

**IN THE MATTER OF:** the  
Resource Management Act 1991  
**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF:** Proposed  
Plan Change 7 to the Selwyn  
District Plan

**SUPPLEMENTARY STATEMENT OF MICHAEL RACHLIN FOR THE  
CANTERBURY REGIONAL COUNCIL  
this 15th day of June 2011**

**Hearing of Submissions on Proposed Plan Change 7**

**1.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 This supplementary statement has been prepared in response to the Minute of Commissioners dated 24<sup>th</sup> May 2011 and in particular addresses option 3 for the Denwood Trust. Counsel for the Canterbury Regional Council has additionally provided comment on the Change 1 issues raised in the Minute.

**Option 3 – Denwood Trustees Ltd.**

- 1.2 The details of option 3 are described in paragraph 14 to the Minute and more particularly shown on the Selwyn District Council plan appended to the Minute. I note that the proposed Business 2 Zone would be located entirely outside of the urban limit for Lincoln as shown on Map 1 to Change 1. The proposed Living Z Zone would largely be within the urban limit but would replace Greenfield Business Area SL7 shown on Map 1 to Change 1.
- 1.3 Policy 13 to Change 1 provides specific policy direction regarding development outside of the urban limits. In particular Policy 13(a) enables

territorial authorities to make minor amendments to provide for urban zoning outside the Urban Limits but only if **all** of the conditions set out in that policy are met. This would not be the case for option 3. In particular I note that condition (i) to Policy 13(a) requires that any extension or reduction must not change the ODP area by more than 5%. Option 3 would considerably exceed this. Condition (iv) requires compliance with the provisions of Policy 8 (Outline Development Plans) and I am not aware that an ODP meeting the requirements of Policy 8 has been produced for this site. Condition (iii) requires that economies of scale or other efficiencies for infrastructure would arise. I am not aware whether this would be the case in this instance.

- 1.4 Since option 3 clearly fails Policy 13(a) regard must also be had to Policy 13(c) and associated Policy 16(d). Policy 13(c) makes it clear that any development for urban activities which is outside of the urban limits and which is not provided for in Policy 1 or elsewhere in Change 1 (including Policy 13(a)) shall only be progressed subject to a change to Map 1 which is underway prior to or at the same time as the change to the district plan. Policy 16(d) sets out the circumstances and process for any such changes to the extent, location and timing of land for development in accordance with Policy 6(b) and 6(c). Even then any change must meet the circumstances set out in Policy 16(e).
- 1.5 In my opinion option 3 fails the above policies. In particular there is no identified shortfall in land supply under the circumstances set out in Policy 16(d). Indeed Plan Change 7 would rezone sufficient land (including the deferred zones) for the projected growth of Lincoln to 2041. Whilst Denwood Trustees have appealed Change 1 seeking inclusion of their land within the urban limit at Lincoln, as a Greenfield Residential and/or Business area there is no certainty that the Environment Court will extend the urban limit to incorporate this land, as is required to meet Policy 16(d). I also note that Policy 13(c) requires this change to Map 1 to occur prior to or at the same time as the consideration of the specific development. This is not the case in this instance.

- 1.6 Furthermore, as identified above, Plan Change 7 already provides for sufficient residential land to meet the needs of Lincoln through to 2041. Thus my views set out in the preceding paragraphs remain, regardless of whether the land is zoned Living Z or Living Z (deferred).
- 1.7 In my evidence to this hearing I identified that Change 1 seeks to implement the overall land use pattern for residential and business land necessary to implement the preferred settlement pattern for greater Christchurch identified through the Urban Development Strategy. The objectives and policies of Change 1 therefore provide for a more sustainable and consolidated land use pattern for greater Christchurch. It is important, therefore, to look at option 3 against the specific policies set out in paragraphs 1.3 to 1.5 above together with the wider objectives of Change 1; namely to achieve urban consolidation and integration of land use and infrastructure including the transport network. In my opinion the inclusion of land outside of the urban limit for urban activities other than in accordance with Policies 13 and 16 would undermine the Objectives and thrust of Change 1 to manage urban growth and deliver a more consolidated and sustainable urban form. I am of the view, therefore, that option 3 fails to have adequate regard to Change 1.

## **2. CONCLUSION**

- 2.1 Option 3 would not overcome the concerns raised in CRC's evidence (paragraph 4.11 of the evidence refers) regarding the rezoning of additional land outside of the urban limit for Lincoln. Plan Change 7 provides sufficient land to meet the foreseeable future demands for growth in Lincoln and the provision of yet more land, outside of the urban limit, would undermine the objectives and policies of Change 1.