

## INTRODUCTION

My name is Patricia Harte. I am a land use planner and have assisted the applicants with preparation of the private Plan Change 78 (PC78) request to the operative Selwyn District Plan.

The following summarizes my evidence provided to this hearing as well as commenting on additional matters that have arisen.

---

## PLANNING RESPONSE

Plan Change 78 is a simple request for rezoning of land in east Rolleston for residential purposes. No new provisions are proposed or sought other than a change to the planning maps in the District Plan and the inclusion of a specific outline development plan to apply to the land being rezoned.

In my opinion PC78 is a **logical planning response** to provide for the growth of Rolleston and in particular to provide for more housing to meet existing and future demand.

There have been numerous assessments of demand and available capacity for housing by central, regional, and local government, the Greater Christchurch Partnership, economists and property analysts. In relation to Rolleston many of these assessments for the short-medium term have underestimated demand which has increased despite earthquake demand being very largely fulfilled.

Until relatively recently Rolleston has been in a position to provide lower cost sections enabling thousands of new houses to be established. This has been positive for the population of Greater Christchurch especially those who needed to relocate as a result of the earthquakes.

The economic assessments prepared for the applicants and the evidence of Mr. Sellars (valuer) conclude that there is now an unmet demand in Rolleston with all land zoned or otherwise authorised either having already been developed or sold for housing. This means that the short term demand (0-3 years) cannot be met let alone the medium term demand (3-10 years). This shortfall has resulted in significant price increases making sections and housing increasing unaffordable for many people and households.

To date the various planning regimes have been lagging in responding to this issue with no new zonings being proposed for Rolleston or the Selwyn District. PC78 is therefore a positive step forward enabling an extension of the Living Z zone in east Rolleston.

---

## SITE SUITABILITY

The PC78 site is very well suited to provide for an extension of the Living Z zone in Rolleston. In particular:

- a. Its location ensures that the residential area can seamlessly extend to the west noting
  - To the west PC78 adjoins **Acland Park** (which is a substantial residential development that is currently built up to the northern half of the western boundary of PC78, including a new primary school. The remaining southern area of Acland Park is undergoing construction and is anticipated to be completed with the next 8 months.
  - To the north PC78 adjoins proposed **Plan Change75** also providing for Living Z zoning.
- b. PC78 has sufficient area (63.35ha) to enable higher densities to be provided for at scale.
- c. The site is provided for in Master Planning “Future Growth Staging for Rolleston” in the Long Term Plan ensuring that it will be able to be serviced in the future.
- d. The site is within an area recognised by numerous spatial policies and planning documents as suitable for the growth of Rolleston i.e.
  - PC78 is within the **Projected Infrastructure Boundary** and now **Future Development Area** as provided for in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement. These areas are specifically identified as areas to accommodate greenfield growth.
  - It is within the **Rolleston Structure Plan** (2009) areas to provide for medium term growth
  - PC78 is within the **Urban Growth Overlay** in the Proposed Selwyn District Plan effectively future-proofing this site for future residential development.
- e. The rezoning is consistent with the RMA and relevant national, regional and district policies and plans as set out in detail in my evidence in paragraphs 6.4 to 6.44.

---

## OUTLINE DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The outline development plan for PC78 contains the basic elements of the development area including connections with adjoining areas. Some of these elements and their identification have been refined through the process of preparing the plan change request and responding to the section 42A reports.

Very recently we have been supplied with a Joint Officer Summary Statement which summarizes their position in relation to some ODP matters. My response to the proposed amendments is as follows and I attach a revised ODP including these amendments;

**Item i** - Frontage upgrades – We are happy to adopt the recommended change to the ODP text relating frontage upgrades.

**Items ii, iv** – We agree to remove the reference to “indicative” for the primary and secondary routes. However we have used the term for the possible access links to the corner block which adjoins the PC78 site as this is the term proposed by Ms. Wolfer in **items v and viii**.

**Items iii, vi, ix-xi, xiii** – no amendments suggested by Officers

**Item v** – Agree to add indicative links through to the corner block

**Item vii** – Firstly I note that the “Officer Recommendation” column refers to the north-south road however the “Officer position” addresses east-west cycle route. We agree to relocation of the cycle link from the secondary east –west route to the primary route.

**Item ix** –I consider reverse sensitivity is a difficult matter to address in an ODP. This is because reverse sensitivity requires a response from people affected by an activity and that response is very likely to result in the activity having to shut down or change significantly. The adverse effect of concern in this situation is the impact on the farmer, not the residents. Added to this is the fact that the relationship between the owners and occupiers of the residential and rural land is likely to change over time and so cannot be presumed. I have therefore propose the following simple reference in the ODP text relating to urban design:-

*Neighbouring productive activities may also need to be taken into account when investigating subdivision layout and design.*

---

## SUBMISSIONS

There are no submissions opposing the proposed rezoning. **Sam Carrick** made a further submission relating to versatile soils but it is not clear what relief is sought.

The **Christchurch City Council** submission raises the matter of what is the appropriate minimum density requirement for this (and other) plan change areas. The **Canterbury Regional Council** seeks that housing densities are linked to capacity assessments. I consider at this stage that the 12 households per hectare proposed in PC78 is an appropriate minimum while acknowledging that applying a minimum density over a large area is a coarse control. However I note that since preparing my evidence a draft RMA (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Bill has been released. This adds another dimension to consideration of density in residential zones. In these circumstances I consider that there is probably little point in refining the current Living Z rules for this greenfield site as it will soon be subject to a plan change under this proposed new legislation.

The **Canterbury Regional Council** also wants the Council to ensure “timely and effective public transport provision to and through the site”. The PC78 roading pattern and road widths provide for efficient bus routes.

**Robin Shultz** rightly points out that the ability to develop the properties within the plan change area is highly dependent on the cooperation from all the land owners. He then seeks that an agreement administered by the Selwyn District Council requiring a developer agreement addressing the sharing of development costs. He proposes that this be put into place via a decision on PC78 requiring a condition on subdivision consents. While I appreciate his concern, I understand that it is not possible

for a District Plan to specify what conditions are to be placed on a subdivision consent. I also doubt whether a Council can insist on private developer agreements being entered into.

I also note that Urban Estates already have unconditional agreements to purchase 9 properties which equates to approximately 44ha of the 63 ha in total on the PC78 site. This indicates to me that the issue of having multiple owners is not as great as may have been anticipated.

---

## CONCLUSION

I agree with the conclusions reached in the 42A Report of Mr. Friedel and his recommendation that Plan Change 78 be granted. In particular I agree that:

- It will promote the social and economic wellbeing of current and future residents of Rolleston and potentially greater Christchurch by providing more land for residential development
  - It is located within an area identified for growth in the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement and the Proposed District Plan
  - It gives effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development 2020, and
  - It is the most efficient method of promptly achieving the outcome of additional land for residential development in Rolleston
-