
From: Plan Change 64 [<mailto:NoReply@selwyn.govt.nz>]
Sent: Wednesday, 18 November 2020 2:17 p.m.
To: crouch@xtra.co.nz
Cc: Submissions <submissions@selwyn.govt.nz>
Subject: PC64-0004 Copy of your submission on Proposed Plan Change 64

Submitter ID: PC64-0004

Submitter Name: Tania & Michael Croucher
Submitter Address: 890 Selwyn Road
City/Town: Springston
Postcode: 7678
Contact Name: Tania & Michael Croucher
Contact Organisation:
Contact Address: 890 Selwyn Road
City/Town: Springston
Postcode: 7678
Contact Email: crouch@xtra.co.nz
Contact Phone Number: 021 295 1873

[Trade Competition Declaration](#)

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

No

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

(a) adversely effects the environment; and

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

[Hearing Options](#)

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

If you choose yes, you can choose not to speak when the hearing date is advertised.

Yes

If others are making a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing?

Yes

Point 1

Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

CANTERBURY REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT 2013 Chapter 5 – Land-Use and Infrastructure
5.2 Objectives 5.2.1(2)(i)

My position on this provisions is:

Oppose

The reasons for my/our submission are:

Plan Change 64

“potential conflict is expected to be limited due to the land use history of the area and use of **larger lot sizes on the eastern periphery of the two areas.**”

Reason for Submission

It is difficult to understand how an average allotment size of 650m² can be considered large in the context of residential allotment sizes in Rolleston. The Township Volume of the District Plan provides for an average allotment size in Rolleston of between 1ha and 350m².

Even if we take a more conservative assessment and remove Living 1C (average 2000m²), Living 2 (5000m²) and Living 2A (1ha) from the equation Living 1B still provides for an average of 1200m² making the assessment that 650m² is a larger lot size difficult to justify in the context of residential sections sizes in Rolleston.

The decision I/we want Council to make:

Provision of a Living 1B zone (1200m² average) within the area highlighted with a blue cloud.



Point 2

Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

CANTERBURY REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT 2013 Chapter 6 – Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch 6.3 Policies 6.3.2

My position on this provisions is:

Oppose

The reasons for my/our submission are:

Plan Change 64

"In summary the ODP delivers residential development at a density of 12 households/hectare and provides for a **variety of residential house types, lifestyles and price points**;"

Reason for Submission

While the statement "A range of section sizes and housing typologies provides future residents with choice and promotes a mixed community demographic, along with a range of price points (Private Plan Change Request, Hughes Developments, p14)" is correct it is difficult to rationalise how the proposed ODP which will make up approximately 15% of the total housing stock in Rolleston provides variety when all sections will be within an average of 500 – 650m². The Township Volume of the

District Plan provides for an average allotment size in Rolleston of between 1ha and 350m². Using the previous argument lets use the range 350 – 1200m² as being the current range of section sizes available in Rolleston. Based on the ODP providing a range of 150m² compared to the current range provided for in Rolleston of 850m² the statement that the proposed ODP provides a variety of residential house types, lifestyles and price points is not supported.

The decision I/we want Council to make:

Provision of a Living 1B zone (1200m² average) within the area highlighted with a blue cloud.



Point 3

Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

CANTERBURY REGIONAL POLICY STATEMENT 2013 Chapter 6 – Recovery and Rebuilding of Greater Christchurch 6.3 Policies 6.3.7(5)

My position on this provisions is:

Oppose

The reasons for my/our submission are:

Plan Change 64

"In summary **the ODP delivers residential development at a density of 12 households/hectare** and provides for a variety of residential house types, lifestyles and price points;"

Reason for Submission

The ODP delivers a density of 12 household units per hectare which is greater than the 10 household units per hectare defined in the CRPS.

A density of 12 household units per hectare for the ODP is **contrary** to The Rolleston Structure Plan's Design Principle 4 which promotes higher density at nodal points, matching population density with centres of activity and high amenity. The contradiction is brought about by the fact that the Living 1B zone rules (1200m²) apply to land 1km from the Town Centre (nodal point) and the proposed Living Z (500-650m²) applies to land approx. 3.5km from the Town Centre thus the higher density is further away from the nodal point than the lower density.

The decision I/we want Council to make:

Provision of a Living 1B zone (1200m² average) within the area highlighted with a blue cloud.



Point 4

Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

DISTRICT POLICY AND PLANS Assessment of Selwyn District Plan Township Section Objectives and Policies Township Section Part B3 People's Health, Safety and Values Objective B3.4.4 Growth of existing townships has a compact urban form and provides a variety

My position on this provision is:

Oppose

The reasons for my/our submission are:

Plan Change 64

"The Living Z framework within the District Plan ensures **a variety of lot sizes, areas and shapes** can be provided..."

Reason for Submission

While the statement "A range of section sizes and housing typologies provides future residents with choice and promotes a mixed community demographic, along with a range of price points (Private Plan Change Request, Hughes Developments, p14)" is correct it is difficult to rationalise how the proposed ODP which will make up approximately 15% of the total housing stock in Rolleston provides variety when all sections will be within an average of 500 – 650m². The Township Volume of the District Plan provides for an average allotment size in Rolleston of between 1ha and 350m². Using the previous argument let's use the range 350 – 1200m² as being the current range of section sizes available in Rolleston. Based on the ODP providing a range of 150m² compared to the current range provided for in Rolleston of 850m² the statement that the proposed ODP provides a variety of residential house types, lifestyles and price points is not supported.

The decision I/we want Council to make:

Provision of a Living 1B zone (1200m² average) within the area highlighted with a blue cloud.



Point 5

Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

DISTRICT POLICY AND PLANS Assessment of Selwyn District Plan Township Section Objectives and Policies Township Section Part B4 Growth of Townships Objective B4.1.1 & B4.1.2

My position on this provisions is:

Oppose

The reasons for my/our submission are:

Plan Change 64

"provide for a mix of medium and low-density development..."

Reason for Submission

While the statement "A range of section sizes and housing typologies provides future residents with choice and promotes a mixed community demographic, along with a range of price points (Private Plan Change Request, Hughes Developments, p14)" is correct it is difficult to rationalise how the

proposed ODP which will make up approximately 15% of the total housing stock in Rolleston provides variety when all sections will be within an average of 500 – 650m². The Township Volume of the District Plan provides for an average allotment size in Rolleston of between 1ha and 350m². Using the previous argument let's use the range 350 – 1200m² as being the current range of section sizes available in Rolleston. Based on the ODP providing a range of 150m² compared to the current range provided for in Rolleston of 850m² the statement that the proposed ODP provides a variety of residential house types, lifestyles and price points is not supported.

The decision I/we want Council to make:

Provision of a Living 1B zone (1200m² average) within the area highlighted with a blue cloud.



Point 6

Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

DISTRICT POLICY AND PLANS Assessment of Selwyn District Plan Township Section Objectives and Policies Township Section Part B4 Growth of Townships Objective B4.3.6

My position on this provisions is:

Oppose

The reasons for my/our submission are:

Plan Change 64

"Objective B4.3.6 requires that the development of Living Z zoned land achieves an average net density of at least 10 households per hectare over an ODP area. Both proposed ODP Areas have been prepared on the basis of achieving **a minimum yield of 12 households per hectare.**"

Reason for Submission

The ODP delivers a density of 12 household units per hectare which is greater than the 10 household units per hectare defined in the CRPS.

A density of 12 household units per hectare for the ODP is **contrary** to The Rolleston Structure Plan's Design Principle 4 which promotes higher density at nodal points, matching population density with centres of activity and high amenity. The contradiction is bought about by the fact that the Living 1B zone rules (1200m²) apply to land 1km from the Town Centre (nodal point) and the proposed Living Z (500-650m²) applies to land approx. 3.5km from the Town Centre thus the higher density is further away from the nodal point than the lower density.

The decision I/we want Council to make:

Provision of a Living 1B zone (1200m² average) within the area highlighted with a blue cloud.

