

Cameron Wood

From: Fax Administrator
Sent: Tuesday, 13 April 2010 4:38 p.m.
To: Cameron Wood
Subject: FW: A fax has arrived from remote ID '+64 3 3660333'.
Attachments: B000997D.TIF

Jeannette Eggleton

Customer Services Officer

-----Original Message-----

From: RightFax E-mail Gateway [mailto:RFAX@sdccex2007.sdc.selwyn.local]
Sent: Tuesday, 13 April 2010 4:20 p.m.
To: Fax Administrator
Subject: A fax has arrived from remote ID '+64 3 3660333'.

A fax has arrived from remote ID '+64 3 3660333'.

Time: 13/04/2010 4:17:36 p.m.
Received from remote ID: +64 3 3660333
Inbound user ID FRONT_DESK, routing code 99
Result: (0/352;0/0) Successful Send
Page record: 1 - 4
Elapsed time: 01:40 on channel 1

534

Form 5
Submission on publicly notified Plan Change
Selwyn District Plan

Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To Selwyn District
Council 2 Norman
Kirk Drive
PO Box 90,
Rolleston
Christchurch 7614
FAX: 03-347-2799

1. Full name of submitter: ROLLESTON PARK RESIDENTS GROUP

This is a submission on the following proposed Plan
Change:

PLAN CHANGE 7

**Growth of Townships, Urban Development and Rezoning of Land for Urban
Purposes Including the introduction of a new Living Z Zone at Lincoln and
Rolleston**

2. The specific provisions of the proposal that my submission relates to are:

Plan Change 7
Policy B4.3.68 (Rolleston Outline Development Plans)

3. *My submission in OPPOSITION is:

We currently oppose the Plan Change 7 unless amendments and alterations are made
because:

Residential and Business Development – specific policies for townships
Rolleston Policy B4.3.68

We are concerned that the inclusion of Outline Development Plans in the Plan Change
limits our opportunity for us to comment on future subdivisions. An Outline Development
Plan is just that, an outline which is broad natured and does not offer sufficient detail to
make an informed decision – but a subdivision consent application consistent with the
Outline Development Plan will most likely be non-notified. Therefore we are robbed of an
opportunity to comment on the subdivision plan and we can't comment in detail on an
Outline Development Plan because of the lack of detail!

Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003

Schedule 1

Page 2 of 4

Outline Development Plan Area 2

As a group of concerned Rolleston Park residents we strongly oppose the inclusion of this area under Plan Change 7 for the following reasons:-

1. The criteria is too broad and as outlined above, by the inclusion of ODPs in the plan change we do not have a detailed subdivision plan we can comment on and may not get the opportunity to comment on one as long as it meets the Council's criteria which has still to be finalised. How can you ask us to approve something today that does not have any specific detail? Do not ask us to put of faith, trust and property values in the hands of the Council and future potential developers!
2. Based on a "concept plan" shown to some of the residents in Rolleston Park, we already have concerns about the possible redevelopment of this land. Under the current zoning there would be a small limited number of properties that could be built on this land. This would be in keeping with the style and nature of our current cul-de-sac community. The rezoning of this land increases the potential number of dwellings dramatically.
3. At the last two Residents Association Meetings both the Mayor himself and Councillor Walters have alluded to the Council's desire to build a small number of units (possibly up to 8) primarily for the aged. We were assured that these would be very tasteful and funding has already been received by the Community Trust. At no point did either of them elude us to the fact that there would also be the potential for a large number of other properties to be built on this land, or clearly point out that it was currently under consideration for rezoning to allow a much higher density of buildings on this area. (Goes back to the previous point of faith & trust really!!!). Had all the residents been fully aware of this factor then we would have eluded you to our concerns much earlier in the process. We appreciate the fact that Plan Change 7 has been advertised but you need to search the documents on your website very carefully to find reference to Markham Way and it is not included on any map under Plan Change 7 documents on the website.
4. Our existing boundary property owners to the empty section at the end of Markham Way currently enjoy a high degree of privacy and sunlight. Changing the zoning with the proposed ODP does not give any of the adjoining land owners' comfort that they will not end up with double-storied properties looking down onto their properties. This has both a serious impact on their privacy and resale values. The Council has a very real possibility of devaluing these ratepayers land. Either amendments to Plan Change 7 need to be made or potential compensation may be sought in the future.

Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003

Schedule 1

Page 3 of 4

Again a definite Development Plan could indicate a building height restriction of properties built with a certain area of these adjacent properties.

5. We also note that Selwyn District Council wishes to build units for the elderly on this land, but the elderly or disabled do not want two storied dwellings.
6. Markham Way is currently used by a number of parents dropping children off to school. Currently there is a well used connection to the rear of the school field. There is no allowance for this under Plan Change 7 or the "concept plan" shown to us. But more importantly with the proposed access, under Plan Change 7, to be by way of Markham Way, the level of traffic would be hugely impacted. This means that parents who drop their children into Markham Way as a "minimal traffic" walk zone would no longer have that feeling of safety for their children. Not to mention the residents in Rolleston Park having the same for their children. Particularly those living at the end of Markham Way & Peel Close where the traffic is VERY minimal, all of a sudden there is now a large risk of more than doubling the traffic flow through these areas.
7. We oppose the vehicle access to ODP Area 2 to be a secondary road connection from the Markham Way cul-de-sac. We believe that an amendment (or better yet a development plan) that clearly indicates that only a small number of properties can access Markham Way cul-de-sac. The rest of the properties should have direct vehicle access to either Norman Kirk Drive or Rolleston Drive. The proposed restriction on vehicle access would be a very inefficient way of accessing ODP Area 2.
8. We also note that the Selwyn District Council is proposing that ODP Area 2 include a community housing development for older residents. It would be much better to access this area from Norman Kirk Drive – especially for emergency vehicles such as ambulances.
9. Pedestrian & cycle access from Markham Way through to the school/Norman Kirk Drive and Rolleston Drive. This would ensure that all local residents both from within Rolleston Park subdivision and the wider community who currently use Markham Way to access the primary school or shopping centre could continue to use this access. This could also allow for extra space between the existing properties and any future dwellings.

**Include whether you SUPPORT or OPPOSE specific parts of the plan change or wish to have them amended; and the reasons for your views. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary.*

4. **I seek the following decision from Selwyn District Council:**

Resource Management (Forms, Fees, and Procedure) Regulations 2003

Schedule 1

Page 4 of 4

They make amendments to Plan Change 7 Outline Development Plan Area 2 before any further consideration can be given:

- a) Vehicle access [to ODP Area 2] be via a secondary road connection to Norman Kirk Drive, with no direct vehicle access to Markham Way or Rolleston Drive.
- b) A pedestrian and cycle link should be provided from ODP Area 2 to Markham Way/Rolleston Primary/Norman Kirk Drive/Rolleston Drive
- c) Building height restrictions to be placed on any dwellings built in ODP Area 2 to a single storied building.
- d) Provision for a maximum number of households per hectare on the ODP Area 2.

5. I WISH / ~~DO NOT WISH~~ to be heard in support of my submission (delete as applicable)

6. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing
(delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)

7.



13 April 2010

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

Date

8. Address for service of submitter:

4 Peel Close, Rolleston

Phone: 03 347 2528

Fax: 03 366 0333

Mobile: 021 36 55 71

EMAIL: lynley.shaw@nzhomeloans.co.nz

Contact person: Lynley Shaw Title: Member of Group