



**aston**  
CONSULTANTS

*resource management & planning*

**A** PO Box 1435 Christchurch 8140 **P** 03 3322618 **M** 0275 332213

**E** [info@astonconsultants.co.nz](mailto:info@astonconsultants.co.nz) **W** [www.astonconsultants.co.nz](http://www.astonconsultants.co.nz)

11 March 2022  
Selwyn District Council  
CHRISTCHURCH

Attn. **Jocelyn Lewes**, Planner

By email only: [Jocelyn.lewes@selwyn.govt.nz](mailto:Jocelyn.lewes@selwyn.govt.nz)

Dear Jocelyn

## **Second Request for Further Information: Plan Change 82**

Thank you for your emailed second Request for Further Information dated 1 March 2022. We have responded to your questions and comments below. I have noted when a response has been provided by a technical expert, for clarity.

Some of the RFI matters have required considerable amendments to the proposals in the Plan Change, especially in regard to the late notice about Council proposals for medium density residential requirements. The RFI matters have been directly addressed and the applicant will, upon acceptance of the RFI responses, propose to prepare a new consolidated Plan Change document for the Council for notification purposes.

For amendments to the application included in this response deleted text is shown as ~~striketrough~~, and new text is shown as **bold/underlined**.

### **Transport**

*Please provide an updated Paramics model that incorporates a right turn lane on the southern approach to the Dunns Crossing Road/Brookside Road intersection, and determine whether this is sufficient to avoid queues extending into the Dunns Crossing/Lowes intersection.*

### **Response:**

This response has been provided by Stantec.

We understand that the request relates to reported levels of service in our first RFI response, where the northbound through movement at Dunns Crossing Road / Brookside Road incurred

**Property**

**Subdivision**

**Industry**

**Community**

**Environment**

delay from the right turning vehicles in the same direction. The representation of the intersection reflected the standard model coding in the Rolleston simulation model, where space for through vehicles to pass right turning vehicles is generally not coded even though in the existing environment such space is available for a car to pass a waiting car. That is a very conservative modelled representation of the actual road network. In this location, the absence of the right turn space from Dunns Crossing Road into Brookside Road did lead to some modelled queue back to the Dunns Crossing Road / Lowes Road intersection, and that then influenced the modelled scale of the roundabout in terms of number of approach and circulating lanes. As per the RFI request, we have incorporated a right turn bay on Dunns Crossing Road into the eastern leg of Brookside Road. Visualisation of queuing indicated that the right turn bay resulted in removal of queue back to the Dunns Crossing Road / Lowes Road intersection. For that reason, in the revised model test the roundabout form was single lane on the western approach. The resultant intersection average delay and LOS results are included in Table 1 below, comparing the 18 January 2022 RFI 1 response (scenario 1) with the updated modelled form described above (scenario 2).

Intersection	Scenario 1: RFI 1 Response, (With PC80+81+82, No right turn bay at Dunns Crossing/Brookside, 2 lane west approach at Lowes / Dunns Crossing)		Scenario 2: RFI 2 Response, (With PC80+81+82, With right turn bay at Dunns Crossing/Brookside, 1 lane west approach at Lowes / Dunns Crossing)	
	AM Peak	PM Peak	AM Peak	PM Peak
Dunns Crossing / Selwyn Roundabout	4s, LOS A	4s, LOS A	4s, LOS A	4s, LOS A
Dunns Crossing / PC73 Northern Road Priority Crossroad	20s, LOS C	23s, LOS C	22s, LOS C	24s, LOS C
Dunns Crossing / Boulez Priority Crossroad	14s, LOS B	12s, LOS B	13s, LOS B	12s, LOS B
Dunns Crossing / Lowes Roundabout (4-legged)	21s, LOS C	9s, LOS A	8s, LOS C	9s, LOS A
Dunns Crossing / Brookside Priority T-Intersection	30s, LOS D	18s, LOS C	10s, LOS A	16s, LOS C
Dunns Crossing / Burnham School Signals	38s, LOS D	10s, LOS A	30s, LOS C	10s, LOS A
Dunns Crossing / Newman Priority	>120s, LOS F	59s, LOS F	>120s, LOS F	49s, LOS E
Dunns Crossing / SH1 Roundabout	37s, LOS D	11s, LOS B	37s, LOS D	11s, LOS B
Lowes / Tennyson Signals	31s, LOS C	29s, LOS C	30s, LOS C	28s, LOS C
Lowes / Broadlands	>120s, LOS F	59s, LOS F	>120s, LOS F	44s, LOS E

The comparable results show that the delays at both Dunns Crossing Road / Brookside Road and Dunns Crossing Road / Lowes Road reduce with the model allowing northbound through traffic to pass any right turning traffic. In addition, the change has enabled some refinement of the Lowes Road / Brookside Road roundabout design. As part of the Plan Change proposal the Dunns Crossing Road / Brookside Road intersection will be adjusted from a four arm to three arm intersection with removal of the western leg of the intersection. At this location there is currently 5m from the centreline to the western approach limit line which is sufficient for a car to pass a car. At the time of intersection reconfiguration there will be opportunity to consider the need for formal right turn facility or provide localised widening.

The additional Modelling Scenario Detailed Outputs are provided as **Attachment 1**.

## Ecological

*There appears to be conflict between the ecological assessment provided by Aquatic Ecology, which considers that the water race is in good order and is likely to have at least moderate ecological value such that a similar treatment to PC73 could be considered and the urban design assessment provided by a+urban, which indicates that, at this point the retention of the water race has not been included in the proposed ODP. However both appear in agreement that a full assessment of the ecological values is critical to inform the decision making process.*

*The degree of the ecological assessment should be proportionate to the significance of ecological values present and the scale of anticipated effects of the proposal. If the ODP is changed to explicitly protect the water race and provide a 10 m buffer either side (as proposed for PC73), then the current ecological assessment would be considered to be adequate, provided a more detailed ecology assessment occurs at the time of subdivision. However, as the RFI response and the current version of the ODP indicate that the water race will not be protected at all, then there are potentially greater ecological effects associated with this approach. Therefore, please either provide an ecological assessment that includes field-based sampling or amend the ODP to acknowledge the retention of the water race in the same manner as PC73.*

### Response:

The inconsistency between Aquatic Ecology and a+urban arose from the Aquatic Ecology RFI #1 response at Item 8 Ecological Assessment, and the a+urban response to Item 11.

This has been addressed by the applicant. Agreement has been reached that the proposed Plan Change will provide for the water race to be retained but relocated to the western boundary where it can contribute to a buffer for the proposed development. Initial investigation suggests such a relocation is feasible from a land contour viewpoint. The assessment of the water race to date has been a desk top assessment only and an examination of aerial photos. A field assessment of its ecological values can be done to inform any subdivision consent.

It is relevant that Commissioner Caldwell in his decision on Plan Change 73 had this to say about the water race issue at para 101-103:

*101. In relation to the water race, this flows across the north-west corner of the Holmes Block and then south-west along the western boundary before passing under Burnham School Road.*

*102. Mr England advised that there are a number of ways to treat the water race including incorporation within the development, closing it, diverting it, or piping it.<sup>56</sup> He advised that SDC's water race closure process requires 80% of downstream users' approval prior to going out for consultation and ultimate Council decision, and that the ultimate treatment of the water race could be determined at subdivision stage.*

*103. I accept the evidence of Mr England in particular that the ultimate treatment of the water race can be determined at subdivision consent stage.*

The ODP has been amended to reflect this (**Attachment 2**).

The supporting ODP narrative at **Attachment 2** has been amended to reflect this new proposal (see highlighted text):

An existing water race runs through the area and **can be retained and realigned**. Further investigation of its ecological values can be undertaken at subdivision stage, including the feasibility and desirability of its possible naturalisation and integration as part of the urban environment.

The following paragraph in the original response to RFI #1 Item 11 is to be deleted and replaced with new text as shown here:

~~There are uncertainties around several of the above matters, in particular around long term water flow, the full ecological values of this particular stretch of the water race, and the lack of detailed design for infrastructure within the plan change area; therefore, at this point the retention of the stock water race has not been included in the proposed ODP.~~

**“An existing water race runs through the area. It can be retained and realigned along the western boundary (Edwards Road) and the southern boundary of the site. It will remain open and fish and kākahi salvage works will be conducted in accordance with Environment Canterbury fish salvage guidelines prior to any works occurring within the water races.”**

The RFI #1 response to Item 11 by a+urban identified several matters that, from an urban design perspective need to be addressed to confirm the merits of retaining the water race, and to ensure integration in to a residential area. These matters are still relevant but can be addressed at any hearing or at subdivision stage for specific details arising from retention of the water race.

### **Changes to the Resource Management Act**

*As you will be aware, the Resource Management (Enabling Housing Supply and Other Matters) Amendment Act 2021 (EHS Act) came into force on 21 December 2021. The commencement of this Act has implications for this plan change request. In particular, s15 of EHS Act inserted clause 25(4A) into Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act, requiring that Councils must not accept or adopt a request if it does not incorporate the medium density residential standards (MDRS). As currently proposed, this request does not incorporate MDRS.*

*...the following further amendments are requested to the plan change documents:*

- 1. amend the request to incorporate this standard suite of provisions, with the exception of density, for which a modification to accommodate a qualifying matter is being sought, and*
- 2. identify and acknowledge the qualifying matter within plan change documents. It is not considered necessary to provide any further evidence at this time, rather this can be provided at later stages of the plan change process as appropriate*

*In relation to the balance of the MDRS provisions to be incorporated, as these have been directed by central government, it is considered that there is no need to amend the expert advice, such as urban design advice, already provided.*

**Response:**

The plan change request has been amended to adopt the Council's standard suite of MDRS provisions without amendment (new Appendix 16) and proposes the 'Living MD' zoning. In response to density, a modification is proposed (cap on household numbers) within the ODP text in order to accommodate a qualifying matter and in response to the findings of the transportation assessment.

I have attached a tracked version of the ODP Text and a clean version (revised Appendix 2 of plan change application), in addition to tracked and clean versions of the plan change application and other appendices which have required consequential changes (plan change Appendices 10, 11, 12, 12 and 13), in particular reference to the MDRS and Living MD Zone and qualifying matter. The ODP diagram (revised plan change Appendix 2) has also been updated from the initial RFI response and reflects the Living MD zoning now proposed.

Yours sincerely



**FIONA ASTON**

Principal Planner

**Appendices**

Attachment 1: Additional Traffic Modelling Scenario Detailed Outputs (Stantec) – see



Rolleston 2033 Heinz  
+ PC 80 and 81 - RTB.

Attachment 2: Revised Plan Change Application Appendix 2 - Amended ODP and narrative (tracked and clean versions)

Attachment 3: Revised Plan Change Appendix 16 - Operative Selwyn District Plan amendments to give effect to MDRS requirements

Attachment 4: Consolidated Amendments to PC82 (dated 10/3/22) with changes tracked and highlighted ie Revised Plan Change application, revised Appendices 2, 10, 11, 12, 12A and 13 – see

<https://www.dropbox.com/sh/31kyfb4fdqzcu7b/AADpl-diCqZjXmWmilhZyGfMa?dl=0>

Attachment 5: Consolidated Amendments to PC82 (dated 10/3/22) clean version ie Revised Plan Change application, revised Appendices 2, 10, 11, 12, 12A and 13 – see

[https://www.dropbox.com/sh/3kl39eitzkolm49/AACwPmk6P\\_lbEXLExcyceTDka?dl=0](https://www.dropbox.com/sh/3kl39eitzkolm49/AACwPmk6P_lbEXLExcyceTDka?dl=0)