer’s report is unequivocal that the existing capacity for wastewater treatment is insufficient for any additional connections (thus the nature of future subdivision is immaterial). While the applicant has identified the installation of another pump in Southbridge as a relatively low cost solution, this is actually irrelevant given that the Leeston Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) has insufficient capacity to process the additional wastewater generated. They have failed to provide any information about their strategy to address this, and the engineer’s report is clear that this issue is complex. The proposed zone change should not be permitted in these circumstances. If the Leeston WWTP was to be upgraded by the Selwyn District Council, it would surely be logical to use this extra capacity to allow more connections in Leeston in the first instance, as Southbridge already exceeds its intended number of connections to the scheme.

**Potable water issues inadequately addressed.** The Opus engineer’s report is clear that water usage in Southbridge runs close to capacity, and that the water supply system lacks redundancy. It is already inadequate to provide sufficient water pressure for firefighting. The Selwyn District Council also highlighted this deficiency in their original response to the applicant (Appendix B). The applicant provides very little detail on how to address this (they simply propose to upgrade the pump and renew the permit to allow a higher water take); these would need to be much more clearly described, and there is no indication that the latter would be likely to be approved by ECan. As is the case for wastewater, the inadequate existing infrastructure means that very few, if any, additional demands can be placed on the system. Thus there is no justification to contemplate a zone change to allow any form of subdivision until these issues have been resolved.

**Evidence of demand/need for zoning change allowing subdivision is not compelling.** The applicant’s previous Southbridge development (with fewer sections created) has taken eight years to be completed – a long time given the population increase that has occurred in the Selwyn district overall (with commensurate demand for housing) in the last four years, i.e. since the earthquakes. Therefore it is likely that the subdivision which is the reason for this proposed zoning change will take many years to be fully taken up, and it is questionable if it is needed at all. Indeed, as the applicant notes in Section 3.1, no studies have been carried out to determine population growth trends in Southbridge. It would be unwise to assume that overall Selwyn growth trends (which will primarily reflect the trends for far larger centres closer to Christchurch) can be extrapolated to a more distant settlement like Southbridge. Although the developer would be bearing most of the financial risk associated

with this, a drawn-out uptake of the sections in the development will result in aesthetic impairment of the location, and considerable disruption to local residents from ongoing building works. The Selwyn District Plan encourages new residential developments to be on land already zoned Living 1, and the applicant acknowledges such land exists in Southbridge (albeit not in their possession). The applicants claim that there are "...no areas of significance..." (Section 8.5) but it is not clear what this actually means. Therefore I believe it would be more appropriate to utilise the existing Living 1 zoned land in Southbridge for development.