

ATTACHMENT B

Officer's recommendation on submissions

	Submitter	Heard	Request	Decision sought		Recommendation
S01	Claire and Martin Allen	Not Stated	Opposed	D1.1	The water supply system does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate PC34.	REJECT - Although there is limited capacity at present to service PC34 there are viable and acceptable options to upgrade the water system to increase capacity. This can be detailed at subdivision stage
				D1.2	The wastewater system does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate PC34.	REJECT - Although there is limited capacity at present to service PC34 there are viable and acceptable options to upgrade the waste water system to increase capacity. This can be detailed at subdivision stage
				D1.3	The costs of providing for infrastructure upgrades may create a financial risk to the ratepayers of Southbridge.	REJECT - The any upgrades work would be funded by the future developer and/or Development contributions payable by future developers.
				D1.4	There is inadequate supply of water for fire fighting	REJECT IN PART – in part, as there is an adequate supply although this may not at present time meet fire fighting standards. Council has matters for discretion and policies to allow consideration of fire fighting capacity for any new subdivision..
S02	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	Yes	Neutral	D2.1	Is neither in support or opposed but seeks that the provision of a fully reticulated water supply is provided that meets the operational needs of the NZFS and the NZFS code, before houses are constructed on the PC34 site.	REJECT IN PART – The Southbridge scheme as a whole does not comply with the NZ Fire fighting code of practice in most areas. The scheme as a whole needs to be considered not just the PC34 site. Council is investigating options to increase water supply, including a new bore that will lead to better compliance with NZ Fire Fighting Code. With regard to PC34 specifically Council has matters for discretion and policies to allow consideration of fire fighting capacity for any new subdivision, including meeting SNZ PAS 4509.
				D2.2	Seeks the inclusion of new Rule 12.1.3.44 as follows: <u>12.1.3.44 Ensure that connections to reticulated water are available at all property boundaries. Where a reticulated water supply cannot provide adequate quantities and pressure for fire fighting as set out in SNZ PAS 4509:2008, an on-site firefighting water supply shall be provided in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>	REJECT – Council already has matters for discretion and policies to allow consideration of fire fighting capacity for any new subdivision..
				D2.3	Seeks an amendment to the proposed new Rule 12.1.6.8, to support the above, as follows: <u>12.1.6.8 Any subdivision subject to Rule 12.1.1 which does not comply with Rules 12.13.43 and Rule 12.1.3.44</u>	REJECT – Council already has matters for discretion and policies to allow consideration of fire fighting capacity for any new subdivision

3	Southbridge Advisory Committee	Yes	Support in Part	D3.1	Seek approval of Plan Change 34.	ACCEPT – It is recommended that PC34 be approved
				D3.2	The Plan Change will avoid future growth of Southbridge being reliant on ad hoc in fill subdivision or construction of residences on vacant sections.	ACCEPT – PC34 will provide an opportunity for greenfield development
				D3.3	Future development of the Plan Change site will likely refresh building stocks in the township and provide opportunity for residents to down size to smaller sections in the township. This may bring new employees to the township.	ACCEPT
				D3.4	An increase in residents will likely enhance the use of existing community infrastructure.	ACCEPT
				D3.5	An increase in residents will likely provide increased support for more service activities and resources for the township	ACCEPT
				D3.6	Development contributions arising from the development of the Plan Change site and an increased rating base will spread the burden of infrastructure maintenance and development.	ACCEPT
				D3.7	The approval of the Plan Change will be able to take advantage of population shifts since the Canterbury Earthquakes	ACCEPT
				D3.8	Support creation and on going protection of a reverse sensitivity buffer between the Plan Change site and McMillan Specialist Drilling Services.	ACCEPT – It is recognised that there is a reverse sensitivity issue and mitigation measures have been recommended.
				D3.9	Support a bush/tree buffer in the reverse sensitivity buffer for aesthetic purposes, provided this could raise issues with access of sunlight for adjoining proposed lots.	ACCEPT IN PART - in that it is accepted a reverse sensitivity buffer is needed but the aesthetics of this would be up to a future developer and/or future land owners
				D3.10	Support the suggestion that the reverse sensitivity buffer be given a reserve status to provide a walkway link to	ACCEPT IN PART - in that it is accepted a reverse sensitivity buffer is needed but it is not requirement for connection or open space provisions.

					Robinsons Road but are uncertain of the costs of achieving this.	
				D3.11	Do not support the use of relocatable houses unless they are new or of a very high quality in terms of their ability to meet the current building code. Safeguards should be put in place to ensure these standards are met.	REJECT – The current District Plan framework and the building code sufficiently control the quality and standard of relocates
4	Nicola Wellby and Martin Wellby	Yes	Opposed	D4.1	Seek that the plan change is declined	REJECT – it is recommended that PC34 be approved
				D4.2	The water supply system does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate a further 56 lots.	REJECT - Although there is limited capacity at present to service PC34 there are viable and acceptable options to upgrade the water system to increase capacity. This can be detailed at subdivision stage
				D4.3	The development will impact on current water supply service levels	REJECT - Although there is limited capacity at present to service PC34 there are viable and acceptable options to upgrade the water system to increase capacity. This can be detailed at subdivision stage
				D4.4	The wastewater system does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate PC34.	REJECT - Although there is limited capacity at present to service PC34 there are viable and acceptable options to upgrade the waste water system to increase capacity. This can be detailed at subdivision stage
				D4.5	The costs of providing for infrastructure upgrades will put further financial pressure on existing ratepayers.	REJECT - The any upgrades work would be funded by the future developer and/or Development contributions payable by future developers.
				D4.6	There is inadequate supply of water for fire fighting	REJECT IN PART – in part, as there is an adequate supply although this may not at present time meet fire fighting standards. Council has matters for discretion and policies to allow consideration of fire fighting capacity for any new subdivision..
				D4.7	Concerned about the impacts of reverse sensitive effects to McMillan Well Drilling, as the largest employer in the township.	ACCEPT – It is recognised that there is a reverse sensitivity issue and mitigation measures have been recommended.
				D4.8	Support the use of a reverse sensitivity buffer adjacent to McMillan Well Drilling	ACCEPT – It is recognised that there is a reverse sensitivity issue and mitigation measures have been recommended, including a reverse sensitivity buffer.
5	Stewart Roger Collie	Yes	Opposed	D5.1	Seek that the plan change is declined	REJECT – it is recommended that PC34 be approved

				D5.2	The proposal does not fit with, and would drastically alter, the character of the existing township	REJECT – The framework of PC34 is consistent with that of the existing township (e.g. lot size, setbacks, height, site coverage etc). It also recommend that fence heights are controlled to retain character along street and reserve frontages
				D5.3	Rural character is a defining characteristic of Southbridge and it is strongly disagreed that the loss of the Plan Change sites rural character is not an adverse effect.	REJECT – as above (D5.2). Southbridge township is an urban environment. Although some rural land adjoining the town is being lost this is insignifcant to the overall rural land area and character of the area around Southbridge. The township will still be surrounded by rural land uses and continue to be a “rural township”
				D5.4	The wastewater system does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate any additional connections.	REJECT - Although there is limited capacity at present to service PC34 there are viable and acceptable options to upgrade the waste water system to increase capacity. This an be detailed at subdivision stage
				D5.5	The proposal to install another pump at Southbridge does not address the waste water infrastructure issue fully as the Leeston Waste Water Treatment Plant has in sufficient capacity to process the additional wastewater generated.	REJECT - Although there is limited capacity at present to service PC34 there are viable and acceptable options to upgrade the waste water system to increase capacity. This an be detailed at subdivision stage. EWWTP is able to service Southbridge and the PC34 site
				D5.6	If the Leeston Waste Water Treatment Plant is to be upgraded it is logical to use the extra capacity to allow more connections in Leeston in the first instance.	REJECT – The EWWTP is able to service Southbridge and the PC34 site. Selwyn District Councils growth model indicates growth to Southbridge out to 2031. Sufficient and appropriately located land should be supplied to accommodate this.
				D5.7	The water supply system does not have sufficient capacity to accommodate a further development and how this will be resolved is not clear or certain.	REJECT - Although there is limited capacity at present to service PC34 there are viable and acceptable options to upgrade the water system to increase capacity. This an be detailed at subdivision stage
				D5.8	There is inadequate supply of water for fire fighting.	REJECT IN PART – in part, as there is an adequate supply although this may not at present time meet fire fighting standards. Council has matters for discretion and policies to allow consideration of fire fighting capacity for any new subdivision..
				D5.9	There is little evidence of demand for more residential development in Southbridge. It is more appropriate to utilise the existing Living 1 zoned land in Southbridge for development.	REJECT - Selwyn District Councils growth model indicates growth to Southbridge out to 2031. Sufficient and appropriately located land should be supplied to accommodate this.
6	McMillan Drilling Ltd	Yes	Support in Part	D6.1	Seeks provisions protecting their business operation from reverse sensitivity effects arising from a residential development.	ACCEPT – It is recognised that there is a reverse sensitivity issue and mitigation measures have been recommended.

				D6.2	Seek a "no objection" (to McMillan Drilling Ltd operations) covenant to be put on each title of the future development.	REJECT IN PART - in that a no objection covenant is a mechanism that could be utilised but this would have to be between a future developer and the landowner. Council must undertake its functions under the RMA and determine the appropriateness of a development by asses but effects and considering objectives and polices of relevant plans
				D6.3	Assurance is sought from the developer that McMillan Drilling will not be adversely affected in the future.	REJECT IN PART – This relates to the developer. However Council through assessing adverse effects can give some surety through the recommends made.
7	John Reuel and Lorraine Anne Summers	Yes	Opposed in Part	D7.1	Concerned about the loss of rural views from their property.	REJECT IN PART - as there will be a loss of rural outlook but this is deemed acceptable subject to the recommendations.
				D7.2	Seek that the Council and the developer protect the nine oak trees to the berm on the south west side of Brook Street	REJECT IN PART - in that developer has no control over the Oak trees. They are in Council road reserve. It will be up to the Council roading department as to whether these are retained.
				D7.3	Seek visual mitigation of the future residential subdivision along its Brook Street frontage through either a bund formation and/or tree planting to soften boundary between a residential development and a rural area. This will also have the benefit of protecting residents in the new development from southerly and south westerly storms.	REJECT IN PART - it is not recommended that there be additional tree planting but it is recommended that fence heights are controlled to soften the interface with public road. Shorter fence heights will also likely encourage more planting along the road frontage thus creating the submitters desired outcome, however there is no certainty or requirement to do this.