From:
 Kim Seaton - Novo Group

 To:
 Rachael Carruthers

 Cc:
 Hamish Wheelans

 Subject:
 PC59 progression

Date: Friday, 14 August 2020 10:53:00 a.m.

Attachments: <u>image001.png</u>

20190814 PC180059 RFI.docx

Hi Rachael

Further to my earlier emails to you regarding a rule to resolve the issues with the NZTA submissions, I can confirm that the applicant wishes to progress with the preparation of a s42a report and move to a hearing. I can confirm that we wish to include the following rules in the plan change application:

Rule 12.1.3.59

From [date plan change becomes operative], no completion certificates shall be issued under section 224 of the Act within the Living WM (South) Zone (other than for a boundary adjustment or creation of an allotment solely for utility purposes), until such time as the State Highway 73/Weedons Ross Road intersection is signalised.

Non-complying Activities – Subdivision- General

12.1.7 Except as provided for in <u>Rules 12.1.5</u> and <u>Rules 12.1.6</u>, the following activities shall be non-complying activities:

..

12.1.7.10 Any subdivision that does not comply with Rule 12.1.3.59.

I have yet to have feedback from yourself on this proposal, and we're open to further amendment to the wording if you prefer an alternative.

Per your RFI, attached, the new rules above are considered to address the NZTA submissions. Re your second question, we consider that, to a large degree, the new National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 effectively overtakes the Our Space document, in so far as Policy 8 of the NPS specifically provides for plan changes that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments, even if the development capacity is unanticipated by RMA planning documents. We understand that ECan has not yet defined what significant development capacity would be, but we consider the proposal is consistent with contributing to a well-functioning urban environment, noting it would enable more variety of house provision than the current zoning allows, will allow for good accessibility to West Melton facilities, and not worse accessibility to the wider district facilities than exists under the current zoning.

Regardless of the NPS, I note that the Our Space document does seek to direct growth in Selwyn primarily to Rolleston and Lincoln. However, it does not exclude growth in other townships, where that growth is within the current urban limits. For example Section 5.3 of the document specifies that additional housing capacity will be directed in the first instance to the key towns of Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. "In the first instance", not solely. Public transport accessibility is a key driver in directing any future residential development capacity locations and we acknowledge that West Melton is not well positioned in this regard. Our Space does however acknowledge the need for smaller and more affordable housing within the district, and a key driver of PC59 is very poor market demand for the large allotment sizes that the current zoning only allows. Provision for smaller, albeit not small, allotments is more consistent with the broader policy drive for more affordable housing, than the current zoning.

In regard question 3, the applicant does not intend to enforce the covenants preventing submissions.

If you have any questions just let me know. Otherwise we look forward to getting your feedback

on the rules above.

Kind regards

Kim Seaton

Principal Planner

D: 03 972 5761 | M: 021 662 315 | O: 03 365 5570

E: kim@novogroup.co.nz | W: www.novogroup.co.nz

Christchurch | Queenstown Lakes

Level 1, 279 Montreal Street | PO Box 365 | Christchurch 8140

NovoGroup-Logo_Final-lockup_email



Notice: The information in this email is confidential and is intended only for the use of the addressee named above.

 $If you are not the intended \ recipient, you are hereby \ notified \ that \ any \ dissemination, copying \ or \ use \ of \ this \ information \ is \ strictly \ prohibited.$

If you have received this email in error, please reply to the author by return email, and delete the original message. Thank you.