



Plan Change 64 Submitter Details and Summary of Submissions

| SubmitterID | Submitter Name  | Late | Could Gain Advantage | Directly Affected | Wish To Be Heard | Consider Joint Case | Contact Name                     | Contact Organisation                                    | Contact Address                                  | Contact Email                    | Submitter Address   |
|-------------|---|------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|--|----------------------------------|---|
| PC64-0001   | Mr Martin Towers  |      | No                   |                   | No               | No                  | Mr Martin Towers                 |   | 20 Robert Street<br>Lincoln 7608                 | tinytowers@xtra.co.nz            | 20 Robert Street<br>Lincoln 7608                                |
| PC64-0002   | Nathaniel Heslop  |      | No                   |                   | No               |                     | Nathaniel Heslop                 |   | 45 Northmoor Boulevard<br>Rolleston 7615         | nathaniel.heslop@icloud.com      | 45 Northmoor Boulevard<br>Rolleston 7615                        |
| PC64-0003   | Christchurch City Council                               |      |                      |                   |                  |                     | Emily Allan                      | Christchurch City Council                               | 53 Hereford Street<br>Christchurch 8154          | emily.allan@ccc.govt.nz          | 53 Hereford Street<br>Christchurch 8154                         |
| PC64-0004   | Tania & Michael Croucher                                |      | No                   |                   | Yes              |                     | Tania & Michael Croucher         |   | 890 Selwyn Road<br>Springston 7678               | crouch@xtra.co.nz                | 890 Selwyn Road<br>Springston 7678                              |
| PC64-0005   | New Zealand Defence Force                               |      | No                   |                   | Yes              |                     | Sarah Bevin                      | C/- Tonkin & Taylor                                     | PO Box 2083<br>Wellington 6140                   | SBevin@tonkintaylor.co.nz        | C/- Tonkin & Taylor, PO Box 2083<br>Wellington 6140             |
| PC64-0006   | Canterbury Regional Council<br>(Environment Canterbury) |      | No                   |                   | No               |                     | Tammy Phillips                   | Canterbury Regional Council<br>(Environment Canterbury) | 200 Tuam Street<br>Christchurch 8011             | Tammy.Phillips@ecan.govt.nz      | 200 Tuam Street<br>Christchurch 8011                            |
| PC64-0007   | Michael Quinn   |      | No                   |                   | Yes              |                     | Michael Quinn                    |   | 870 Selwyn Road<br>Rolleston 7678                | mmquinn1969@gmail.com            | 870 Selwyn Road<br>Rolleston 7678                               |
| PC64-0008   | Ministry of Education                                   |      | No                   |                   | Yes              |                     | Morgan Fallowfield               | Beca Ltd  | PO Box 13960 Armagh Street<br>Christchurch 8141  | morgan.fallowfield@beca.com      | C/-Beca Ltd, PO Box 13960<br>Armagh Street<br>Christchurch 8141 |
| PC64-0009   | Freelance Canterbury Ltd<br>C/-JP Singh                 |      | No                   |                   | Yes              |                     | Lisa Steele                      | Planz Consultants Ltd                                   | PO Box 1845<br>Christchurch 8140                 | lisa@planzconsultants.co.nz      | PO Box 26500,<br>Epsom Auckland 1344                            |
| PC64-0010   | Peter Tilling   | Yes  | No                   |                   | Yes              |                     | Trudi Burney                     | Eliot Sinclair  | PO Box 9339, Tower Junction<br>Christchurch 8149 | trudi.burney@eliotsinclair.co.nz | 545 East Maddisons Road<br>Rolleston 7678                       |
| PC64-0011   | Canterbury District Health Board                        | Yes  | No                   |                   | No               |                     | Canterbury District Health Board |   | PO Box 1475<br>Christchurch 8140                 | matt.willoughby@cdhb.health.nz   | PO Box 1475<br>Christchurch 8140                                |

| Submitter ID | Submitter ID:Submitter Name | Point # | Position        | Summary  | Decision Requested  |
|--------------|-----------------------------|---------|-----------------|--|---|
| PC64-0001    | Mr Martin Towers            | 001     | Oppose          | Concern that more houses means more people going to work, and unless there are more employment opportunities in Rolleston, most will travel into the city, putting more cars on the road with all the associated consumption of fuel and materials, extending delays and prompting further road developments, which appears inconsistent with the ambitions for sustainability that are talked about so much.  | That consent for large residential developments be suspended until it can be shown that transport arrangements are in place that are more economical in all aspects - travel time, carbon emissions, road loading, cost etc.  |
| PC64-0002    | Nathaniel Heslop            | 001     | Support In Part | Concerned that increased traffic from Faringdon and Acland Park subdivisions will make it difficult to turn right onto what is a main arterial route.  | That lights be installed at Northmoor Boulevard and Springston-Rolleston Road intersection to ensure traffic turning right can access arterial route without significant delays or increased risk of crashes.   |
| PC64-0002    | Nathaniel Heslop            | 002     | Support In Part | Noticed that a significant number of vehicles already turn right at Selwyn Road / Springston-Rolleston intersection and continue up to Shands Road to avoid bottleneck at Selwyn Road / Shands Road.   | That lights be installed at the intersection of Selwyn Road and Springston Rolleston Road to reduce the uncertainty of drivers due to the existing road alignment.  |
| PC64-0002    | Nathaniel Heslop            | 003     | Support In Part | Support a bus route being created along Northmoor Boulevard, making buses more accessible for a significant portion of houses in South Faringdon and in the new subdivision where medium intensity housing is proposed in plan.  | That a bus route be provided along Northmoor Boulevard.   |
| PC64-0002    | Nathaniel Heslop            | 004     | Support In Part | Consider that cycleways connecting with the Rolleston-Lincoln cycleway are important.  | Support increased off-road cycleways to connect Rolleston, which are safer and provide reassurance for users.   |
| PC64-0002    | Nathaniel Heslop            | 005     | Oppose In Part  | Consider that the line of trees on the western boundary of the Faringdon South East ODP area should be retained as these create a visual landmark and also windbreak for trees.  | That the line of trees on western boundary of Faringdon South East ODP be retained.   |
| PC64-0002    | Nathaniel Heslop            | 006     | Oppose In Part  | Consider increasing the size of the Neighbourhood Centre shown on the Faringdon South East ODP as the bulk of Rolleston shops are at the other end of town and Southpoint is small and quaint but lacks substance for retail choice. This would reduce traffic across town.  | That the Neighbourhood Centre in the Faringdon South East ODP area be increased in size to provide more commercial and retail space.  |
| PC64-0003    | Christchurch City Council   | 001     | Oppose          | Concerned that the plan change request does not adequately support the integration of transport and land uses so as to reduce dependency on private motor vehicles; reduce greenhouse gas emissions; manage network congestion, particularly in terms of the downstream effects on the Greater Christchurch network or promote active and public transport modes.  | That, prior to any residential development, a funded and implemented public transport system service the that provides an economically sustainable attractive alternative relative to private vehicle travel and that an assessment of the downstream effects from the development on the Greater Christchurch transport network is undertaken. |
| PC64-0003    | Christchurch City Council   | 002     | Oppose          | Concerned that the plan change request is intending to provide 12 households/hectare while the submitter has previously sought a higher minimum density requirement of 15 households/hectare, which would better achieve efficiencies in coordination of land use and infrastructure, support mixed land use activities, support multi-modal transport systems and protect the productive rural land resource. | That the plan change be refused unless, it provides a minimum density of 15 households per hectare, and that relevant recommendations of the Greater Christchurch Density Review be incorporated in the Plan Change.  |
| PC64-0003    | Christchurch City Council   | 003     | Oppose          | Concerned that the proposed plan change may impact on the availability of highly productive land for primary production now and for future generation.   | That the plan change be refused unless further, more detailed, assessment of the impact on versatile soils from development in this area, and how to mitigate the impact, is undertaken.  |
| PC64-0003    | Christchurch City Council   | 004     | Oppose          | That the plan change incorporates the relevant recommendations of the Greater Christchurch Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan.  | That the plan change be refused unless, the relevant recommendations of the Greater Christchurch Social and Affordable Housing Action Plan be incorporated in the Plan Change.  |
| PC64-0004    | Tania & Michael Croucher    | 001     | Oppose          | Considers that, in the context of the wider township of Rolleston, the proposed plan change does not provide a variety of residential house types, lifestyles and price points when all sections will be within an average of 500 – 650m <sup>2</sup> , or that the sites can be considered as large, when the various zones provide for an average of 1200m <sup>2</sup> .                                    | Amend the ODP to provide a Living 1B zone (1200m <sup>2</sup> average) within the area highlighted with a blue cloud.<br>  |

|           |  |     |                            |  |  |
|-----------|--|-----|----------------------------|--|--|
| PC64-0004 | Tania & Michael Croucher                             | 002 | Oppose                     | Opposes the density of 12 household units per hectare which is proposed to be delivered by the plan change, as considers that this provides for higher densities further away from the Town Centre which is contrary to the CRPS and the Rolleston Structure Plan's Design Principle 4, which both promote higher density at nodal points, matching population density with centres of activity and high amenity.  | Amend the ODP to provide a Living 1B zone (1200m <sup>2</sup> average) within the area highlighted with a blue cloud.<br>   |
| PC64-0005 | New Zealand Defence Force                            | 001 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | NZDF wishes to highlight the critical importance of Burnham Military Camp and the importance of avoiding reverse sensitivity effects on its ongoing operations and functioning. The Camp hosts a wide variety of activities, and reverse sensitivity can represent a major challenge to the continued operation of NZDF's facilities.  | NZDF seeks to ensure that the operation of Burnham Military Camp is not affected by this Plan Change and resulting increase in residential development in the surrounding area, particularly in terms of ensuring safe and efficient access to and from the Camp, the potential traffic and transport effects on the Camp, along with reverse sensitivity effects.   |
| PC64-0006 | Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) | 001 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | Considers that, in terms of the actions identified in the future development strategy for Greater Christchurch, <i>Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update - Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga (Our Space 2018-2048)</i> , and to be considered as delivering significant development capacity under Policy 8 of the National Policy Statement-Urban Development, the plan change change should better support identified housing needs.  | That consideration is given through future processes to the nature of residential development proposed for the sites in order that it could be justified as delivering significant development capacity for the District and, in particular, that housing densities and typologies are appropriate and linked to housing needs identified in the capacity assessment collaboratively prepared by councils in the Greater Christchurch area.        |
| PC64-0006 | Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury) | 002 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | Considers that the the plan change request should coordinate the staging of development, both within the internal areas of each development block and between adjacent development sites, to ensure that effective public transport access can be provided and maintained.   | That consideration is given through future processes to appropriate mechanisms that ensure timely and effective public transport access to and through the sites and, in particular, that the primary public transport link to Faringdon Boulevard to the north is expedited to enable public transport services at the earliest opportunity.  |
| PC64-0007 | Michael Quinn  | 001 | Oppose In Part             | Concerned about the implications of costs associated with boundary fencing and the integration of existing hedge rows due to change of zoning to both the plan change area and possibly to own land in the future.   | That the developer pay for any boundary fencing required at the time of development, or that time be provided negotiate an alternative.  |
| PC64-0008 | Ministry of Education                                | 001 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | Lemonwood Grove School is located at the edge of current urban development and opposite the Faringdon South West Outline Development Plan area. There are existing footpaths along the eastern side of East Maddisons Road but no pedestrian crossing facilities on East Maddisons Road adjacent to the school. While footpath provision is indicated to be included along the western side of East Maddisons Road, no reference in the application to the provision of pedestrian crossing facilities across East Maddisons Road to the school. | That the proposal addresses the provision of safe crossing facilities across East Maddisons Road.  |
| PC64-0008 | Ministry of Education                                | 002 |                            | The proposed increase in urbanisation of the immediate area creates the opportunity for the current speed limits to be reviewed to provide an overall safer roading environment, and a speed limit of 50km/h may be more appropriate, particularly for East Maddisons Road given the projected residential development on both sides and the movement of pedestrians, including students across East Maddisons Road to access Lemonwood Grove School.  | That a speed limit review for the area to determine the safe and appropriate speed for when the area is developed, particularly for East Maddisons Road.   |
| PC64-0009 | Freelance Canterbury Ltd C/-JP Singh                 | 001 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | That the Plan Change, as notified, would level 545 East Maddisons Road as a small, isolated pocket of rural zoned land, surrounded on four sides by land zoned for residential development.  | That the plan change be amended to include 545 East Maddisons Road, and that this parcel be rezoned from Rural (Inner Plains) to Living Z and that the layout of the secondary roads shown on the proposed ODP be positioned to minimise impacts on the future development potential of this property.   |
| PC64-0009 | Freelance Canterbury Ltd C/-JP Singh                 | 002 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | The intersection of Goulds and East Maddisons Roads is complex and consideration has been given in the past to options for reconfiguring it.   | That, should the Plan Change application be granted, the ODP road layout is designed to ensure that the intersection of Goulds and East Maddisons Roads continues to operate safely and efficiently.   |
| PC64-0009 | Freelance Canterbury Ltd C/-JP Singh                 | 003 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | Supports the development of local and neighbourhood centres to meet the needs of local communities however, in light of the conclusions of the applicant's own economic assessment, considers that the proposed neighbourhood centres may be larger than that which could be sustained by the local population and could be reduced in size, to minimise the possibility of adverse effects on Rolleston's other centres.  | That, in light of the conclusions of the applicant's own economic assessment, consideration should be given to the scale of the proposed commercial centres.   |
| PC64-0010 | Peter Tilling  | 001 | Oppose In Part             | That it is inappropriate to re-zone the Faringdon South West land without the inclusion of the land at 545 East Maddisons Road, being the submitters site, as it is inconsistent with overarching strategic planning framework with required integrated development in National, Regional and District contexts and will create the isolation of one rural allotment.  | That PC64 be declined in part (being the area described as Faringdon South West), unless the site at 545 East Maddisons Road is included and the submitters proposed alternative ODP be incorporated within the provisions of the Selwyn District Plan (including the planning maps) to provide for high amenity and integrated development to occur as part of PC64. Supporting documentation has been provided in support of decision requested. |
| PC64-0011 | Canterbury District Health Board                     | 001 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | The CDHB seeks to ensure that adequate lateral infrastructure is provided to service this proposed development allowing for future population increases, this includes but is not limited to; drinking water supply, wastewater services and stormwater management.  | Treatment facilities associated with the development must also have capacity for future demand including but not limited to drinking water treatment and wastewater treatment.   |