

**Private Plan Change 46:** Gillian Logan – 160 Bangor Road, Darfield (Amend Living 2A (Deferred) Zone to Living 2A Zone and Insert an Outline Development Plan and Associated Rules

Submitter Number	Submitter	Address	Submission	Oppose/ Support	Relief Sought	Wish to be Heard?
1	J & K Young	17 McHugh Crescent DARFIELD klyoung@clear.net.nz	The proposed hedgerow along State Highway 73 shown on the Outline Development Plan (ODP) will adversely affect the views currently enjoyed by the submitters' property.	Oppose	That the hedgerow along State Highway 73 be maintained at a maximum height of 2.8m (not requiring regular trimming).	Yes
2	Ivan Hatton (on behalf of Hatton Investments Ltd)	c/- Baseline Group Ltd PO Box 100 LEESTON 7656 Attention: Aaron Grey aaron@baselinegroup.co.nz	<p><b>Scope of Plan Change</b></p> <p>The submitter owns land zoned Living 2A (Deferred) within Area 5 (as shown in Appendix 25 to the Townships Volume of the District Plan).</p> <p>The submitter's land is one of a few parcels of land within Area 5 that is not part of the area affected by Proposed Plan Change 46.</p> <p>The submitter considers that inclusion of all land within Area 5 as part of the plan change would result in a more co-ordinated planning outcome.</p> <p><b>Roading</b></p> <p>The proposed ODP shows "potential links" through to land outside the plan change but within Area 5. Without the</p>	Oppose	<p>Plan Change be declined, or otherwise be amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Include all land within Area 5 similarly zoned Living 2A (Deferred).</li> <li>ii. The proposed ODP be amended to require the potential future roading connections through Lot 1 DP 81020 and Part Lot 2 DP 18559 to be provided.</li> <li>iii. That the densities shown on the proposed ODP be amended to ensure that the decrease in density as the distance from Darfield Town Centre increases is retained when other sites zoned</li> </ul>	Yes

			<p>certainty of these connections, this is effectively the same as not showing them at all.</p> <p><b>Density</b></p> <p>The graduated pattern of decreasing density towards the outskirts does not account for the adjoining Living 2A (Deferred) zoned land, which if separate ODP were created would only allow for a minimum average allotment size of 1ha. Therefore the gradual decrease in density sought by the Plan Change would be disrupted by the potential density of these other Living 2A (Deferred) zoned sites.</p> <p><b>Reverse Sensitivity</b></p> <p>The proposed Plan Change has recognised reverse sensitivity by including larger allotment sizes along the State Highway corridor and neighbouring rural allotments. However, this has not been provided adjacent to the submitter's property and others within the balance of Area 5, which are effectively still within a rural zone. Some consideration of reverse sensitivity effects to the current (and permitted) uses of this land should be made in order for the Proposed Plan Change to be consistent with Policy B4.3.28.</p>		<p>Living 2A (Deferred) are considered, whilst ensuring a minimum 1ha average allotment size is retained.</p> <p>(as shown on amended ODP attached to the submission).</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

			<p><b>Section 32</b></p> <p>The Plan Change application has considered lifting the deferred status of the Living 2A zone over the entire Area 5 as Option 5 in the accompanying Section 32 analysis.</p> <p>The potential difficulties relating to dealing with multiple stakeholders are highlighted as costs in relation to lifting the deferred status of all sites in Area 5. However, there is potential for a plan change to consider a larger area of land without the direct involvement of these landowners.</p> <p>The costs of Option 5 are considered to be inflated, whilst the stated benefits are unnecessarily (and potentially intentionally) limited.</p> <p>It is considered that Option 5 is the most effective and efficient way of achieving the objectives of the Selwyn District Plan and the Resource Management Act.</p> <p><b>Consultation</b></p> <p>At the informal drop in meeting owners of land within Area 5 did express their wish to discuss the inclusion of their sites as part of the plan change; however, the applicants proceeded to focus solely on their own sites.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

3	NZ Transport Agency	PO Box 1479 CHRISTCHURCH 8140 Attention: Caroline Hutchinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The Agency is concerned at potential reverse sensitivity effects related to their operation and management of the State Highway network. To manage such effects, the Agency requires separation and setback distances between habitable buildings and the road edge; and requiring design and construction of sensitive activities to meet “maximum” internal sounds levels set out in AS/NZ2107:2000. Proposed Rule 4.9.6 included in the Plan Change will not meet Agency guidelines for mitigating the effects of a noise sensitive activity, as only buildings within 40m are required to be acoustically insulated.</li> <li>ii. The density of development to some extent defines the urban boundary. The Agency considers that the urban boundary should be better defined along SH77 and also balanced with existing development on the south side of SH77.</li> <li>iii. The Agency does not support allotments west of the western road access having direct access onto SH77. To do so will extend</li> </ul>	Supports in Part	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Reword proposed Rule 4.9.6 to provide for 80m of acoustic internal noise insulation from the road edge of the State Highway (<i>sic.</i>).</li> <li>ii. Remove higher density 3700m<sup>2</sup> lots west of the western most road access onto SH77 road and replace with a minimum 2ha lot density.</li> <li>iii. That there be no direct property vehicle access to the zone from SH77 from the western side of the proposed second SH77 access to the western boundary of the proposed zone. No direct property access onto SH73. That these requirements be embedded in the rules and the ODP.</li> <li>iv. The ODP, associated policy and rules are strengthened to ensure that there is an explicit requirement for a road connection to the east to secure connections back into the urban area and ultimately onto SH73 closer to Darfield Township.</li> </ul>	Yes
---	---------------------	--	--	------------------	---	-----

			<p>the urban boundary further along SH77 and this will have an impact on considering appropriate future speed limits on SH77.</p> <p>iv. The Agency seeks to ensure that access to support the growth of northwest Darfield is located closer to the urban core. On that basis the road connection to the adjoining land to the south east is considered very important from a connectivity perspective.</p>			
4	Te Taumutu Runanga	PO Box 3214 CHRISTCHURCH Attention: Lisa MacKenzie lisa.mackenzie@ngaitahu.iwi.nz	<p>While it is noted that parts of the Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan 2013 (M.I.M.P) have been considered as part of the Plan Change, water supply, stormwater and wastewater etc. are also relevant. The Plan Change must consider the entire M.I.M.P.</p> <p><b>Water Supply</b></p> <p>The water supplied from the community wells is from within the Selwyn-Waimakariri Allocation Zone which is considered to be over allocated.</p> <p>The effects of allowing further subdivision will result in an increase in community takes from the area adding additional pressure on an over-allocated groundwater resource.</p>	Neutral	<p>While Te Taumutu Runanga is generally supportive of community growth, they are unable to support the application in its current form.</p> <p>If the decision makers are of a mind to grant the Proposed Plan Change, Te Taumutu Runanga considers that it should be consistent with the Iwi Management Plan and take into the accounts the matters raised in their submission.</p>	Yes

			<p>The Selwyn District has advised the Applicant they could service water to the properties at 2000L/day, but the Applicant seeks more.</p> <p><b>Wastewater</b></p> <p>By allowing this Plan Change with the use of individual systems there is the potential that effects will be greater than anticipated on water quality as a result of the increase in wastewater systems in the area.</p> <p><b>Stormwater</b></p> <p>As with the wastewater system, Te Taumutu Runanga considers that given the size of the township stormwater should be treated at a community level rather than to ground at individual sites.</p>			
--	--	--	---	--	--	--