

From: submissions@selwyn.govt.nz
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: Form 5 Submission
Date: Wednesday, 29 July 2020 3:41:50 p.m.

**** Your Details ****

Proposed Plan Change No: : 63
First Name: : Katherine
Surname : Molloy
Organisation Name :
Contact Name :
Email Address : Ksmolloy01@gmail.com
Box/Road/Street Number and Name/Property Name : 12 Landsborough Drive
Suburb : Darfield
Town/City : 7571
Post Code :
Phone Number : 0210432094
Fax Number :

**** Submission ****

My/Our Submissions is: : I oppose some parts of the application because

-There is currently no clearly defined plan for a wastewater system for Darfield Township as a whole. Current schools of thought for either a local plant, or piped line to Rolleston are not conclusive or formalised, and time periods seem to be extended. The proposal for a short-term solution for the ODP with the possibility of extensions of resource consents should there be further delays to a township plan, further exacerbate the need for a long-term solution.

- 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. This is on top of already existing subdivisions.

- A township divided by a state highway and rail, Darfield is a thriving community with a busy main road which hosts the commercial hub. Council needs to look at this and how it intends the commercial area to grow in terms of business, traffic, parking, pedestrian access (especially in relation to schools and access across a busy state highway)etc. I do not believe that there is enough information in the proposal about such a large development's impact on the wider community.

Eg The growth of residential developments in West Melton, and the lack of town planning around the growth has led to a community divided by a state highway commuter route, dangerous intersections and little room for commercial growth. The growth in West Melton households and population is less than that proposed for Darfield. Darfield has a similar division and traffic growth has been great over recent years (main tourist/truck route West). Local businesses do not want to loose local trade because it is too difficult to get access to them.

- the ITA submitted indicates potential traffic to be 2888 daily, and that key destinations would either be to Christchurch/Rolleston or Darfield town. There is no indication that this traffic would use Kimberly Rd/Old West Coast Rd, and all traffic would therefore use the current access points for SH73 at McMillan St and Mathias St. This is a considerable extra burden on access points restricted by level crossings and a built up area.

- the ITA refers to a previously commissioned report (Stantec) on the existing traffic network, it's ability to accommodate greenfield developments, and its relevance in relation to a future subdivision north of Landsborough (opposite side of Kimberly Rd to the ODP). It concludes that any wider network upgrades will be addressed by the network will be addressed by network operators. I do not believe that the comparable greenfield area would use the same access points to main roads as the ODP, and given the low density, the volume of traffic would be considerably lower.

I/We seek the following decision from the Council for the following reasons : I would like council to finalise

reticulated sewerage proposals for Darfield before it considers further zoning changes. Proposed township growth and its impact on the wider community needs to be clearly identified and planned. Impacts on traffic and the planning of Darfield and other communities around it needs to be closely monitored. Smaller sections are the way forward, but such planned growth on top of sections already planned but not selling, and what seems to be no clearly defined township plan has cause for concern.

If you are attaching your submission separately, do so here : No file uploaded

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 :
Maybe

**** 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 :

From: submissions@selwyn.govt.nz
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: Form 5 Submission
Date: Wednesday, 29 July 2020 5:43:34 p.m.

**** Your Details ****

Proposed Plan Change No: : 63
First Name: : Katherine
Surname : Molloy
Organisation Name :
Contact Name :
Email Address : Ksmolloy01@gmail.com
Box/Road/Street Number and Name/Property Name : 12 Landsborough Drive
Suburb : Darfield
Town/City : 7571
Post Code :
Phone Number : 0210432094
Fax Number :

**** Submission ****

My/Our Submissions is: : I oppose some parts of the application because

-There is currently no clearly defined plan for a wastewater system for Darfield Township as a whole. Current schools of thought for either a local plant, or piped line to Rolleston are not conclusive or formalised, and time periods seem to be extended. The proposal for a short-term solution for the ODP with the possibility of extensions of resource consents should there be further delays to a township plan, further exacerbate the need for a long-term solution.

- 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. This is on top of already existing subdivisions.

- A township divided by a state highway and rail, Darfield is a thriving community with a busy main road which hosts the commercial hub. Council needs to look at this and how it intends the commercial area to grow in terms of business, traffic, parking, pedestrian access (especially in relation to schools and access across a busy state highway)etc. I do not believe that there is enough information in the proposal about such a large development's impact on the wider community.

Eg The growth of residential developments in West Melton, and the lack of town planning around the growth has led to a community divided by a state highway commuter route, dangerous intersections and little room for commercial growth. The growth in West Melton households and population is less than that proposed for Darfield. Darfield has a similar division and traffic growth has been great over recent years (main tourist/truck route West). Local businesses do not want to loose local trade because it is too difficult to get access to them.

- the ITA submitted indicates potential traffic to be 2888 daily, and that key destinations would either be to Christchurch/Rolleston or Darfield town. There is no indication that this traffic would use Kimberly Rd/Old West Coast Rd, and all traffic would therefore use the current access points for SH73 at McMillan St and Mathias St. This is a considerable extra burden on access points restricted by level crossings and a built up area.

- the ITA refers to a previously commissioned report (Stantec) on the existing traffic network, it's ability to accommodate greenfield developments, and its relevance in relation to a future subdivision north of Landsborough (opposite side of Kimberly Rd to the ODP). It concludes that any wider network upgrades will be addressed by the network will be addressed by network operators. I do not believe that the comparable greenfield area would use the same access points to main roads as the ODP, and given the low density, the volume of traffic would be considerably lower.

I/We seek the following decision from the Council for the following reasons : I would like council to finalise

reticulated sewerage proposals for Darfield before it considers further zoning changes. Proposed township growth and its impact on the wider community needs to be clearly identified and planned. Impacts on traffic and the planning of Darfield and other communities around it needs to be closely monitored. Smaller sections are the way forward, but such planned growth on top of sections already planned but not selling, and what seems to be no clearly defined township plan has cause for concern.

If you are attaching your submission separately, do so here : No file uploaded

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 :
Maybe

**** 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 :

From: submissions@selwyn.govt.nz
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: Form 5 Submission
Date: Wednesday, 5 August 2020 7:00:03 p.m.

**** Your Details ****

Proposed Plan Change No: : 63
First Name: : Katherine
Surname : Molloy
Organisation Name :
Contact Name :
Email Address : Ksmolloy01@gmail.com
Box/Road/Street Number and Name/Property Name : 12 Landsborough Drive
Suburb : Darfield
Town/City : 7571
Post Code :
Phone Number : 0210432094
Fax Number :

**** Submission ****

My/Our Submissions is: : I oppose some parts of the application because

-There is currently no clearly defined plan for a wastewater system for Darfield Township as a whole. Current schools of thought for either a local plant, or piped line to Rolleston are not conclusive or formalised, and time periods seem to be extended. The proposal for a short-term solution for the ODP with the possibility of extensions of resource consents should there be further delays to a township plan, further exacerbate the need for a long-term solution.

- 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. This is on top of already existing subdivisions.

- A township divided by a state highway and rail, Darfield is a thriving community with a busy main road which hosts the commercial hub. Council needs to look at this and how it intends the commercial area to grow in terms of business, traffic, parking, pedestrian access (especially in relation to schools and access across a busy state highway)etc. I do not believe that there is enough information in the proposal about such a large development's impact on the wider community.

Eg The growth of residential developments in West Melton, and the lack of town planning around the growth has led to a community divided by a state highway commuter route, dangerous intersections and little room for commercial growth. The growth in West Melton households and population is less than that proposed for Darfield. Darfield has a similar division and traffic growth has been great over recent years (main tourist/truck route West). Local businesses do not want to loose local trade because it is too difficult to get access to them.

- the ITA submitted indicates potential traffic to be 2888 daily, and that key destinations would either be to Christchurch/Rolleston or Darfield town. There is no indication that this traffic would use Kimberly Rd/Old West Coast Rd, and all traffic would therefore use the current access points for SH73 at McMillan St and Mathias St. This is a considerable extra burden on access points restricted by level crossings and a built up area.

- the ITA refers to a previously commissioned report (Stantec) on the existing traffic network, it's ability to accommodate greenfield developments, and its relevance in relation to a future subdivision north of Landsborough (opposite side of Kimberly Rd to the ODP). It concludes that any wider network upgrades will be addressed by the network will be addressed by network operators. I do not believe that the comparable greenfield area would use the same access points to main roads as the ODP, and given the low density, the volume of traffic would be considerably lower.

I/We seek the following decision from the Council for the following reasons : I would like council to finalise

reticulated sewerage proposals for Darfield before it considers further zoning changes. Proposed township growth and its impact on the wider community needs to be clearly identified and planned. Impacts on traffic and the planning of Darfield and other communities around it needs to be closely monitored. Smaller sections are the way forward, but such planned growth on top of sections already planned but not selling, and what seems to be no clearly defined township plan has cause for concern.

If you are attaching your submission separately, do so here : No file uploaded

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 :
Maybe

**** 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 :