

Schedule 1

Clause 6 of First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

A circular clock-style stamp. The outer ring contains numbers 1 through 12. The center contains the text "RECEIVED" at the top, "13 APR 2010" in the middle, and "SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL" at the bottom. A small arrow points to the number 12.

- This is a submission on the following proposed Plan Change:**

.....(give details).

- *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: attached.
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-
-

†Give precise details, including the nature of any change sought. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

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.   9/4/10
Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on their behalf) Date

8. Address for service of submitter: 17 Branthwaite Dr
R.D.8. Christchurch. 7678

Telephone: 347 9749 Fax: 347 9740

Email:

Contact person: Title(if appropriate)

I wish to lodge the following submission in regard to "Proposed" Plan Change 7.

1. The adoption of Plan Change 7 would see our ability to utilise our property for residential subdivision deferred until at least 2041. This comment applies to the several properties in the area bounded by Lincoln Rolleston Road and Branthwaite Drive and for the reasons detailed below is, in our view, unsatisfactory planning.
2. At the time in 2009 that the Rolleston Draft Structure Plan was open for public comment, we lodged a submission seeking a review of the time frame within which our own and adjoining properties would be utilised for residential purposes. We stressed in that submission:-
 - a. our property is within virtual walking distance to the existing town centre. When one considers the siting of the new Warehouse complex this comment becomes even more relevant;
 - b. the like of the Tennyson Street Primary School and the recreation area opposite is equally handy;
 - c. our property, and those adjoining, has an existing water supply. All other services, with the exception of wastewater disposal, exists;
 - d. statistics show 72% of the workforce currently residing in Rolleston commutes each day to Christchurch. Our property either fronts or is adjacent to a main access to that city via Selwyn Road. Like comments apply to residents who may work at the like of Lincoln.

All of the above in our view remain relevant.

3. If adopted, Plan Change 7 will see a land block fronting Levi Road available for virtual immediate development. We note with interest that planning documents provide for the building of a pumping station to take effluent from that block to the new sewage disposal unit. When we made submissions in 2009 to the Rolleston Draft Structure Plan, Council Planning staff made much of the difficulty in moving sewage from the Lincoln Rolleston Road - Branthwaite Drive area and particularly emphasised the cost involved. Now we find a pumping station will be installed literally down the road and to which wastewater from the Lincoln Rolleston Road - Branthwaite Drive block would, I believe, freefall. This would seem to clearly negate counter-arguments put forward by Council representatives in 2009.
4. In our 2009 submission we pointed out that the land area in the Draft Structure Plan zoned for commercial use was inadequate given the projected population increase. That argument would seem to have been accepted given Council's recent efforts to rezone part of the Tennyson Street recreation area for commercial purposes. That suggestion was vehemently rejected by numerous objectors and there could be no guarantee that any future effort by Council to have the proposal approved would be successful. Harking again to our 2009 submission, we suggested that the current sewage treatment area comprising 14 hectares at the end of Branthwaite Drive was perfect for the extended commercial development of the town. That suggestion does not appear, from any published material, to have been given even minimal consideration. Yet we note that under the latest planning document it is now classed as 2B or available for residential development between 2037 and 2041. That is an illogical decision and one that highlights the anomaly in regard to the zoning status of the Lincoln Rolleston Road - Branthwaite Drive properties.
5. It is interesting that Council documents make reference to the need to ensure that no one

owner or developer has the ability to land bank and so create an artificial market in which buyers must purchase. It does seem that in the proposed Stage 1, now promoted for residential development, the number of owners involved is small. Could this create the very problems to which Council documents refer?

6. There are, too, some simple matters which should have exercised the minds of planners. Some owners have a preference for quiet surrounds. The area in which we reside is far removed from the State Highway and the rail line. As a consequence, quiet enjoyment is a guarantee. The area is close to the District Park proposed for Weedons Road and, as already pointed out, gives the easiest of access to the city and is just so handy to the town centre, Tennyson Street School and recreation park. If you were a prospective section purchaser would you not be impressed?

I/We believe that the arguments set out above are logical and realistic. We would hope that Councillors and Planning staff involved would simply take the time and trouble to give them the consideration we believe they deserve and so rethink the time frame within which properties in the Lincoln Rolleston Road - Branthwaite Drive block might be developed. If Council is not prepared to move in the manner suggested, it may be appropriate for all land designated Stage 3 to be removed from the Urban Limits and accorded a zoning which could see it developed in the like of 1 - 2 hectare lots. It is interesting that paragraphs 85.3 and 85.4 of the Environment Canterbury critique on the proposed plan changes canvasses this issue.