

## **Submission on PC 79 Tom and Helen Fraser**

### **Introduction:**

My wife Helen and I bought our property at 198 Birchs Road in 1970. Our property is part of the land within Plan Change (PC) 79. At date of purchase, it was a bare block with no buildings or trees. The land was in lucerne with a small area of blackcurrants.

We purchased this land after much deliberation as we wanted a property that we would be able to develop meet our requirements to bring up our family in a country environment but still within easy commuting distance of schools and other amenities. One of the main reasons for selecting this property was that it had great views not only of the Port Hills to the east but also to Mt Hutt and the foot hills of the Southern Alps to the West. We selected a building site well back from the road to reduce any traffic noise and all the plantings undertaken have maintained our views to both east and west.

In selecting this location, we took into account that it was around mid-way between Prebbleton Village and Lincoln Township as we didn't want to be "built out" by any future urban subdivisions.

The long-term plan when buying the property and all developments carried over the following 52 years to the present date have been with an intention of staying on the property for the remainder of our life. Our intentions are that one of our Grandchildren will take over our property when we eventually "move on" and they will be able to bring up their children in a rural environment with all the advantages that that brings with it.

We would also like to point out that we are the longest-term residents within the proposed subdivision and that the applicant has only had their property for some 6 years and is not living on the site.

We find it incomprehensible that someone can apply to subdivide our land without our consent.

**We oppose the application (PC 79) that seeks a change to the Operative Selwyn District Plan by rezoning approximately 37 hectares of current rural land in Prebbleton to residential land.**

For this submission we object to the Plan Change under the following headings:

Location/Connectivity

Supply and Demand

Traffic congestion

Amenities

General

### **Location/Connectivity**

The proposed site has very poor connection with the existing Prebbleton Village. If the proposed PC was to be approved this would create a "Satellite Dormitory" township with no physical connection to the existing Prebbleton Village.

From Applicant

Private Plan Change Request

Point 4.7      Application Site Details (page 12)

*The application site is located south of the existing Prebbleton Township (Hamptons Road) and west of Birchs Road (see Figure 7). The site adjoins the existing township boundaries to the north, on the opposite side of Hamptons Road, the Birchs Road Reserve and rural land to the east and smaller rural land holdings to the west and a larger contiguous rural land holding to the south*

The above statement gives a very biased and unbalanced description of the proposed site.

The land to the North of Hamptons Road is zoned LLRZ and has section size of around 0.5 ha. The immediate property on the North side of Hamptons Road is a 3 ha. property owned by Orion and my understanding is that they intend maintain this site for future development.

The closest residential housing on Hamptons Road (zoned LLRZ) is at least 200 metres from the nearest point of PC 79 and the nearest GRZ zone housing is over 500 metres away. All the remaining boundaries to PC 79 are zoned Prebbleton Domain or Inner Plains ranging in size from 4 to over 50ha.

*Birchs Road Reserve and rural land to the east*

There is a lot of mention of the new Birchs Road Reserve in the application. The frontage of the Reserve with Birchs Road is mainly a large car park and a changing shed with “service areas to the north and south of the road frontage. Not the most attractive outlook. From Birchs road the ka reserve has the appearance of a large car park with a concrete block building. It is not till you view the reserve from Leadleys road that that you can appreciate the potential of this amenity. The remainder of the land to the east is zoned Inner Plains.

*a larger contiguous rural land holding to the south*

The 50-ha property is an established market garden enterprise and as such would generate significant “reverse sensitivity” issues including machinery noise and chemical spraying. These operations are often carried out in the early mornings and late evenings

The total boundary length for PC 79 covers around 2330 metres made up of the following:

120 m. or 5% across Hamptons Road and is the 3ha. Orion property.

500 m. or 20% across Birchs Road from the Domain

With the remaining 75%, farm land and is zoned Inner Plains

If this Plan Change is approved it will extend the existing 50km/hour speed limit south on Birchs road by 1.4 kms.

**Kakaha Park.**

The Applicant states many times in their submission how the PC will tie in with the Kakaha Park To take this argument to its conclusion then it should limit the extent of the development south down Birchs Road to Leadleys Road and then directly west for around 200 m. to include the 3 properties along Birchs Road that are directly across the road from the domain. The current application

continues down Birchs Road past the park for another 300m and then some 900m to the west to include the applicant's property. Some sections would be 1000 m. from the Domain.

Report and recommendations by Hearing Commissioner Paul Thomas for PC 72 30th March 2022

In point 193 he states:

*I agree with Mr Cleese that the build-out of available land, combined with the directions in the NPS UD and the park development are all material changes in both the policy framework and the physical environment since the site was identified for rural residential development. He reports that a key driver of the rural residential strategy was to locate very low-density development in township edge locations where rural residential dwellings would form a transition or edge to the rural area. **This edge outcome is now able to be better provided by the development of the new 22-hectare park which establishes a large and permanent edge to the southern side of Prebbleton.*** (My highlight)

From applicant PC 79

Summary report Page 9

*There are a number of existing dwellings along Hamptons Road and Birchs Road, with the closest residential property approximately 150m from the proposed site boundary.*

The dwelling on 61 Hamptons Road is within 10 m of the boundary of the proposed sub division.

*The proposal lies approximately 1km to the south of Prebbleton Domain and 1.7km to the south of Prebbleton Township.*

These measurements are as the 'crow flies. It would be closer to 2500m by road to the Prebbleton Domain.

*Existing medium density housing is 527m to the north of the site, with a buffer of low-density housing between this, providing an overall rural suburban character.*

Correct. So, the proposal would go from medium density to very low-density housing then back to medium density

If this sub division was to be consented it would create a peninsula town with no immediate connection to the current Prebbleton village.

### **Supply and demand:**

In the applicants' submissions there are many contradictory statements that are difficult to comprehend. As I am not a property expert, I will make comment on the following statements from those that have submitted in evidence for the applicant.

Application for Plan Change PC 79 May 2022

Appendix 4:

Author Blackburn Management Limited. Response for Further Information.

Page 11. *This period of five to ten years reasonably represents the extent of any current and proposed residential development in the District Projected population for **any time frame further out than this is simply subject to too many variables** with respect to changes in the market, the economy and other factors that would influence the residential construction sector. (My highlight)*

Page 18. *Which brings us to Population growth. **Unfortunately, long term predictions (more than ten years) for population growth are almost always wrong.** Simply because there are too many factors and variables that impact on different aspects of the drivers behind the modelled numbers (my highlight)*

The two comments that I have highlighted (page 11 and the above on page 18 of Blackburn submission) point to the difficulty even the “experts” have in predicting housing supply and demand for any time frame greater than 5 to 10 years out. We must not tie up highly productive land for a residential development that may or may not be required in the long term.

#### **Demand:**

Comments on the 2 statements on page 12:of Blackburn report

The Prebbleton population will increase by around 1100 residents between 2021 and 2028. A number of this increase will come from dwellings consented during 2021 and 2022 (perhaps 500 residents) so there will only be around 300 extra dwellings (600 new residents) required up to 2028 to reach the projected target of 1100 new residents.

Fraser Colegrave Insight Economics: Response for Further Information. App: 4

Page 2. *Current and Future Demand for Housing in Prebbleton The economic assessment lodged with the plan change application projects demand for an additional 450 households to 2028, or about 65 new dwellings per annum. This may be conservative, and recent market indicators suggest demand is much stronger than this.*

The Experts state that demand will be around 65 new dwellings per annum

#### **Supply:**

The supply of sections is much easier and more predictable. There have been two new subdivisions approved in Prebbleton in the past 18 months and together with some infills within these developments I estimate there will be around 1500 new sections available.

However I will leave the debate around supply and demand to the experts.

#### **Potential yield of dwellings from PC 79**

From reading the documentation in the application for PC 79 there are several different figures relating to numbers of allotments that would become available if this Plan Change was approved.

In Private Plan Change Request: page 2.

858 allotments of 400 square m

527 allotments of 650 square m.

Then on page 18 Table 2

There are a number of different scenarios ranging from 1600 to 2600 units. For clarity of understanding this PC it should be stated what is the preferred option.

The above numbers are based on an area of 34.26 ha available. This is after taking out the areas for Commercial and Central Reserve. It appears that the submitters have taken the 34.26 ha and divided by the lot size, e.g., 34.26ha. divided by 400 square m gives 858 lots No allowances for roadways.

In Appendix 2 Outline Development Plan:

Page 7.

An area of 24.57 ha is stated.

I conclude that this is the area available for sections after the Commercial and Central Reserve areas are taken out but also the area required for roading. This makes sense to me. Therefore if allotment size is 400 sq m. there would be 614 allotments and at 650 sq m there would be 378. Significantly less than the numbers stated in the Plan Change request.

I may have interpreted these numbers wrongly but if I am correct, I find it difficult to reconcile that all the "experts" except for one have got this wrong.

In the expert evidence submitted on April 17 2023 I cannot find any reference to the number of allotments this PC would yield.

The number of allotments that a PC will yield should be one of the most important factors when considering a PC. If my calculations are correct then most of the recommendations made throughout the evidence will need to be corrected as they are based on incorrect data.

#### **Availability of Sections in Prebbleton:**

The applicant refers to the lack of sections available in Prebbleton and Selwyn District. Appendix 4 page 22. *Currently there are no residential sections available in*

*Prebbleton*

This was at May 2021. There are now a number of sections available in Prebbleton, even though there have been no new subdivisions that have been developed over this period. This indicates the change that there has been in demand over this period. On Trademe on April 22<sup>nd</sup> there were a number of sections advertised with one section priced at more than \$40 000 below valuation.

The number of houses for sale in Prebbleton is now significantly more (and taking longer to sell) than were available when this document was prepared indicating that the demand has fallen.

Further evidence of the slowdown in the property market in Selwyn is as follows

PC 81

Garry Sellars Summary of Evidence September 2022

*6. The land market in Rolleston in 2021 exhibited a dysfunctional market where there was virtually no supply or choice with uncompetitive market practices being adopted by vendors resulting in extreme price escalation.*

*7. Developers and real estate agents report there is now reduced enquiry, with marketability poor for all but titled lots. Off-plans section purchases are also low*

### Supply and Demand Balance:

There is a lot of mention made of always having many more sections available than the demand to keep prices affordable. While I understand the reasoning behind this, if the balance is too much in the favour of excess section available this defeats the purpose of the Medium Density Housing legislation. By continuing to develop highly productive land to make more sections available defeats the purpose of the Highly Productive Land legislation.

### Traffic Assessment:

Traffic in the Prebbleton area has significantly increased in the past 10 years. Many of the intersections on the arterial roads have now reached the dangerous state. While the impact of traffic from the proposed PC 79 is not the cause of the current traffic state it will only add to the existing problems.

We have difficulty in understanding the raft of numbers and tables associated with the traffic Appendix's. We have documented information from the current submission along with information from previous PCs and from the traffic count numbers available on the SDC web page.

PC 79

Appendix 6 Integrated Traffic Assessment: Lisa Williams

Assumed approximately 600 residential sections plus commercial.

*Traffic counts:*

<i>5/11/20 Birchs Road</i>	<i>/</i>	<i>4422 trips</i>
<i>11/02/21 Hamptons Road</i>		<i>329 trips</i>
<i>No date Leadleys Road</i>		<i>1174 total trips</i>

Traffic counts from previous PC applications:

Lisa Williams Nova Group Limited:	6/05/2020 New Birchs Road Domain. Evidence
<i>Birchs Road as approximately</i>	<i>5,319 vehicles per day</i>
<i>Leadleys Road as approximately</i>	<i>685 vehicles per day.</i>

Looking at these 2 sets of traffic number:

Birchs road from Hamptons Road to Leadleys Road

5/11/20	4422	PC 79	(Nova)
before April 2020	5319	New Domain	(Nova)
2/05/2018	5430		SDC traffic counts

Between the counts taken between 2/05/18 and 5/11/2020 there has been a **decline** in traffic numbers on Birchs Road of 1008 or 19%. Over a 4-year period.

Leadleys Road from Ellesmere Road to Birchs Road

5/11/20	1174	PC 79	(Nova)
Before April 2020	685	New Domain	(Nova)
13/07/2020	309	SDC	traffic counts

Between the counts taken 13/07/20 and 05/11/2020 there has been an **increase** in traffic numbers of 865 or 281 %

Something doesn't add up:

Maybe it is as simple as the count numbers taken 5/11/2020 were taken during Covid and a time when people were being encourage to work from home.

However, this would not account for the massive increase in traffic numbers on Leadleys Road.

The counts taken in 2018 and 2020 are now almost 4 years old. While I understand that counts only need to be taken every 5 years, I would have thought that with the significant development that has happened in Lincoln and Prebbleton during this period that a more up to date count needs to be undertaken on key arterial routes.

Traffic counts I attained from SDC for Birchs Road between Trices and Hamptons taken on 25/07/22 were 7942. This is an increase of 3520 or 80% on the count on 5/11/20 (the date used in appendix 6 of PC79

In my opinion the data that is being used for the Traffic Model is out dated and flawed.

In my employment as Senior Scientist in Farm Systems with AgResearch I have had significant involvement with computer models.

I have experience with collecting data to enter into models, writing models and interpreting the outputs from them. Experience has shown me that models can be extremely powerful but can also be misleading if the correct information is not entered or that they are interpreted incorrectly. The first and main criteria is the data that is imputed. Models such as the Traffic Model that is being used work on numbers and have the ability to produce masses of tables as is evident evidence from in the application.

However, the inputs used in this model appear to be from a single data point, e.g., number of vehicle movements per day for a single day. Example 5319 on Birchs Road on a date before April 2020. Therefore, in this case all the outputs are reliant on one day's number. To get any credibility with an output from a model many more days records would be needed to be used. I would think in this case at least 20 days.

While I generally agree with Mr Matt Collins conclusions in Appendix 2 of the 42A report of April 6<sup>th</sup> 2023 there a some other points that need to be taken into account.

The Birchs/Leadleys road corner will be even more congested than has been stated. The traffic on Leadleys Road has increased significantly since the Kakaha Park has partially opened around 6 months ago. This past Saturday (April 29<sup>th</sup>) all the car parks at the dog park and all the parks along Leadleys Road were full for most of the afternoon. There was overflow on the south side of Leadleys road (on the yellow lines). While it is great to see that the park is being well used the traffic numbers far exceed the projections that have been made.

Most of the pedestrian and cycle traffic from the proposed sub division entering the park will use the Birchs/Leadleys road intersection.

The latest information from the applicant indicates that the commercial area will be sited further south on Birchs road, almost opposite the main car park entrance.

If PC 79 is approved a Roundabout on the corner of Leadleys and Birchs roads should be in place before any development

#### **Amenities and General:**

If the proposed PC is approved it would create a satellite village not connected to the existing Prebbleton Village. It is interesting that the applicant calls the proposed sub division Birchs Village, (not a suburb) so is already separating it from the Prebbleton Village.

Prebbleton has very limited employment opportunities and the proposed PC 79 has none. All workers will have to travel, mainly by car to their place of work.

Current infrastructure in Prebbleton, particularly, wastewater, transport and schooling are already under extreme pressure without any of the new residential developments that have been approved, therefore there needs to be a period of consolidation, and allow for infrastructure to be put in place before thinking about further development.

Storm water storage/drainage:

From applicant:

*App 7 Baseline 12/03/2022*

*Stormwater 3.1 Existing Stormwater System Roadside drains along Birchs Road convey stormwater toward the intersection of Birchs and Leadleys Roads or further south along Birchs Road. In both instances, stormwater joins a series of open drains and creek networks that drain the wider area towards the Halswell River located approximately 4.5 km to the southeast of the development site.*

Roadside drains have not conveyed stormwater towards the intersection of Birchs and Leadleys roads for at least the past 50 years and there is no drain across Birchs road at this corner. Any drainage at this junction would direct stormwater into the new Domain. The Domain already has some significant problems with stormwater and the July 2022 rainfall event (not even a 1 in 5-year event) resulted in some major ponding within the Domain. Any extra stormwater being directed in this direction will only make this situation worse.

After the rainfall in July 2022 (not a major event and the soil was not at moisture holding capacity prior to the rain event) there were large areas of ground water at the south east and north east corners of the proposed subdivision. These persisted for 3 to 4 weeks even though it was being pumped out over this period. In wet winter/spring periods there is nearly always surface water on areas within this Plan Change area.

#### **3.2**

*Preliminary calculations (based on the Christchurch City Councils Waterways Wetlands and Drainage guide (CCC WWDG)) suggest a volume of approximately 37,000 m<sup>3</sup> of storage would be required to satisfy the attenuation requirements for the 36-hour 2 % return interval storm event.*



37 000m<sup>3</sup> of storage would require nearly 2ha. with an average depth of water at 2m. The total blue/green area proposed is only 1.54ha. and this area is also designated for service areas and walk ways etc.

## Part 6

*Groundwater has been established to be at a depth of 2.0 m and it is not anticipated any future earthworks activities will intercept groundwater*

While the groundwater has been established at 2.0 m. (this was measured in the autumn, the time when groundwater is at its lowest) from readings taken in 2021. Experience from living in this area for 50 years has shown that there have been many instances when groundwater is much closer to the surface. If the area required for storm water retention needs to be around 2m. deep then ground water will almost certainly be intercepted. The new domain is experiencing a significant problem with this at present. In this location there is significant artisan effects and when the water table is disturbed the water comes to the surface particularly in winter and spring.

## Landscape:

### Appendix 11 Landscape and Visual Assessment:

*April 2022*

*3.1: To the north of the site lies the edge of Prebbleton development, where expansion with a typical suburban character increases the number of dwellings, hard surfaces, and infrastructure present in the landscape*

The immediate area to the North is Orion land (3ha.) and is rural in character. Adjacent to this is Large Lot Residential that is definitely not typical suburban in character. As stated in the document the nearest Living Z housing is 527 m. away

*There are a number of existing dwellings along Hamptons Road and Birchs Road, with the closest residential property approximately 150m from the proposed site boundary.*

The closest residential property on Hamptons Road to PC 79 is less than 10m. from the boundary of the proposed subdivision.

*Existing medium density housing is 527m to the north of the site, with a buffer of low-density housing between this, providing an overall rural suburban character.*

Agree. Closest medium density housing is 527 m. away. If this PC was to be approved Prebbleton would go from medium density, to low density (around 0.5 ha. allotments, to a 3 ha. block of land then backup to medium density.

### 3.3 Page 12

*The proposed plan change adjoins existing Living Zones to the north and the Birchs Road Reserve to the east. While the park (Designation D421) has an underlying zoning of Inner Plains, the future character will be more urban in character albeit with an open feel. The proposal does not leave rural zoned land with three or more boundaries against living or business zones. It is highly likely Prebbleton will continue to develop within the area bounded by the transmission lines to the south, west and north to surround Birchs Road Reserve.*

The statement that Prebbleton will continue to develop to surround the reserve is highly speculative and no more than a person's opinion. We are firmly of the opinion that Prebbleton will not develop in this direction as all the areas mentioned are Highly Productive Soils.

#### **Further points for consideration:**

If the applicant makes significant changes to their application during the hearing, then Submitters should have an extended period to make further submission. At the PC 69 hearing the applicant made significant changes over night during the hearing and this resulted in some of the submitters being at a disadvantage.

The Public Notice for PC 79 (September 7th) mentions approximately 400 residential sites. This number has not been updated from the original application June 2021. The number of sites within the application goes up to over 800 sites. The 400 in the Public Notice is there for significantly underestimating the potential sites and as such is misleading. A number of residents in Prebbleton that I have spoken to were unaware of the density of the proposed subdivision and the potential change to the Prebbleton landscape that this would result in.

#### **Soil contaminant.**

**Mr John Smith who previously owned most of the land within the PC 79 boundaries reminded me that when he was the owner of 214B he carted 100s of loads of Meadow Mushroom compost to the site. This compost had been treated with chemicals in the process of growing the mushrooms. While most of the chemicals will have broken down by now it would be prudent to soil test before any dwellings were built on this site if PC 79 is approved.**

#### **Social Impact evidence**

Hilary Konigkramer – Social Impact

There was no contact was made with residents, some of who have lived within the Site for more than 50 years. The social impacts of a Plan Change are more than just those of the developer.

From Hilary Konigkramer evidence:

Page 9 1.2 Assumptions and Exclusions

*The following assumptions and exclusions apply to the scope of this study:*

- *This study **is not** considered to be a Social Impact Assessment (SIA) as it has been undertaken at a desktop level, therefore does not include engagement with key stakeholders and the community which is a key feature of a robust SIA study.*
- *WSP has **relied exclusively on existing information provided by BVL and the project team, as such no baseline data nor primary data has been collected to inform the assessment.***
- ***A site visit has not been conducted.***
- *Economic impacts have been identified from a social perspective only, considering the potential social impacts on local communities.*
- *An assessment of cultural values and / or cultural outcomes is excluded.*
- *The assessment has considered the **current use** of the site and the social implications of the **potential** for the site to be used for other activities related to primary production **is excluded.***

## My highlights:

So, this is not a balanced investigation. Only including evidence from the Applicants experts will always come up with a one-sided conclusion.

Page 10            2.1 Methodology Overview

Document review –

*Description of current land use activities within the PC application site provided by email (April 2023)*

The source and contents of this email have not been included.

Page 17

### 5.2.1 Loss of land-based livelihoods

Many of the Land Use facts stated in Table 5.3 are wrong.

Example:            212A Birchs Road.            *A few sheep are grazed by the neighbour to prevent fire risk for approximately 3 months of the year.*

Good crops of silage have been taken every year for at least the past 5 years and up to 100 lambs have been grazed on this property from autumn till early spring every year.

There is other land within the same distance to Prebbleton centre as the proposed PC 79 site that has no class 1 land (class 2 and class 3 soils) and is less suitable for intensive agriculture production due to the variation in soil classes across the area. This is a large block west of Shands Road between Hamptons and Blakes roads. This area has many advantages for subdivision to residential than the PC 79 site. It is a large block (probably in excess of 200ha) and would provide land for Prebbleton's growth for many years to come, it connects with the current Prebbleton Village and the approved PC 68, and importantly has much better access to the arterial roads to Christchurch and Rolleston. Traffic from this area would not travel through Prebbleton.

The area of farm land lost to housing in New Zealand over the past 20 years is very significant.

Gerald Rys, (Principal Science Advisor at MPI) published a paper in the New Zealand Grassland Proceedings 2021 pages 37 to 53 Titled; 'Productivity changes and resilience in New Zealand Grasslands over the past three decades'

In this paper the author stated that between 1990 and 2018 there were 27 000 ha. of New Zealand agriculture land lost to residential development. This is averaged at around 1 000ha per year and it is noted that this area will have been greater in the later years than in the 1990s.

How much Rural land in Selwyn is being converted to housing?

In most of the Plan Changes applied for the comments from the Applicants are *that "the loss of rural land in this Plan Change is insignificant"* However when they are all added up the area lost to agriculture production is very significant.

Plan Changes in SDC that are at various stages of Consent Hearings as at end August 2022 total some 1037ha. and cover a period from November 2020 to August 2022, a period of less than 2 years or around 520ha annually.

So Selwyn District has had more than its fair share.

**Economics:**

David Compton-Moen evidence Dated 17th day of April 2023

Page 21

*113 In addition, I note that the PC79 land is probably too expensive to be viable for rural production over the longer term. In fact, according to Core Logic's Property Guru tool, the median land value of Selwyn district properties used for arable/horticultural is \$3.50/m<sup>2</sup>. The subject site's land value, conversely, is more than 20 times higher at \$73/m<sup>2</sup> (again, according to Property Guru)*

This valuation has been taken from the inflated value that has been put on the land within PC 79 by Quotable Value (QV) when the Selwyn District was revalued in September 2021, just 3 months after the Plan Change was first applied for.

QV valued the land as if it had already been approved for rezoning to residential. (Who needs a hearing before a Commissioner when QV can decide without hearing any evidence) We believe that the rationale for QV value is incorrect and have appealed the valuation to the Valuation Tribunal.

As a result of our land being included in PC 79 without our consent and QV valuing our land as if it is already been approved for rezoning to residential our rates have increased by over 200%

Looking at Land Values on adjoining land holdings give a more accurate value of Inner Plains land in this location.

5-ha block to the west is valued at \$800 000	\$16 sqm/m
---	------------

51 ha block to the south LV \$3 590 000	\$7.04/sqrm
---	-------------

All the economic assessments are wrong

Then 144

*To complete my assessment, I compared PC79's TEV to the four rural production scenarios identified by Mr Everest. Now, because economic activity associated with PC79 will last only (say) 10 to 15 years while rural production would likely last longer, I compared the net present (current dollar) value of their TEVs over a 50- year timeframe.*

The rural production will last in perpetuity.

We ask that PC 79 be declined in full.

Helen and Tom Fraser                      01/05/2023