

5th May 2021

Trices Rd Rezoning Group
C/- Aston Consultants
PO Box 679
CHRISTCHURCH 8140
Attention: Fiona Aston

Sent by email to: fiona@astonconsultants.co.nz

Dear Fiona

**PC72: Private Plan Change Request to the Operative Selwyn District Plan at South Prebbleton:
Review of Response to Request for Further Information**

Thank you for your response received on 16th March 2021 to the RFI issued by Rachel Carruthers on behalf of Selwyn District Council on 2nd December 2021. As recently discussed, I have taken over the processing of PC72 due to Ms Carruthers competing work commitments associated with the current District Plan Review.

I have forwarded on your response on three-waters servicing to Murray England, geotechnical matters to Ian McCahon, urban design to Hugh Nicholson, and Preliminary Site Investigation to Hannah Mirabueno at the Canterbury Regional Council for their review. I am currently awaiting their feedback and will forward this to you once received (expected late next week).

In the meantime I have reviewed the balance of your RFI from a planning perspective, including the proposed updates to the Operative Plan text, Outline Development Plan ('ODP') and associated landscape and urban design assessment. Overall the response generally addresses the issues raised in Ms Carruthers's earlier RFI and no further information is required on the majority of these matters. Further clarification is however sought on two matters regarding first the link between the ODP and the subdivision rule package, and secondly the link between the suite of mitigation set out in the landscape report and the effectiveness of the rule package/ ODP in ensuring this mitigation is delivered.

Density rules and ODP

It is understood from your RFI response that the site is to have a split zoning, with an existing lifestyle block fronting onto Birches Rd to have a Living 3 zoning, and the balance of the site zoned Living Z. The ODP clearly shows the L3 zoned area, and the proposed rule amendments to Table C12.1 set out in your RFI response provide an effective link between the L3 zone and the subdivision density rules.

The Living Z zone across the balance of the site is likewise proposed to link to Table C12.1, but with a reduced minimum average and minimum lot size requirement. The LZ minimums in the Operative Plan are set out below:

Township	Minimum Average	Minimum lot
Lincoln	600m ²	500m ²
Rolleston	650m ²	550m ²
Prebbleton	700m ²	550m ²
PC72 proposed	650m²	500m²

I am unclear from your response how this site differs from the balance of the Living Z zone in Prebbleton that would justify a lesser minimum average, and if a minimum average of 650m² is indeed justifiable, why the minimum lot size reduces to 500m², compared with the long-established LZ approach in Rolleston where the minimum average of 650m² is aligned with a minimum lot size of 550m². In short, there appears to be little justification for the need to depart from the standard LZ zone provisions regarding density outcomes. If a bespoke outcome is sought for this site then please provide a detailed s32 assessment setting out why this site is unique relative to other LZ areas and justifying the need to depart from the generic LZ density rules in order to better give effect to the policy framework.

In general, Living Zones across the inner plains achieve the requisite overall density (currently 10 households/ha but looking to increase to 12 hh/ha through the 'Our Space' Greater Christchurch process) through a mix of suburban density stand-alone dwellings and areas of medium density housing. These medium density areas are all shown on the ODPs for the various new LZ zones. Table C12.1 is explicit for LZ zones in Pebbleton, Lincoln, and Rolleston that medium density housing is to be located within a medium density area shown on an ODP. Any medium density housing not located within a medium density area shown on an ODP becomes a fully discretionary activity under rule 12.1.6.7. The rule includes a note that if the consent *"is assessed by the Council as being acceptable, then a consent notice or similar mechanism shall be registered on the title of those lots indicating that the District Plan controls relating to those sites are to be those applying to the Living Z Medium Density areas"*.

The ODP for PC72 does not show any medium density areas, with the only reference being a short description of locational preference for this type of housing in the ODP narrative. The proposed approach does not therefore align with the long-established structure of the Operative Plan or how the subdivision rules work. I have discussed this approach with Ms Caruthers who has informed me that locating medium density lots outside of areas shown on ODPs is relatively common in Rolleston and Lincoln, with these applications processed as discretionary activities and a consent notice lodged on the title, as per the note in 12.1.6.7.

In order for medium density housing to be able to be achieved in the PC72 block, the location of such housing either needs to be shown on the ODP, consistent with the Operative Plan rule framework, or you need to be aware that all medium density lots will require a fully discretionary consent under Rule 12.1.6.7. As long as the applicant is aware of the procedural implications of the approach sought then no further changes to the application documents are necessary.

If alternatively the applicant wishes to make medium density development easier in the future, then either the ODP will need to be amended to show the location of medium density lots, or the subdivision rules set out in Table C12.1 and 12.1.6.7 will need revision to provide a bespoke alternative consenting pathway for this site. If a new approach is proposed regarding how medium density housing is developed, with such an approach differing significantly from the Operative Plan approach, then an associated s32 assessment is required that demonstrates how the new rule framework more

effectively achieves the Operative Plan policy framework than the long-established Operative Plan provisions.

Landscape mitigation and implementation

The landscape report prepared by A+urban sets out a substantial suite of measures necessary to mitigate the effects generated by the proposal. These measures are set out section 4.3 and section 6. This mitigation is in part delivered through the ODP. The following matters do not however appear to be linked to any form of implementation mechanism that would provide the requisite level of certainty that they will actually be delivered:

- Retention of existing planting (located off-site) along the northern half of the eastern boundary, with new screen planting along the southern half of the eastern boundary;
- Provision of rural wire or post and rail fencing along the eastern boundary;
- Provision of larger and deeper lots (minimum 30m) along the eastern boundary;
- Increased building setbacks (minimum 6m) along the eastern boundary;
- Height restrictions (maximum 6m) along the eastern boundary;
- Medium density housing located centrally within the site or adjacent to open space areas. Whilst identified in the ODP narrative, as noted above there is no mechanism to ensure delivery of medium density typologies. Rule 12.1.6.7 will not apply in the event that low density lots are proposed across the entire site as such an outcome would be in general compliance with the ODP as the ODP does not show any medium density areas;
- Retention of the Birches Rd planted edge. Whilst the ODP shows a landscape strip, there is no reference to the retention of existing mature vegetation;
- The delivery of post and rail fencing along Birches Rd;
- Limits on property access from Birches Rd across the rail trail;
- Trices Rd and Hamptons Rd frontages to have post and rail fencing and a minimum 2m deep planted landscape strip.

The visual assessment and associated conclusion that the plan change outcomes are acceptable are based on the successful implementation of the above mitigation measures. The above matters do not form part of the generic Living Z or Living 3 rule packages (although the L3 road frontage rules may be effective in delivering the mitigation for the L3 portion of the Birches Rd frontage). There do not appear to be any proposed rules or proposed site-specific assessment matters to deliver the mitigation, and in most cases there are no references to the mitigation in the ODP or associated ODP narrative. As such it is unclear how the mitigation upon which the landscape/ urban design assessment is based will be delivered with any certainty. Can you please confirm any text changes to the Operative Plan necessary to deliver the mitigation, or set out how the mitigation can be relied upon to be delivered through alternative methods.

Please do not hesitate to contact me on (03) 964-4630 or jonathan@planzconsultants.co.nz if you have any questions.

Yours faithfully

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Jonathan Clease', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Jonathan Clease

Consultant Planner

On behalf of the **SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL**