

## Notice of Submission on Proposed Plan Change 73

---

### Resource Management Act 1991 – Form 5

**Name of submitter:** Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)

**Physical address:** 200 Tuam Street, Christchurch, 8011

**Address for service:** Canterbury Regional Council  
PO Box 345  
Christchurch 8140

**Contact person:** Tammy Phillips

**Email:** [tammy.phillips@ecan.govt.nz](mailto:tammy.phillips@ecan.govt.nz)

**Telephone:** 027 597 2874

**This is a submission on proposed Plan Change 73 to the Selwyn District Plan – to rezone approximately 160 hectares of Living 3 land to Living Z and Business 1, West Rolleston.**

[1] **Environment Canterbury opposes Plan Change 73 in its entirety for the reasons outlined in this submission.** The proposed plan change is inconsistent with policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the strategic sub-regional land use and infrastructure planning framework for Greater Christchurch.

### **The reasons for our submission are:**

#### **Inconsistency with the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement**

##### Settlement Pattern

[2] Rolleston is located within Greater Christchurch, which means that the Objectives and Policies contained within Chapter 6 of the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement (CRPS) for the recovery and rebuilding of Greater Christchurch are applicable. Chapter 6 requires that

development is located and designed in a way that achieves consolidated and coordinated urban growth that is integrated with the provision of infrastructure.

- [3] Chapter 6 of the CRPS directs the location of growth and development within Greater Christchurch. It encourages the sustainable and self-sufficient growth of Lincoln, Rolleston and Prebbleton but within defined locations supported by planned infrastructure.
- [4] The plan change site is not identified as a Greenfield Priority Area (GPA) for residential development and is located outside the projected infrastructure boundary shown on Map A. The plan change request is therefore considered to be inconsistent with Objective 6.2.1 (3) which “avoids urban development outside of existing urban areas or greenfield priority areas for development”, and Policy 6.3.1 (4) to “ensure new urban activities only occur within existing urban areas or identified greenfield priority areas as shown on Map A, unless otherwise expressly provided for in the CRPS”.
- [5] In January 2021 Environment Canterbury notified, under a Streamlined Planning Process, Proposed Change 1 to Chapter 6 of the CRPS to amend Map A to identify Future Development Areas in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. The Proposed Change to the CRPS supports the outcomes of the *Our Space 2018-2048 Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update*. Neither of these processes identified the land subject to Plan Change 73 as necessary to meet future growth demands in Greater Christchurch over the 30 year period to 2048 (see also paragraphs [21] to [24] below). The application site was also not included within the ‘Urban Growth Overlay’ notified as part of the proposed Selwyn District Plan in October 2020. Policy UG-P3 in the Urban Form and Development Chapter of the proposed District Plan explicitly states: “Avoid the zoning of land to establish any new urban areas or extensions to any township boundary in the Greater Christchurch area of the District outside the Urban Growth Overlay.”
- [6] The suitability of the application site for urban development would be more appropriately considered through a comprehensive review of the settlement pattern and long-term strategic growth planning exercise for Greater Christchurch (see also paragraphs [25] and [26] below).
- [7] In assessing the plan change it is also important to note that CRPS Policy 6.3.9 (7) states that: “a rural residential development area shall not be regarded as in transition to full urban development”.

#### Infrastructure

- [8] The plan change application is inconsistent with Policy 6.3.5(2) which seeks to ensure that the nature, timing and sequencing of new development is co-ordinated with the development, funding, implementation and operation of transport and other infrastructure. The plan change application notes that water supply and waste service upgrades would be required to facilitate development of the two blocks and options for reticulated servicing for the proposed development will be investigated further with Selwyn District Council at subdivision stage. Upgrades sufficient to enable development in accordance with the plan change are not contained in the Selwyn District Council Long Term Plan.

- [9] CRPS Policy 6.3.5 seeks to ensure that new development does not occur until provision for appropriate infrastructure is in place, meaning that any proposed or potential future upgrades to the Selwyn District Council's reticulated services network should not be relied upon, particularly in regard to any servicing requirements that will occur out of sequence.
- [10] Other plan change requests in the Rolleston area are currently being processed or assessed by Selwyn District Council for notification<sup>1</sup>. These proposals amount to approximately 300 hectares of land, could yield in excess of 3,500 additional households and could alter the most appropriate infrastructure options to facilitate future development.
- [11] These matters further suggest that a strategic planning exercise is required to consider the most appropriate scale, direction and timing of any growth for the township, linked to a coordinated assessment of the available options to overcome identified infrastructure constraints.
- [12] In addition, whilst acknowledging the evidence provided in the Odour Assessment provided as part of the proposed plan change (Appendix H) we also remain concerned that residential urban development of the subject land could give rise to reverse sensitivity, particularly with regard to the planned expansion of the Rolleston Wastewater Treatment Plant and Rolleston Resource Recovery Park. These facilities comprise important strategic infrastructure for the Selwyn District and Policy 6.3.5 (3) seeks to ensure the efficient and effective functioning of infrastructure, including transport corridors, is maintained, and the ability to maintain and upgrade that infrastructure is retained.

#### Transport and Public Transport

- [13] Objective 6.2.4 in the CRPS prioritises the planning of transport infrastructure so that it maximises integration with land use patterns and facilitates the movement of people and goods and provision of services in Greater Christchurch, while (1) managing network congestion; (2) reducing dependency on private motor vehicles; (3) reducing emission of contaminants to air and energy use; (4) promoting the use of active and public transport modes; (5) optimising use of existing capacity within the network; and (6) enhancing transport safety.
- [14] CRPS Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5 seek to ensure an efficient and effective transport network across Greater Christchurch, with Policy 6.3.4 (2) stating:
- “providing patterns of development that optimise use of existing network capacity and ensuring that, where possible, new building projects support increased uptake of active and public transport, and provide opportunities for modal choice”.*
- [15] The plan change site is not well serviced by public transport and the Integrated Transport Assessment appended to the plan change indicates that the accommodation of additional traffic volumes is contingent on planned intersection upgrades, particularly in relation to SH1. As noted above in relation to the provision of infrastructure, any proposed or

---

<sup>1</sup> Hughes Developments: Notified PC64 (78ha) also subject of a Covid-19 Fast-track consenting application; Hughes Developments: Lodged PC70 (63ha); Four Stars/Gould Developments: Lodged PC71 (53ha); Yoursection: Lodged PC75 (24ha); Dunweavin: Lodged PC76 (13ha); Urban Estates: Lodged PC78 (63ha).

potential upgrades to the transport network should not be taken for granted or relied upon to demonstrate capacity.

- [16] The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) has been completed in isolation of the potential for other proposed plan changes to further impact the efficiency and effectiveness of both the local and strategic transport network. Development of the plan change site should not precede the provision of appropriate infrastructure (CRPS Policy 6.3.5(2)(d)) and it should not impede the maintenance of an efficient and effective transport corridor (CRPS Policy 6.3.5(3)).
- [17] The application site and the adjacent area of West Rolleston is not directly served by regular public transport. There is a Metro service that operates from the more central part of Rolleston but this is not within an acceptable walkable catchment. In addition, the proposed plan change does not provide for any integrated transport options. Development in this location is therefore likely to be dependent on private motor vehicle use.
- [18] Policy 6.3.2 (3) of the CRPS requires “emphasis at a local level placed on walking, cycling and public transport as more sustainable forms of transport”. Policy 6.3.3 (8) requires outline development plans to “demonstrate how effective provision is made for a range of transport options including public transport”.
- [19] The proposed plan change does not meet the above policies or the wider transport network and land use integration outcomes sought by Objective 6.2.4 and Policies 6.3.4 and 6.3.5. Importantly, the ITA and the Economic Assessment do not adequately address the wider transport and environmental impacts (e.g. congestion and carbon emissions) arising from trips into Christchurch City.

## **Strategic Planning Context**

- [20] *Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update Whakahāngai O Te Hōrapa Nohoanga* (Our Space 2018-2048) was endorsed by the Greater Christchurch Partnership (GCP) in June 2019 and subsequently adopted by each partner council, including Environment Canterbury and Selwyn District Council. It is the future development strategy for Greater Christchurch developed under the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity (NPS-UDC).
- [21] Our Space 2018-2048 updates the settlement pattern originally set out in the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy (UDS) from 2007 and which underpins the planning framework outlined in Chapter 6 to the CRPS, inserted through a statutory direction as part of the Land Use Recovery Plan. Our Space 2018-2048 identifies sufficient development capacity to meet anticipated housing needs over a thirty year planning horizon out to 2048.
- [22] A significant amount of housing development capacity is already enabled by the CRPS. Our Space 2018-2048 indicates there is existing capacity for nearly 74,000 dwellings in Greater Christchurch, against a housing target of 86,600 (including the additional margins that were required by the NPS-UDC), between 2018 to 2048. Our Space sets out a proposed approach

to meet the projected shortfall, which includes intensification in existing urban areas and the identification of new greenfield areas for urban housing (termed Future Development Areas (FDAs)) in Rolleston, Rangiora and Kaiapoi. These locations have been identified in long-term growth strategies since 2007 and signalled by the Projected Infrastructure Boundary on Map A in Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

- [23] A Proposed Change to Chapter 6 of the CRPS, to identify the FDAs on Map A and insert associated policy provisions, was notified in January 2021 under a Streamlined Planning Process. Density scenarios indicate that, at a minimum density of at least 12 households per hectare, the FDAs could collectively provide for over 10,000 homes.<sup>2</sup>
- [24] Further development capacity in Rolleston is not required to meet medium and long term housing targets, identified in Our Space 2018–2048 and expressed in the CRPS and Selwyn District Plan.
- [25] Any reassessment regarding the desirability of additional growth at Rolleston is best considered as part of a future spatial planning exercise rather than ad-hoc and individual assessments prompted by private plan change requests. This would ensure that the benefits and implications of urban growth at Rolleston are appropriately weighed against alternative spatial growth scenarios such that sufficient development capacity is enabled at a Greater Christchurch level in a manner that best delivers the outcomes sought by the shared vision established through the Greater Christchurch Partnership.
- [26] It is noted that scoping of a spatial planning exercise is currently being considered by the Greater Christchurch Partnership, in conjunction with delivery of the Greater Christchurch 2050 Strategic Framework and the establishment of an Urban Growth Partnership with the Crown. This dovetails with parallel future mass rapid transit and public transport business cases to determine routes and investment requirements to significantly improve the provision of public transport services across Greater Christchurch.

#### National Policy Statement on Urban Development

- [27] Environment Canterbury acknowledges that Policy 8 of the National Policy Statement on Urban Development (NPS-UD) requires local authorities to be responsive to unanticipated or out-of-sequence plan change proposals and give particular regard to proposals that would add significantly to development capacity and contribute to well-functioning urban environments. Clause 3.8 applies to a plan change that provides significant development capacity that is not otherwise enabled in a plan or is not in sequence with planned land release. In those circumstances, a local authority must have particular regard to the development capacity provided by the plan change if that development capacity:
  - a. would contribute to a well-functioning urban environment; and
  - b. is well-connected along transport corridors; and
  - c. meets the criteria set under subclause (3).

---

<sup>2</sup> (Greater Christchurch Partnership, Our Space 2018-2048: Greater Christchurch Settlement Pattern Update, Table 5, page 28).

- [28] Environment Canterbury is currently working with relevant territorial authorities to formulate criteria, in response to clause 3.8(3) of the NPS-UD, to determine how to consider whether plan changes would add significantly to development capacity in a Greater Christchurch and Canterbury context. Ultimately, the criteria will clarify how NPS-UD Policy 8 will be interpreted at a regional level. In the meantime, we recognise that decision makers assessing plan changes will need to consider the implications of this national direction alongside the policies contained in Chapter 6 of the CRPS.

*Significant development capacity*

- [29] Importantly, Policy 8 relates to decisions affecting 'urban environments' and the NPS-UD defines these as areas predominantly urban in character and which are, or are intended to be, part of a housing and labour market of at least 10,000 people.
- [30] The applicant cites Our Space 2018-2048, which identifies the Greater Christchurch area as the relevant urban environment for the purposes of the future development strategy, and therefore concludes that it is encompassed within the intent of Policy 8.
- [31] It follows that significance would also then need to be considered in the context of Greater Christchurch as the relevant urban environment. The anticipated yield of 2,100 allotments identified in the plan change is less significant when set against the medium term housing target of 32,300 households for Greater Christchurch as a whole.
- [32] Guidance released by the Ministry for the Environment (MfE) on this matter in September 2020<sup>3</sup> also advises that, as well as the scale of a development proposal, the extent to which it fulfils an identified demand is a factor that should influence an assessment as to its significance (including citing gaps in the supply of certain types of housing such as affordable houses, provision for higher densities and a range of housing typologies).
- [33] Future housing needs have been identified in the most recent capacity assessment prepared for the Greater Christchurch area. The capacity assessment highlights the continued trend towards smaller household size (i.e. fewer people per household) and the future affordability constraints many households will face in accessing housing. Furthermore, a recent report into densities commissioned by the Greater Christchurch Partnership has concluded that on a case-by-case basis 15 houses per hectare is both desirable and feasible as the minimum net density in new greenfield areas.
- [34] The proposed lot sizes and housing typologies identified in the plan change do not go far enough to align with these identified housing needs and gaps in housing supply and detract from a determination that the plan change adds significantly to development capacity. It is also noted that research undertaken as part of the Building Better Homes, Towns and Cities (BBHTC) National Science Challenge identifies the prevalence of private land covenants in Selwyn District as inhibiting the provision of more affordable housing<sup>4</sup>. Should similar covenants be established as part of development of the subject land this could limit the

---

<sup>3</sup> <https://www.mfe.govt.nz/publications/towns-and-cities/understanding-and-implementing-responsive-planning-policies>

<sup>4</sup> [https://www.buildingbetter.nz/publications/homes\\_spaces/adm/Fredrickson\\_Saville-Smith\\_2018\\_covenants\\_risk\\_to\\_supply\\_of\\_land\\_for\\_affordable\\_housing\\_rb.pdf](https://www.buildingbetter.nz/publications/homes_spaces/adm/Fredrickson_Saville-Smith_2018_covenants_risk_to_supply_of_land_for_affordable_housing_rb.pdf)

ability for smaller houses to be built on individual lots and undermine the ability to deliver the affordable housing options sought by CRPS Policy 6.3.7.

- [35] To create significant development capacity a proposal should also be able to demonstrate how infrastructure is committed and how it will be provided because development capacity includes ‘the provision of adequate development infrastructure to support the development of land for housing or business use’ (ref. definition of development capacity in clause 1.4 of the NPS-UD). This point is reiterated in the responsive planning ‘factsheet’, and in the guidance published by MfE on understanding and implementing the responsive planning policies in the NPS which states that ‘private plan change proposals should therefore show how the infrastructure needed to service the development would be provided’. As outlined above, this matter is not sufficiently addressed by the plan change.

#### *Contribution to a well-functioning urban environment*

- [36] The NPS-UD Policy 1 contains a non-exhaustive list of attributes of well-functioning urban environments which include:

- enabling a variety of homes that meet the needs, in terms of type, price, and location, of different households, and allow Māori to express their cultural traditions and norms (a)
- have good accessibility for all people between housing, jobs, community services, natural spaces, and open spaces, including by way of public or active transport (c)
- support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions (e).

- [37] This is reinforced by the guidance on the NPS-UD responsive planning policies which states that proposed developments need to be well connected along transport corridors and:

*“Ideally, developments under this policy will be transit-orientated with mixed land uses and densities. This would enable genuine transport choices and less reliance on private vehicles”.*

- [38] Environment Canterbury notes that the factsheet published by MfE on well-functioning urban environments provides guidance on the application of Policy 1, including:

- a. that the term ‘accessibility’ in Policy 1 refers to the ease and cost of accessing opportunities (e.g. amenity, employment) across an urban area.
- b. that the outcomes referenced in the well-functioning urban environments policy are interrelated and need to be considered together – for example, housing and transport choices that relate to Policies 1(a) and 1(c) have an impact on greenhouse gas emissions, policy 1(e).
- c. that the well-functioning urban environments policy is central to the NPS-UD and is to be read alongside other key policies, such as the intensification and responsive planning policies.

#### *Well-connected along transport corridors*

- [39] To trigger the responsiveness policies in the NPS-UD, a proposed development needs to be well connected along transport corridors (ref. clause 3.8 (b)). The MfE guidance on

understanding and implementing the responsive planning policies states that ideally the transport corridors should be connected via a range of transport modes or there should be plans for this in the future. At a minimum, the corridors should be designed to allow for a range of modes in the future. The guidance further states that, if possible, people should not need to rely solely on private vehicles to travel within a proposed development, to and/or from other urban areas, or to access essential services like employment, and health or community services. The well-functioning urban environment and well connected along transport corridors criteria together signal the importance of considering the location of a proposed development in relation to other areas and amenities, relative accessibility and transport infrastructure and / or options, when assessing unplanned development proposals such as this proposed plan change.

*Alignment with other objectives and policies in the NPS-UD*

[40] The proposed plan change does not give effect to a number of other key objectives and policies in the NPS-UD, including but not limited to:

- Objective 6(a)-(b) of the NPS-UD is that local authority decisions on urban development that affect urban environments are integrated with infrastructure planning and funding decisions, and strategic over the medium and long term.
- Objective 8(a) is that NZ's urban environments support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions. This is supported by Policy 1(e), which identifies that well-functioning urban environments are those that (among other outcomes), support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.
- Policy 6 sets out matters decisions makers must have particular regard to when making planning decisions that affect urban environments. These matters include (a) the planned urban built form anticipated by RMA planning documents that have given effect to the NPS, and (c) the benefits of urban development that are consistent with well-functioning urban environments (as described in Policy 1).

[41] As outlined above, Our Space 2018-2048 identifies sufficient development capacity to meet anticipated housing needs for Greater Christchurch. Periodic capacity assessments and reviews of this future development strategy are the appropriate mechanisms to ensure local authorities continue to meet such obligations under the NPS-UD. The proposed plan change draws attention to wording in the NPS-UD which states that local authorities provide 'at least' sufficient development capacity to meet expected demand.

[42] This point needs to be balanced with other responsibilities and functions of local authorities (for example Section 30(1)(ba) and (gb) of the RMA) that require the strategic integration and an efficient and effective provision of infrastructure. Oversupply of land for urban development may support competition in land and development markets but could equally undermine urban form objectives, delay development in growth and urban regeneration areas already identified through the CRPS and thereby underutilise the associated supporting infrastructure in these locations.

## **Conclusion**

- [43] In summary, for the reasons set out above, the proposed plan change is inconsistent with policy direction in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the strategic sub-regional land use and infrastructure planning framework for Greater Christchurch.
- [44] Environment Canterbury also does not consider it has been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed plan change will add significantly to development capacity or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, nor has it been demonstrated that the proposal is, or will be, well connected.

## **The decision we would like the Council to make is:**

Decline the plan change in its entirety.

Without prejudice to the relief sought that the plan change be declined in its entirety, if the plan change is not declined Environment Canterbury seeks changes to the plan change to address issues raised in this submission.

**We wish to speak in support of our submission at the hearing on this plan change.**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'AP', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

**Andrew Parrish**

**Planning Section Manager**

(Authorised under delegation from the Canterbury Regional Council)

Date 03/05/2021

**From:** [Tammy Phillips](#)  
**To:** [Submissions](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Environment Canterbury Submission on Plan Change 73 PC73-0049  
**Date:** Tuesday, 4 May 2021 11:33:46 a.m.

---

Hi Tina,

My apologies! I have responded below:

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission:

~~Yes~~/No

Thanks and warm regards,

Tammy

---

**From:** Submissions <submissions@selwyn.govt.nz>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, 4 May 2021 11:30 AM  
**To:** Tammy Phillips <Tammy.Phillips@ecan.govt.nz>  
**Subject:** RE: Environment Canterbury Submission on Plan Change 73 PC73-0049

Hi Tammy,

Environment Canterbury's submission on Plan Change 73 (ref PC73-0049) has been assessed for completeness under the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991. Your submission was missing the following information:

Trade competition declaration

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission:

Yes/No

For the Selwyn District Council to accept this submission please complete the questions above by reply of this email.

Nga mihi,

**Tina Van Der Velde**  
DISTRICT PLAN ADMINISTRATOR

**DDI:** (03) 347 1814  
**Web:** [www.selwyn.govt.nz](http://www.selwyn.govt.nz)



---

**From:** Tammy Phillips [<mailto:Tammy.Phillips@ecan.govt.nz>]  
**Sent:** Monday, 3 May 2021 4:13 p.m.