Submission on Proposed Plan Change 66 to the Operative Selwyn District Plan

Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Selwyn District Council

Note to person making submission

You can make this submission by filling in an online submission form which you can find on Council's website at www.selwyn.govt.nz/pc66

The submission period for the Proposed Plan Change 66 closes at 5pm Thursday 25 February 2021.

Your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the Council is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- · It is frivolous or vexatious.
- · It discloses no reasonable or relevant case.
- · It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further.
- · It contains offensive language.
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

1. Submitter details

Please note: all fields marked with an asterisk (*) are compulsory.					
Name of submitter(s)* Davina Penny					
Submitter address* 17 Iraklis close, Templeton					
City/Town* Christchurch	Postcode* 8042				
Contact name (if different from above)					
Contact organisation (if different from above)					
Contact email address					
Contact address (if different from above)					
City/Town	Postcode				
Contact phone number					

Please note that by making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available in accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, any further submission supporting or opposing your submission must be forwarded to you as well as to the Council.

While all information in your submission will be included in papers which are available to the media and the public, your submission will be used only for the purpose of the Plan Change Process.



I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.
☐ Yes ☑ 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.
☐ Yes ☐ No
Note: If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.
3. 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 □ No
If others are making a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? You can change your mind once the hearing has been advertised.
✓ Yes □ No



2. Trade competition declaration*

4. Submission details*

✓ Yes, I am enclosing further supporting information to this submission form.

(Please specify the Objective, Policy, Rule, Rule Requirement, Assessment Matter, Mapping feature or other reference your submission relates to) CRC regional policy statement section 15 is nighly relevant. As is the Baseline report reversatile soils (SDC (Select one option) (Please specify if you want the provision to be retained, amended or deleted, eg Amend – change the activity status to non-complying) CRC regional policy statement section 15 is nightly relevant. (Please specify if you want the provision to be retained, amended or deleted, eg Amend – change the activity status to non-complying) A search on Canterbury maps (versatile soils) appears to indicate the proposed site is predominantly LUC 2 soil, with possibly some LUC 3. There is a forthcoming national policy statement directing councils to protect such soils for long term / future production to account for future population growth. Support in full Support in full Only 14% of the country's available soil is LUC 1 & 2. Therefore it is VITAL this is	Provision to which my/our submission relates:	My position on this provision is:	The reasons for my/our submission are: (Please give details) This is LLIC 2 land and should not be developed. (Please see	The decision I/we want Council to make:
is predominantly LUC 2 soil, with possibly some LUC 3. Oppose in full Support in part Support in full Support i	(Please specify the Objective, Policy, Rule, Rule Requirement, Assessment Matter, Mapping feature or other reference your submission relates to)	(Select one option)	This is LOC 2 land and should not be developed. (Flease see	to be retained, amended or deleted, eg Amend – change the activity status
2020. That land (170 hectares) is approx 98% LUC 2 and 3 land, with the majority of the site being LUC 2. SDC did NOT bring this to the attention of the commissioners in their s42 reporting. This is negligent. So we have already had land that should be protected (due to the zoning it will not be developed) consented for use as a quarry where it cannot and will not be restored to productive use. This should not be allowed to happen again. There is land further afield	CRC regional policy statement section 15 is highly relevant. As is the Baseline report re Versatile soils (SDC document)	✓ Oppose in full Support in part	is predominantly LUC 2 soil, with possibly some LUC 3. There is a forthcoming national policy statement directing councils to protect such soils for long term / future production to account for future population growth. Only 14% of the country's available soil is LUC 1 & 2. Therefore it is VITAL this is not subject to development. SDC only recognise LUC 1 & 2, but is it important to note that the Land inventory and the national policy statement documents recognise LUC 1 - 3. It is not acceptable for SDC to allow this land to be developed, knowing their	in its entirety. It will set a precedence, and may if consented preclude the neighbouring land (which be of value) from being utilised due to adverse effects from the activity. Therefore it is not just this section that will be of
		Oppose in full Support in part	2020. That land (170 hectares) is approx 98% LUC 2 and 3 land, with the majority of the site being LUC 2. SDC did NOT bring this to the attention of the commissioners in their s42 reporting. This is negligent. So we have already had land that should be protected (due to the zoning it will not be developed) consented for use as a quarry where it cannot and will not be restored to productive use. This should not be allowed to happen again. There is land further afield	also negativel impact further productive land. This issue is detailed in the reports that form part of the NPS discussion

Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)



Date 28th January 2021

Note: A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Please return this form no later than **5pm Thursday 25 February 2021.** You can:

- · scan and email it to submissions@selwyn.govt.nz (Subject line: Proposed Plan Change 66)
- · post it to Selwyn District Council, Freepost 104 653, PO Box 90, Rolleston 7643, Attention: Proposed Plan Change 66
- · deliver it to a Council service centre in Darfield, Lincoln, Leeston or Rolleston.



Submission on Proposed Plan Change 66 to the Operative Selwyn District Plan

Image to support submission made by:

Davina Penny - 17 Iraklis Close, Templeton

IMAGE TAKEN FROM CANTERBURY MAPS - VERSATILE SOIL SHOWING THE LUC CLASSIFICIFACTION OF THE PROPOSED SITE.

