

18 February 2020

Planning Department
Selwyn District Council
P O Box 90
ROLLESTON 7643

RE: PLAN CHANGE 62 – SUBMISSION OF N A WARREN

I, Nicki Ann Warren, of 24 Spring Place, Leeston, Legal Secretary, am a landowner of property neighbouring the proposed rezoned land and, accordingly, an affected party, and I object to the proposed plan change and submit as follows:

1. The Outline Development Plan does not address a known landfill site on the 125A High Street, Leeston property owned by Cochranes of Canterbury Limited. The landfill is historically known, has a HAIL listing on Environment Canterbury's Listed Land Use Register, and historical imagery on Environment Canterbury's Canterbury Maps service shows the landfill pit to have existed at least since the commencement of Cochranes of Canterbury's commercial operation on Leeston's High Street in the 1950s and quite possibly prior. Oral history in the township recognises this landfill, which is presently an un-investigated site (SIT 123263), to have been used for commercial/industrial, agricultural, and residential waste. Given there has never been and is no Council managed landfill in the Leeston township one could expect such private landfills to have been utilised by neighbouring property owners and others in the vicinity. Given the nature of materials discarded to landfill — which are known to have included early plastics and polystyrene packaging, treated wood, tyres, batteries, storage drums, and machinery parts — and the duration and extent of ongoing landfill use across decades, it is a virtual certainty the land is significantly contaminated with arsenic, cyanide, and various heavy metals of some toxicity. The land would require extensive remediation to meet residential guidelines.



2. The contaminated site is a substantial portion of the north-western corner of the land incorporated in Lot 2 DP 319397. The Outline Development Plan situates a potential pedestrian/cycle link across this land area and suggests a right of way would afford a series of Living 1 zoned properties to be situated thereon. I submit that this land should instead be vested in Council as a reserve. It is not suitable for the proposed developmental uses. Remediation of such an extensive contaminated area would have severe financial implications for the development proposal as a whole. Council should be mindful of addressing such a significant matter in advance of any plan change or development consent given the costs occasioned by *Monticello Holdings Ltd v Selwyn District Council*.
3. As concerns design and planning, I have concerns the proposal does not consider population demographics and more progressive understandings of residential housing needs in Canterbury. Living 1 zone size sections would inevitably result in productive farmland being divided to the fullest extent possible and houses being built thereon to the greatest footprint possible; a situation largely predicated by the cultural view of property as primarily an investment matter. The flow-on consequences of the same are that standardised characterless houses are produced on mass in the most cost-effective manner possible by the developer and on-sold to heavily debt-financed housing market entrants who need higher incomes from urban office work to sustain longitudinal debt repayments.
4. This does a disservice to the township and the Selwyn District, whereby a satellite population lives and works its days in greater Christchurch and remains largely economically and culturally segregated from the District. Such outcomes inevitably place pressure on infrastructure, resulting in more rapid wear-and-tear of roads, etc.
5. Development that was focused more on community outcomes might perhaps consider urban redevelopment projects creating low-maintenance living spaces for urban workers, and also more diverse residential options, including flats and apartments for elderly and single persons. The creation of a more diverse and community-appropriate/responsive property market is disincentivised by bulk development.

A handwritten signature in black ink, located in the bottom right corner of the page. The signature is stylized and appears to be a combination of letters, possibly 'AFA' or similar, with a long, sweeping flourish extending upwards and to the right.

6. The proposed development is also out of step with general development within the township. For example, the population increase which would accompany the realisation of the proposed development has not been factored into the recently-announced but yet to be achieved upgrade of the high school and would immediately create capacity issues for the school. Main street commercial activity would struggle to respond to rapid population increase.
7. The land under consideration is known to be susceptible to flooding and inundation. While subdivision infrastructure may mitigate this as concerns the proposed development, there remains potential that such issues could be displaced onto contiguous established township and the township's high school, especially given the increasingly extreme weather events occasioned by climate change.
8. The inevitable impacts of increased traffic on the Southbridge turnoff corner (junction of High Street, Southbridge Leeston Road, Feredays Road, & Harmans Road) would need to be investigated further and the corner may require redevelopment to improve safety. Any such works should be funded largely by the developer, rather than rating increases. Increased traffic in the Spring Place cul-de-sac, anticipated to more-than-treble under the proposal, would add substantial noise pollution and other adverse amenity and safety outcomes.
9. Consideration should be given of any development which impacts on the hitherto western boundaries of the established Spring Place residences and the existing Leeston township, as contiguous Living 1 developments would have severe impact on the existing amenity values, including but not limited to sunlight, quite enjoyment with limited noise pollution, unimpeded outlook to the Southern Alps. These issues could in part be managed by setback requirements registered as consent notices on the contiguous land areas upon issue of new title.
10. Pets in the outer Leeston township would be impacted by any development. A number of smaller domestic dogs, including my own, reside in the outer Leeston township and are currently largely free from environmental stress factors. A 400+ dwelling development would inevitably result in a number of large, vicious or noisy dogs being in close proximity causing noise pollution and distress.



11. A comprehensive range of land covenants could be imposed on the development properties to ensure quiet enjoyment of existing properties continues. The developer needs to address how impacts on existing property owners will be minimised.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in black ink, consisting of a series of loops and a long horizontal stroke.

Nicki Ann Warren
24 Spring Place
Leeston 7632

Planning Unit

Notice of Submission on Proposed Plan Change 62

Resource Management Act 1991 - Form 5

Lodge your application: Post to Selwyn District Council, PO Box 90, Rolleston 7643

Email to submissions@selwyn.govt.nz

Fax to 347-2799

Enquiries phone (03) 347-2868 or email pc62@selwyn.govt.nz

Submission Reference:

Submissions Close at 5pm, Wednesday 19 February 2020.

1. Submitter Details

Name of Submitter(s) (state full name(s)): Nicki Ann Warren
Physical Address: 24 Spring Place, Leeston 7632

Address for Service (if different):

Email: nickiwarren@hotmail.com

Telephone (day):

Mobile: 021 367 642

2. Trade Competition Declaration

I could gain a competitive advantage in trade competition through this submission

☐ Yes ☒ No

If **yes**, I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

☐ Yes ☐ No

(a) Adversely affects the environment; and

(b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition

3. Submission Details

This is a submission on proposed Plan Change 62.

I / We: ☐ Support all or part of the application
☒ Oppose all or part of the application
☐ Are neutral towards all or part of the application

The specific parts of the application that **my / our** submission relates to are: (give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

see attached.

The reasons for **my / our** submission are (give details, continue on a separate sheet if necessary):

see attached

The decision I / We would like the Council to make is: (give precise details including, if relevant, the parts of the proposal you wish to have amended and continue on a separate sheet if necessary)

see attached

4. Submission at the Hearing

- ☒ I / We wish to speak in support of my / our submission.
- ☐ I / We do not wish to speak in support of my / our submission.
- ☒ If others make a similar submission I / We will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

5. Signature

(Of submitter(s) or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter(s))

Signature: 

Date: 218 February 2020

Signature:

Date:

Note: A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

6. Privacy Information

The personal information requested in the form is being collected by Selwyn District Council so that we can process your application. This information is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. This information will be held by the Council. You may ask to check and correct any of this personal information if you wish. The personal information collected will not be shared with any departments of the Council not involved in processing your application. However under the Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 this information may be made available on request to parties within and outside the Council.

7. Important Information

1. The Council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submissions on this application.
2. You must also send a copy of this submission to the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable, at the applicant's address for service.
3. All submitters will be advised of hearing details at least 10 working days before the hearing. If you change your mind about whether you wish to speak at the hearing, please contact the Council by telephone on 347-2868 or by email at pc62@selwyn.govt.nz
4. Only those submitters who indicate that they wish to speak at the hearing will be sent a copy of the planning report.

Note to person making submission

If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Please note that your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the authority is satisfied that at least 1 of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

It is frivolous or vexatious:

It discloses no reasonable or relevant case

It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further:

It contains offensive language

It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialized knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

For Office Use Only

Received at the Office on at am / pm

Property Statement from the Listed Land Use Register

Visit www.ecan.govt.nz/HAIL for more information about land uses.



Customer Services
P. 03 353 9007 or 0800 324 636

PO Box 345
Christchurch 8140

P. 03 365 3828
F. 03 365 3194
E. ecinfo@ecan.govt.nz

www.ecan.govt.nz

Date:

17 December 2019

Land Parcels:

Lot 3 DP 50527

Valuation No(s): 2416019003

Lot 2 DP 319397

Valuation No(s): 2416019003



Site Category:	Not Investigated
Definition:	Verified HAIL has not been investigated.

Land Uses (from HAIL):	Period From	Period To	HAIL land use
	?	?	Landfill sites

Notes:

5 Nov 2014 This record was created as part of the Selwyn District Council 2015 HAIL identification project.

5 Nov 2014 Pit (to check)

Investigations:

There are no investigations associated with this site.

Information held about other investigations on the Listed Land Use Register

For further information from Environment Canterbury, contact Customer Services and refer to enquiry number ENQ249243.

Disclaimer: *The enclosed information is derived from Environment Canterbury's Listed Land Use Register and is made available to you under the Local Government Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 and Environment Canterbury's Contaminated Land Information Management Strategy (ECan 2009).*

The information contained in this report reflects the current records held by Environment Canterbury regarding the activities undertaken on the site, its possible contamination and based on that information, the categorisation of the site. Environment Canterbury has not verified the accuracy or completeness of this information. It is released only as a copy of Environment Canterbury's records and is not intended to provide a full, complete or totally accurate assessment of the site. It is provided on the basis that Environment Canterbury makes no warranty or representation regarding the reliability, accuracy or completeness of the information provided or the level of contamination (if any) at the relevant site or that the site is suitable or otherwise for any particular purpose. Environment Canterbury accepts no responsibility for any loss, cost, damage or expense any person may incur as a result of the use, reference to or reliance on the information contained in this report.

Any person receiving and using this information is bound by the provisions of the Privacy Act 1993.