

From: submissions@selwyn.govt.nz
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: Form 5 Submission
Date: Sunday, 26 July 2020 2:43:47 p.m.
Attachments: [Wightman-submission-PC63.docx](#)

**** Your Details ****

Proposed Plan Change No : PC63
First Name : Paul and Alison
Surname : Wightman
Organisation Name :
Contact Name :
Email Address : wightmen@outlook.com
Box/Road/Street Number and Name/Property Name : 156C Horndon Street
Suburb : Darfield
Town/City : Darfield
Post Code : 7510
Phone Number : 0276053218
Fax Number :

**** Submission ****

My/Our Submissions is : See separate file containing our (opposing) submission on PC63. Word file ref: wightman submission PC63
I/We seek the following decision from the Council for the following reasons : Council to not turn down this Plan Change 63 on the basis of: demand, effect on existing properties, flood zoning. Also more clarity on what the zoning "L1 Deferred" actually means.
If you are attaching your submission separately, do so here : Wightman-submission-PC63.docx, type application/vnd.openxmlformats-officedocument.wordprocessingml.document, 22.3 KB
Supporting Information : No file uploaded

**** Hearing Options ****

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission : Yes
If others are making a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at the Hearing : Yes

**** Trade Competition ****

I could gain a competitive advantage in trade competition through this submission : No (please skip to Hearing Options)
If yes, I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that (a) Adversely affects the environment; and (b) Does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition :

Submission to Plan Change 63

This is a submission from Paul and Alison Wightman. We are owners of 156c Horndon St and 156B Horndon St. Both properties purchased in Oct – Nov 2019.

We are alarmed by the publishing of Selwyn District Council Plan Change 63. It has come as a complete surprise to us. This plan, to rezone 60 hectares of Rural Zone – Outer Plains land to Living 1 residential, will completely change the outlook on the northern boundary of our properties. It will negate the very purpose we bought these properties.

We would like to object to Plan Change 63 on 4 grounds: Demand, effect on properties, flood risk and the meaning of terms.

Demand /Need

A major selling point of the proposed Plan 63 is stated that the re-zoning will allow for smaller sections (400 – 1000sqm) and that these will be in great demand for retirees, first home buyers and others.

While there could be a future demand for the proposed Retirement Home and village along Kimberly Rd, we can see no current, or future, demand or need for development of the large area designated L1 Deferred on Plan 63.

- As of 20 July 2020, there are approx. 50 empty residential sections available in Darfield. Most are L1 zoned and are from 600 to 1000 sqm. At least 40 have been available for sale for over 2 years and many of them over 5 years. (Broadgate – 2 sections. Cressy Oaks Stage 2 – 7 sections + 3 on hold, Newbrook Terrace -38 sections.)
- In addition, there is the already zone-changed area (shown on the Plan 63 map in red as L1 X) extending the Broadgate subdivision to the west along Horndon St to Kimberly Rd. That is likely to produce at least another 40+ residential sections. We note that development of that area has not been instigated even after 6 or 7 years of L1 zoning of the initial stages of the Broadgate subdivision.

There actually appears to be very limited demand in Darfield for these smaller sections – so why do we need to approve a L1 Deferred zoning change that is earmarked for another 300 of them?

We suspect that with the very low demand for these type of properties and the extremely high development/subdivision costs (especially including the proposed private waste-water treatment plant) any Darfield extension of this type is decades in the future. So, why make the huge zoning change to 'L1 Deferred' at this stage?

Effect on properties

In the reply to Selwyn District Council (SDC) questions to the original Plan 63 regarding the effect on Darfield and neighbouring properties, there are a number of responses regarding the effect on properties on the Horndon St boundary.

- In: Character and amenity values. ii) , a) 10 it refers to the boundary with Land already zone L1 X and suggests that the Proposal plan change does not need to consider the effects on these properties.
- The report in Appendix B. 6.2.2 dealing with the effect on properties on Horndon St, suggests that: *“rural outlook cannot reasonably be expected to remain in perpetuity in a L1 zone”*. It is not clear if this is referring to **all** properties on Horndon St, or those adjoining the already L1 X zoned area, or those on the boundary of the Broadgate subdivision. They are different.

We take issue with both of those statements. We believe it is entirely reasonable that the area adjacent to these properties remains zoned as rural and the outlook is maintained because:

The Broadgate subdivision was developed and managed by members of the Plan 63 proposer’s family in 2005-14. The sections were subdivided and sold by the family with the rural boundary sections being sold at a premium price to reflect their view and outlook.

The properties along the Broadgate Horndon St /rural boundary were subsequently built and oriented to take in that view and expectation. For many properties, the blocking of that outlook will make a nonsense of their house design and section layout.

In our own case, the section 156B Horndon St was sold to us by the Plan 63 proposer’s family in November 2019 with that very same premium and outlook expectation. No disclosure on the Sale and Purchase agreement was made that suggested any development plans were being proposed for adjoining land and rural outlook.

When we purchased 156C and 156B Horndon St in Oct/Nov 2019, the LIM reports produced by Selwyn DC made no mention of any development plans – or, indeed, of this area being a *‘Preferred development area for Darfield’ under the Malvern MAP*. From the Plan Change documents, it is clear that the council were already in discussion about this plan change at that time.

All of the Broadgate properties along the Horndon St boundary with this proposed plan change will already have been negatively affected from a financial and resale point of view – just by the very existence of this proposal. Should the plan change be approved, there will be significant financial and saleability penalties for each owner.

This will then be exacerbated by the ongoing construction noise and air pollution should any actual development take place.

Flood risk

In March 2020, owners of properties in the Broadgate sub-division were informed by Selwyn DC that, as part of the review of the District Plan, this area was now identified as potentially being at risk of flooding.

This was another complete surprise to most of the owners. No mention or pre- advice had been published.

Presumably this Flood risk also applies to the areas defined for re-zoning in Plan Change 63 as the land is contiguous with – und contributes to - the flood risk of our property. If that is the case, why seek, or approve, the building of 300+ new properties in an acknowledged flood risk area?

What is meant by zoning 'L1 Deferred'?

A large proportion of the proposed Plan 63 change is to change 50 odd hectares of Rural Zone – Outer Plains land into 'L1 Deferred' zone. It is not clear anywhere in that plan or supporting documents as what is actually meant by the term: "L1 deferred". Is it Deferred to an event? Or a date? Or what? This needs to be made clear.

The only reference we can find to this in Plan 63 is in Section 5 on wastewater assets. (see below) which suggests that the 'deferred' means it's deferred until Selwyn DC /Darfield has implemented its waste water treatment plant and infrastructure for the area. As the plans for that waste water facility are currently under delay/review by Selwyn District Council into the future, why approve a huge 'deferred' zone change that is based upon it?

"5 wastewater assets

b) The application contains inconsistencies surrounding if the L1 deferred area would potentially be linked with the community wastewater scheme (proposed Rule 12.1.6.16B v Point 4.4 of the report). Please: a. Clarify this aspect; b. And if the L1 deferred area will also be linked to the community wastewater scheme, if allowance has been made for this in both treatment capacity, and land discharge area.

41. It is not intended to connect the deferred area to this WWTP and land treatment area, so the Rule is correct. The L1 deferred area is deferred until there is a Council scheme."

If approved, we believe that this Plan Change 63 will mean that another 60 odd hectares of prime, arable land will eventually be lost from NZ's economic and productive future in return for an unwanted, largely unnecessary and possibly unsafe mass of urban sprawl.

We have been let down by limited or no information by the Council and the property developers of this Plan 63 – and will suffer significant financial and amenity costs as a result.

We oppose Plan Change 63.

Paul & Alison Wightman

26 July 2020