

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

| Submitter ID | Submitter Name | Point | Position | Summary | Decision Requested | Recommendation | Summary of Reasons |
|--------------|-----------------------|-------|----------------|--|--|----------------|--|
| PC67-0002 | John and Sandra Owens | 001 | Support | Supports zone change as it will increase the supply of larger residential sections in the West Melton area. | Rezone the subject land from Rural Zone to Living WM South Zone. | Accept | For the reasons addressed in the body of my Recommendation, I consider the proposed plan change, including the amendments proposed through the hearing process, is the most appropriate way of achieving the purpose of the Act. |
| PC67-0003 | Wendy Beaven | 001 | Oppose | West Melton is a rural township and submitter is opposed to expansion that will allow higher density housing in the area. | Not specified. | Reject | For the reasons addressed in the body of my Recommendation, I consider the proposed plan change, including the amendments proposed through the hearing process, is the most appropriate way of achieving the purpose of the Act. I find that the density proposed is appropriate. |
| | | 002 | Oppose | Traffic will increase on busy narrow rural roads. | Not specified. | Reject | The traffic effects have been fully assessed in expert evidence and I find the effects on both the local roading network and the wider roading network less than minor and appropriate. |
| | | 003 | Oppose | The rezoning will place greater demand on infrastructure, such as impacting on existing wells in the area. | Not specified. | Reject | I accept the evidence of Mr Hall in particular that while there is not currently sufficient supply to meet all proposed plan changes in West Melton, SDC have confirmed that there are viable means to achieve future demand. |
| | | 004 | Oppose | Increased housing density will negatively impact the night sky darkness near an existing observatory. | Not specified. | Reject | As addressed in the body of my Recommendation, issues can be assessed and addressed through subdivision process. |
| PC67-0004 | Julie Manera | 001 | Oppose | The expansion of West Melton would risk losing its country feel. | Not specified. | Reject | For the reasons identified in my Recommendation, effects on the character of West Melton are appropriately addressed. |
| | | 002 | Oppose | Concerned about the impact on existing wells in the area | Not specified. | Reject | I accept the evidence of Mr Hall that while there is not currently sufficient supply to meet all proposed plan changes in West Melton, SDC have confirmed that there are viable means to achieve future demand without impacting on existing users. |
| | | 003 | Oppose | The night sky and observatory will be impacted by increase in people. | Not specified. | Reject | As addressed in the body of my Recommendation, issues can be assessed and addressed through subdivision process. |
| | | 004 | Oppose | The rezoning will increase traffic. | Not specified. | Reject | The traffic effects have been fully assessed in expert evidence and I find the effects on both the local roading network and the wider roading network less than minor and appropriate. |
| PC67-0005 | Name Withheld | 001 | Oppose In Part | <p>Accepts that nature of West Melton has and will continue to change, but is concerned that allowing for further subdivision near their rural zoned land will result in loss of the lifestyle protections provided by the rural zoning, and restrict their ability to use their land for rural purposes, such as running farm machinery, permitted burn offs or riding dirtbikes.</p> <p>The submitter considers that their land should be included in the zoning change, as their property and others are no</p> | If the plan change is approved, rezone 581 Weedons Ross Rd from Rural to Living WM South zone. | Reject | I received no evidence from the submitters in relation to the appropriateness of rezoning 581 Weedons Ross Road. In addition to potential scope issues, I accept Ms White's opinion that while the request included detailed assessments relating to servicing, landscape and visual effects, traffic, geotechnical matters and contamination, as well as an assessment of rezoning under the requirements of the RMA, there was no assessment in relation to this additional land. Further, the issues of reverse |

| Submitter ID | Submitter Name | Point | Position | Summary | Decision Requested | Recommendation | Summary of Reasons |
|--------------|---------------------------|-------|----------------|--|---|----------------|---|
| | | | | longer suitable for most rural uses, because of the significant surrounding residential development. If their property cannot be included in the rezoning, they consider that amendments should be made to the plan change (refer to subsequent submission points). | | | sensitivity raised by the submitter have been addressed. |
| | | 002 | Oppose In Part | The rezoning will result in increased noise from traffic, walkers and neighbours and a loss of privacy. | If 581 Weedons Ross Rd is not rezoned, amend the plan change to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> require a bund to be built on the west side of the road; restrict development of sections within the site closest to the road to low density larger sections; and require houses to be setback 40 metres from the road boundary. | Reject | For the reasons provided in my Recommendation, including consideration of Mr Nicholson's evidence, the proposed boundary treatment with Weedons Ross Road is appropriate. |
| | | 003 | Oppose In Part | Concerned about the impacts of increased traffic movements on the submitter's driveway. | If 581 Weedons Ross Rd is not rezoned, amend the plan change to move the proposed road entrance to the subdivision at least 20 metres further from the submitter's entrance way. | Reject | This issue was addressed by Mr Metherell in particular. He considered that there would not be impacts on the intersection and the operation of their driveway as they would be separated by approximately 100 metres. He advised further that Weedons Ross Road would continue to carry modest traffic volumes for an arterial road and the low volume residential driveway would continue to be able to operate safely. I have accepted that evidence. |
| PC67-0006 | Christchurch City Council | 001 | Oppose | Considers that the significance of the development capacity and the appropriateness of the proposal needs to be considered in a broader context of the Greater Christchurch sub-region, the direction in the NPS UD as a whole, and the CRPS framework. | Reject plan change unless concerns outlined in submission are addressed. | Reject | The significance of development capacity and appropriateness of the proposal has been considered, and significance of development capacity addressed. |
| | | 002 | Oppose | Plan Change 67 does not give effect to the CRPS as the site is outside of the areas identified for development in the CRPS, and in the submitter's view must be declined. | Reject plan change unless concerns outlined in submission are addressed. | Reject | I have concluded in the Recommendation that Policy 8 of the NPS-UD enables the merits of PC67 to be assessed, and this addresses the issue identified. |
| | | 003 | Oppose | Concerned that the proposal relies on a future public transport network which has not been planned or funded to provide connections. Considers that without a funded and established public transport network to service the site, it is likely that this development will impact on the ability of the Christchurch City Council to manage the downstream transport network. Considers that new urban growth areas and development should be of a form which enables viable public transport services. | Reject plan change unless a funded and implemented public transport system is provided to service the site, including connections to Christchurch City, prior to any residential development. | Reject | Public transport has been addressed in my Recommendation. It would be inappropriate to reject a plan change unless a funded and implemented public transport system was provided prior to residential development. Amendments to the proposal enable public transport to access the site. |
| | | 004 | Oppose | The proposed density is less than the requirement outlined in Objective 6.3.7(5) of the CRPS of 10 households per hectare for greenfield development in Selwyn District. Considers that a higher minimum density of 15 households per hectare 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. | Reject plan change unless a minimum level of density for the development of 15 households per hectare is provided, and the relevant recommendations of the review of minimum densities undertaken under Action 3 of Our Space are incorporated in the Plan Change. | Reject | The evidence from urban design/landscape expert considered increased density was inappropriate. Evidence from Mr Tallentire largely agreed. I have accepted the expert evidence. |

| Submitter ID | Submitter Name | Point | Position | Summary | Decision Requested | Recommendation | Summary of Reasons |
|--------------|---|-------|-------------------|---|---|----------------|--|
| | | 005 | Oppose | Considers that productive land in the region holds substantial value as it contributes to the sustainability of the region through providing land on which locally grown and sourced produce can be farmed appropriately, reducing transport costs and providing for a variety of land uses in the surrounding region. Also considers that protecting highly productive land in proximity to the Christchurch City is essential for ensuring that urban environments are resilient to the current and future effects of climate change. | Reject plan change unless a further more detailed assessment of the impact on versatile soils from development in this area, and how to mitigate the impact, is undertaken. | Reject | A more detailed assessment of the impact on versatile soils from development in this area has been undertaken as part of the hearings process. |
| PC67-0007 | Helen P Stevenson | 001 | Oppose In Part | Opposes the rezoning due to the permanent change it will have on the low density, rural-residential character of West Melton. | Not specified. | Reject | For reasons addressed in the Recommendation. |
| | | 002 | Oppose In Part | Opposes the rezoning due to the increased pressure it will place on roading and the potential impact of this on rates. | Not specified. | Reject | For reasons addressed in the Recommendation. |
| | | 003 | Oppose In Part | Opposes the rezoning due to the effects of residential lighting pollution on the local dark-sky reserve. | Not specified. | Reject | For reasons addressed in the Recommendation. |
| | | 004 | Oppose In Part | Opposes the rezoning due to lack of water supply in the area and adverse impacts of additional water supply on the water table. | Not specified. | Reject | As noted above, this matter has been addressed in the evidence of Mr Hall and Mr Bishop and water supply issues can be addressed |
| | | 005 | Oppose In Part | Considers that the Council has a duty of care to balance the rights of existing residents and care of the environment against financial benefits to the developer. | Not specified. | Reject | The effects on character and the environment have been assessed in my Recommendation and I consider they are appropriate and acceptable |
| PC67-0008 | West Melton District Residents Association Inc. | 001 | Oppose In Part | The rezoning may erode the low-density, rural-residential character of West Melton and the value placed on the small footprint of the village by residents, changing it from a small village to a medium-sized town. The submitter would prefer that demand is addressed through providing for growth in a more moderate, well-managed and well-considered way, through consultation with the community on a Master Plan that balances all elements of the village including commercial spaces, transport, school capacity, key natural resources, and maintenance of the character of the town. | Request Council place PC67 on hold, pending production of a Master Plan for West Melton. | Reject | As addressed in my Recommendation, any changes to character of West Melton are less than minor and appropriate. These issues are addressed through density and various other matters. In relation to the master planning process, that has been considered and addressed in the evidence and my Recommendation. I consider that the location and scale of this proposal will not impede any spatial or master planning process. |
| | | 002 | Oppose In Part | The rezoning will place increased stress and demand on key village infrastructure which was not designed for a larger population. The submitter would prefer that demand is addressed through providing for growth in a more moderate, well-managed and well-considered way, through consultation with the community on a Master Plan that balances all elements of the village including commercial spaces, transport, school capacity, key natural resources, and maintenance of the character of the town. | Request Council place PC67 on hold, pending production of a Master Plan for West Melton. | Reject | Increasing demand on key village infrastructure is not, on the evidence, a sufficient ground for declining the Request. |
| | | 003 | Oppose In Part | The rezoning would set a precedent for piecemeal development and unbridled expansion. The submitter would prefer that demand is addressed through providing for growth in a more moderate, well-managed and well-considered way, through consultation with the community on a Master Plan that balances all elements of the village including commercial spaces, | Request Council place PC67 on hold, pending production of a Master Plan for West Melton. | Reject | As addressed in my Recommendation and above in response to Point 001, I consider the location and scale of this proposal will not impede any spatial or master planning process. This rezoning will not set a precedent for piecemeal development or unbridled expansion. |

| Submitter ID | Submitter Name | Point | Position | Summary | Decision Requested | Recommendation | Summary of Reasons |
|--------------|--|-------|-------------------------------------|--|--|----------------|---|
| | | | | transport, school capacity, key natural resources, and maintenance of the character of the town. | | | |
| PC67-0009 | Elene (Helen) Anderson | 001 | Support In Part | Supports the low density nature of this development and the provision for larger "buffer" zones with the adjacent rural land as this retains the township's rural feel and sense of community and space. However, has concerns that further development in West Melton is inconsistent with Environment Canterbury's rejection of submissions on proposed change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS, to expand the areas identified as Future Development Areas outside of Rolleston, Kaiapoi and Rangiora. | Request Council to put consideration of plan change on hold until the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement update process has been completed. | Reject | In the context of the clear evidence in relation to demand and capacity for residential development and the impact that is having on the competitive market, it is inappropriate to await any potential update of the CRPS. |
| | | 002 | Support In Part | Considers that the consent notice issued on the certificate of title for each lot of the existing Wilfield development, that required lighting to be consistent with the West Melton Lighting Observatory Area rules, should be extended to any new development, as this area is within the West Melton observatory zone and sky glow has been noted by the Observatory to be an issue with the ever-increasing scale of development since 2012. | Add to the certificate of title of each lot in this new development, the same consent notice that requires compliance with the requirements of the West Melton Lighting Observatory Area. | Reject | Can be appropriately addressed through subdivision. |
| | | 003 | Oppose In Part | Concerned that the planned signalisation of the intersection of SH73 and Weedons Ross Road is now delayed until after winter 2022, and that the traffic assessment is based on this signalisation, along with widening improvements proposed along Weedons Ross Road, that has not yet happened. Considers that this development should not be given approval until these improvements have been made. | Amend plan change to require that prior to development, signalisation of SH73 and Weedons Ross Road; and widening along Weedons Ross Road, is completed. | Accept in part | Rules included in the plan change appropriately address this issue. |
| | | 004 | Support In Part | Concerned that the ODP lacks any mechanism to protect the night sky and minimise light pollution, which is required given this area is in the West Melton Lighting Observatory Area. | Amend the ODP to specify provisions for protection of the night sky and minimising light pollution, such as specific outdoor lighting to be used, and to require consultation with the West Melton Observatory and Royal Astronomical Society of NZ regarding appropriate use of lighting in both homes and public green spaces. | Reject | It can be addressed through subdivision process. |
| PC67-0010 | Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency | 001 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | Considers that the plan change will have additional traffic effects that would further exacerbate the functioning of the SH73 and Weedons Ross Road intersection prior to its signalisation. Considers that any traffic related effects on the intersection can be addressed by the Plan Change being subject to the provisions addressing this that were applied through Plan Change 59. | Ensure rules 12.1.3.59, 12.1.7 and 12.1.7.10 apply to the plan change area. | Accept | Rules have been incorporated. |
| | | 002 | Neither Support Nor Oppose | The rezoning of the application site should be considered against the updated provisions of the Urban Development Strategy and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. | Give consideration to the implications of the Urban Development Strategy and the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. | Accept | Particular regard has been had, and consideration given to the relevant documents. |
| PC67-0011 | Canterbury Regional Council - Environment Canterbury | 001 | Oppose | The plan change is inconsistent with the policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the strategic sub-regional land use and infrastructure planning | Reject zone change from Rural Zone to Living WM South Zone; or If the plan change is not rejected, | Reject in part | For the reasons given in my Recommendation, the rezoning is the most appropriate option. A number of amendments have been made throughout the hearing process which in part address the issues |

| Submitter ID | Submitter Name | Point | Position | Summary | Decision Requested | Recommendation | Summary of Reasons |
|--------------------------|---|-------|----------|---|---|----------------|---|
| | | | | framework for Greater Christchurch; including in relation to water supply. | amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission. | | raised by this submitter. Infrastructure, including water supply, has been appropriately addressed, and any inconsistency with Policy direction has been given due regard. |
| | | 002 | Oppose | Does not consider it has been demonstrated that the proposed plan change will add significantly to development capacity or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, nor has it been demonstrated that the proposal is, or will be, well connected, and therefore does not give effect to various provisions in the NPS-UD. | Reject zone change from Rural Zone to Living WM South Zone; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission. | Reject | For the reasons fully addressed in my Recommendation, the proposed plan change will add significant development capacity, contribute to a well functioning urban environment, and is well connected. |
| | | 003 | Oppose | Considers that the desirability of growth at West Melton is best considered as part of a future spatial planning exercise rather than ad-hoc and individual assessments prompted by private plan change requests. | Reject zone change from Rural Zone to Living WM South Zone; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission. | Reject | For the reasons recorded in my Recommendation, I consider the granting of this proposal would not impact on future spatial planning exercises due to its scale and location. |
| | | 004 | Oppose | The plan change is inconsistent with the policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the strategic sub-regional land use and infrastructure planning framework for Greater Christchurch; including in relation to wastewater disposal. | Reject zone change from Rural Zone to Living WM South Zone; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission. | Reject | Matters have been considered and addressed throughout my Recommendation. Wastewater disposal has been considered and can be appropriately addressed. Particular regard has been had to the policy direction in the context of the evidence and the NPS-UD. |
| | | 005 | Oppose | The plan change is inconsistent with the policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the strategic sub-regional land use and infrastructure planning framework for Greater Christchurch; including in relation to public transport. | Reject zone change from Rural Zone to Living WM South Zone; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission. | Reject | Matters have been considered and addressed throughout my Recommendation. Public transport has been considered and can be appropriately addressed. Particular regard has been had to the policy direction in the context of the evidence and the NPS-UD. |
| | | 006 | Oppose | The submitter wishes to draw attention to the emerging national direction strengthening measures to protect highly productive land from development. | Reject zone change from Rural Zone to Living WM South Zone; or If the plan change is not rejected, amend the plan change to address issues raised in the submission. | Reject | As addressed in my Recommendation, the NPS-HPL is not operative. It remains a draft. The issues in relation to loss of highly productive land have been addressed in the evidence of Mr Mthamo in particular and is not such to justify rejection of the zone change. |
| Further Submitter | | | | | | | |
| PC67--0012 | Robert John Smith and Chanel Anne Farrelly (supports submission of John and Sandra Owens) | | | | | Accept | For the reasons outlined in relation to the primary submission. |