

Form 5  
Submission on publicly notified Plan Change  
Selwyn District Plan

Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To Selwyn District Council  
Attention: Ben Rhodes, Strategy & Policy Team Leader  
PO Box 90  
Rolleston 7643  
FAX: 03-347-2799

Full name of submitter:

Peter and Pamela Aidersley  
as trustees of the Ancients Trust

This is a submission on Private Plan Change 54 Ballymena Holdings Ltd.

1. The specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to are:

The submission to change the Selwyn District Plan  
in respect of the properties lots 1 and 2 DP400509  
located at the intersection of Pocock Rd and Annavale Rd,  
Springfield, from Rural (Outer Plains) Zone to Living 2 Zone,  
merely allowing a low density residential development  
on the north western outskirts of the Springfield Township  
(give details)

2. \*My submission in ~~SUPPORT~~ OPPOSITION is:

Please see attached sheets.

\*Include whether you SUPPORT or OPPOSE specific parts of one or both of the plan changes or wish to have them amended; and the reasons for your views. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

3. †I seek the following decision from Selwyn District Council: .....  
We request that the application be rejected.

thank you for the opportunity to submit on this matter.

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

4. I WISH / ~~DO NOT WISH~~ to be heard in support of my submission (delete as applicable)
5. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing  
(delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)

6. Paidy (Pamela Aidersley) ..... 30/5/18 .....  
Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on their behalf) Date

7. Address for service of submitter: 107 Pocock Rd, RD 1, Springfield 7681

Telephone: 021 296 7685 Fax: —

Email: paidersley@hotmail.com

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

**SUBMISSIONS CLOSE AT 5PM WEDNESDAY 30 MAY 2018**

Responses to be:

**Posted to:**

Ben Rhodes, Strategy & Policy Team Leader  
Selwyn District Council  
P.O. Box 90  
Rolleston 7643

**Delivered to:**

A Council Service Centre in Darfield,  
Lincoln, Leeston or Rolleston

**Emailed to:**

[submissions@selwyn.govt.nz](mailto:submissions@selwyn.govt.nz)



Two additional sheets as part of Form 5, Submission on publicly notified Plan Change 54 Ballymena Holdings Ltd, from Peter and Pamela Aldersley.

2. Our submission is in opposition to the plan change. The reasons for our opposition are as follows:

- a. All across New Zealand there is a recognised creep of urban areas into productive arable land. An increasing percentage of New Zealand's food is produced offshore. We need to carefully consider our future and major impacts such as climate change and fuel crises/shortages which will impact food production in our lifetime. Long term there will be a requirement to produce food locally, however this is not possible without land. Already we are seeing farming being pushed out onto less suitable land due to arable land being consumed by population growth, resulting in intensification and destruction of fragile ecosystems. Having valuable arable land to feed the population is surely a higher priority than the questionable goal of providing an alternative property size to a select few. We consider the plan to develop 16 residential units on 30 hectares of good food producing land to be a frivolous waste of a precious resource.
- b. There is more than sufficient land currently zoned Living within Springfield to cope with anticipated population increase for at least the next 15 years (as identified in the Malvern Area Plan).
- c. It is extremely questionable that there is a market need for this type of property. There are a number of larger sections currently for sale in Rilco Lane, Springfield ranging from 1084m<sup>2</sup> to 1232m<sup>2</sup>, however these have been on the market for a number of years and are as yet unsold. These have the same uninterrupted views of the alps as the property in question, however despite being presumably much more affordable than a 2ha block, uptake on these properties has been extremely slow.
- d. The applicant has suggested that development on the property in question will be 2ha per dwelling. Although this sounds like this will continue to provide openness of landscapes, in reality the density of buildings will be significantly more than suggested. The 80m building setback from the Midland railway line, setbacks from road frontages and additional sheds and outbuildings will inevitable cluster buildings closer together.
- e. The applicant states that the subject site is currently part of a general agricultural setting characterised largely by pastoral grazing, with the nearest portions of the Springfield township to the subject site are the residential areas with any commercial activities being well removed, however this is untrue. The property in question is bordered by a honey factory and a dairy farm, both of which have aspects to their operations that would almost certainly result in reverse sensitivity effects arising.

- f. The applicant suggests that such large allotment areas will provide the ability for future residents to establish a more diverse range of vegetation beyond what currently exists, and that any further landscaping/vegetation plantings may well consist of indigenous species that could be part of a wider trend of increasing indigenous biodiversity within urban / semi-rural areas. That is possible in the ideal world, however realistically we feel that this allotment size and attached price tag would more likely lend itself to owners who need the additional space for semi-industrial use, such as yards for trade vehicles/heavy machinery, which would have a detrimental environmental effect.
- g. Like many people living in Springfield, we have chosen to live here for the rural amenity and character. Having our boundaries surrounded by Rural (Outer Plains) zoned properties, we felt confident that our investment in this area would be protected, and the things we value (the views, openness, low building density, minimal artificial lighting at night) would be safe. The District Plan acknowledges that unobstructed views are one of the things that people consider make up the rural character of an area, and that land features unobstructed by structures are anticipated and valued in these areas. If this plan change is successful, this would be jeopardised for us and many people who have chosen to call Springfield home.

In conclusion, our chief concerns are:

- Unnecessary urban creep into arable land
- Sufficient Living zoned land to fulfil current and forecasted population requirements
- Questionable demand for larger section sizes within Springfield
- Higher building density than suggested in the application
- Reverse sensitivity effects with respect to the bordering honey factory and dairy farm
- Possible detrimental environmental effects
- Loss of rural amenity and character for current Springfield landowners.