

9 November 2021

Two Chain Road Ltd  
C/- Kim Seaton  
Novo Group Ltd  
PO Box 365  
Christchurch 8140

Dear Kim,

**Re: Plan Change 80 to the Operative Selwyn District Plan - Two Chain Road Ltd**

Thank you for your application lodged on behalf of Two Chain Road Ltd requesting a change to the Operative Selwyn District Plan. In accordance with Clause 23 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA), the following information is requested to better understand the potential effects of the proposal, the ways in which adverse effects may be mitigated and the nature of consultation undertaken.

**Extent of Plan Change Area**

1. The south-west corner of the proposed Outline Development Plan (ODP) incorporates an area of unformed legal road. This land parcel is not mentioned in the Request and it is not shown on the ODP as providing road access. Please confirm if the parcel is to be included in Plan Change area, and if so, please amend paragraph 1 of the Request to include this parcel, and outline how the road is proposed to be managed. For example, will it remain as an area of road (and if so, does this need to be noted on the ODP and/or the traffic assessment updated to reflect this), or will an application be made to stop it. If it is not to be included in the Plan Change area, please remove it from the ODP and update any relevant assessments that its exclusion may affect.

**Landscape and visual effects**

2. A preliminary review of the Urban Design, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (UDLVIA) prepared by DCM Urban Design Ltd has been undertaken by Bron Faulkner. To assist a better spatial understanding of the existing trees and the proposed planting and cycleway along the Two Chain Road boundary please provide a scaled cross-section. This will be useful to inform the total width required for the landscape treatment. The cross section should indicate the spatial requirements of the existing mature trees (allowing for canopy width) and the feasible location of the secondary planting, the proposed shared path and site boundary location. Please consider if it is appropriate for this cross-section to be included as part of the ODP.
3. It is not clear why there is no landscape treatment or mitigation proposed along the Walkers Road frontage or the railway reserve boundary. Ms Faulkner considers that mitigation of the scale proposed for Two Chain Road is required along the Walkers Road frontage, to screen the industrial activity from Walkers and Runner Roads, SH1 and nearby rural areas. Similarly, along the rail reserve boundary, existing trees on the state highway and railway land currently provide visual screening. However, consideration should be given to providing a buffer of trees within the site rather than reliance on mitigation located on neighbouring land. Please provide details (including a cross section as above) for planting along the Walkers Road and railway reserve boundaries to provide visual mitigation to areas beyond the Site.

4. There appear to be nine rural residential properties on Two Chain Road opposite the site and others in close proximity of the Walkers Road intersection which are likely to be the most affected in terms of the changes to the rural character of the area and their rural amenity. The UDLVIA has considered the effects on visual amenity from representative viewpoints, including three properties, but has not specifically considered the effects on more holistic rural character and rural amenity that the local community currently experience amidst the Inner Plains zone. Visual amenity is just one contributor to overall rural amenity. The assessment is considered to accurately note that *“The proposed development will modify the landscape from one that is semi-open and agricultural in character to one that is characterised by large scale industrial warehouse buildings, large areas of hardstand and landscape planting.”*<sup>1</sup> The nine rural residential properties on Two Chain Road opposite the Site (and near the Walkers Road intersection) currently experience a level of rural amenity contributed to by the relatively rural nature of Two Chain Road corridor and the rural residential properties across the road (on the Site), which also serve as a buffer from SH1 and the railway line. The application proposes to substantially change the activity on both the Site and Two Chain Road to an industrial environment. As such the rural residential properties opposite the site will be at the interface of a new industrial zone. Please describe and assess the changes and magnitude of effects the proposal will have on the rural character and amenity for local residents of the Two Chain Road/Walkers Road given their current rural environment.
5. In relation to the above, UDLVIA notes that there *“are several policies in the Rural Objectives and Policies of the Selwyn Operative District Plan which relate to Landscape Values and amenity which have been addressed in 3.3 below.”*<sup>2</sup> The policies considered in section 3.3 relate to the Township Volume and do not address rural values or rural amenity. Please provide an assessment of the rural objectives and policies relating to landscape values and amenity.
6. The following paragraph is included in the summary of effects on visual amenity:  
*The bulk and form of the proposal is consistent with the character of the receiving environment and is considered an anticipated activity. Residents outlined above at 110 and 208 Two Chain Road are two rural residential properties. Both properties are set back from the road and have established vegetation and additional structures located between the property boundary and the main dwelling. Given the location of the proposal and the permitted baseline of surrounding activity, any adverse effects are considered to be less than minor.*<sup>3</sup>

Please clarify this paragraph, particularly in relation to:

- a) The first sentence referring to consistency with the character of the receiving environment, (which suggests the receiving environment is industrial in nature,) given that in page 10 of the report, the receiving environment is described as *“a rural, semi open [environment] transiting to urban fringe peri urban.”*
- b) The third sentence, which seems to assume the ‘permitted baseline’ is more industrial in nature than rural.

In both cases, the urban aspects appear to have greater influence than the rural aspects of the receiving environment, despite the receiving environment being largely rural. Please clarify the basis for this.

---

<sup>1</sup> Section 3.2 of the UDLVIA (Appendix C to the Application).

<sup>2</sup> Section 2.7.2 of the UDLVIA (Appendix C to the Application).

<sup>3</sup> Section 3.4.1 of the UDLVIA (Appendix C to the Application).

7. The following paragraph is included in the summary of effects on streetscape and users:  
*Given the scale and character of the proposed development compared with the existing permitted baseline, negligible adverse effects are likely for streetscape users.*<sup>4</sup>

Please explain the components of the 'permitted baseline' associated with the existing Inner Plains zone that are considered to be the same in scale and character to the development facilitated under the proposed Business 2A zoning; or reconsider the assessment of the change on the Two Chain Road corridor resulting from the rezoning.

8. The following sentence is included the third paragraph of the conclusions:  
*In terms of landscape character and values of the area, subject to the mitigation measure proposed, the proposal will result in an acceptable magnitude of change on the existing rural landscape character and associated values.*<sup>5</sup>

Please clarify:

- a) what magnitude of effects (as per tables on page 7) equate to the term "acceptable magnitude of change"?
- b) if, following the assessment of effects on rural amenity and character, (requested in 6 above) this conclusion would change.

#### Contaminated Land

9. Environment Canterbury have undertaken a preliminary review of the PSI included in the application. They note that the site walkover identified a rubbish pit/ burn material and a diesel tank at 139 Two Chain Road. There are no photos or comments on the condition of the diesel tank, just that no staining was observed in the soil. Please clarify the location of these HAIL activities by plotting them on a map (which also allows for them be added to the LLUR).
10. Environment Canterbury also note that the PSI included a site walkover at 77 and 139 Two Chain Road, but that a large portion of the site was not visually inspected on site via a walkover. Looking at aerial imagery, there appears to be possible waste disposal to land or burn pile at 7 Two Chain Road that does not appear to have been addressed in this report. There may also be other HAIL activities blocked from view in the aerial imagery which would be identified by a site walkover. Please provide justification for not undertaking a site walkover of the remainder of the site, or provide an updated PSI that includes this.

#### Transport

11. A preliminary review of the Integrated Traffic Assessment (ITA), prepared by Novo Group Ltd has been undertaken by Mat Collins from Flow Transportation Specialists. He notes that the Request proposes to make it a non-complying activity for any building to be occupied prior to the upgrade of the site frontage with Walkers Road and Two Chain Road, but that it is not clear in the ITA what the proposed form of these upgrades are. The 2033 Rolleston Paramics model indicates the following increases in traffic due to the Request (peak direction):
- Walkers Road (between Two Chain Road and SH1)
    - No plan change: 320 vph (AM), 360 vph (PM)
    - With plan change: 550 vph (AM), 540 vph (PM)
  - Two Chain Road (west of Wards Road)

---

<sup>4</sup> Section 3.4.1 of the UDLVIA (Appendix C to the Application).

<sup>5</sup> Section 5 of the UDLVIA (Appendix C to the Application).

- No plan change: 180 vph (AM), 240 vph (PM)
- With plan change: 270 vph (AM), 300 vph (PM)

Please confirm the intended roading hierarchy for the anticipated frontage upgrades for Walkers Road and Two Chain Road, referencing Council's Engineering Standards and Guidelines where relevant, that are needed to support the plan change. Please note this information does not need to include detailed cross sections.

12. The ITA discuss the proposed upgrade to the Walkers Road / Two Chain Road / Jones Road corridor and states that the assessment assumes these works are in place.<sup>6</sup> The proposed amendments to Rule 22.9.x include reference to frontage upgrades to Walkers Road and Two Chain Road, however they do not restrict development prior to the upgrade of other sections of the adjacent transport network, including:

- Two Chain Road / Walker Road intersection;
- Walkers Road / Runners Road intersection; and
- Two Chain Road / Wards Road / Jones Road intersection, including the level rail crossing (which currently does not include barrier arms).

Mr Collins understands that these works are programmed by Council and potentially Waka Kotahi, however, the ITA does not assess the potential safety and efficiency effects should development precede these programmed upgrades. For example:

- The ITA states that it assumes the Two Chain Road / Walker Road intersection is upgraded to a roundabout prior to any development,<sup>7</sup> however this is not identified in the proposed amendments to the District Plan rules; and
- The 2033 Rolleston Paramics model, which is referenced in the ITA, assumes that the upgrade/realignment for the Two Chain Road / Wards Road / Jones Road intersection (including safety upgrade for the rail crossing) is in place, but again this is not identified in the proposed amendments to the District Plan rules.

While the Request proposes changes to Chapter C17 BZone Roding, Rule 17.3 to allow Council to consider effects on some of these locations during future subdivision, Mr Collins' view is that such provisions do not effectively address cumulative effects and should be assessed prior to rezoning, and thresholds/triggers established during the Plan Change process for any required upgrades. He considers that it may be acceptable for a degree of development within the plan change area to occur prior to further upgrades beyond the site frontage, but this has not been established by the ITA. Therefore, please provide further discussion on the potential safety and efficiency effects, and any required mitigation measures (including potential staging of development), should development within the site proceed the upgrades programmed by:

- Upgrade of Two Chain Road / Walker Road intersection to a roundabout (Council project for 2028/2029);
- Walkers Road / Runners Road intersection, including the level rail crossing (potentially within NZUP but not confirmed); and
- Upgrade / realignment of Two Chain Road / Wards Road intersection, including level rail crossing improvements (Council project for 2028/2029).

13. The ITA discuss the modelling results for the future State Highway 1 / Dunns Crossing Road / Walkers Road roundabout.<sup>8</sup> The 2033 Rolleston Paramics model indicates a significant increase in delay for the western approach during the AM peak (increasing from 27 seconds to 70 seconds).

---

<sup>6</sup> Paragraphs 24, 26 and 46 of the ITA (Appendix B to the Application).

<sup>7</sup> Paragraph 51 of the ITA (Appendix B to the Application).

<sup>8</sup> Paragraphs 47-50 of the ITA (Appendix B to the Application).

The ITA provides further assessment of the intersection using SIDRA, and concludes that the Paramics model may be underestimating the capacity of the roundabout. To allow for further interrogation of the difference between the Paramics and SIDRA models, please provide the SIDRA model files for the State Highway 1 / Dunns Crossing Road / Walkers Road intersection, that have been used for the assessment included in the ITA.

14. The ITA states that the assessment has adopted vehicle trip generation rates for the Business 2A zone based on those used to support the Plan Change for the nearby Izone industrial area.<sup>9</sup> Mr Collins has reviewed the trip generation assumptions in the traffic assessment undertaken for Plan Change 10, and notes that the assessment identifies that two trip rates were used, one for bulk retail and one for warehousing.<sup>10</sup> It is not clear how the rates used in the ITA for the PC80 Request have been established from PC10. Additionally, the PC80 ITA applies a lower PM rate compared with the AM peak, whereas the PC10 ITA applies a more even rate in the AM and PM peaks. While we generally consider that it is appropriate to use the trip rates from PC10, please provide further explanation of how the vehicle trip rates used in the ITA are consistent with PC10.

15. The ITA discusses the future cycle network, and the applicant notes that the proposed rail sidings will conflict with the shared use path along SH1, proposed as part of the NZUP works.<sup>11</sup> The ITA concludes that the shared path can be rerouted along Walkers Road and Two Chain Road. Mr Collins disagrees with the ITA and considers that such a diversion would add significant journey distance for cyclists using SH1, with comparative distances between the SH1/Dunns Crossing/Walker Road intersection and the SH1/Hoskyns Road intersection being:

- Approximately 4km via Walkers Road, Two Chain Road, Jones Road, and Hoskyns Road; and
- Approximately 3km via SH1.

Further, the ITA does not consider the effect on cyclists that would result from the increase in intersections that would need to be traversed (resulting in additional delays), nor the effect on catchment (including the residential areas south of SH1). In Mr Collins' view, the proposed cycle route on Walkers Road and Two Chain Road is required on its own merits and does not provide a suitable alternative to a cycle route along SH1. However, he understands that Waka Kotahi currently plans to provide the cycleway on the southern side of SH1, therefore it may be unaffected by the proposed rail sidings. Please provide further assessment of the effects on the shared use path on SH1, scheduled for construction by Waka Kotahi, and how the proposed diversion onto Walkers Road and Two Chain Road will affect cyclist journey times and accessibility.

16. The ITA states that internal roads will be designed to accommodate on-road cycle facilities, where appropriate.<sup>12</sup> Section 8.6 of the Selwyn District Council Engineering Standards indicates that cycle facilities should be provided on all collector and arterial roads. Based on the vehicle volumes and proportion of heavy traffic anticipated on roads within the plan change site, Mr Collins considers that the two indicative primary roads identified on the ODP will function as at least collector roads. He also considers that an internal cycle network should be identified within the site and on the ODP, consistent with the IZone development, which includes shared use paths on key roads such as Jones Road and Hoskyns Road. Please provide further assessment of the requirement for cycle facilities on internal roads, including reference to relevant Council Standards and Guidelines where relevant.

---

<sup>9</sup> Paragraph 31 of the ITA (Appendix B to the Application).

<sup>10</sup> Section 6 of the traffic assessment for Plan Change 10, prepared by Abley, dated 17 April 2014.

<sup>11</sup> Paragraphs 39-40 of the ITA (Appendix B to the Application).

<sup>12</sup> Paragraph 41 of the ITA (Appendix B to the Application).

17. Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 of the ITA contain SIDRA results, however the contents do not relate to the title of each appendix. Please consider if the labelling of Appendix 3 and 4 of the ITA should be revised.

### Ecology

18. A preliminary review of the Ecological Assessment, provided by Aquatic Ecology Ltd (AEL), has been undertaken by Dr Greg Burrell. He notes that the AEL assessment mentions a “minor blind raceway” at 15 Two Chain Road and “vegetation associated with damp ground” near 25 Two Chain Road. Aerial photographs show areas of open water and distinct vegetation that suggests both these features are wetlands. However, neither of these wetland areas have been assessed for their ecological significance using recognised criteria, such as those in the Selwyn District Plan or in the National Environmental Standards for Freshwater. Given the national decline and rarity of wetlands, Dr Burrell considers that the ecological significance of these wetlands needs to be assessed before any change to the current land zoning can occur. This information can then be used to help guide any revisions to the proposed Outline Development Plan and associated environmental protection. Therefore, please provide an ecological assessment of the potential wetland areas identified in the ecology report, using appropriate protocols for wetland assessment, comparison against appropriate ecological significance criteria, and discuss what mitigation measures are needed to protect the wetlands from potential adverse effects of the proposed land use change facilitated by the rezoning.

### Wastewater

19. Two options have been provided in the WSP report to convey wastewater to the Selwyn District Council network.<sup>13</sup> Since this work was completed, an addition discharge location has potentially become available. Council is currently constructing a wastewater pipeline between Darfield and the Pines WWTP and a tee will be added into this line at the corner of Aylesbury Rd and Runners Rd and another at the corner of Aylesbury Rd and Two Chain Rd. Please advise if the development be viable if it were to pump to either of these two proposed tees?

### Water

20. As the township of Rolleston grows the consented allocation of water will be put under pressure. To ensure that growth is appropriately integrated with the provision of infrastructure, and planned growth is able to be serviced, Council considers that the priority of water allocation needs to be given to those developments within the Rolleston Structure Plan area. To enable the provision of water to this development, please advise if there is any consented water that can be transferred to Council? If not, could the Request be amended to limit the type of industry to low water uses such as warehousing?

### Economic Impacts

21. The economics assessment states that the applicant “*wishes to create the opportunity for a range of industrial activities consistent with the provisions of the Selwyn District Council’s B2A provisions which allow for a range of industrial activities, service stations and trade suppliers with limited residential and retail activity which is related to industrial uses.*”<sup>14</sup> The requested B2A zone provides for a diverse range and large amount of retail space. While the applicant has indicated a preference for industrial use, it is possible that (at least some of) the site could be used for non-industrial uses, and that a potentially large amount of retail and services space could establish on the site. Please

---

<sup>13</sup> Appendix A of the Infrastructure Report (Appendix A to the Application).

<sup>14</sup> Paragraph 1.1 of the Assessment of Economic Impacts (Appendix D to the Application).



provide an assessment of the potential effects of non-industrial activities, in particular retail and commercial activities, establishing on the site, including potential effects on the Rolleston and Lincoln Key Activity Centres. It would assist evaluation of the merits of the proposal if the assessment could provide an opinion as to whether any limitation on non-industrial activities such as was proposed by the processing planner in Plan Change 66 (Rule 22.10.4), is similarly necessary for this plan change area.

22. The Request refers to there being an identified shortage of land within Greater Christchurch.<sup>15</sup> Reference is made to evidence presented at the Plan Change 66 hearing to support this. For the ease of parties reviewing this Request, please provide a summary of the key points, reasoning and conclusions reached in this evidence that are relevant to this Request.
23. The Request also refers to there being high levels of demand for industrial land proximate to the main rail corridor and State Highway 1.<sup>16</sup> Please provide further details to support this statement.

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

24. The Request identifies that the NPS-UD is relevant to this Plan Change and identifies those objectives and policies that are considered relevant to the plan change. However only a brief assessment is provided of why the application is considered to be consistent with the NPS-UD. Provide a more detailed assessment of the PC against each of the provisions of the NPS-UD that are relevant.

#### **Proposed District Plan**

25. Council notified its Proposed District Plan on 5th October 2020. While the list of statutory documents to be considered when changing a district plan, as prescribed in s74 and s75 of the RMA, does not include a Proposed District Plan, case law<sup>17</sup> suggests that s74 is not an exhaustive list and that scope exists to consider the provisions of the Proposed District Plan. As such, please provide an assessment of the request against the relevant provisions of the Proposed District Plan, and in particular those provisions that have immediate effect.

#### **Consultation**

26. It is noted that the plan change request has been provided to Mahaanui Kurataiao Limited for their comment. Please provide a copy of any feedback received.
27. It is noted that the applicant has informally consulted KiwiRail about the development of the site. Please advise what, if any, consultation has been undertaken with Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency and the Ministry of Corrections, who also have designations in close proximity to the plan change area.

Please provide the requested information or provide written confirmation if you do not agree to provide the requested information. However, if the requested information is not provided, Council may reject the request or decide not to approve the plan change request, if it is considered that there is insufficient information to enable Council to consider or approve the request.

---

<sup>15</sup> Paragraph 97(i) of the Section 32 Evaluation.

<sup>16</sup> Paragraph 97(i) of the Section 32 Evaluation.

<sup>17</sup> *Kennedys Bush Road Neighbourhood Association v Christchurch City Council (W063/97, at page 20) and Canterbury Regional Council v Waimakariri District Council (C94/99, at page 15).*

Once all requested information is provided, Council will consider its adequacy and within 15 working days of receiving the information and may require additional information relating to the request.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns regarding the above request or further processing of the application.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to be 'Liz White', with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Liz White  
**Principal Planner**  
[liz@lwp.co.nz](mailto:liz@lwp.co.nz)  
027 2285 006