



Application for Plan Change

Main South Road, Rolleston

September 2014

Selwyn District Council

REQUEST TO CHANGE THE SELWYN DISTRICT PLAN UNDER CLAUSE 21 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

REQUEST BY: Dreamtime Limited
C/- Aston Consultants Ltd
PO Box 1435
Christchurch 8140, Attn Fiona Aston

TO: The Selwyn District Council

INVOLVING THE: The Selwyn District Plan

The location to which this application relates is:

An area of approximately 20.59 ha located at the northern approach to Rolleston, bounded immediately to the south of SH1, east of Living Z zone and north of Levi Road.

The names of the owners and occupiers of the land to which this application relates are as follows:

Lot 4 DP 74253 Dreamtime Limited (20.59 ha)

The title is attached as **Annexure 1** to this Plan Change request.

The Proposed Plan Change seeks to rezone the subject land from Rural Inner Plains to Living 3 zone which includes the following changes to the District Plan and Maps:

- Amend Township Planning Map 013 sheets 1 and 2, Map 098 sheets 1 and 2, and Rural Map 13 sheets 1 and 2, to rezone the subject land Living 3.
- Amend the rules of the District Plan as set out in Section 2 of the attached report.
- Make any consequential changes to text where necessary, including but not limited to the renumbering of clauses as appropriate.

Signed:



Fiona Aston, for and on behalf of Dreamtime Limited

Dated: Friday, February 20, 2015

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. Overview | 4 |
| Purpose of the Plan Change Request | 4 |
| Reason for the Request | 4 |
| Description of the Site, Locality and land Use | 5 |
| Background and Strategic Considerations | 5 |
| <i>Regional Policy Statement</i> | |
| <i>Rural Residential Strategy</i> | |
| <i>Rural Residential Background Report</i> | |
| <i>Plan Change 17</i> | |
| <i>Plan Change 32 and LURP Action (viii)</i> | |
| Approach and Key Features of the Plan Change | 8 |
| 2. Proposed Amendments to the District Plan | 10 |
| 3. Statutory Framework | 15 |
| Requests for Changes to Plans | 15 |
| <i>Section 74 and 75 – Matters to be Considered</i> | |
| Assessment Against Selwyn District Plan | 16 |
| Regional Planning Documents | 16 |
| Other Planning Documents | 17 |
| <i>The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy</i> | |
| <i>Christchurch, Rolleston and Environs Transport Strategy (CRETS)</i> | |
| <i>Draft Rural Residential Strategy</i> | |
| <i>Selwyn District Council Rural Residential Background Report</i> | |
| <i>Plan Chang 32 – Rural Residential Activities</i> | |
| <i>Rolleston Structure Plan</i> | |
| <i>Selwyn District Council Walking and Cycling Strategy and The Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Strategy</i> | |
| <i>Iwi Management Plan</i> | |
| Further RMA considerations | 20 |
| <i>Section 31 – Consistency with RMA Functions</i> | |
| <i>Integrated Management – Section 31(a)</i> | |
| <i>Prevention or Mitigation on Contaminated Land – Section 31(b)(iia)</i> | |
| <i>Emission of Noise – Section 31(d)</i> | |
| <i>Section 32 Evaluation</i> | |
| <i>Adverse Effects on the Environment</i> | |
| Part 2 – Purpose and Principles of the Act | 22 |
| <i>Section 5(1)</i> | |
| <i>Section 5 (2) (a) – (c)</i> | |
| <i>Section 7 – Other Matters</i> | |
| <i>Section 6 and 8 – Matters of National Importance/ Treaty of Waitangi</i> | |
| 4. Assessment of Effects on the Environment | 25 |
| Neighbourhood and Wider Community Effects | 25 |
| <i>Reverse Sensitivity</i> | |
| Physical Effects | 26 |
| <i>Landscape Effects</i> | |
| <i>Ecosystems</i> | |
| <i>Natural and Physical Resources</i> | |
| Servicing | 28 |
| <i>Stormwater</i> | |
| Aston Consultants Resource Management and Planning | 2 |

| | |
|---|----|
| Waste Water | |
| Water Supply | |
| Discharge of Contaminants | 28 |
| Natural Hazards and Hazardous Substances | 29 |
| 5. Section 32 Assessment | 30 |
| Key District Plan Objectives | 30 |
| Efficiency and Effectiveness | 31 |
| Alternative Options – Costs and Benefits and Efficiency and Effectiveness | 33 |
| <i>Option One: Status Quo – Leave the Land Zoned Rural</i> | |
| <i>Option Two: Rezone the Land for Rural Residential Purposes (Living 3)</i> | |
| <i>Option Three: Rezone to a Medium to High Density Living Zone</i> | |
| <i>Option Four: Apply for a Resource Consent for the Proposed Subdivision and Development</i> | |
| <i>Preferred Option: Rezone to Living 3</i> | |
| Evaluation of Risk | 43 |
| 6. Consultation | 44 |
| 7. Conclusion | 45 |

Annexures:

| | |
|--|--|
| Annexure One: Certificates of Title | |
| Annexure Two: Outline Development Plan | |
| Annexure Three: Assessment Against Planning Provisions | |
| Annexure Four: Landscape Report | |
| Annexure Five: Transport Assessment | |
| Annexure Six: Engineering and Servicing Report | |
| Annexure Seven: Site Contamination Preliminary Site Assessment | |
| Annexure Eight: Geotechnical Report | |
| Annexure Nine: SDC Letter re Pre-Application Meeting | |
| Annexure Ten: Matson & Allan Letter | |
| Annexure Eleven: Assessment Against Rural Residential Background Report Preferred Rural Residential Criteria | |
| Annexure Twelve: Section 32 Evaluation Report | |
| Annexure Thirteen: NZTA Approval | |

1. OVERVIEW

Purpose of the Plan Change Request

- 1.1. The purpose of the Plan Change is to allow for the rezoning of approximately 20.59ha of land on the eastern side of Rolleston from its current Rural (Inner Plains) zoning to Living 3 zoning. The rezoning of this land represents an appropriate and sustainable use of the land resources. The location is optimal with respect to integrating with a self-sustaining township and promotes connectivity via infrastructure services and transport networks. The proposal also provides opportunities for employment and access to social services for future residents. The proposal enables development while avoiding adverse effects on strategic infrastructure, including avoiding the airport noise contours, and by providing an appropriate setback from State Highway 1.
- 1.2. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the objectives and policies of the District Plan and gives effect to the Regional Policy Statement (particularly Chapter 6). The Plan Change request provides for a sustainable and integrated provision of rural residential land with use of an Outline Development Plan to ensure coordinated and well planned outcomes.

Reason for Request

- 1.3. The reason for the request is that it is an appropriate location for rural residential development, as evidenced by the fact that it was identified as a 'preferred location' in the Council's Plan Change 17 (Rural Residential) which was subsequently withdrawn; and the proposal will assist in meeting the strong unmet demand for rural residential land (as discussed below). Further, rural residential zoning overcomes issues with the current Inner Plains zoning arising from residential development occurring to the west. The proposal represents a means to reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity effects between residential activities and the rural activities to the east (or activities which currently occur on the site and would continue to occur should development not be undertaken). The proposed larger lots to the east ensure larger setbacks and potentially residence with a higher tolerance to agricultural activities. As the landowner of the both the development to the west and the Site, it is considered that the most appropriate use of the Site for rural residential housing, with larger section sizes, and road access from the land to the west. This solves the access problem and with larger section sizes, this enables greater setbacks from adjoining rural activities, thus reducing any reverse sensitivity issues at the living/rural zone interface.
- 1.4. The existence of a strong demand for rural residential sections was the finding of the Ford Baker report, commissioned by the Council in July 2010 (prior to the earthquakes) as part of its Rural Residential Background Report (August 2010, 'RRBR'). The report found that the Greater Christchurch part of Selwyn District alone could sustain 120 rural residential households per year, which amounts to 1800 households until 2028.

- 1.5. A need for rural residential sections in the Greater Christchurch area has been accentuated by pressure from earthquake affected people from urban areas seeking to relocate to a more rural setting (see letter from Matson & Allan Real Estate attached as **Annexure 10**).

Description of Site, Locality and Land Use

- 1.6. The land to which the Plan Change relates ('the Site') is located on the eastern side of Rolleston. The land is currently zoned Rural Inner Plains and is approximately 1-2 kilometers from the main commercial hub of Rolleston.
- 1.7. The Site involves a total of 20.59 ha of land in a single allotment, being Lot 4 DP 74253.
- 1.8. Land to the immediate south which forms the southern boundary of the Site is currently zoned Rural Inner Plains and comprises two large rural residential lifestyle blocks of between 5 and 6ha respectively. The Site is screened from activity to the south by establish rural shelterbelts tall popular trees.
- 1.9. The land to the immediate west of the Site is owned by the applicant (Lot 3 DP 74253) the land is zoned for low density residential development (Living Z, average allotment size 750m²) and is currently subject to a subdivision application for Greenfield development, as is the land beyond Lot 3 to the south, which is also zoned Living Z. This land currently has a harness racing track and is used for general rural grazing and rural lifestyle purposes.
- 1.10. SH1 is on the immediate northern boundary of the Site. State Highway 1 ('SH1') is classified as a strategic road, is a limited access road and the section of SH1 adjoining the Site contains a passing lane. Further to the north of the Site, beyond SH1, is rural land in pastoral activity and the New Zealand Railway Line (at its closest point from the northern boundary approximately 135m). To the east of the Site are large rural and rural lifestyle properties, including horse racing tracks. Immediately adjoining the Site along the eastern boundary adjoining SH1 there is a long narrow block with an area of approx. 0.8ha. This block does not extend for the full length of the Site, and is screened from the Site by shelter belts. Current access to the Site is from SH1 and an access strip to Levi Road to the south. The access to SH1 will cease after rezoning and implementation of the consent.
- 1.11. The Site and surrounding area has a generally flat contour comprising paddocks separated by shelter belts and shelterbelts bordering the Site. There are distant views to the Port Hills in some areas within the Coles block and from SH1. The Site is currently used for grazing stock and growing crops. SH1, while a busy arterial route, has an attractive avenue of trees adjoining the northern boundary. Currently the Site is generally open visually to SH1 and has one vehicle access to SH1 which is used for access to the existing farm dwelling only (sited 60m from the SH1 Site frontage). The only farm road access is via a 9.56m wide access leg which runs along the western boundary of the neighbouring property to the south, is not within the Rolleston Living Z Zone Outline Development Plan (ODP) Area 3. Exclusion from the Area 3 ODP is an error, as clearly the intention is for the land to be

developed as part of the adjoining residential development given its location within the Urban Limits.

- 1.12. The Site is part of a well-established farm contracting business and includes a dwelling and farm yard. The rural contracting operations include an intensive cropping regime involving the use of farm machinery at night time throughout the summer months for harvesting.
- 1.13. The owners have run this farm in association with a 20ha lot to the west (Lot 3 DP 7352). Lot 3 has now been rezoned Living Z zone and is within the urban limit at Rolleston. This severs the existing farm property and renders continued use of the balance farm (Lot 4) for farming purposes impractical and not viable. It will be without road access, substantially reduced in size, and therefore too small to support the farm contracting business. The current intensive cropping regime involves use of farm machinery at night-time throughout the summer months for harvesting. There is potential that such continued activity will result in complaints from residents once the land to the west is developed, creating reverse sensitivity issues.

Background and Strategic Considerations

Regional Policy Statement

- 1.14. The Regional Policy Statement (RPS) 2013 sets out the objective and policy framework for resource management issues in the Canterbury Region. Chapter 6 of the RPS provides the framework for development outside of urban areas in the Canterbury Region. The chapter was developed as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP) which provides for the future development of the Canterbury Region post the 2011 earthquakes. The LURP provisions are considered as part of the objectives and policies in relation to this plan change.

Rural Residential Strategy

- 1.15. The primary purpose of the Rural Residential Strategy is to provide guidance and policy direction on how best to manage rural residential development within the area of Selwyn District that is subject to the Land Use Recovery Plan/ Te Mahere Whakahaumanu Tāone (LURP). This includes establishing the optimal form, function and character of rural residential development and where it is best located.
- 1.16. Rural residential development in this context includes land holdings integrated into existing townships that range in size from between 0.3ha to 2ha in size at an average density of one to two households per hectare. This form of development is managed through the Living 3 zone of the Selwyn District Plan (SDP).
- 1.17. This Strategy identifies specific criteria to consider when identifying sites suitable for Rural Residential development, including landscape values, Cultural values, infrastructure limits and market demands. This strategy goes on to identify a number sites which are

suitable for consideration taking into consideration the criteria. One of the identified sites is the site subject to this proposed plan change.

Rural Residential Background Report

- 1.18. The Rural Residential Background Report (RRBR) was adopted by Council in February 2011. The RRBR investigated methods to manage rural residential development (development of land between 0.3ha and 2ha) in the eastern portion of Selwyn District, and identified criteria for determining preferred areas for rural residential growth. The purpose of the report was to provide the background context to inform Plan Change 17 (now withdrawn) to the District Plan. This report identifies a demand for rural residential development in the Selwyn District in the order of 120 households per year.
- 1.19. The Site was identified as a preferred location for rural residential development.
- 1.20. The Site meets all of the criteria for preferred locations for rural residential development in the RRBR (see assessment against criteria in **Annexure 11**). It is noted that the Site does contain versatile soils, but that maintenance of their life supporting capacity will not be precluded due to the low density of residential development with limited areas of hard surfaces. The continuation of the existing farming activity (cropping and farm contracting) is not feasible in any case, due to half of the farm being rezoned Living Z.
- 1.21. The proposal is for a relatively small rural residential 'node', which adjoins and will be integrated with the existing Rolleston township, and with a proposed ODP and rules which provide design solutions that achieve rural residential character and preserve the openness characteristic of the Plains landscape.

Plan Change 17

- 1.22. Plan Change 17 (PC17) was proposed and notified by Council to implement some of the findings of the RRBR. PC17 used the criteria set out in the RRBR to identify areas which were considered suitable for rural residential development, including the current proposed Site. This plan change was withdrawn after it became apparent there was significant contention as to which areas ought to be included or excluded. Instead Plan Change 32 was proposed (see below) which did not include identified locations

Plan Change 32 and LURP Action 18 (viii)

- 1.23. Plan Change 32 (PC32) was notified in March 2012 and proposed to incorporate more detailed and prescriptive Living 3 Zone objectives and policies into the Selwyn District Plan to inform the assessment of privately requested plan changes seeking a Living 3 Zone. Since notification, PC 32 has been withdrawn. The recently adopted Rural Residential Strategy is now proposed to be incorporated into the District Plan via the recommendations made by SDC to the Minister for Earthquake Recovery under Action 18 (viii) of the LURP. The Minister is yet to make a decision on these proposed amendments to the District Plan, and it is understood that they hold no legal weighting at this time. Nevertheless,

consideration of the proposed amendments as recommended to the Minister, have been made in **Annexure 3**.

Approach and Key Features of the Plan Change

1.24. The existing Living 3 rural residential zone for Rolleston is proposed to apply to the Site. This adopts the provisions of the existing Living 3 zone, but with site specific controls/rules.

1.25. Additional provisions are proposed to apply to the Site as follows:

- Requirement for development to be in general accordance with an outline development plan which applies good design principles and ensures development of the land is reflective of, and retains elements of, rural character expected for a rural residential zone and that the development will be serviced in a comprehensive and integrated manner, including:
 - A 20m setback from road boundaries.
 - A 15m setback from internal boundaries.
 - A 40m setback from boundaries with SH1.

1.26. Key design features of the Outline Development Plan include:

- A mix of lot sizes, with larger lots fronting onto SH1 (minimum 1 ha); smaller lots (minimum 2500m² adjoining LZ land to the west); and mid-size lots (4000 – 7500m²) for the balance land.
- A potential yield of 36 lots, with an average size of 4962m² as calculated using the method below. It is noted that this is consistent with the requirements in the Rural Residential Strategy, which sets out a minimum 1-2 households per ha (based on gross area of allotments).

total land area 205900 m² less –

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|
| • sewer pump station | 400 m ² |
| • internal roading | 21800 m ² |
| • access to rear lots | 1240 m ² |
| • SH road provision | 2796 m ² |
| • reserve + linkage (vest in SDC) | 1000 m ² (approx) |

leaves a total of 178664 m² which when divided by 36 = 4962 m² average

Note: if land along the SH frontage is taken as reserve, then the
Aston Consultants Resource Management and Planning

average lot size will reduce to around 4700m².

- Vehicle access from the adjoining Living Z zone to the west of the Site.
- Internal roading to be semi-rural in character with informal groupings of trees, grass berms and swales.
- Comprehensive and integrated plan for reticulated water supply, reticulated sewer disposal, stormwater management system, and reticulated electricity and telecommunications connections
- A Local Purpose – Landscape Reserve between the SH1 frontage and the northernmost rural residential lots, to incorporate a walkway/cycleway which will be an extension of the equivalent landscape and reserve with walkway and cycleway area for the residential development to the west. The ODP includes a walkway/cycleway link from the L3 zone internal road to this landscape buffer area.
- An area of approximately 2796m² along the northern end of the site which will be set aside for acquisition by NZTA to provide for the widening of the State Highway.

1.27. Access to SH1 has been precluded to maintain the operational integrity and safety of SH1.

1.28. Subdivision is a Restricted Discretionary Activity. The existing provisions provide performance conditions relating to the issues identified above as well as a list of more general matters for discretion to ensure that development is designed to ensure a sensitive rural/ urban interface, integration with land to the west and good urban design and amenity.

2. PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT PLAN

- 2.1. It is considered that the most appropriate means to achieve the proposed plan change is to largely adopt the existing provisions of the Living 3 zoning of the Selwyn District Plan. No new objectives or policies are proposed as part of this plan change request.
- 2.2. The following amendments to the District Plan provisions, appendices and planning maps are outlined below. Any text that is proposed to be added is shown as **bold, underlined and in italics** and any text to be deleted is shown as bold in italics and with a ~~strikethrough~~. Please note that only the proposed new and amended provisions to the District Plan are shown in this section and therefore should be read in conjunction with the full provisions of the District Plan. The following specific changes are sought to the District Plan to enable the rezoning to proceed:

| | |
|--------------|--|
| Amendment 1: | Amend Planning maps 13 and 98 to identify the zoning of the site as Living 3. |
| Amendment 2: | Include the Outline Development Plan attached to this document as a new Appendix 45 to the District Plan. |
| Amendment 3: | <p>Insert new rule after rule 4.9.31 as follows:</p> <p><u>4.9.31(a) Any building in the Living 3 Zone at East Rolleston (as shown on the Outline Development Plan in Appendix 45) shall be set back at least:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>20 metres from any road boundary except that on corner lots a minimum setback of 15m applies to one road boundary;</u> • <u>40 metres from any boundary with a state highway;</u> • <u>15 metres from any other boundary</u> |
| Amendment 4: | <p>Amend rule 4.9.42 as follows;</p> <p>.Any activity which does not comply with Rule 4.9.3 and Rule 4.9.30 to 4.9.32 and Rule 4.9.36 and 4.9.31(a) shall be a discretionary activity.</p> |
| Amendment 5: | <p>Amend Reasons for Rules – Building Position, 6th Paragraph on Page C4-032 as follows;</p> <p>Controls on side and front yard spaces apply to sites in the Living 3 Zone at Rolleston identified on the Outline Development Plan in Appendix 39, and 40 <u>and 45</u>, in order to retain views between residences and to assist in retaining elements of rural character and</p> |

| | |
|--------------|--|
| | provide visual integration and visual attractiveness. |
| Amendment 6: | <p>Amend Rule 5.1.1.6 as follows;</p> <p>5.1.1.6 For the Living 3 Zone at Rolleston identified on the Outline Development Plan in Appendix 39 and 40 and 45, the road shall include the <u>relevant</u> cross sectional treatment as shown in Appendix 39 and 40 and 45</p> |
| Amendment 7: | <p>Insert a new rule after rule 12.1.3.37 as follows:</p> <p><u>12.1.3.37(a) Any subdivision of land within the area shown in Appendix 45(Living 3 Zone at East Rolleston) complies with:</u></p> <p><u>(a) the establishment of discontinuous framework tree planting following some private lot boundaries and planting within the State Highway 1 Landscape Reserve , where the trees shall be comprised of the following species; existing species, or Tulip tree (Liriodendron tulipifera), Chinese poplar (Populus yunnanensis), Aspen poplar (P. Tremula), Plane tree (Platanus orientalis), Algerian oak (Quercus canariensis), Turkey oak (Q. Cerris), Pin oak (Q. Palustris), Sessile oak (Q. Petraea), Large-leaved lime (Tilia plataphyllos), Weeping silver lime (T. Petiolaris), Wych elm (Ulmus glabra) or similar species. A planting plan showing the detail of proposed framework planting shall be supplied and approved at the time of subdivision and the planting shall be undertaken by the developer. Planting shall be maintained at all times. Any dead, damaged or diseased trees shall be removed and replaced.</u></p> <p><u>The purpose of the framework planting is to provide shelter and amenity for private lots; maintain and/or create rural character elements; reduce the overall apparent scale of the development; and provide screening of glare and vehicle movement from the proposed southern motorway extension to the east. The planting will not be continuous and will retain vistas through the planting to the surrounding rural landscape.</u></p> <p><u>(b) The roading layout of the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 45;</u></p> <p><u>(c) where any conflict occurs with Rule E13.3.1 the cross sections in Appendix 45 shall take precedence;</u></p> <p><u>(d) No more than 36 lots shall be created.</u></p> |

| | | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|---|------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-------------------------------|---|
| Amendment 8: | <p>Amend Table C12.1 – Allotment sizes (page C12 – .015) to include the following;</p> <table><tr><td>Township</td><td>Zone</td><td>Average Allotment Size not less than</td></tr><tr><td>Rolleston</td><td><u>Living 3 (Appendix 45)</u></td><td><u>The land contained within the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 45 shall be developed with an average allotment size of no less than 4700m² with a minimum allotment size of 2500m²</u> <u>The maximum number of allotments within the area defined by the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 45 shall be 36</u></td></tr></table> | Township | Zone | Average Allotment Size not less than | Rolleston | <u>Living 3 (Appendix 45)</u> | <u>The land contained within the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 45 shall be developed with an average allotment size of no less than 4700m² with a minimum allotment size of 2500m²</u> <u>The maximum number of allotments within the area defined by the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 45 shall be 36</u> |
| Township | Zone | Average Allotment Size not less than | | | | | |
| Rolleston | <u>Living 3 (Appendix 45)</u> | <u>The land contained within the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 45 shall be developed with an average allotment size of no less than 4700m² with a minimum allotment size of 2500m²</u> <u>The maximum number of allotments within the area defined by the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 45 shall be 36</u> | | | | | |
| Amendment 9: | <p>Insert new clause after Clause 12.1.4.80 as follows:</p> <p>12.1.4.81 In relation to the Living 3 (<u>East Rolleston</u>) Zones as shown on Appendix <u>45</u>:</p> <p>Whether the pattern of development and subdivision is consistent with the Outline Development Plan <u>45</u>;</p> <p>Whether local road, and trees and planting on roads and lots are proposed in general accordance with the Outline Development Plan, road cross sections and associated planting schedules and requirements shown in Appendix 45;</p> <p>Whether the roading pattern and proposed hard and soft landscape treatments in the road reserve and on private lots will create a semi rural character to the development and distinguish it from conventional suburban development;</p> <p>Whether suburban road patterns and details such as cul de sacs, arbitrary curves and kerb and channels are avoided;</p> <p>Whether the provision of public walkways is consistent with the public walkways identified on the Outline Development Plans in appendix 45</p> <p>Whether the proposed framework planting meets the purpose of the</p> | | | | | | |

| | | | | | |
|---------------|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|------------------|---|
| | planting as specified in Rule 12.1.3.37(a) | | | | |
| Amendment 10: | Amend Appendix 13 Transport Table E13..8 –Roading Standards as follows: | | | | |
| | Type of Road | Legal Width (m) Min Max | Carriageway width (m) Min Max | Kerb and channel | Footpath(s) |
| | Local Roads – Living 3 Zones at Rolleston (as shown within Outline Development Plans at Appendix x <u>ces</u> 39 and 40 and <u>.45</u>) | 18m 20m | 6m 6.5 | Nil | One side only <u>(Holmes)</u> Nil, other than informal on both sides of road within berms (East Rolleston) |
| Amendment 11: | Include any consequential amendments and renumbering of provisions as required to give effect to the plan change request. | | | | |

3. STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

Requests for Changes to Plans

3.1. Section 73(1A) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (“the Act”) gives a territorial authority the right to change its District Plan. In addition, section 73(2) enables any person to request a territorial authority to change a District Plan in the manner set out in the First Schedule of the Act. This Plan Change request has been prepared in accordance with Schedule 1, Clause 21 of the Act.

Under Clause 22 of the First Schedule, a plan change request must:

- a) Explain the purpose and reasons for the request;*
- b) Contain an evaluation under s32 of the objectives, policies, rules or other methods proposed.*
- c) Assess environment effects in such detail as correspond with the scale and significance of actual and potential effects anticipated from the implementation of the plan change;*

3.2. In making a determination on the request under Clause 25 (2) Council may adopt the request, or part of the request, as if it were a proposed plan by the territorial authority, or accept the request, in whole or part, and proceed to notify.

3.3. It is requested that the request is accepted and notified in accordance with Clause 25(2)(b). There is considered no reasons to reject the request in whole or part under Clause 25(4) of the 1st Schedule.

3.4. The process for dealing with a Plan Change once it has been publicly notified and submissions received is set out in the First Schedule of the Act. In the case of a private plan change request, the procedure in Part 1 of the First Schedule, with all necessary modifications, apply except as set out in sub-clauses (2) to (9) of Clause 29 of Part 2 of the Schedule. This means that in this case:

- a) There needs to be a hearing into submissions on the proposed Plan Change (Clause 8(b) Part I);*
- b) The person who made the request for the Plan Change has the right to appear at the hearing under Clause 8(b);*
- c) After considering the Plan Change the local authority may decline, approve, or approve with modifications the Plan Change and shall give reasons for its decision;*
- d) The decision to decline or approve shall be served on every person who made a submission and the person who made the request; and*
- e) Every person who made a submission on the Plan Change and the person who made the request may refer the decision to the Environment Court.*

Section 74 and 75 – Matters to be considered

3.5. The matters to be considered in respect of a Plan Change are set out in sections 74 and 75 of the Act. In summary, before a plan change can be incorporated into a District Plan, the key matters that need to be considered include:

- (a) Consistency with other provisions of the district plan;*
- (b) Whether it gives effect to the regional policy statement and any relevant regional plans;*
- (c) The functions of a territorial authority at section 31;*
- (d) Whether the plan change will lead to the most appropriate outcome under s32;*
- (e) Actual and potential adverse effects anticipated from implementation of the Plan Change; and*
- (f) The purpose and principles within Part 2 of the Act.*

3.6. Each of the above matters is addressed below.

Assessment against Selwyn District Plan

3.7. The purpose of the Plan Change is to provide for rural residential zoned land, at an appropriate density, that ensures a sensitive integration and interface with the urban and rural edge, adjoining partially developed, low density residential development; and addresses reverse sensitivity with SH1. There are no new specific objectives proposed for the Site. The existing objectives for townships, Rolleston, and the Living Zones, set the policy framework that Living 3 Zone 'sits under'. Specific rules are proposed to address the effects of reverse sensitivity with SH1 and the rural/urban interface and to ensure that development occurs in an integrated and efficient manner to maintain a compact township shape.

3.8. **Annexure 3** provides a detailed assessment of the plan change request against the relevant objectives and policies of the District Plan.

Regional Planning Documents

3.9. The Regional Policy Statement (RPS) 2013 provides an overview of the resource management issues of Canterbury. It sets out how natural and physical resources are to be managed in an integrated way, with the aim of sustainable management. Chapter 6 provides more specific direction for growth, development and enhancement of the urban and rural areas of Greater Christchurch. This Chapter has recently been added to the RPS through the Land Use Recovery Plan (LURP), and has been considered as part of this application. The relevant provisions of the RPS are considered in **Annexure 3**, Table 1 and 2.

3.10. In addition to the above, the Regional Land Transport Strategy (2008 – 2018) sets out the targets and vision for land transport within Greater Christchurch. The key components

of this strategy are identified and assessed in Table 3 of **Annexure 3** and further discussed in the Transportation Assessment at **Annexure 5**.

- 3.11. The Proposed Natural Resources Regional Plan (NRRP) addresses sustainable management of natural resources in the Canterbury Region. It may be that a discharge consent for stormwater will be required for future development on the Site, under the provisions of the NRRP. This assessment process will ensure consistency with the provisions of the NRRP.

Other Planning Documents

The Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy

- 3.12. The principal planning document for giving statutory effect to the UDS is LURP's proposed Chapter 6. The proposed plan change is generally consistent with these provisions as set out in Tables 2, **Annexure 3**

Christchurch Rolleston and Environs Transport Strategy (CRETS)

- 3.13. The intention of CRETS is to help reduce traffic congestion to the west and south of Christchurch over the next 10 to 15 years.

- 3.14. Key transportation improvements include:

- *Extending the Southern Motorway from Halswell Junction Road to south of Templeton,*
- *Improving road links between the growing townships of Rolleston, Linclon and Prebbleton, and*
- *Improving connections to Christchurch and between Rolleston and State Highway 1.*

- 3.15. Improvements/ proposals for improving the accessibility of Rolleston as a key activity hub within the district and regional transport network include:

- *Upgrading of the cross section of the inner and outer ring roads.*
- *Upgrading intersections along these routes.*
- *Modify most intersections to either limit the number of different turns that can be made or provide for all movements with less delays and improved safety.*

- 3.16. The proposed plan change will not affect or compromise in any way, any of the above improvements. Its proximity to Rolleston will mean its residents will be able to take full advantage of the above roading improvements.

Selwyn District Council, Rural Residential Strategy 2014

- 3.17. The Rural Residential Strategy, adopted in June 2014, outlines criteria for identifying sites suitable for Rural Residential Development. This Strategy was required to be prepared under the LURP. The Site which this Proposed Plan Change is subject to is specifically

identified as meeting the criteria outlined in the Draft Strategy and as being suitable for Rural Residential Development.

Selwyn District Council Rural Residential Background Report 2010 (RRBR)

- 3.18. The RRBR is a discussion document which outlines preferred criteria for rural residential sites in the Greater Christchurch area of the District and assesses the various townships in terms of their respective constraints and opportunities for rural residential development. It is a non-statutory document and was approved by Council in February 2011.
- 3.19. A number of criteria were identified as critical outcomes required to achieve the goals of the Urban Development Strategy, PC1 and PC17. Many of these criteria have been adopted into objectives and policies for rural residential land in LURP's Chapter 6 to the RPS. An assessment of these criteria has been made in **Annexure 11** and the proposal is in general accordance with them.
- 3.20. The RRBR also contains site specific issues that require detailed assessment and contextual analysis to determine how any identified potential adverse effects could be avoided, remedied or mitigated. An assessment of such issues has been made within the Assessment of Environmental Effects (section 4) of this report, and any mitigating factors considered.

Action 18 (viii) Recommendations on the Implementation of the Rural Residential Strategy

- 3.21. SDC were required to provide recommendations to the Minister for Earthquake Recovery on how they intended to implement the Rural Residential Strategy. These recommendations have been provided to the Minister but as yet no determination from the Minister has been made.
- 3.22. Of particular note from these recommendations is the requirement by SDC that all sites identified in the Rural Residential Strategy are required to go through the plan change process to be rezoned Living 3. This plan change application is consistent with that requirement.

Rolleston Structure Plan

- 3.23. The Rolleston Structure Plan was adopted by Council in September 2009. The plan considers how existing and future development in Rolleston should be coordinated to ensure development occurs in a sustainable manner and makes best use of the available natural and physical resources. The structure plan identifies the importance of ensuring that a clear rural/urban interface is provided between the urban limit of the township and the rural surrounds. A 50m wide Green Belt/landscape buffer is proposed at the urban/rural boundary to provide a distinctive identity to Rolleston, and sense of arrival at the town within the rural plains landscape. This includes on the eastern boundary of the Site. However, it is understood the Council do not now wish to proceed with this concept. No provision has been made for a Green Belt as part of this plan change request, consistent

with the previous Plan Change 17 Outline Development Plan for the Site, which did not include a Green Belt.

- 3.24. The Rolleston Structure Plan also proposes that as part of the Greenbelt concept, the section of SH1 between Dunns Crossing Road and Weedons Ross Road (which includes land adjoining the northern Site boundary) is enhanced with amenity highway planting. The proposed 40m dwelling setback from SH1 will ensure a high amenity setting towards the proposed rural residential development as viewed from the SH1. There is an existing long line of oak trees spaced at 5m intervals within the road reserve which will ensure filtered views towards future rural residential dwellings along the SH1 Site frontage (three more in addition to the existing farm dwelling). In addition, it is proposed to that an approximately 20m wide strip be planted with poplar and oak trees to give a bucolic appearance to the subdivision for passing motorists.

Selwyn District Council Walking and Cycling Strategy & The Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Strategy

- 3.25. The broad intent of these documents is to increase the provision of sustainable transport modes including walking and cycling and reduce reliance on private motor vehicle transport. The location of several of the rural residential Existing Development Areas in the District some distance from the District townships means they are highly reliant on the private motor vehicle for access to services and facilities. In contrast, the Site adjoins Rolleston township. The site is within cycling distance of the services and facilities of the township, including the New World Supermarket on Rolleston Drive.
- 3.26. The Transport Assessment (**Annexure 5**) confirms that the Site proposed roading layout is suitable for an extension of public transport services if required in the future. The internal road design as shown in the ODP incorporates informal footpaths (mowed grass within the grass berm area) on either side of the road, in keeping with the rural residential character of the development. The low traffic volumes and lack of any heavy vehicles will ensure that the internal roads are suitable for cyclists as well as motorised vehicles.
- 3.27. There is a possible pedestrian and cycleway connection from the north east of the Site to a separate path along the northern end of the site adjoining SH1, should this be deemed appropriate by SDC. If required, the average lot size will be 4600m², as opposed to 5000m² without this walkway link,
- 3.28. In conclusion, the Site's location and design features, as shown on the ODP, will ensure a range of sustainable transportation options for the Site, consistent with the SDC Walking and Cycling Strategy and Greater Christchurch Travel Demand Strategy.

Iwi Management Plan

- 3.29. The Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan (IMP) 2013 represents the collective effort of the six Papatipu Rūnanga that represent the hapū who hold manawhenua rights over lands and waters within the takiwā from the Hurunui River to the Hakatere River and inland to Kā

Tiritiri o Te Moana. This document is considered to be relevant to policy and planning processes under the Resource Management Act (RMA) 1991.

- 3.30. This plan is broken into 6 sections, with a specific section relating to Regional issues and policies (section 5) and a specific section relating to catchment issues and policies (section 6). The plan identifies a collective statement of values of Papatipu Rūnanga. The plan covers the areas of Ranginui (air), Wai Māori (water quality and quantity and catchment mixing), Papatūānuku (land and how it is managed), Tāne Mahuta (biodiversity and areas of mahinga kai), Ngā tūtohu whenua (significant sites), and the catchment of Te Waihora (Lake Ellersmere).
- 3.31. The objectives and policies of the IMP have been considered with respect to the development of this plan change. Of particular interest is the methods of stormwater disposal which are proposed to go to an on-site disposal system, ensuring that there is no mixing of waters from different catchments, and ensuring there is no adverse effect from the detention and treatment of stormwater.
- 3.32. Furthermore there are not any identified sites of significance on the proposal Site, nor are there any known areas of mahinga kai from the Site. The Site has a long history of use as a farm, with exotic species of trees on the site.
- 3.33. Overall it can be considered that the proposal is not contrary to the provisions of the IMP.

Further RMA Considerations

Section 31 – Consistency with RMA Functions

- 3.34. The functions of the Council are outlined in section 31 of the Act. The following functions are of particular relevance to the Plan Change:
- (a) the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to achieve integrated management of the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the district;*
 - (b) the control of any actual or potential effects of the use, development, or protection of land, including for the purpose of:*
 - (iia) the prevention or mitigation of any adverse effects of the development, subdivision or use of contaminated land*
 - (d) the control of the emission of noise and the mitigation of the effects of noise*

Integrated Management – section 31 (a)

- 3.35. Integrated management relates to both the management of effects at the site level and the integrated management of a district's natural and physical resources at a wider strategic level. The Site is at the urban/rural interface and adjoins SH1, a strategic transport network. Extensions to the urban boundary occur best when there is comprehensive

planning. Good planning process requires a top down approach where all the issues for a site are identified and appropriate design solutions are adopted.

- 3.36. Strategically the Site integrates with the wider vision for the District, in particular managed growth of the township of Rolleston, including the rural/urban interface. The proposed rezoning is consistent with the policy direction for rural residential development at the sub regional (Greater Christchurch) level as set out in PC1 and proposed Chapter 6 of the RPS in the LURP.
- 3.37. At a site level, the application seeks to integrate good urban design solutions and infrastructure extensions that manage the effects of the use, development, or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources. Additionally methods are proposed to be implemented that avoid and mitigate the effects of rural residential development in close proximity to SH1.

Prevention or Mitigation of Contaminated Land – section 31 (b) (iia)

- 3.38. The assessment of effects in section 4 of this document concludes that while a small isolated portion of the Site is likely to have soil contamination present (the area around the fuel tankers associated with the existing farming activities), the remainder of the Site as a whole is suitable for future rural residential development. Given that it is proposed to retain the dwelling on a site in its existing location, the report concludes that it is unlikely to pose a risk to future users of the Site.

Emission of Noise – section 31 (d)

- 3.39. Refer to the discussion on noise and reverse sensitivity in the assessment of effects in Section 4 of this request.

Section 32 Evaluation

- 3.40. Section 32 requires that an evaluation report is prepared which identifies the objective of the proposal, determines if it is the most appropriate method of achieving the purpose of the RMA, and if the proposed amendments are the most efficient and effective method of achieving the objective. The report is attached in **Annexure 12** and indicates that of the possible alternative methods of achieving rural residential development for this site, a plan change is the most efficient and effective method.

Adverse Effects on the Environment

- 3.41. The actual and potential adverse effects on the environment that are anticipated from the implementation of the plan change request are discussed in Section 4 of this application, with reference to the various assessments and reports attached as annexures.

Part 2 – Purpose and Principles of the Act

Section 5(1)

- 3.42. Under section 5(1) of the Act, the overall purpose of the Act is to promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. The proposed zone promotes the sustainable management of natural resources by providing for an appropriate use of the land given its proximity to the existing Rolleston township, planned urban growth to the immediate west of the Site, and ability to sustain efficiently the growing population of Rolleston.
- 3.43. The proposed zone also promotes the sustainable management of physical resources. The roading network is being planned with growth in mind for Rolleston. The effect of the development on the roading network is considered minor given the links through to existing road networks. Infrastructure can be provided for in a manner that efficiently utilises the systems already in place for the growth of Rolleston, negating the need for additional major new services.
- 3.44. With planned urban growth to the immediate west, retaining the existing rural zoning and resultant lot size of the Site would create an unsustainable use of the natural and physical land resource. It will result in a small parcel of rural land restricted in its potential and ability to carry out sustainable rural activities. It is considered that rural residential zoning of the Site will better achieve the purpose of the Act.

Section 5(2) (a) – (c)

- 3.45. Section 5(2) defines “sustainable management” as:

Managing the use, development and protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing and for their health and safety while-

- (a) Sustaining the potential of natural and physical resources (excluding minerals) to meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations; and*
- (b) Safeguarding the life supporting capacity of air, water, soil and ecosystems; and*
- (c) Avoiding, remedying, mitigating any adverse effects of activities on the environment.*

- 3.46. Utilising the site for rural residential purposes will provide housing choice and provide for rural residential land supply in a sustainable manner, in accordance with the provisions of the relevant planning documents. The Site is in close proximity to existing and proposed expanded Rolleston township services and facilities, and this minimises travel distances for future residents. The Plan Change proposes sensitive interfaces at the urban/rural residential and rural residential/rural boundaries. It carefully considers design and provides for a socially connected and high amenity rural residential living environment while avoiding and mitigating the effects of reverse sensitivity with SH1. The needs of future generations

are well served by urban and adjoining rural residential areas that provide integrated, well planned and sensitive designed living zones in regard to the surrounding environment, which in this case is achieved.

- 3.47. The potential adverse effects of rural residential development of the Site are outlined in Section 4 of this request, which establishes that all adverse effects can be appropriately avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Section 7 – Other Matters

- 3.48. Relevant “other matters” under section 7 include the following:

- (b) The efficient use and development of natural and physical resources;*
- (c) The maintenance and enhancement of amenity values;*
- (f) Maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment;*
- (g) Any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources; and*
- (i) The effects of climate change*

- 3.49. Under sections 7(c) and 7(f), particular regard must be had to the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values and the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of the environment. The amenity of the existing rural environment will be changed, but the plan change request provides for a sensitive change that mitigates the potential adverse effects thorough requirements for setbacks from SH1 and other road boundaries, appropriate lot sizes across the Site and street landscaping and road treatments. These requirements will ensure that the sense of openness is maintained and the quality of the environment is not diminished. Appropriate transport connections for all modes of transport to the urban area of Rolleston provides for the amenity of future residents. Methods to address the noise effects from SH1 to ensure an appropriate amenity for residential living are regulated as part of the proposed setback from SH1 and existing plan provisions relating to noise.

- 3.50. Under section 7(g) the Act requires particular regard of any finite characteristics of natural and physical resources. Rural land as a resource is finite, however in this case the subject land cannot be efficiently used as rural land due to the size of the lot, existing access provisions, and the reverse sensitivity restrictions that impending residential development to the west impose. Enabling the Site, due to constraints, to be utilised for rural residential development is a better use of the land resource and will enable finite rural land parcels that do not have such constraints to better meet the purpose of the Act in terms of sustainable development of natural and physical resources.

- 3.51. With respect to section 7(g) the proposal makes specific consideration of the SH1, which is a physical resource of significance to the national transport network. Appropriate setbacks from this highway to avoid reverse sensitivity effects have been included as part of this proposed plan change.

Section 6 and 8 – Matters of National Importance / Treaty of Waitangi

- 3.52. Overall the proposal is consistent with section 6 of the Act, however there are no specific matters set out in Section 6 which apply to this proposal.
- 3.53. The principals of the Treaty of Waitangi have been taken into consideration throughout the development of this plan change. An assessment of the Iwi Management Plan has been undertaken, and considered in earlier in this section.

4. ASSESSMENT OF EFFECTS ON THE ENVIRONMENT

- 4.1. An Assessment of the Effects on the Environment (AEE) is required to be carried out for any plan change request. Schedule 4, Part 2 (a) – (f) RMA sets out the matters which should be considered when undertaking an AEE. These matters have been considered below and also include consideration of the matters and issues identified in the relevant District and Regional planning documents.

Neighborhood & Wider Community Effects

Reverse Sensitivity

- 4.2. Consideration of the effects on the neighbourhood and wider community includes consideration of the potential 'reverse sensitivity' effects generated as a result of rezoning the Site. Reverse sensitivity effects occur where a new residential activity establishes and new residents have an issue with noise, odour, dust or other effects from existing activities on adjoining sites, creating conflict.
- 4.3. In the case of this plan change request there is potential for conflict between the Site and noise from SH1, and potential conflict between the Site and farming activities on adjoining rural land to the east and south.
- 4.4. The plan change request includes a 40m setback from SH1 and includes proposed landscaping along this boundary to reduce the visibility of vehicles using the highway. Existing District Plan rules require appropriate acoustic design for dwellings sited within 80m of a state highway. This will ensure that reverse sensitivity conflicts with SH1 are mitigated, and ensure that the physical resource of SH1 is protected.
- 4.5. The Site adjoins a proposed Living Z residential subdivision to the west which contains higher density residential activities than proposed under the proposed rural residential zoning for the Site. If development of the Site did not proceed, it is likely that it would continue to be used for farming and cropping purposes (although rather uneconomically due to the Site's size and access provisions). Farming and cropping activities usually have a high dust and noise component during harvesting seasons.
- 4.6. By enabling rural residential development, with much larger sections, larger building setbacks, and greater opportunity for garden plantings, there is an opportunity to reduce any potential reverse sensitivity conflict with neighboring rural zoned properties.
- 4.7. Furthermore it is intended to provide for a variety of section sizes across the Site, with larger sections to the north and moderate to larger sections to the east and south in order to reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity effects with the various adjoining activities. It is understood that there are no existing intensive farming activities such as poultry or pig farming in the locality.

- 4.8. Based on the above proposed measures, the adverse effects of noise and reverse sensitivity will be no more than minor.

Physical Effects

Landscape Effects

- 4.9. The Site is on the urban/rural fringe, therefore landscape and visual effects have been considered, with particular emphasis on ensuring a sensitive transition from the rural to urban interface. A Landscape Assessment for the Site has been undertaken by Chris Glasson Landscape Architects Ltd and is attached as **Annexure 4** to this report.
- 4.10. The surrounding landscape character is generally rural, with the exception of residential subdivision to the west. The surrounding land contour is flat with fields separated by shelterbelts, with crops and stock grazing. There are some panoramic views from the Site limited by existing shelter belts. There is an existing dwelling with associated sheds on the northwestern corner of the Site. Within the vicinity, the area consists of scattered farm buildings and single storied residential dwellings surrounding by specimen trees and some garden areas. Immediately to the west of the Site is a proposed new residential development. Views to the Site from SH 1 are limited by tall hedgerow and shelterbelt planting, 6 -10m in height.
- 4.11. The visual character will change from rural to rural residential subdivision. However the assessment concludes that potential visual effects can be reduced by adopting appropriate landscape controls, and as such there are no perceived adverse visual effects arising from rural residential subdivision that cannot be avoided, remedied or mitigated. The large allotment sizes, site coverage requirements, road boundary setbacks, large wide roads with grass berms, and opportunities for garden plantings will enable a sense of openness and natural character to be maintained within the Site. Views from SH1 across open farmland will be reduced, however given existing shelter belts restrict views currently it is considered that there will not be a significant loss of views as a result of the change in use of the Site. There is an existing long line of oak trees spaced at 5m intervals within the road reserve which will ensure filtered views towards future rural residential dwellings along the SH1 Site frontage (three more in addition to the existing farm dwelling). In addition, it is proposed that an approximately 20m wide strip be planted with poplar and oak trees to give a bucolic appearance to the subdivision for passing motorists.
- 4.12. The Landscape Assessment includes a landscape concept for the subdivision which includes discontinuous framework planting within private lots, including at the Site boundaries. An additional District Plan rule requires this planting to be undertaken by the developer at the time of subdivision, with the requirement for a planting plan to be submitted for approval. The purpose of the framework planting is to provide shelter and amenity for private lots; maintain and/or create rural character elements; reduce the overall apparent scale of the development; and provide major screening of glare and vehicle movement from the proposed southern motorway extension to the east. The planting will

not be continuous and will retain vistas through the planting to the surrounding rural landscape.

- 4.13. Overall it is acknowledged that there will be a landscape and visual change across the Site from a rural to a more built up landscape. However the effect of this change is mitigated by the nature of rural residential development and the effects are considered to be minor.

Ecosystems

- 4.14. The Site has a history of being used for farming activities as is common for the Canterbury Plains. The Site contains a number of shelter belts around the periphery and a row of poplar trees through the middle. Some of these trees will be removed as part of the subdivision of the Site, however given the nature of rural residential developments, there will be an increase in trees on the Site associated with gardens and street trees. These are likely to have the greatest impact once they are established (7-10 years). This will be a positive effect of the plan change request.
- 4.15. There are no known areas of significant indigenous vegetation or habitat for significant indigenous fauna within the Site.

Natural and Physical Resources

- 4.16. One of the most significant physical resources in this area is the transport network, both within the Site and the wider area. A detailed transportation assessment, is included in **Annexure 5**. The report concludes that the proposed development can be safely and efficiently accommodated within, and integrated into, the local transportation environment, with effects that are less than minor.
- 4.17. SH1 adjoins the northern end of the Site and provides a strategic link between Christchurch City to the east and Rolleston township. Currently traffic volumes on this road are around 19,900 vehicles per day (refer to the Transport Assessment attached in **Annexure 5**). It is anticipated that SH1 will be upgraded between Templeton and Rolleston to extend the current Christchurch Southern Motorway. The ODP proposed for the Site does not include connections to SH1, but rather shows connections to the local roads to the east of the Site, and a landscaped buffer zone between proposed residential sections and SH1. It is considered that given there is no direct link to SH1 from the Site, and given the low traffic volumes generated by the Site, the proposed plan change request will have a minor effect on the current and future, safe and efficient functioning of SH1.
- 4.18. Analysis of the traffic effects on the local roading network from the Site has set out that there would be an increase during peak traffic of approximately 36 vehicle movements and that this when considered in the context of the increase in vehicle movements from the development to the west of the Site (to which the Site's vehicle movements would be additional), the additional traffic from the Site is unlikely to be noticeable on the local road network.

- 4.19. The Transport Assessment concludes that: “The site is located along the eastern edge of the Rolleston township and can be serviced through existing and planned transport network which makes efficient use of transport infrastructure to accommodate the demand for rural residential growth”. Therefore the proposed plan change request has effects on the physical resource of the road network that are no more than minor.

Servicing

- 4.20. Infrastructure is a physical resource. Servicing has the potential to create adverse effects on the environment, particularly with respect to disposal of sewerage and stormwater, and water supply. **Annexure 6** includes an Engineering and Servicing Report which sets out the key methods for servicing the Site, the key points and issues are set out below.

Stormwater

- 4.21. In Rolleston there is no piped township stormwater reticulation. Given the free draining gravel soils under the township it is most practical to require future residents of the Site to install rapid soak holes for roof water and onsite hardstanding areas. This is a typical solution for dwellings in Rolleston. Stormwater for road and driveway runoff will be treated and discharged using a sump and soak pit system located in the road berms. The development of the Site will not significantly increase surface runoff from the Site.
- 4.22. Specific design solutions and devices can be the subject of the subdivision application. The site is well suited for onsite stormwater treatment and disposal and the adverse effects of the increase in stormwater discharge can be adequately mitigated.

Wastewater

- 4.23. Rolleston’s reticulated system has the capacity to receive the additional volumes from the Site. A gravity fed reticulation system to the southeast of the Site can then be pumped through a variety of means to connect to the reticulated system. A number of specific options are provided in the report in **Annexure 6**.

Water Supply

- 4.24. The Site can be adequately serviced Rolleston’s existing town water supply. Connections will be made to the west to provide reticulated services to the Site.

Discharge of Contaminants

- 4.25. The proposal has the potential to discharge contaminants from stormwater runoff from buildings and hardstand areas (including roads) during storm events. The discussion on servicing above indicates that stormwater can be managed in an appropriate manner to ensure that the actual and potential effects of the discharge of contaminants from the Site will be no more than minor.

Natural Hazards and Hazardous Substances

- 4.26. A preliminary site inspection was undertaken by Geoscience Consulting (NZ) to assess the potential for contaminants to have been deposited at the Site as a result of historic activities undertaken within, or in the immediate vicinity of, the property and report on the risk posed to future site users. A report on their findings is attached in **Annexure 7**. It concludes that there are two above ground fuel storage units on the part of the Site containing the existing dwelling which could pose a soil contamination threat. However given that it is intended to retain the existing dwelling, including the fuel tankers, on its own separate lot, the risk to future users of the remainder of the Site is considered to be low. There are no other hazardous substances identified on the Site.
- 4.27. A geotechnical report for the Site has been prepared by Riley Consultants and is attached in **Annexure 8**. The report concludes there no significant risk posed by liquefaction on the Site as concluded from test pit investigations and no observed effects from the 2011 earthquakes on the Site.
- 4.28. In terms of DBH guidelines, the Site is likely to be similar to those sites that fall into the technical category TC1.
- 4.29. Ground conditions in the test locations do not meet the requirements of NZS3604:2011 for standard shallow foundations and therefore house foundations require specific investigation and design. Indications based on investigations to date are that enhance slab TC2 foundations or other specific design is applicable.
- 4.30. Given the indications in the above reports it is considered that the effects of hazardous substances on the future users of the Site will be less than minor, and that the potential effects of natural hazards on the Site will be no more than minor.

5. CONSULTATION

- 5.1. Consultation has been carried out with Selwyn District Council planning and assets officers during the course of preparation of the plan change, including in relation to the ODP. Attached as **Annexure 9** is a copy of a letter from SDC summarizing matters discussed at a pre-application meeting and subsequent email correspondence with SDC.
- 5.2. Initial advice was that the preliminary ODP with smaller lots in a central position was supported, but on the basis of subsequent SDC expert landscape advice, this was changed to a preference for the reverse ie. smaller lots around the periphery and larger lots in the centre, in order to provide more of an open space character in the centre and greater degree of 'rural' character. The final ODP layout reflects this later advice. The email advice from the Council Planner commenting on the change in lot layout was provided without knowledge of the concurrent advice being provided by the Council's landscape advisor on this matter. The approach has now been confirmed as that recommended by the Council's landscape advisor.
- 5.3. The final draft plan change takes into account the matters raised in the above consultation with the Council.
- 5.4. The proposal for rural residential use of the Site has already been the subject to considerable consultation through other SDC processes, principally the RRBR and PC17 (withdrawn). The site was identified as a preferred rural residential site in PC17, and there were no submissions on PC17, including from neighbouring landowners, which opposed this.
- 5.5. There is a Notice of Requirement from the New Zealand Transport Agency for a small part of the land adjoining the State Highway, to provide for an extended southern motorway. The proposed plan change has been developed with this in mind. NZTA and in discussion with the applicant and their advisors regarding acquiring this land. There has also been discussion with NZTA planners regarding the plan change and a copy of the final draft has been forwarded to them. They have indicated that based on the ODP they received they have no objection to the Plan Change. In particular they note that the proposal removes the exiting access to SH1, provides for reverse sensitivity for dwellings located near SH1 and provides for future road widening SH1 as required under the Notice of Requirement. Correspondence with NZTA is attached in **Annexure 13**. T
- 5.6. Consultation has been undertaken with Local Runanga, through their consultancy Mahaanui Kurataiao Ltd via an email with a copy of the application sent to them on 19th June 2013. As yet there has been no response from this organization regarding the application.

6. CONCLUSION

- 6.1. The proposed plan change seeks to rezone 20.59ha of land, legally described as Lot 4 DP 74253, from Rural Inner Plains to a Living 3 Zone. The Site adjoins the current urban limits of Rolleston township to the east, and adjoins SH1. The site currently contains farming and cropping activities, however given recent development to the west, the Site will no longer have appropriate access from SH1, and, due to its size, will no longer continue to be an economically viable farming unit.
- 6.2. The proposed development of the Site to a Living 3 Zone with large setbacks from SH1 and setbacks from other roads and internal boundaries, will ensure that reverse sensitivity effects with traffic on SH1, and other rural activities to the east of the Site will be avoided. The proposed wide streets, with grass berms, and informal grouping of street trees, along with road boundary setbacks and a low yield across the Site will ensure retain the sense of openness associated with the rural surroundings is maintained or enhanced. The connections to the development to the west will ensure a high level of connectivity of the Site with the urban area of Rolleston township, and provides for good transport connections for all modes of transport. Overall the effects on the environment will be no more than minor.
- 6.3. The proposed plan change represents an efficient and effective use of land, and reduces the potential for reverse sensitivity effects at the rural/urban interface. The rezoning is consistent with the policies and objectives of the District Plan, and the Regional Policy Statement, including LURP's Chapter 6.
- 6.4. The plan change is consistent with the relevant provisions of the RMA and can be accepted by Council.