



10 December 2014

Dreamtime Limited  
c/- Aston Consultants Ltd  
PO Box 1435  
**CHRISTCHURCH 8140**

Attention: Fiona Aston

Dear Madam,

**PC140044: DREAMTIME LIMITED - PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE: REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

The following letter outlines the further information Council considers to be necessary to enable a full and complete understanding of the proposal. This information is considered necessary before a decision on how to process the request can be made.

**Environmental health**

1. It is noted that rules are proposed relating to setbacks from SH1 to mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects from noise. It is unclear as to what evidence was used to determine these rules would be the most appropriate for the subject site, other than comments they were already in place for another rural residential development. Other developments adjoining State Highways propose acoustic fencing. The application specifically states the development would not include acoustic fencing along the SH1 boundary. There is insufficient information to demonstrate that the proposed 40m setbacks that will apply is sufficient to ensure appropriate noise attenuation is achieved.
2. There is no assessment of the effectiveness of the proposed rule to address effects of traffic noise on outdoor living areas that would result from the projected increase in traffic.
3. The application states there will be a requirement for acoustic insulation consent notices to be registered on new titles for lots adjoining SH1, however, there does not appear to be a rule requiring this. The application should include a further requirement, that any building consent application for a new residential development or an extension to an existing residential development shall include a report from an experienced acoustic engineer which verifies the proposed construction will satisfy the internal noise limits in the proposed rule.
4. A report from an experienced environmental acoustics consultant that assesses the above matters with appropriate regard to relevant standards and guidelines is required. Please confirm if you wish to commission your own report (which Council will then have peer reviewed), or if you are happy for Council to commission an independent report on your behalf (for which you will be on charged).

## Canterbury Regional Policy Statement

5. The proposal appears to be inconsistent with the Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement which requires a density of 1-2 households per hectare. Please advise how the proposal complies with the RPS.

## Section 32 Assessment.

6. It seems the s32 report covers most options, however, appears to have excluded an obvious alternative – creating five 4ha blocks in the Inner Plains. Because this is an obvious use of the land, it should really be included as an official option. If this is a less desirable option, perhaps more economic information as to why Rural Residential Development is the preferable option should be included to support this.

## Expert Reports

7. We are still waiting on confirmation from Tonkin and Taylor (for the PSI) that the information provided is adequate for the application be proceed to notification. I expect confirmation of this shortly.
8. Council's own engineers have confirmed they have no issues from a roading, water, wastewater point of view.
9. I have also forwarded a copy of the application for MKT (Representatives for the Runanga) for comment, to date, I have had no response to date.
10. Andrew Craig (Landscape Architect) has had a look over the Landscape information supplied and has requested the following information be clarified:
  - In anticipation of a submission from Ngai Tahu Te Taumutu Runanga matters – the *Ngai Tahu Subdivision and Development Guidelines* in the *Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan* encourages the use of indigenous vegetation. Regarding landscaping, these guidelines strongly promote the use of locally sourced indigenous vegetation. In particular it states under the “Landscaping and open space” heading, clause 73, that;
 

*Indigenous biodiversity objectives to include provisions to use indigenous species for:*

    - (i) *Street trees*
    - (ii) *Open space and reserves*
    - (iii) *Native ground cover species for swales*
    - (iv) *Stormwater management network, and*
    - (v) *Home gardens*

- Can the applicant clarify what they propose in this regard or how they might respond? It is appreciated that they have consulted with the Runanga and have had no response.
- The SH1 roadside oaks – it looks as if some will be removed – can applicant confirm which will stay as indicated in paragraph 22 of the landscape report? Are these trees going to be retained when CSM2 is implemented?
- There appear to be differences between the 'Indicative Landscape Plan' prepared by Chris Glasson and the ODP – eg; extent of retained shelterbelt, cycle/walkway route, perimeter planting and the 20m wide SH1 frontage planting. Can the applicant confirm the status of the landscape plan in relation to what is shown on the ODP?
- What mechanisms are proposed to monitor and maintain the framework planting, including the SH1 frontage planting? It is understood this planting will be undertaken by the developer subject to a proposed DP rule.
- The retained shelter belt – who will maintain this and how will it be maintained?
- Can the applicant confirm whether the District Plan amendments they propose still stand regarding the LURP which is now beyond challenge?
- Can the landscape architect confirm whether there are any significant landscape features on site (such as protected trees, heritage items, indigenous vegetation, water courses etc) that would impede re-zoning?

### **The LURP and recently approved Private Plan Changes.**

11. Due to recently approved Plan Changes and the LURP, Appendix 42 presently exists, therefore the application should technically refer to Appendix 45 (the next available appendix) in the proposed rules. I note that you have allowed for sub-sequential renumbering to occur, but thought I would offer the opportunity to have this amended pre-notification for ease of understanding.

Obviously it is up to you if you wish to do this. Appendix 43 relates to fencing typologies in Living 3 zones, which are not presently referenced in your application.

### **Process from Here**

Once we have received a response to the above requests, it may be necessary to ask for further clarification of the extent to which this response addresses the above requests.

Whilst you may decline to provide the above information (Clause 23 (6)) you need to be aware that the Council may reject the request on this basis.

Once the Council is satisfied that it has adequate information, a report will be finalised to consider and make a recommendation on how to deal with your requests.

If you have any queries or have any concerns regarding the contents of this letter then please contact me on (03) 347 2974 or [jessica.tuilaepa@selwyn.govt.nz](mailto:jessica.tuilaepa@selwyn.govt.nz).

Yours sincerely

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Tuilaepa', with a large, stylized loop at the beginning.

Jessica Tuilaepa

**STRATEGY AND POLICY PLANNER**