

3. †I seek the following decision from Selwyn District Council: Decline the applications in their entirety and Retain the status quo.

†Give precise details, including the nature of any change sought. Continue on a separate sheet if necessary.

4. I WISH / ~~DO NOT WISH~~ to be heard in support of my submission (delete as applicable)
5. If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing ✓
(delete if you would not consider presenting a joint case)

6. M. D. Greebel 05/09/10
Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on their behalf) Date

7. Address for service of submitter: 113 Edwards Road
R.D. 7 CHRISTCHURCH 7677.

Telephone: 3479807 Fax: _____

Email: mal.greebel@xtra.co.nz

Contact person: self Title MR (if appropriate)

SUBMISSIONS CLOSE AT 5PM FRIDAY 10th SEPTEMBER 2010

Responses to be:

Posted to:

Craig Friedel, Policy Planner
Selwyn District Council
P.O. Box 90
Rolleston
Christchurch 7643

Delivered to:

A Council Service Centre in Darfield,
Lincoln, Leeston or Rolleston

Emailed to:

submissions@selwyn.govt.nz

Submission in Opposition to PC8 and PC9

1: Old 1KM Rule:

The Selwyn Plantation Board (S.P.B.) was a submitter wishing to retain the old "1Km Rule" for housing development in the Selwyn District. Their submissions and those of similar ilk were declined by the Commissioners for excellent reasons given in their written decision. I fully support that decision and submit that the reasoning given applies equally here.

The Selwyn Plantation Board missed out on that occasion and its current application for PC8 and PC9 is an underhand way to bypass such decision.

No-one should be able to build a dwelling in that 1km area from the current urban boundaries, as decided by the Commissioners.

2: Role of the Selwyn Plantation Board:

This Board had areas in the Burnham/Rolleston areas (including those off Dunns Crossing Road) planted in pine plantations. Kind of goes with their name of course! For various reasons they ripped those trees out and chiefly re-pastured for dairy cattle. It would appear that they had no thought as to the effect the removing of trees without their being replaced has on our environment when taking into account global warming. Although it is not in the domain of the S.D.C. to rule of course, but the S.D.C. should never-the-less take into account that the S.P.B. should be using this land for other, environmentally friendly, purposes such as replanting of trees, re-pasturing for cattle.

3: Our Environment:

My wife and I purchased our property of 13.2ha because it was in a secluded, quiet country area with no nearby neighbours. I had been a Detective Inspector and after an at-times hectic police career, just wanted somewhere to enjoy a quiet lifestyle. Now that we are retired, we appreciate our current environment even more and want it kept as is. The erection of dwellings just over the paddocks from us will adversely effect our environment; looking at houses instead of just paddocks with cattle grazing; the sounds emitted from housing such as lawnmowers, vehicles, people, music and the likes. The size of the sections upon which those houses are built will not stop such pollution of our environment. One solution for us would of course be to have the S.P.B. erect one of those dirt embankments at least 4metres high (similar to those in other Rolleston sub-divisions) running all the way along the proposed boundary with the current privately owned paddocks and adjacent to the current stock water race.

4: Greater Urban Development Strategy:

The above Strategy was formulated and accepted after considerable input from a very wide range of organisations and people. This Strategy very clearly marks the boundary

as being Dunns Crossing Road which at law means of course a line drawn down the middle of such. So PC's 8 and 9 are contrary to that widely accepted Strategy and accordingly should be dismissed.

There is currently, nor in the foreseeable future, any shortfall in the provision of housing in the Rolleston area as defined by that Strategy. Should the S.P.B. succeed with their proposals, then there would be no certainty to landowners and the community as to the extent of the urban boundary which there is currently following the above Strategy.

5: Precedent:

I am aware of landowners in the very near vicinity to Dunns Crossing Road who are awaiting the decision of the S.D.C. re P.C.'s 8 and 9 because if these changes succeed, then they too will be seeking boundary changes etc., so that they too can subdivide along the same lines. *Criticism of the S.D.C. in the past has been about the unstructured nature of subdivisions in the area.* Currently the boundaries for housing are very neat, clear and accepted by most. By permitting PC 8 and 9, the S.D.C. would be introducing an *amoeba-effect* to these boundaries not just as a result of the S.P.B. applications BUT as a result of everyone else who quite rightly would then be in a position to make similar applications which would have to be likewise approved.

6: P.C.9..Affect On Current Adjacent Property Owners Occupiers:

Dairy cattle are farmed on the land between Edwards and Dunns Crossing Roads and bordering the land owned by the S.P.B. This of course is in exact keeping with the current zoning. There is also the Tegal chicken "factories" in the same area. This land is also downstream from the Pines Sewage Treatment Plant and the Selwyn District Rubbish Transfer Plant. Put housing near these and you also put in place potential "nuisance complaint" problems. From my Police career knowledge and no doubt common knowledge from members of the public, people will willingly and knowingly erect houses next to such sites and then once established, start complaints about such operations. I make in point the houses which were erected in Riccarton many years after the Carpet Factory began operation. The factory was there, people built houses nearby, occupied these and then began making formal complaints about the noise annoying them due to the factory operation. Look at Ruapuna Raceway as an even more recent and closer example.

If P.C. 9 is granted, people will eventually complain about such things as:

- ...cattle mooing at night.
- ...bulls mating calls
- ...the click-clack of irrigation machinery operating 20 hours or more per day
- ...sounds associated with the making of hay, silage and the likes which is frequently carried out at night
- ...the dust caused by the many large transport trucks travelling along shingled Edwards Road

...the “dust” of fertilisers and lime drifting over their properties as they are applied by contractors
...the smell of cattle dung and silage/baleage
...smells from the chicken “factory” and the noises from the operation of such “factory.”
...alleged problems from the rubbish transfer and the Pines sewage operations.

Just to name a few!!! These will undoubtedly happen.

Then from the cattle owner’s point of view:

...the safety of their stock from the dogs which will live on such properties
...the safety of their stock from people throwing vegetation over their fences into the paddocks such vegetation unknowingly being noxious to stock.
...simple trespassing causing associated problems
...receiving complaints as above

Grant the application and the S.D.C. accordingly “open up a can of worms” beyond any doubt. The results will be a problem not only for the landowners/occupiers but also for the local New Zealand Police and the S.D.C. who will have to deal with them. Leave well enough alone!

7: Alternative Use of the Land in Question:

The Selwyn Plantation Board should follow their “Nature and Scope of Activities” as per their web site and not become property developers but use this land for which they were established:

Trees
Farming

Currently the S.D.C. has an application before Environment Canterbury to increase dramatically the use of its Pines Sewage Treatment Plant operation. It also has an application to increase the land area over which the allegedly treated effluent is spread. Should the S.D.C. application succeed, then eventually there will undoubtedly be a request for a further expansion of its operation as even more people than planned come and live in the district. This land should be farmed until such time and of course that land would then also be available for the spreading of the additional allegedly treated effluent. Put houses there and you negate such future opportunity.

8: Current Land Use in Vicinity:

The land in the Edwards Road/ Dunns Crossing Road vicinity consists of Lismore loam. It is “light” land as opposed to clay type land. It does not retain water and for this reason is a major asset to nearby dairy farmers who have “heavy” soil which is winter water logged: they use this land for winter grazing purposes accordingly. This land is most

sought after by these farmers who will undoubtedly have to go elsewhere due to the problems which will arise with adjacent housing development as I have detailed above. These farmers have been here for years and should be able to continue problem-free as is their current situation, a situation protected by the current rules and regulations.

The old plantation land of course would be most suitable for this winter grazing and summer grazing under irrigation for cattle; the irrigation in conjunction with effluent spread from the Pines site as detailed earlier.

9: Buffer Zone:

This proposed Living 3 Zone is not needed and especially not as some form of merging zone between the rural and urban boundaries. There are several houses already along Brookside Road, Edwards Road, the western side of Dunns Crossing Road whose existence negates the necessity of such blending of zones.

10: Conclusion:

Quite clearly I am strongly opposed to these applications from the Selwyn Plantation Board and request that the Selwyn District Council reject them in their entirety leaving, for the reasons stated above, the status quo.

.....
