

11 February 2021

Dunweavin 2020 Ltd  
c/- Aston Consultants  
PO Box 1432  
CHRISTCHURCH 8140

Attention: Fiona Aston

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

Dear Fiona,

**PC200076: Private Plan Change Request to the Operative Selwyn District Plan from Dunweavin 2020 Limited in Rolleston – Request for further information**

Thank you for your application lodged on behalf of Dunweavin 2020 Limited requesting a change to the Operative Selwyn District Plan. In accordance with Clause 23 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991, the following information is requested to enable Council to better evaluate the potential effects of the proposal, the ways in which adverse effects may be mitigated and the nature of consultation undertaken.

**Support for Plan Change and Consultation Outcomes**

1. Please provide evidence that the owners of the properties subject to the plan change are party to, or supportive of, the request.
2. Please also document any consultation the applicant may have undertaken with Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited in relation to the plan change request.

**National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020 (NPS-UD)**

3. This Plan Change is heavily reliant on the NPS-UD to address the conflict with the Regional Policy Statement, particularly CRPS Objectives 6.2.1 and 6.2.2.5, and their associated policies.
4. The request relies on Policy 8 of the NPS-UD, in that it would add significantly to development capacity. In Appendix 10, when responding to this policy, as well as to Policy 6, it is stated that the request will add *“an additional 3% over and above existing zoned supply”*. Please set out how this percentage figure has been derived.
5. There are a significant number of plan change requests currently lodged with Council, most of which propose to provide significantly more capacity than this plan change request. However, in the absence of criteria at this time in the CRPS, guidance<sup>1</sup> from the Ministry for the Environment suggest that factors that can help to determine significant development capacity include

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.mfe.govt.nz/sites/default/files/media/Towns%20and%20cities/Understanding-and-implementing-responsive-planning-policies.pdf>

significance of scale and location; fulfilling identified demand; timing of development and infrastructure provision (development infrastructure and additional infrastructure).

6. To address the provisions of Policy 8, please provide further analysis that considers the contribution that the proposed plan changes may make to development capacity against the other factors suggested by Ministry for the Environment.
7. 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.

### **Scope of Plan Change**

8. In Appendix 9, in response to UD-P13, it is stated that the proposal is inconsistent with Map A of Chapter 6 [of the RPS] *"but is consistent with the approach of the NPS-UD for significant development capacity if it is added to the adjoining Plan Change 70"*. This plan change request, as well as that of PC70, are currently being considered separately, as individual requests. Please advise if there is any intention that the two plan changes be combined into one or consider revising this statement.

### **Infrastructure**

9. As previously mentioned, there are a significant number of plan change requests currently lodged with Council, and consideration is required to be given to the position of key movement linkages and reserves between this plan change, the existing environment and other plan change requests. Details of other plan changes can be found on Council's website<sup>2</sup>.

### **Reserves**

10. The plan change request has been reviewed by Council's Manager – Open Space and Property.
11. The ODP shows a single recreation reserve at the northern end of the development area and the request documents mention *"creating a landscape feature for the development by creating a neighbourhood park"*. However, it does not appear that consideration has been given to the provisions of open space in the surrounding area, including the location of an existing reserve on Chris Drive to the north. The proposed location exceeds the Council's distribution criteria of 500m and, as such, the location of the proposed reserve as shown on the ODP is not supported. However, a neighbourhood reserve (of around 2,000 m<sup>2</sup>) is desirable in this area, but this should be more centrally located and ideally be next to medium density areas. Given this, please either:
  - a. provide an assessment as to why this location was chosen or the rationale for its need and position; or
  - b. amend the application as per the above comment.
12. Please also provide a landscape assessment incorporating an open space assessment.

---

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.selwyn.govt.nz/property-And-building/planning/strategies-and-plans/selwyn-district-plan/plan-changes>

## Transport

13. The Integrated Transport Assessment provided with the plan change request was reviewed by Council's Asset Manager – Transportation.
14. Please provide a network safety assessment and specific traffic/SIDRA analysis associated with the existing East Maddisons/Goulds Road intersection. An upgrade of this intersection, to a future roundabout, is planned for 2029/30 which should then coincide or thereabouts with the extension of Shillingford Blvd (CRETS Collector Rd) through to Dunns Crossing Rd. Therefore, while the current intersection arrangement may be sustainable if development proceeds ahead of the proposed upgrade, any assessment should include cumulative effects.
15. While the proposed ODP appears to be reasonable based on the main roading connections on their own, there are concerns in relation to how the local network and further connections to East Maddisons Road will practically work. In the proposed subdivision layout included in the request, a road/intersection (which appears to have the same status as the main ODP roads) is positioned too close to the realigned section of East Maddisons Road/Goulds Rd Intersection, as shown below. Please revise the ODP to avoid this type of outcome at any subsequent subdivision consent stage.



16. Please review the ODP to address walking and cycling connections through the area.
17. A review of the Yellow line timetable would indicate that it takes upwards of an hour to make the journey from Rolleston to the bus interchange in the centre of the city, and longer to make the trip from the City to Rolleston. Similarly, the timetable for the 85 Rolleston direct service, which runs three times a day, takes between 45 and 50 minutes to make the trip in and out of the City. Please provide evidence to support the assertion in paragraphs 30 and 67 that the standard bus trip between Rolleston and the City takes 37 minutes, and the express takes 30 minutes.
18. The road design criteria referred to in Section 4.1.2 Table 1 of the infrastructure report (included at Appendix 3 of the request documents) is inconsistent with the standards set out in Appendix E13 of the Operative District Plan. Given this, please either:
  - a. provide an assessment of this variance in terms of its effect on plan integrity in terms of different road design standards; or
  - b. amend the application to be consistent with the Operative District Plan provisions.

## Water

19. The Infrastructure Assessment provided with the application was reviewed by Council's Asset Manager – Water Services.

### *Note:*

- i. The proposed Plan Change area is bounded by undeveloped land. Wastewater pipelines may need to be installed at greater depth and size to service areas outside the proposed Plan Change area. Developer lead infrastructure may be required under an Infrastructure cost share agreement. Please confirm that this is a viable option should it be required.*

## **Urban Design**

20. The plan change has been reviewed by Council's Senior Urban Designer and it is requested that an urban design and landscaping statement be supplied which provides a contextual analysis of the site, its characteristics and its surrounds, including consideration of the constraints and opportunities of the wider area.
21. Please clarify how the request will provide "*affordable housing, which is currently undersupplied*", as stated at paragraph 3(g).

## **Mahaanui Iwi Management Plan**

22. At paragraph 166, the request states that "*the plan change seeks to include landscaping within the reserves, and in road corridors adding to the overall biodiversity of the Canterbury Plains consistent with Chapter 5.5 of the MIMP*". Please identify if the existing framework within the Operative District Plan is sufficient to achieve the statement above.
23. At paragraph 168, the request states that "*the plan change has been designed taking into consideration the potential effects of resultant subdivision and development on the rivers and streams that flow into Te Waihora/Lake Ellesmere*". Please identify if the existing framework within the Operative District Plan is sufficient to achieve the statement above.

## **Operative District Plan**

24. Please consider if it is appropriate that Policy B4.3.9, which specifically references the number of Living Z areas within Rolleston, and Policies B4.3.63 and B4.3.77, which identify the specific matters relevant to each ODP area, be amended to reflect the plan change request. If so, please provide text for inclusion in the Operative District Plan.
25. At paragraph 50 it is stated that there will be no hazardous installations. Is this proposed to be managed by existing rules within the District Plan, or are specific provisions required to support this statement?
26. Please confirm that the plan change seeks to adopt the existing Living Z (Rolleston) sizes set out in Table C12.1 in the Operative District Plan.

### *Note:*

- ii. Through the Proposed District Plan process, Council is seeking to establish a consistent ODP design with an approach to minimise features on an ODP and utilise assessment considerations in supporting text. While this is a request to change the Operative District*

*Plan, please be aware that alignment of the ODP design may be sought as this request progresses.*

### **Geotechnical Assessment**

27. The Geotechnical Assessment provided with the plan change request was peer reviewed on behalf of Council by Ian McCahon of Geotech Consulting Limited and this is attached for your information.
28. It is requested that, in order to provide a better basis for accepting the geotechnical suitability of the site for the purpose of the plan change, the following is requested:
  - provide data of the well logs (the well reference number and location relative to the site) used to verify the shallow gravel found in the site tests is continuous for many metres.
  - confirmation that the equivalent Foundation Technical Category is TC1.
  - An outline of whether any hazards identified in s106 of the RMA are present or not and, if they are, how they may be mitigated.
29. At paragraph 56, please clarify which recommendations, from which report, are being referred to. Please advise if any recommendation requires specific measure to be incorporated into the District Plan to support those recommendations.

### **Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) Report**

30. The PSI report provided with the plan change request was peer reviewed on behalf of Council by Environment Canterbury.
31. The PSI indicates that the various properties are, or have been, used for keeping horses and the photographs appear to show a horse training arena on Lot 2 DP 74311, as well as one possibly also on Lot 3 DP 74311. However the PSI has not discussed the material used to line the horse training arena/s. As areas are occasionally lined with ash or material of unknown origins, please provide an amendment to the PSI that addresses this matter.

*Note:*

- iii. Should the plan change request be approved, a Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) will be required over all the identified HAIL areas of the site. If the DSI identifies contamination that exceeds the soil contaminant standards for residential use, then a Remedial Action Plan will be required, remedial works will be required to be undertaken as per the plan, and a Site Validation Report will be required to be submitted to council confirming that the site is suitable for residential use.*

### **Section 32 Assessment**

32. Please review the statement in relation to a cost of Option 3 is that it would contribute some commuter traffic from a portion of the anticipated 155 households as a yield of this nature is inconsistent with the Living 3 zoning option proposed by Option 3.
33. Please clarify the statement in relation to a benefit of Option 2, being rezoning the whole site to Living Z, would provide for a “*greater choice in typology than currently available*”.

34. Please clarify how the following are 'benefits' to Option 3, being rezoning to Living 3 – it being *“consistent with the Future Development Area status under Our Space Greater Christchurch Settlement Update but not the current RPS”* and *“ODP provides overall plan of integrated land development for smaller site”*.
35. Please identify any risks of acting or not acting in relation to the plan change area specifically, rather than more broadly in terms of the wider township.

#### **Amendments to Request Documents**

36. Please amend the request documents as follows:
  - a. ensure that the correct title references are shown in Table 1;
  - b. amend the signature block on page 2 from Trices Road Rezoning Group to Dunweavin 2020 Ltd;
  - c. provide titles for all properties included in the plan change request;
  - d. amend Figure 2 to correctly reference other private plan changes currently before Council;
  - e. amend paragraph 10 to remove reference to Living 3 as this is not part of the request;
  - f. amend paragraphs 20 and 24, and elsewhere as required, to ensure that the request reflects the nomenclature used in the Operative District Plan, rather than the Proposed District Plan;
  - g. correct the reference to Living 3 at paragraph 68 to reflect the current zoning of the site;
  - h. correct the reference to Figure 7 in paragraph 69 – the preceding text references the Our Space, however the reference points to the Rolleston Structure Plan;
  - i. consider the relevance of paragraph 135 to this plan change request;
  - j. correct the reference in paragraph 152 that the plan change is not within an Urban Growth Overlay within the Proposed District Plan;
  - k. renumber the paragraphs referring to the Rolleston Structure Plan (paragraphs 129-134) as they are out of sequence with the proceeding and following paragraphs;
  - l. in Appendix 6, in response to Objectives 5.3.7 and 6.2.2, correct the street name - Maddisons Road and East Maddisons Road are two different locations in Selwyn;
  - m. in Appendix 7, in response to Objective 3.23, clarify the contradiction between the first and second sentences with regard to the quality of soils within the plan change area;
  - n. in Appendix 8:
    - i. consider the appropriateness of including reference to the Proposed District Plan on page 6 when responding to the assessment of the plan change request against the provisions of the Operative District Plan;
    - ii. provide an assessment of the request against the policies for Rolleston, rather than Prebbleton;
  - o. in Appendix 9, in response to UG-P13, amend as appropriate the reference to DEV-PR3;
  - p. in Appendix 11, paragraph 8(b), consider if the reference to the future District Park is relevant in the context of this request.

#### **Process from here**

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 1809 or [jocelyn.lewes@selwyn.govt.nz](mailto:jocelyn.lewes@selwyn.govt.nz) if you have any questions.

Yours faithfully  
SELWYN DISTRICT COUNCIL

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'J Lewes'. The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looping initial 'J'.

Jocelyn Lewes  
**Strategy and Policy Planner**