

Plan Change 63 Submitter Details											
Submitter Name	Company-Organisation	Address	Email	Late	Could Gain Advantage	Directly Affected	Wish To Be Heard	Consider Joint Case	Agent Name	Agent Organisation	SubmitterID
Phillipa Joan Anderson		1 Whitcombe Place Darfield 7571	hgp.anderson@xtra.co.nz	No	No	No	Yes	No			PC63-1
Darren and Vanessa Davies		134 Horndon St Darfield 7510	dvdavies@xtra.co.nz	No	No	No	Yes	Yes			PC63-2
Janice and Collan Perriton		2 Landsborough Drive RD1 Darfield 7571	jp@oystercatcher.biz	No	No	No	No	No			PC63-3
Paul and Alison Wightman		156C Horndon Street Darfield 7510	wightmen@outlook.com	No	No	No	Yes	Yes			PC63-4
Crystal Vercoe		38 Kimberley Road Darfield 7510	crystal_damian@hotmail.com	No	No	No	Yes	Yes			PC63-5
Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	PO Box 345 Christchurch 8140	tammy.phillips@ecan.govt.nz	No	No	No	No		Tammy Phillips	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	PC63-6
Duncan and Irene Mattushek		7 Dundee Close Darfield 7510	mattushek@xtra.co.nz	No	No	No	Yes	Yes			PC63-7

Canterbury District Health Board	Canterbury District Health Board (CDHB)	Attn Matt Willoughby Community and Public Health C/- Canterbury District Health Board PO Box 1475 Christchurch 8140	matt.willoughby@cdhb.health.nz	No	No	No	No		Matt Willoughby	Community and Public Health	PC63-8
KiwiRail Holdings Ltd (KiwiRail)	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd (KiwiRail)	PO Box 593 Wellington 6140	michelle.grinlinton-hancock@kiwirail.co.nz	No	No	No	Yes	Yes	Michelle Grinlinton Hancock	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd (KiwiRail)	PC63-9
Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	PO Box 1479 Christchurch 8011	gemma.kean@nzta.govt.nz	No	No	No	Yes	No	Gemma Kean	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	PC63-10
Maddison McCullough		9 Dundee Close Darfield 7510	madi.mccullough@xtra.co.nz	No	No	No	No	No			PC63-11
Katherine Molloy		12 Landsborough Drive Darfield 7571	Ksmolloy01@gmail.com	No	No	No	Yes	Yes			PC63-12
Westmar Senior Care, Darfield	Westmar Senior Care, Darfield	C/- Ashley Ross 12 Kimberley Road Darfield 7510	westmar@xtra.co.nz		Yes	No	Yes	No	Ashley Ross	Westmar Senior Care, Darfield	PC63-13
Kirsty Lucey and Ben Hanburger		146 Horndon St Darfield	kirst12@hotmail.com	Yes	No	No					PC63-14

### Summary of Submissions PC63

Point #	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Submitter ID
01	Oppose	The proposed minimum lot sizes are too small.	Section sizes should be at least 800m2	PC63-1
02	Oppose	Proposed building heights for houses and rest home are too tall	Buildings should be limited to a single storey, with covenants imposed by and enforced by SDC	PC63-1
03	Oppose	The application would result in a loss of rural identity	Refuse the application	PC63-1
04	Oppose	Concerned about increased traffic on Kimberley Road	Refuse the application	PC63-1
01	Oppose	Housing down the eastern boundary of the application site would impact on our amazing mountain and rural views and outlook	Refuse the application	PC63-2
02	Oppose	Due to the current urban sprawl and the current vacant sections available around the district, we see no need for an extra 60ha to be rezoned	Refuse the application	PC63-2

03	Oppose	The application would impact on the infrastructure services within Darfield, as these are already overstretched	Refuse the application	PC63-2
01	Neither Support Nor Oppose	The application will result in changes to the rural landscape	Properties along Kimberley Road should have a minimum lot size of 2000m2. This should be placed as a covenant and controlled/managed by SDC	PC63-3
02	Neither Support Nor Oppose	The application will have traffic effects in the area of Kimberley Road in the area of Landsborough Drive	Properties along Kimberley Road should gain their vehicle access from within the development area.	PC63-3
03	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Concerned about noise effects during development	Ensure that a plan is put in place to limit roading and infrastrucutre noise during the development.	PC63-3
01	Oppose	There is insufficient demand for residential land in Darfield to justify zoning the proposed Living 1 Deferred area.	Refuse this portion of the application	PC63-4

02	Oppose	The proposal would result in a loss of rural outlook for properties along the northern boundary of Broadgate, which were sold at a premium to reflect their rural boundary	Refuse the application	PC63-4
03	Oppose	Concerned about noise effects during development	Refuse the application	PC63-4
04	Oppose	Concerned about air pollution during development	Refuse the application	PC63-4
05	Oppose	The site is presumably at risk from flooding, as identified by Council in March 2020	Refuse the application	PC63-4
06	Oppose	There is insufficient clarity about when any deferred status would be lifted	Refuse the application	PC63-4

07	Oppose	The application would result in the loss of 60ha of prime arable land from NZ's economic and productive future.	Refuse the application	PC63-4
01	Oppose	Concerned about loss of rural outlook	That Council consider the effects on existing properties, including outlook, privacy and the expectations of owners based on the existing zoning	PC63-5
02	Oppose	Concerned about increased traffic, particularly the noise of it and the potential to disturb our dog, who will in turn disturb the neighbours	Refuse the application	PC63-5
03	Oppose	There are already too many small (less than 800m2) sections being developed in Darfield	That Council reconsider the size of sections in the application area	PC63-5
04	Oppose	There are too many houses being built in Darfield while the township is still on septic tanks	That Council reconsider the size of sections in the application area	PC63-5

05	Oppose	Concerned about the potential height of the retirement village	That Council consider the potential impact of the retirement village on the wider community	PC63-5
01	Neither Support Nor Oppose	<p>The application site appears to provide a logical extension to the township boundary – being close to the existing town centre and providing for a compact urban development pattern. The proposed Plan Change also makes provision for a range of housing types, including older persons housing, which is supported.</p> <p>However, the need to rezone additional rural land, when significant available capacity (i.e. zoned but undeveloped land) exists within the current township boundary, is unclear.</p>	To require a thorough assessment of whether it is appropriate to re-zone the land for residential development in light of the direction contained within the CRPS and pNPS-HPL. An appropriate analysis should be undertaken through an RMA process, either through this Private Plan Change application or more appropriately through the Selwyn District Plan review, to determine the outcome of re-zoning this area of land.	PC63-6

02	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Environment Canterbury supports the provision of reticulated wastewater servicing for the area as part of this proposed Plan Change.	To require the outline development plan to include reticulated wastewater servicing, or that a mechanism is in place to require a co-ordinated approach to reticulation (site-wide, to include surrounding ODP areas, or community-wide), at the time of subdivision.	PC63-6
----	----------------------------	--	---	--------



03	Neither Support Nor Oppose	<p>Results of the modelling for the 200 year rainfall runoff event show some overland flow flooding across the property, limited to historic channels. There is a small area of significantly deeper flooding (~1 m) proximal to Dundee Close. It appears that this ponding area has been demarked as a potential stormwater pond.</p> <p>Results of the 500 year modelling show that the property is outside of areas defined at 'High Hazard' in the CRPS, with the exception of the small ponding area along the southern boundary.</p>	To ensure that any buildings forming part of this development have floor levels suitably above the 200 year flood level as required by CRPS Policy 11.3.2.	PC63-6
01	Oppose	The application would result in a loss of rural outlook, privacy and quiet for our property	Refuse the application	PC63-7

02	Oppose	The site is at risk from flooding	Refuse the application	PC63-7
03	Oppose	There is a limited amount of good arable agricultural land, and many vacant/unsold sections available in and around Darfield.	Ensure that those vacant lots and existing zoned land are developed before the application site is developed.	PC63-7
04	Oppose	The existing stormwater network will be unable to cope with the increased runoff from 300+ new homes and associated roads	Ensure that stormwater management would not affect existing properties	PC63-7
05	Oppose	The application is unclear about when the deferred status would be lifted over that part of the application site.	Confirm that no development could take place in the deferred area until reticulated wastewater treatment is available.	PC63-7
06	Oppose	Considering the number and variety of birds we see in the paddocks and the healthy bee population during the summer months, it will be a shame to lose this habitat.	Refuse the application	PC63-7

01	Support	Based on the AEE presented to the CDHB on the 29th November 2019 and the applicant's willingness to proceed with Option 3 (full reticulation); the CDHB supports the proposed application.	The CDHB seeks that the proposal be granted as sought	PC63-8
----	---------	--	---	--------

01	Neither Support Nor Oppose	<p>KiwiRail considers that a Level Crossing Safety Impact Assessment (LCSIA) should be completed for the level crossings in the area as they may be affected by traffic flows generated by the proposed development and other developments. The LCSIA will determine whether mitigation (if any) is required.</p>	<p>KiwiRail requests that LCSIA assessments on the level crossings in the area be prepared prior to the plan change proceeding to a hearing, or at the very least clarification on what work has been done with regard to the level crossings and what work is still to be completed so that the effects of the proposal in relation to the level crossings can be fully understood.</p> <p>If as a result of the LCSIA mitigation measures are required, KiwiRail seeks for provisions to be included in the plan change that would enable any mitigation measures or safety improvement measures be undertaken at the time of subdivision.</p>	PC63-9
01	Oppose	<p>Intersection safety and efficiency - Waka Kotahi is concerned that the traffic generation has been underestimated by the applicant, and that the potential effects on State Highway 73 have been severely underestimated.</p>	<p>That Council ensure that the effects of the increased volume of traffic on the operation of the existing intersections are considered appropriately</p>	PC63-10

02	Oppose	The applicant has assumed that any level crossing upgrades will be undertaken and funded by KiwiRail, SDC and Waka Kotahi. However, an assessment of the safety of each crossing may be required, given the increase in traffic volumes at these crossings as a result of the proposed plan change.	Refuse the plan change, unless the level crossing safety issues have been adequately addressed.	PC63-10
----	--------	---	---	---------

03	Oppose	<p>In its current form, the proposed plan change does not support multi-modal transport options, particularly as retail and commercial development in Darfield is limited. This does not support New Zealand's greenhouse gas emission reduction targets.</p> <p>The proposed plan change would necessitate the need for vehicles and pedestrians to cross both the railway and State Highway 73 to access Darfield School and Darfield High School, with the potential to have adverse effects on pedestrian safety.</p>	Refuse the application, unless effects on transport connections and pedestrian safety have been adequately addressed.	PC63-10
----	--------	---	---	---------

04	Oppose	<p>Darfield is situated outside the Urban Development Strategy (UDS) area, but the proposal would result in a large area of residential development that may affect residential demand in the UDS area, particularly Rolleston and Lincoln.</p> <p>There are large areas of land in the Darfield area which are zoned for living but which are currently undeveloped.</p>	Refuse the application, unless it can be demonstrated that the plan change is not inconsistent with the Regional Policy Statement.	PC63-10
----	--------	---	--	---------

05	Oppose	The application has the potential to affect the safe and efficient operation of the land transport network, and further assessment is required to understand the potential effects of development and determine the extent to which the plan change would result in residential development that is consistent with Chapter 5 of the Regional Policy Statement (RPS).	Refuse the application, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not inconsistent with Chapter 5 of the RPS, particularly Objective 5.2.1, Objective 5.2.3 and Policy 5.3.7.	PC63-10
----	--------	---	--	---------



06	Oppose	Employment is limited in Darfield, and further residential development at this location is likely to result in travel outside of the immediate area - to the greater Selwyn and Christchurch areas, which does not support multi-modal transport and supports the continued reliance on private vehicle use. The application therefore appears to be inconsistent with the Selwyn District Plan objectives in relation to integrating land use and transport planning.	Refuse the application, unless it can be demonstrated that it is not inconsistent with the Selwyn District Plan.	PC63-10
01	Oppose	Development of this land would destroy the rural outlook for adjoining properties	Refuse the application to rezone the 40ha of land north of Dundee Close	PC63-11
02	Oppose	There is undeveloped residential capacity in Darfield that should be developed before the application site	Refuse the application	PC63-11

03	Oppose	Development of the site would lead to land erosion, due to the need for a large construction area to be open over a long time, exposed to the high NW winds.	Refuse the application	PC63-11
04	Oppose	Darfield should be provided with a Council reticulated wastewater network before any large residential development occurs in the township, rather than relying on a temporary system.	Refuse the application	PC63-11
	Support In Part	A retirement village has been needed in Darfield for some time.	That Council consider whether this is the best location for a retirement village.	PC63-11
01	Oppose	There is currently no clearly defined plan for a wastewater system for Darfield.	That Council finalise reticulated sewage proposals for Darfield before it considers any zoning change.	PC63-12

02	Oppose In Part	There is no timeline indicated for the development of the ODP, and therefore the impacts of such a growth in population on the local area. While a retirement complex and high-density housing are positive for the area, current projections for population growth do not allow for an increase of this size (approx 1400 people for this ODP alone), until 2040.	Proposed township growth and it's impact on the wider community needs to be clearly identified and planned	PC63-12
----	----------------	--	--	---------

03	Oppose	The application does not contain sufficient information about the potential impact on the wider community, specifically in relation to traffic, parking, pedestrian access (especially in relation to schools and access across a busy state highway) from the application site to the commercial area of Darfield, schools etc.	That the traffic effects of the application be carefully considered.	PC63-12
01	Oppose	An Aged Residential Care facility of this size in Darfield would place considerable pressure on the infrastructure and amenities of Darfield. In particular, increased water usage, increase in traffic on the neighbouring roads, parking and the difficulties in safely getting rid of the waste water.	Refuse the application in relation to the retirement village	PC63-13

02		A large complex such as that planned, would make the small rural community into a more metropolitan area which is not what the Darfield community want. The planned area is currently rural, however the buildings may be unsightly and affect the overall community.	Refuse the application in relation to the retirement village	PC63-13
03	Oppose	The application would result in an over-supply of aged residential care in Darfield	Refuse the applicaiton in relation to the retirement village	PC63-13
01	Oppose	The application would result in the submitter's no-exit street becoming a primary road, raising concerns about the safety of children and pets	That the access route be moved away from the submitter's property	PC63-14
02	Oppose	Loss of rural outlook	That the area be reduced in size - continue with the retirement village, but make the area of land smaller. Alternatively, have the yellow lots become green space	PC63-14