

2 February 2021

Four Stars Development Ltd and Gould Developments Ltd  
C/- Aston Consultants  
PO Box 1435  
**CHRISTCHURCH 8140**

Sent by email to: [info@astonconsultants.co.nz](mailto:info@astonconsultants.co.nz)

Dear Fiona

**PC200071: FOUR STARS DEVELOPMENT LTD AND GOULD DEVELOPMENTS LTD PRIVATE PLAN  
CHANGE: REQUEST FOR FURTHER INFORMATION**

Your application for the above plan change has been assessed for completeness under the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991. A review has been undertaken of the application, with the following further information request being issued accordingly.

**Further information**

Clarification of the following points is requested to enable Council to better evaluate the nature and effects of the request (Clause 23(1)):

**REQUEST DOCUMENT**

1. There appear to be some procedural errors with the request document. Please review and amend the application, including supporting documents, as appropriate:
  - a. The list of owners and occupiers does not include the land subject to the operative ODP for Rolleston Area 4.
  - b. The request makes no mention of the proposed changes to the operative ODP for Rolleston Area 4.
  - c. The applicants for this plan change are listed as Four Stars Development Ltd and Gould Developments Ltd, but the request is signed on behalf of Trices Road Rezoning Group.
2. Please provide a landscape assessment which identifies the existing natural and heritage features of the site and their values.

**APPROACH AND KEY FEATURES OF THE PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE**

3. The future use of the Council-owned land to the northeast of the plan change area has not been finalised, and may include a district park, full residential use, or something in-between. Your proposal therefore needs to provide for flexible scenarios along this boundary.
4. Paragraph 20 – you propose to develop the rezoned lots in accordance with the General Residential Zone, which does not exist in the Selwyn District Plan (SDP). Please either amend the application to Living Z (as described in the request document), or provide additional justification for the introduction of a new zone. Please note the Council does not generally support the introduction of any new zones at this late stage in the life of the SDP.

**[www.selwyn.govt.nz](http://www.selwyn.govt.nz)**

Selwyn District Council, 2 Norman Kirk Drive Rolleston / PO BOX 90, Rolleston 7643  
Tel: 03 347 2800 Fax: 03 347 2799 Email: [admin@selwyn.govt.nz](mailto:admin@selwyn.govt.nz)

5. Paragraph 21 – please demonstrate how the development proposes to achieve 12 households per hectare over the development area as a whole. This may include the provision of a conceptual development plan.
6. Paragraph 22 onwards – the application makes frequent reference to RO-DEV 9. From the context, this appears to be a reference to proposed ODP for Rolleston Area 5. If this is the case, please provide an amended document referring to proposed ODP for Rolleston Area 5. If this is not the case, please clarify what the reference is to.
7. Paragraph 23 – please expand this paragraph to include all the proposed changes to ODP Area 4, including the proposed increase in density.
8. In paragraph 45 you discuss the loss of rural productive potential and state that lifestyle blocks are proposed within the Airport Noise Contour, which will enable the use of land for small-scale or low level rural activities. Given that you are in fact proposing residential development of this land within the foreseeable future (assuming that the CIAL contour moves in 2023), please explain how the short-term retention of 4ha blocks would retain rural uses over the medium term.
9. The application describes the difficulties faced on the Rasmussen/Purdon land in relation to continuing their existing operation, and in paragraphs 45 and 46 you appear to use this as the basis for your statements that productive farming of any description is no longer feasible. Given that the land is predominantly LUC Class 2, described by the classification system as “very good land with slight physical limitations to arable use, readily controlled by management and soil conservation practices. The land is suitable for many cultivated crops, vineyards and berry fields, pasture, tree crops or production forestry” (Land Use Capability Survey Handbook 3e), please provide sufficient evidence to support your statement that productive farming of any description is no longer feasible in the proposed plan change area.
10. Paragraphs 47-48 – given that subdivision inevitably releases contaminants into the environment, not least in the form of dust during site works, please revisit these paragraphs.
11. Paragraph 53 – given that the current proposal is only for zoning rather than development, it is premature to state that there will be no hazardous installations. Please revisit this paragraph.

#### STATUTORY PLANNING ASSESSMENT

12. The assessment of the criteria in Policy 1 of the NPS-UD for ‘well-functioning urban environments’ provided with the request only considers this in relation to the plan change area. The urban environment is considered to encompass all of Greater Christchurch. Therefore, please provide an assessment of how the request would contribute to the function of the wider urban environments of the Rolleston township, the surrounding district and the Greater Christchurch area.
13. Your response to NPS-UD Policy 1(a) refers to the proposal having medium, standard and large lots supporting three housing typologies. Elsewhere the request uses the terms Low Density and Medium Density (small-lot and comprehensive), which terms are consistent with the terminology of the SDP. Please either amend your response to NPS-UD Policy 1(a) for consistency, or explain why different terms are required.

14. Your response to NPS-UD Policy 1(e) appears to be a 'copy and paste' error from Proposed Plan Change 72 Trices Road. Please review and resubmit.
15. Your response to NPS-UD Policy 1(f) does not reflect all the likely effects of climate change. Please amend and resubmit, including an assessment of the likely effects of flooding associated with storm events (flood ponding rather than river flooding).
16. The requests relies on Policy 8 of the NPS-UD as it asserts that it would add significantly to development capacity. At its meeting on 9 December 2020, Council adopted an update its Housing and Business Development Capacity Assessment for the short, medium and long term<sup>1</sup>. There are a significant number of plan change requests currently lodged with Council. While the capacity assessment provided with the request considers the percentage increase that the request will add to Rolleston, please amend this to consider the additional capacity provided to the wider district over the short term timeframe considered by the NPS-UD. The capacity proposed within the other plan change requests (available at <https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/planning/strategies-and-plans/selwyn-district-plan/plan-changes>) should be considered in regards to the above request.

#### APPENDIX 1 – OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLANS

17. Please provide an amended ODP for Area 4, including all required text, that:
  - a. Incorporates all required changes, including text changes required.
  - b. Emphasizes the importance of the indicative primary route aligning with both Broadlands Drive and proposed ODP Area 5.
18. Please provide an amended ODP for proposed Area 5, including all required text, that:
  - a. Aligns the northern-most primary route with ODP Area 5.
  - b. Shows these pedestrian/cycle connections as also able to accommodate roading as well, in case there is a need to service the District Park with say road extensions into it to for carparks etc. Maybe a "future transport link"?



<sup>1</sup> [https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf\\_file/0006/360735/PUBLIC-Agenda-Council-Meeting-9-December-2020.pdf](https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/data/assets/pdf_file/0006/360735/PUBLIC-Agenda-Council-Meeting-9-December-2020.pdf) pages 39-54

#### APPENDIX 2 – URBAN DESIGN STATEMENT

19. Please provide an amended urban design statement addressing the whole plan change area, including ODP Area 4, and addresses the following comments from Gabi Wolfer:
- a. Please provide a visual assessment of the impacts for the residential neighbours to the west of the proposed site and rural sites to the south. Please describe how you propose to mitigate a compromised rural outlook, including any proposed amendments to District Plan provisions.
  - b. How will the proposed residential development integrate with the adjoining rural land, including managing potential reverse sensitivity effects associated with farming operations?
  - c. The statement raises concerns about boundary fencing, but does not consider the relevant rules of the SDP, and no changes to Rule 4.13 is proposed. Please amend the application for consistency.

#### APPENDIX 3 – FLOOD HAZARD ASSESSMENT

20. The flood hazard assessment provided does not include all of the land subject to the proposed plan change. Please provide an adequate assessment of the entirety of the plan change area, including the area covered by Rolleston ODP Area 4.

#### APPENDICES 6 & 7 – PRELIMINARY SITE INVESTIGATIONS

21. As outlined in my email of 14 December 2020, please provide an amended land contamination assessment or series of assessments that address the following concerns:
- a. There are a few things that may have missed been out in the review of the aerial photos, particularly for 131-139 Levi Road and 274 & 294 Lincoln Rolleston Road, as there was no site inspection undertaken as part of the scope of works.
  - b. The areas where some potentially contaminating activities have not been included in the PSI report for 131-139 Levi Road and 274 & 294 Lincoln Rolleston Road, Rolleston are:
    - i. Uncharacterised stockpiles at the northern boundary (west end) of 294 Lincoln Rolleston Road
    - ii. Potentially treated timber cuttings(?) at the southern boundary (west end) of 294 Lincoln Rolleston Road
    - iii. Burnt patch near the northern boundary of 294 Lincoln Rolleston Road
    - iv. Domestic garage/workshop was mentioned in the PSI report that was erected in 2005, but no additional information has been provided
    - v. Burnt patch near the northern boundary of 294 Lincoln Rolleston Road
    - vi. Stockpiles near veggie patches at the southern boundary of 294 Lincoln Rolleston Road
  - c. The areas where some potentially contaminating activities have not been included in the PSI report for 232 Lincoln Rolleston Road & 5-25 Nobeline Drive, Rolleston are:
    - i. Uncharacterised stockpiles near the southern boundary of 139 Levi Road (Lot 2 DP 416195, Lot 2 DP 322710) observed in the 2010-2015 and latest imagery.
    - ii. Potential horticultural activity indicated by rows observed from 2004-2010 and 2010-2015 aerial photos
    - iii. A DSI report prepared by Bussell Developments for Lot 1 DP 416195 referred to a PSI report which determined an area potentially contaminated from a sheep dip on 5 Nobeline Drive (Lot 1 DP 416195). The PSI report has included this area as

part of the Risk Area that's recommended for a DSI, but it would be good to investigate the possibility of the sheep dip in this area since it has already been raised in another report.

#### APPENDIX 9 – INTEGRATED TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

22. In reviewing the ITA for this application to include the changes proposed to ODP Area 4, please incorporate the following comments from Andrew Mazey:
- a. The application refers to Council undertaking an upgrade of the Levi/Lowes/Masefield Dr/Lincoln Rolleston Rd intersection. This is proposed for 2025/26 In the Daft Long Term Plan. While Council originally envisaged a roundabout, recent work undertaken with the SH1/Rolleston Access Business Case with the NZTA suggested traffic signals, with this PC and likely development and therefore more pedestrians and cyclists in the area this would add weight to this. LTP funding should cover either decision but if this PC was approved it would likely cement traffic signals relating to the extra local traffic generated in the area.
  - b. A section of the Broadlands Drive extension is still under the noise contours. If this section is constructed before any deferral is lifted, it will need to be constructed to full urban standard at the outset, to avoid future inconsistencies or upgrade requirements.
  - c. As Levi Road is the main arterial route from the Weedons Interchange, it is important that the route is still effective. What more could be considered here to address the LoS issues with the Ruby Drive-new ODP road intersection etc?
  - d. The frontages of all existing roads (Levi Road, Lincoln Rolleston Road and Nobeline Drive) will need to be upgraded to an urban standard as there will be direct site access.

#### **Process from here**

Once we have received a response to the above request, it may be necessary to ask for further clarification of the extent to which this response addresses the request.

Whist you may decline to provide the above information (Clause 23(6)), you need to be aware that the Council may reject the request on this basis.

Once the Council is satisfied that it has adequate information, a report will be finalised to consider and make a recommendation on how to deal with your request.

Following that report, further processing of Plan Change 71 has been reallocated to Liz White at Incite.

Liz White, Resource Management Consultant, Incite  
Mobile: 027 2285 006  
Email: [liz@incite.co.nz](mailto:liz@incite.co.nz)

Please contact me on (03) 347 2833 or [rachael.carruthers@selwyn.govt.nz](mailto:rachael.carruthers@selwyn.govt.nz) if you have any questions.

Yours faithfully  
SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL



Rachael Carruthers

Strategy and Policy Planner