

5 February 2018

Ballymena Holdings Ltd  
C/- John Cook  
Planning Solutions Ltd  
PO Box 109  
Christchurch 8140

Sent by email to: [plansol@xtra.co.nz](mailto:plansol@xtra.co.nz)

Dear John,

**PC54 PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE REQUEST FOR A NEW LIVING 2 ZONE –  
SPRINGFIELD**

I have been engaged by Selwyn District Council to process the private Plan Change 54 request to establish a rural residential Living 2 zone on Lots 1 & 2 DP400509 located at the intersection of Pocock and Annvale Roads, Springfield.

The application for the above plan change has been assessed for completeness under the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991. The following further information is requested so Council can better evaluate the nature and effects of the request under Clause 23(1).

In accordance with clause 23(1) of the first schedule RMA, the following information is requested to enable Selwyn District Council to better understand the proposal and its potential effects on the environment.

- 1) **Natural Hazard Risk:** The Selwyn District Plan maps identify a potential faultline running through the middle of the site. This potential fault has its origins in a report provided to the Council from the Canterbury Regional Council. A copy of this report has been previously supplied to the applicant. It is requested that the applicant provide an updated geotechnical report that assesses the natural hazard risk, its implications for the change in zone sought, and the potential for such risk to be managed through the proposed Plan Change. It is noted that the Council is required to recognise and provide for the management of significant risks from natural hazards as a matter of national importance under s.6(h) RMA.
- 2) **Canterbury Regional Policy Statement Assessment:** Please provide an assessment of the proposal against the CRPS objectives and policies with particular reference to Chapter 5 and the management of urban growth. In this regard it is noted that the CRPS has been developed after the District Plan and therefore the operative District Plan policy direction may not reflect the more recent direction provided in the higher order CRPS.
- 3) **Malvern Area Plan 2031** (adopted Sept 2016): The application has to a certain extent relied on the application site being identified as a potential future growth

area in the Malvern Area Plan. This Plan anticipates a projected population increase of approx. 100 people between now and 2031 and an increase of 32 households for Springfield over this time period. The Area Plan identifies that there is existing zoned capacity for 56 houses. The Area Plan identifies the application site as a possible future growth path beyond 2031. Please provide an assessment as to why the proposed growth is needed now and how the utilization of some 30 hectares of land to provide only 16 units is consistent with the outcomes sought in both the Area Plan and the CRPS.

- 4) **NES Contamination:** The National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health (NES) was considered in a Preliminary Site Investigation ('PSI') report prepared by Tasman Environmental Management. This report is dated August 2013. Can the applicant please confirm that since the report was written no activities have occurred on the land that would increase the risk to human health from soil contamination. In the event that such potential activities have occurred, can the applicant provide an updated PSI to assess the risk.
- 5) **Transport:** The Transport Assessment prepared by Novo Group is dated June 2013. It contains a review of the NZTA Crash Analysis System for the five year period ending 25 June 2013. Given that this review is now over four years old please provide an updated review of the NZTA CAS for the adjacent road network to confirm that there have been no recent changes in road safety/ crash risk.
- 6) **Consultation:** Can the applicant confirm whether consultation has been undertaken with the owners and occupiers of the 1 ha lot with frontage to Pocock Road (Lot 1 DP 400509) that appears to be in separate ownership, and if so what the response was.
- 7) **Proposed rule package:** Please confirm the text/ ODP details to clarify the following matters:
  - Para.5.1.33 references the ODP including a statement that there is a railway crossing setback. The ODP does not include such a statement;
  - Please confirm which rule is relied upon to require subdivision and subsequent development to be in accordance with the ODP, or alternatively provide additional text changes to ensure that compliance is achieved at both subdiviosn and land use stages;
  - The application notes that the proposed internal accessway shown on the ODP is to be retained as a private access rather than being vested with Council as public road. Andrew Mazey, Council Transport Asset Manager, has advised that the maximum number of lots to be serviced off a private accessway is 6 (8 lots are shown on the proposed ODP) and therefore this access would need to be vested in Council at time of subdivision (or alternatively separate accessways provided to two of the lots). Please advise whether the application is made on the basis that the accessway will be vested or alternatively amend the ODP to reduce the number of lots served by the shared access.

**Advice notes:**

- Further to the above information requests, I can confirm that there are no outstanding matters regarding the servicing of stormwater, sewer, or potable water supply. As previously advised to you by Murray England (and noted in the application), any development will be on a restricted water supply, with the Plan Change including a rule to address this matter. There will be a requirement as part of any future subdivision consent process for a minimum of 3 days storage to be provided on-site. It is recommended that you discuss fire fighting requirements with Fire & Emergency New Zealand given that the provision of on-road hydrants may not be an appropriate design solution. Whilst this is a design matter that can be resolved as part of any future subdivision consent process, the applicant may wish to confirm FENZ requirements now to ensure that there are economic solutions available (water pressure and volume) that meet FENZ expectations.
- The application and the associated Landscape assessment both reference the Selwyn Rural Residential Background Report 2010. This report has since been superseded by the Selwyn Rural Residential Strategy 2104. The Strategy applies primarily to the UDS portion of the District where Chapter 6 of the CRPS requires rural residential development to be in accordance with such a strategy. As such it does not have direct statutory relevance for PC54. It does nonetheless provide a useful framework as to the outcomes expected from rural residential development in the District and therefore is useful for informing the final rule package applying to PC54.
- It is noted that no consultation appears to have been undertaken with mana whenua. The applicant is encouraged to undertake such consultation at a pre-notification stage.

**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.

Please contact me on (03) 964-4630 or [jonathan@planzconsultants.co.nz](mailto:jonathan@planzconsultants.co.nz) if you have any queries.

Yours faithfully

**PLANZ CONSULTANTS LTD**



Jonathan Clease  
**Associate and Urban Designer**