

From: [Tim Schurr](#)
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: Re: Copy of your submission on Proposed Plan Change 67
Date: Sunday, 18 April 2021 8:10:31 a.m.

Hi there -

I was just checking this submission today and read

"My position on this provisions is: Support in Part"

This should actually read "Oppose in Part". I'm not sure how this mistake happened. Are you able to adjust this for me please?

Thanks
Tim

On Mon, Apr 12, 2021 at 3:50 PM Plan Change 67 <NoReply@selwyn.govt.nz> wrote:

Submitter ID: PC67-0008

Submitter Name: West Melton District Residents Association Inc.

Submitter Address: c/- 32 Rotherham Drive

City/Town: West Melton

Postcode: 7618

Contact Name: Tim Schurr

Contact Organisation:

Contact Address:

City/Town:

Postcode:

Contact Email: tim.schurr@gmail.com

Contact Phone Number: 021420456

[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.

Yes

[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?

No

Point 1

Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

Attachment 3 Section 32 - 10.2

My position on this provisions is:

Support In Part

The reasons for my/our submission are:

The proposed extension to the West Melton boundary is concerning to the committee. We believe this plan change might erode the unique low-density, rural-residential character of West Melton. It raises the question of "How big is too big?". Residents of West Melton highly value the small footprint of our village, the ability to know one another and how our size enables a whole-village community to function. We might expect the proposed extension to add some 1,000 new residents, elevating West Melton from a small village on the Canterbury Plains, to being well on its way to a medium sized town in a state of rapid expansion.

We foresee problems relating to heightened demand for, and stress on key village infrastructure such as the shopping centre & parking, community centre facilities, school and churches. These assets were never designed for a large township population.

Repeatedly allowing the town boundary to extend would set a precedent for piecemeal development and unbridled expansion. We expect it would erode the very thing which is unique about West Melton - its rural character and small community.

We accept that our village is desirable to new residents, but instead raise the option of more moderate, well-managed, well-considered growth.

The decision I/we want Council to make:

The Association would like the Council to consult with the community on the vision for West Melton in light of the new National Policy Statement on Urban Development. To place PC67 on hold, pending production of a Master Plan for West Melton which balances all elements of the village such as commercial spaces, transport, school capacity and key natural resources, while holding the character of the town in-tact. We believe council and developers have a duty of care to balance the rights of existing residents against the wants of developers / future residents.

Point 2

Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

My position on this provisions is:

The reasons for my/our submission are: