

**BEFORE THE SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**IN THE MATTER OF** the Resource Management Act 1991

**AND**

**IN THE MATTER OF** Proposed Plan Change 73 being a request by Rolleston West Residential Ltd in relation to approximately 160 hectares of land generally on the western side of the Rolleston Township, to the west of Dunns Crossing Road and south of Main South Road (State Highway 1)

---

**MINUTE NO 4 OF COMMISSIONER DAVID CALDWELL ADDRESSING  
QUESTIONS FOR MR NICHOLSON AND TIMETABLING APPLICANT'S REPLY**

**Dated 7 October 2021**

---

1. By Minute dated 4 October 2021, I advised that I proposed to undertake a site visit. I confirm that I have now undertaken that site visit, attending both the Pines Wastewater Treatment Plant site and the Pines Resource Recovery Park. On my visit to the wastewater treatment plant, I was escorted by Mr Darryl Collins from Sicon and Mr Amit Chauhan, Council's Water and Wastewater Engineer. On my visit to the Resource Recovery Park, I was accompanied by the Manager, Mr Tony Sheard.
2. Those escorting me identified the component parts of both the wastewater treatment plant and the resource recovery park together with identifying where particular processes were undertaken if not readily apparent. For the avoidance of doubt, there were no discussions in relation to this proposed plan change.
3. I also took the opportunity to view the Holmes and Skellerup Blocks and the surrounding areas to identify locations identified in submissions and evidence. I spent some time driving around the area, drove along Lowes Road, Goulds Road and other roads through to Fosters Park and its surrounds, before driving into the town centre.

#### **Question for Mr Nicholson**

4. I have considered Mr Nicholson's Evidence Summary in light of the evidence of Mr Compton-Moen, Ms Lauenstein and the Expert Joint Witness Statement.
5. It is apparent from Mr Nicholson's Summary that concerns remain. Excluding concerns in relation to the appropriateness of the private plan change method for addressing the rezoning, they appear to relate to urban form and connectivity to Rolleston and its facilities.
6. Clause 14 of the Joint Witness Statement expressly records agreement that the revised ODPs would provide an appropriate urban form and would allow for future connections to adjacent land, that both blocks would provide neighbourhood commercial areas within a walkable distance of the plan change area, and that the town centre, schools and recreation areas would be reasonably accessible from the plan change area.
7. On the face of it, there appears to be some discrepancy between the agreement recorded in Clause 14 of the Joint Witness Statement and paragraphs 1.5 and 1.7 of Mr Nicholson's Summary of Evidence dated 24 September 2021.
8. I am conscious that Mr Nicholson's unavailability to attend the hearing was not a matter of the Applicant's making and I do not wish to unnecessarily delay the conclusion of the hearings process. Nevertheless, I consider it important that I understand the principal areas in dispute.
9. My question for Mr Nicholson is:

*The Expert Conferencing Joint Witness Statement records, in relation to the revised ODPs, a number of matters of agreement. Clause 14 records:*

*There is agreement that both blocks would provide neighbourhood commercial areas within a walkable distance of the plan change area, and that the Town Centre, schools and recreation areas would be reasonably accessible from the plan change area.*

*Your Summary of Evidence records your opinion in relation to the Holmes Block that it “would be poorly connected with the Rolleston township ...”.*

*It provides further in 1.7 that in relation to the Skellerup Block, you consider that would have a low level of connectivity with Rolleston and would not contribute to a compact urban form.*

*So that I am sure that I properly understand your evidence, can you please address what appears to be a discrepancy in relation to your concerns regarding connectivity and the recorded agreement in relation to the Town Centre, schools and recreation areas being reasonably accessible?*

10. Given the narrow scope of the question, I expect the response to be no more than a page to a page and a half. I direct that be provided through Ms Robertson no later than **5pm Thursday 14 October 2021**.

#### **Applicant's Reply**

11. In terms of the Applicant's Reply, I request that be provided by no later than **5pm Thursday 28 October 2021**. It may assist the focus of that reply, and overall efficiency, if Ms Appleyard identifies the topics she proposes to address in her Reply. If there are additional matters which I consider I would benefit from having specifically addressed, I will identify those by way of Minute.
12. Any questions or concerns relating to the matters which I have addressed in this Minute can be raised through Ms Robertson for my consideration ([Emma.Robertson@selwyn.govt.nz](mailto:Emma.Robertson@selwyn.govt.nz)).



**David Caldwell**  
Hearing Commissioner

Dated: 7 October 2021