

PC81 – Recommendations by submission point

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
PC81-0001	Malcom & Jan Douglas	001	Transport Networks	Oppose	Opposes rezoning to the south of Dunns Crossing Road until the road and surrounding roads are upgraded to manage increase in traffic. Considers that speed limits will need to be lowered. Concerned about safety of Dunns Crossing Road and Main South Road intersection and impact of additional traffic on safety, as well as increased congestion and lack of public transport. Also concerned that costs of upgrades will fall on ratepayers.	Reject the plan change until a suitable, efficient and effective transport network has been planned, accepted and financed to accommodate the plan change.	Accept in part	The arrangements for transport network improvements are considered acceptable. However, plan change is rejected on other grounds
PC81-0001	Malcom & Jan Douglas	002	Water	Oppose	Concerned about the impact of the Plan Change on water supply and water pressure for existing residents in the west of Rolleston township.	Reject the plan change until a suitable, efficient and effective water supply has been planned, accepted and financed to accommodate the plan change.	Accept in part	If the Plan Change had been approved it would have included requirements for water supply ahead of development.
PC81-0001	Malcom & Jan Douglas	003	Community Facilities	Oppose	Concerned about impact of plan change on community facilities such as medical centres, emergency services and schools.	Reject the plan change until a suitable, efficient and effective community facilities have been planned and financed to accommodate the plan change.	Reject	Education services have been addressed, other facilities will be planned as part of the wider development of Rolleston.
PC81-0001	Malcom & Jan Douglas	004	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	Concerned about the effects on the environment for surrounding residents, including construction noise, the impact of heavy vehicles and dust.	Reject the plan change, or if approved, include: - a condition	Reject	These matters can be managed through the more detailed consenting

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					Also concerned that adverse effects of carbon and greenhouse gas emissions from private motor vehicles have not been addressed.	requiring that sufficient barriers and other mitigation measures such as watering are provided to protect health of nearby residents; and - A requirement to widen and seal Edwards Road; or - Include the submitters' property in the Plan Change.		processes. Evidence was provided on greenhouse gas emissions. Upgrade of Edwards Road would have been required as part of PC 82.
PC81-0001	Malcom & Jan Douglas	005	Waste Disposal	Oppose	Considers that the area is not suitable for housing, and that as the Wastewater Treatment Plant has reached saturation level, the plan change site should be considered instead for spraying operations as part of sewage treatment facility.	Reject the Plan Change.	Reject	The PWTP is being expanded over time to accommodate Selwyn growth and this includes additional land based irrigation of wastewater.
PC81-0001	Malcom & Jan Douglas	006	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Considers that the circumstances applying to PC73 are also relevant to PC81, including that it will not give effect to the NPS-UD or CRPS. Concerned that the rezoning would remove the existing gradual buffer between the suburban, semi-rural and rural nature, and would result in an isolated island.	Reject the plan change.	Accept in part	The NPS UD and CRPS are considered in detail in the report. The partial development of this area is a grounds for decline.
PC81-0002	Ministry of Education	001	Residential and Business Development	Neither Support	Considers that the plan change may set a precedent for development outside of existing planned areas,	Only approve the plan change if the potential	Accept	The Plan changes have been judged on their merits

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
				Nor Oppose	making planning for school capacity and networks increasingly difficult. Considers that Policy 8 of the NPS-UD should be balanced against other parts of the NPS-UD including requirement to ensure additional infrastructure, including schools, is provided.	inconsistencies between Policy 8 of the NPS-UD and the CRPS are satisfactorily resolved as it relates to development capacity and well-functioning urban environments.		taking into account Policy 8 and other parts of the NPS UD.
PC81-0002	Ministry of Education	002	Community Facilities	Neither Support Nor Oppose	Concerned about the increase in population in West Rolleston, and the resulting increase in school children. Notes that consultation with the submitter has not occurred.	Only approve the plan change if adequate consideration is given to ensuring there is sufficient capacity within the existing school network to accommodate school aged children, or enabling provisions are provided within the ODP to allow additional educational facilities.	Accept in part	Additional text to the ODPs was agreed relating to education services and would have been included if approved.
PC81-0003	Linda Woltersdorf	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Considers that the Rolleston Structure Plan, which the site is outside of, is still relevant and should be adhered to, as there is plenty of undeveloped land within the structure plan area and there is no need yet to develop this land past the Dunns Crossing Road boundary.	Delete the provision.	Accept in part	Development capacity was carefully assessed and influenced the recommendation to decline.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
PC81-0004	Hill Street Limited	001	Residential and Business Development	Support	Considers that eventual development to Selwyn Road to the south and Edwards Road to the west (or south-west) would create sensible edges, provide additional housing options, and form part of a logical extension to Rolleston while maintaining a consolidated urban form for the future. Therefore supports provisions for road connection with adjoining land.	Approve the plan change, subject to the ODP continuing to include roading connections from the site to the land that constitutes the remained of the block to the Selwyn Road/Edwards Road corner.	Reject	ODP connections to this area are provided for, had PC 81 been approved.
PC81-0005	Tania Croucher	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Does not consider that the site is adjacent to the exiting township. Considers that until the Rolleston Structure Plan is updated, provision for ad hoc plan changes will significantly hinder the ability for Council to provide for a well-functioning urban environment.	Decline the plan change until the Structure Plan is updated.	Accept in part	The Plan change is recommended to be declined. However, the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan will in part replace the Rolleston Structure Plan.
PC81-0005	Tania Croucher	002	Residential Density	Oppose	Considers that the ODP is contrary to the Rolleston Structure Plan Design Principle 4 which promotes higher density at nodal points, matching population density with centres of activity and high amenity, due to density proposed on site and distance to town centre, comparative to closer, lower density zones.	Decline the plan change until the Structure Plan is updated.	Accept in part	The Plan change is recommended to be declined. However, the Greater Christchurch Spatial Plan will in part replace the Rolleston Structure Plan.
PC81-0005	Tania Croucher	003	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	The impacts on 890 Selwyn Road have not been considered.	Update the Landscape/Visual Effects and Amenity	Reject	Effects on landscape values and visual amenity

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
						Values and Reverse Sensitivity Effects on 890 Selwyn Road.		have been considered in the report.
PC81-0006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	001	Transport Networks	Oppose	<p>Concerned about the safety of the Dunns Crossing Road/Walkers Road/ State Highway 1 intersection, and the impact of intensification of development on this intersection, including in combination with additional vehicle movements resulting from other proposed plan changes in the wider area. States that consideration should be given to potential cumulative impacts where plan change applications are outside the Project Infrastructure Boundary.</p> <p>Considers that it is unclear what trigger has been included within the plan change to require an integrated transport assessment when development increases beyond 350 households.</p>	Suitably address the issue raised before determining whether the plan change is approved.	Accept in part	If the recommendation was to accept, then the ODP provides that works cannot commence until this upgrade has started.
PC81-0006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	002	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	The Plan Change site is outside the Projected Infrastructure Boundary and not within a Future Development Area. However, consideration of the weight to be given to the CRPS should be considered in the context of the NPSUD. If the request does not align with the intentions of the NPSUD and provisions of the CRPS, then it may necessitate further consideration of the approval of the proposal.	Suitably address the issue raised before determining whether the plan change is approved.	Accept in part	This is carefully considered in the Report.

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
PC81-0006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	003	Transport Networks	Oppose	Further consideration should be given to opportunities for multi-modal transport. Considers that there is no certainty of linkages shown on ODP providing connectivity to wider Township and other facilities as they are reliant on other plan changes being accepted and developed.	Suitably address the issue raised before determining whether the plan change is approved.	Accept in part	The ODP includes detailed transport upgrade requirements including pedestrian and cycle facilities.
PC81-0006	Waka Kotahi NZ Transport Agency	004	Transport Networks	Oppose	Considers that the proposed plan change will likely further contribute to the transport associated carbon emissions as there appears to be a reliance on private vehicle use due to limited job opportunities and local amenities in the Rolleston Township. As the plan change site is located outside of the Projected Infrastructure Boundary, there is limited planning for the provision of improved public transport to support the future residents of the plan change area. Specific consideration should be given to consistency of the request with the provisions of the NPSUD and what improvements could be made to reduce vehicle-related carbon emissions from the residential development of the site.	Suitably address the issue raised before determining whether the plan change is approved.	Accept in part	GHG emissions were assessed and no found to be a determining factor.
PC81-0007	Christchurch City Council	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose In Part	Considers that the Plan Change is not consistent with Policy 8 of the NPSUD as the proposal will not add significant development capacity or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment,	Decline the plan change unless concerns outlined in submission are addressed.	Accept in part	The report finds that the Plan Change does not meet the requirements of the

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
					and will therefore not give effect to the NPSUD and in the submitter's view must be declined.			NPS UD including Policy 8
PC81-0007	Christchurch City Council	002	Residential and Business Development	Oppose In Part	Considers that as the site is outside the area anticipated for urban development, the plan change will not give effect to the CRPS. As a change to the CRPS has not been sought, in the submitter's view the plan change must be declined.	Decline the plan change unless concerns outlined in submission are addressed.	Accept in part	The report finds that the Plan Change does not give effects to the CRPS even if qualified by the NPSUD.
PC81-0008	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	001	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Considers that PC81 is inconsistent with various provisions in the CRPS and the strategic sub-regional land use and infrastructure planning framework for Greater Christchurch. Considers that the NPSUD does not negate the urban growth framework in the CRPS and the obligation to give effect to it. Considers it has not been sufficiently demonstrated that the proposed plan change will add significantly to development capacity, contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, or is or will be well connected.	Decline the Plan Change. Without prejudice to the relief sought that the plan change be declined in its entirety, if the plan change is not declined, seeks changes to the plan change to address issues raised in this submission.	Accept	The report finds that the Plan Change does not give effects to the CRPS even if qualified by the NPSUD.
PC81-0008	Canterbury Regional Council (Environment Canterbury)	002	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Considers the suitability of the subject land for urban development would be more appropriately addressed through the comprehensive spatial planning exercise which has recently been initiated by the Greater Christchurch Partnership as part of an Urban Growth Partnership with the Crown.	Decline the Plan Change. Without prejudice to the relief sought that the plan change be declined in its entirety, if the plan change is not declined, seeks changes to the plan	Accept	The Proposed District Plan and the emerging Spatial Plan has the opportunity to strategically assess this wider growth

Submitter ID	Submitter Name	Point #	SDP Topic	Position	Summary	Decision Requested	Commissioner Recommendation	Reason for Recommendation
						change to address issues raised in this submission.		area and timing of development.
PC81-0009	Jason Horne	001	Transport Networks	Oppose	Concerned about the increase of traffic in and around West Rolleston School and surrounding areas and on the roading system.	Decline the Plan Change.	Accept in part	Recommended decline, bit not on traffic grounds.
PC81-0009	Jason Horne	002	Community Facilities	Oppose	Concerned about the increase in population and additional demand that would place on West Rolleston School.	Decline the Plan Change.	Accept in part	School provision is now identified as an issue in the ODP.
PC81-0009	Jason Horne	003	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	Concerned about the location of residential living so close to the Pines Resource Recovery Park and waste water facility and impacts on living environment due to noise and smell.	Decline the Plan Change.	Reject	This concern is not substantiated for PC 81 but is an important issue for PC 82.
PC81-0009	Jason Horne	004	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Considers that as PC73 was declined, PC80 should be as well.	Decline the Plan Change.	Accept in part	PC 73 is a factor that has been taken into account in assessing urban design issues.
PC81-0009	Jason Horne	005	Residential and Business Development	Oppose	Concerned about increased pressure on water supply.	Decline the Plan Change.	Accept in part	A new water supply would have been a requirement ahead of development.
PC81-0009	Jason Horne	006	Land and Soil	Oppose	Concerned about prime growing and producing land being removed.	Decline the Plan Change.	Reject	The land is not highly productive land.
PC81-0009	Jason Horne	007	Quality of the Environment	Oppose	Concerned about additional noise and light pollution on the local community.	Decline the Plan Change.	Reject	This is not a ground for decline.