

# Selwyn District Plan, Private Plan Change 67 – Weedons Ross Road, Rolleston

## Summary Statement, Planning, Selwyn District Council

### Introduction

1. My name is Liz White and I prepared the Section 42A Report on Private Plan Change 67 to the Selwyn District Plan, dated 23 August 2021. After circulation of that report, the applicant and submitters have lodged statements of evidence. The purpose of this summary statement is to outline where, as a consequence of the evidence lodged, I have revised any of the views set out in the Section 42A report. To avoid repetition, I have therefore not repeated any matters on which Ms Seaton and I, or Mr Tallentire and I, agree.

### Significant Development Capacity

2. In the s42A report, I noted that the proposal had been considered to provide significant development capacity in the context of the West Melton Township, but noted the potential inconsistency with treating West Melton as part of Greater Christchurch in order to allow for it to be considered as part of the urban environment under the NPS-UD, but then considering the significance of the capacity in relation to West Melton only.<sup>1</sup> This was not intended to suggest that I did not consider the capacity to be significant; it was more to point out that when having particular regard to the development capacity provided, the capacity could be considered in both a local and wider context.
3. For the avoidance of doubt, I agree with Ms Seaton that neither Policy 8 nor 3.8 of the NPS-UD require that the significance of the development capacity provided by the plan change is determined relative to that “urban environment”.<sup>2</sup> I note that this was perhaps contradicted by my comment that the significance of the Request in the context of Greater Christchurch resulted in a conflict with the NPS-UD in this regard.<sup>3</sup> Having reflected on this, I consider citing this as a ‘conflict’ was overstating my point.

### Well-functioning urban environment

4. In the s42A report, I noted concerns that the Site is not located within a walkable catchment of the facilities located in the town centre at West Melton, and would not provide accessibility between the proposed housing area and jobs by way of public or active transport, and consequently would not support reductions in greenhouse gases.<sup>4</sup>
5. I accept that in general terms, provision for public transport will respond to growth.<sup>5</sup> However, my concern is that the level of development facilitated by the plan change will not be sufficient, on its own to make increased provision viable. Mr Metherrall notes, for example, that

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 42A report at 94.

<sup>2</sup> Ms Seaton at 7.14.

<sup>3</sup> Section 42A report at 115(a).

<sup>4</sup> Section 42A report at 91.

<sup>5</sup> Ms Seaton at 5.5.

*The Site **may** generate additional demand for public transport and by being located adjacent to the existing township, the additional demand **could** assist the viability of increasing the frequency and / or coverage of services.*<sup>6</sup> (my emphasis.)

6. While I support changes to the ODP to better facilitate potential public transport provision with the Site, in my view this does overcome the wider concerns about the lack of accessibility between the Site and jobs by way of public or active transport. More specifically I agree with the changes that seek to ensure that provision of public transport in future is not precluded; however this in itself does not guarantee that this will eventuate and therefore in my view it is difficult to rely on this to conclude that the proposal will achieve a well-functioning urban environment. As a minor point, I do accept Ms Seaton's argument though, that the proposal is not inconsistent with Policy 6.3.4 of the CRPS.<sup>7</sup>
7. In a similar vein, I accept that over time, changes can occur that reduce the effects of concerns to Mr Nicholson regarding walkability and connectivity, such as increased micro-mobility, use of electric cars and people working from home. However, I consider that there is a difficulty with 'relying' on these to overcome tensions between the plan change and the outcomes sought in various planning documents, because there is nothing in the plan change that guarantees this.
8. In broad terms I also consider that the proposed 'sustainability' measures will to some extent mitigate greenhouse gas emissions, it is hard to quantify this; like Ms Seaton I tend to consider that *"the proposal is still likely to lead to an increase in greenhouse gas emissions to some extent"*.<sup>8</sup>
9. Overall, while I consider that the changes proposed in relation to public transport and sustainability are positive, I do not consider that they are sufficient to overcome the tensions between the plan change and the outcomes sought in the relevant planning documents in relation to a reliance on car-dependent travel and greenhouse gas emissions.
10. In coming to the above conclusion, I have given some thought to the need to consider the aspects of a well-functioning urban environment set out in Policy 1 as a whole (i.e. across greater Christchurch as a whole), rather than simply considering the Site in isolation. In this regard I again note that Our Space, in determining how best to accommodate housing needs to meet identified outcomes, seeks growth in areas which best support public transport enhancement opportunities.<sup>9</sup>

#### Compact and consolidated growth

11. In the s42A report, I noted that based on the evidence of Mr Nicholson, I considered that that the rezoning would not consolidate West Melton or contribute to a compact urban form for the township and therefore not achieve or give effect to various objectives in the District Plan and

---

<sup>6</sup> Mr Metherall at 8.11.

<sup>7</sup> Ms Seaton at 7.41-7.42.

<sup>8</sup> Ms Seaton at 7.29.

<sup>9</sup> Section 42A Report at 99.

CRPS.<sup>10</sup> I note that Ms Lauenstein and Mr Compton Moen both address this and provide their views on why they disagree with Mr Nicholson in this regard.

12. In my view, PC67 needs to be considered on its own, and not in terms of how it might fit in with wider growth of the township. In this regard I consider that Mr Compton-Moen's assessment against Policy B4.3.6 of the District Plan is reliant on other development also occurring, which does not form part of PC67. Similarly, Ms Lauenstein's assessment appears heavily based on how PC67 would contribute and relate to the growth of the Township to the south, particularly in terms of development of what she refers to at the south west quadrant. However, PC67 does not proposed to rezone any land in this south-west quadrant; it is currently zoned Rural Inner Plains, and is not earmarked for future development in any strategic planning documents. Similarly, Ms Lauenstein discusses further community and commercial growth, which in her view would occur on the southern side of the township and help to consolidate the Township's form; again, I note that there is no additional commercial or community expansion proposed, either through PC67 or anticipated in any planning document. It therefore appears to me that their conclusions around the contribution PC67 makes to the compactness and consolidation of the Township is reliant on currently unanticipated development occurring beyond the PC67 site.
13. Similarly, while I understand Mr Compton-Moen's and Mr Metherall's point that improvements to the SH73/Weedons Ross Road intersection will assist in connectivity between the north and south of the township<sup>11</sup>, while ensuring the safety and efficiency of SH73,<sup>12</sup> I consider that the proposal need to be considered against Policy B4.3.98 as it currently stands; as the plan change does not propose to amend this policy. This policy directs that the primary focus for growth is to the north of SH73. In my view, whether the driver behind this direction is still valid does not alter the inconsistency of the proposal with the current policy.

## **Conclusion**

14. I consider that the changes proposed in Ms Seaton's evidence improve the Request and I acknowledge that they seek to address matters raised in the Section 42A report. However I do not consider that they are sufficient to overcome the matters of concern. Overall, I continue to consider that the rezoning is not the most appropriate way to achieve the purpose of the RMA, as the significance of the capacity provided is not sufficient to outweigh the other tensions arising between the Request and the NPS-UD, CRPS and the Plan that extend beyond the Site simply being outside a planned area for urban growth, as well as other wider outcomes sought in various strategic planning documents.

**Liz White**

14 September 2021

---

<sup>10</sup> Section 42A Report at 114 – 117.

<sup>11</sup> Mr Compton-Moen at 10.2.

<sup>12</sup> Mr Metherall at 8.9.