

2 February 2021

Trices Road  
C/- Aston Consultants  
PO Box 1435  
**CHRISTCHURCH 8140**

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

Dear Fiona

**PC200072: TRICES ROAD REZONING GROUP 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. I note that you have applied to create a new Living 3 zone (there is no 'Living 3' zone at Prebbleton, just 'Living 3 (Hamptons Road)' and 'Living 3 (Trents Road)'). Therefore, please either:
  - a. Provide an assessment of the effect of creating a new zone (including on plan integrity); or
  - b. Amend your application to use a pre-existing zone.
2. Your proposed amendment to Table C12.1 for the Living Z zone at Prebbleton has the effect of creating another new residential zone in Prebbleton. Therefore, please either:
  - a. Provide an assessment of the effect of creating a new zone (including on plan integrity); or
  - b. Amend your application to use a pre-existing zone.
3. Paragraph 55 of the overview mentions a minimum floor height proposal to address flood risk, but the requested changes to the District Plan do not include such a provision. Please amend and resubmit.
4. Please provide a landscape assessment which includes:
  - a. identifying the existing natural and heritage features of the site and their values;
  - b. discussing any fencing issues; and
  - c. elaborating on the location of public green space and its function and use within the development – in particular, how a 900m<sup>2</sup> pocket park is considered appropriate in size and location.

**[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. How are potential reverse sensitivity issues between residential housing and operating farming to be addressed?
6. Please explain why Living 3 is an appropriate zoning for part of Birch's Road (including given the existing active public transport/bus route) and discuss how future intensification can successfully occur within this area without compromising good urban design principles.
7. Please elaborate why only small-site medium density, as supposed to comprehensive development, has been considered for the site and how this satisfies the need for affordable housing with a variety of typologies.
8. The requests appears to rely on Policy 8 of the NPS-UD. 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 Prebbleton, please amend this to consider the additional capacity provided to the wider district over the short term timeframes 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.
9. 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 Prebbleton. 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 Prebbleton township, the surrounding district and the Greater Christchurch area.

#### APPENDIX 1 – OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN AREA 5

10. The colours used to indicate residential density on the plan appear to differ from the colours used in the key. Please review and resubmit.
11. Please confirm that you are proposing that the trees to be retained on Birches Road would remain in private ownership rather than being placed under public management.

#### APPENDIX 2 – URBAN DESIGN STATEMENT

12. Please provide a visual assessment of the impacts for adjoining residential, rural-residential and rural sites. Please provide the measures that the proposal includes to mitigate a compromised rural outlook, including all relevant maps or diagrams.
13. How has the story of the land (and existing homes) been incorporated into the design and how will existing built form be able to positively contribute?
14. Please elaborate on the eastern interface and on your proposed boundary treatment.

---

<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

15. How, with no physical or natural boundary, will urban sprawl further east be prevented?
16. How is Medium Density in this location (see figure 14 of the statement) be considered an appropriate housing typology next to rural land uses?
17. What is considered 'soft landscaping treatment'?
18. Please elaborate on the role of Hamptons Road, which currently is a dead-end and does not link to the wider transport network.

#### APPENDIX 5 – FLOOD HAZARD ASSESSMENT

19. The information currently provided is considered sufficient for this stage of development, but please note that as part of future work you may be required to demonstrate that your proposed site levels/stormwater infrastructure/road network etc will:
  - a. allow residential units to meet floor height requirements; and
  - b. not exacerbate flooding on neighbouring properties

#### APPENDIX 6 – GEOTECHNICAL INVESTIGATION

The report on the geotechnical investigation has been peer reviewed by Ian McCahon of Geotech Consulting Ltd, and is attached. As set out in that review, please provide the following:

20. The mean peak ground accelerations from the Bradley & Hughes model are set out in Table 1. Please advise how these relate to SLS and ULS levels of shaking and if the site has been "sufficiently tested" at SLS (MBIE 13.5.1), as past performance has been used to partially justify the TC1 classification.
21. Please supply the test data from the NZGD (location and logs) used to help identify the soil profile (8.3).
22. Please supply the Ecan well logs and locations used to model the gravels as extending to 18m depth (8.3).
23. Please confirm that the number of tests either on site or close by, do adequately meet the intent of the MBIE Guidance (16.2) to adequately characterize the soils to at least 15m depth in terms of density and depth (MBIE 16.3).
24. Please supply the data from which the groundwater depth has been derived (8.4).
25. The RMA section 106 sets out natural hazards which need to be considered before granting subdivision consent. Please supply a natural hazard assessment.

#### APPENDIX 7 – PRELIMINARY SITE INVESTIGATION

26. The Preliminary Site Investigation has been reviewed by the Environment Canterbury Contaminated Land team. Please provide an updated PSI that adequately addresses their comments:
  - a. The PSI report has identified numerous potential HAIL. The HAIL sites that were identified in the PSI were summarised and indicated in the site plan, E00417-01 B. However, there are instances that the HAIL activities were mis-identified or not identified at all. For example, aboveground tanks were assigned HAIL I when it should be HAIL A17 or HAIL I for rubbish when HAIL G5 may be more appropriate. Or stockpiles

were not assigned a HAIL category. There are also potential HAIL that were mentioned in the text but was not included in the site plan, E00417-01 B. Please provide an amended site plan showing these additional areas of concern.

- b. There were also a number of sites identified as HAIL E1 and HAIL I, however, these sites can only be HAIL I after a detailed site investigation has confirmed that there are contaminants with concentrations that may be of significant risk to human health. Please note that these sites will therefore not be included in the LLUR at this time, until the results of the DSI have been received.
- c. There are a number of sheds and dwellings within the investigation site that were considered for potential asbestos contamination, given their construction age. Currently, lead contamination in soil from lead based paint is not a HAIL category in the MfE HAIL list. However, there are many investigations which have demonstrated that soil around these structures were contaminated with lead from lead based paint use, often at concentrations exceeding the NES SCS residential. Please provide an assessment on lead-based risk in soil for all the areas currently and previously occupied by structures painted with lead-based paint, including: 299 Trices Rd; 321 Trices Rd; 327 Trices Rd; 329 Trices Rd; and 42 Hamptons Rd.
- d. 329 Trices Road – in addition to the above, please address the risk posed by the trotting track, consistent with other PSIs and subsequent DSIs. These tracks are sometimes filled with materials of unknown sources and can be contaminated. As such, the area should be noted in the PSI as requiring a DSI.
- e. 299 Trices Road – in addition to the above, please provide a risk assessment of the area in the northern part of the site where sheds have been demolished.
- f. 311 Trices Road – in addition to the above, please:
  - i. Either confirm that the structure in the northwestern portion is not a sheep dip, or include it in the amended PSI;
  - ii. Address the risk posed by the trotting track, consistent with other PSIs and subsequent DSIs. These tracks are sometimes filled with materials of unknown sources and can be contaminated. As such, the area should be noted in the PSI as requiring a DSI.; and
  - iii. Address the risk associated with the southeastern portion of the lot where soil stockpiles and drums of oil were identified. This may be by listing in the PSI that the area requires a DSI.

#### APPENDIX 9 – SERVICING REPORT

- 27. Council has constructed a new terminal wastewater pump station located at 612 Springs Road. Please comment on the feasibility for this proposed plan change area to be serviced by a reticulated wastewater system pumping directly to this wastewater pump station. Please contact Murray England Asset Manager Water Services ([murray.england@selwyn.govt.nz](mailto:murray.england@selwyn.govt.nz)) for further information.
- 28. The success of the proposed stormwater system relies on an appropriate free outfall clear of obstructions. The proposed stormwater system is likely to rely on a drainage outfall across the Drinnans land, through land owned by Urban Estates until it reaches Tosswill Rd and

Drain 22 which is operated and maintained by Environment Canterbury. Please confirm the arrangements (agreements / easements etc.) which will ensure the ongoing and functional drainage path through the above mentioned properties.

#### APPENDIX 10 – INTEGRATED TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT

29. The reference on the ODP to an “indicative shared pedestrian/cycle lane on road” is unclear whether you are proposing a separate cycle lane on the carriageway or a separate path within the road reserve. Please provide indicative road cross sections to assist in understanding the difference between on and off road facilities and what you are envisaging.
30. Please provide an updated ITA that incorporates the following comments:
  - a. Section 46 of the ITA acknowledges the upgrade of Hamptons, Birchs and Trices Road frontages which is as expected. Hamptons Road is unsealed apart from the first 50m, so this would need to be sealed as part of the upgrade, along with, for consistency, the frontage of the landscaping/existing houses – this would only be for kerbing and lighting etc. as the Rail Trail pathway is already there.
  - b. Council is planning to construct the Springs/Hamptons Rd roundabout in 2024/25. To enable this the Trices Rd leg will be closed off and Trices Rd will become a cul de sac/no exit west of Trices Rd. Council has moved away from the intention signalled in CRETS and the Prebbleton Structure Plan to develop a local orbital route using Hamptons, Trices, etc to Halswell due to the problems in upgrading the route and other “rat running” it would create. The ITA refers to this intention as still current – which it is now not. Hamptons Rd between Shands Rd and Springs Rd will be upgraded only as part of this connection between those two roundabouts/ arterials. The closure of Trices Rd will also reduce the amount of through traffic at the Birchs Rd intersection which will improve safety and/or accommodate the extra traffic from this development.
  - c. The development should upgrade the Birchs/Hamptons Rd intersection to the same safety standard as the Birchs/Trices with median splitter islands etc. to cater for the extra traffic from the Hamptons Road east of Birchs Rd.
  - d. As was found with the Flemington subdivision alongside Birchs Rd to south, there can be some resistance to direct lot access/vehicle crossings then crossing the Rail Trail pathway. This has to be balanced with achieving urban form requirements with developments needing to front the road. In addition there is also an established and planted with trees “speed threshold” on the Birchs Rd frontage that will have to be dealt with as part of any frontage upgrades/lots access provisions.

#### **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.

Whilst 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 72 has been reallocated to a consultant planner, and will be processed by Jonathan Clease at Planz Consultants.

Jonathan Clease, Consultant Planner, Planz Consultants

DDI: 03 964 4630

Mobile: 022 170 0204

Email: [jonathan@planzconsultants.co.nz](mailto:jonathan@planzconsultants.co.nz)

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

Whilst 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.

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

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rachael Carruthers', written in a cursive style.

Rachael Carruthers

Strategy and Policy Planner