

30 OCT 2024

Name:

Mel

Planning Unit

Notice of Submission on an Application for Resource Consent

Application Reference:
RC 245009

Resource Management Act 1991 - Form 13

Send or deliver your application to: Selwyn District Council, PO Box 90, Rolleston 7643

For enquiries phone: (03) 347-2868

For enquiries email: planninginfo@selwyn.govt.nz

1. Submitter Details

Name of Submitter(s) (state full name(s)): CHRISTOPHER EAMON WHITE

Physical Address: 995 GOULDS ROAD ROLLESTON

Address for Service (if different):

Email:

Telephone (day): SEE MOBILE Mobile:

2. Application Details

Application Reference Number (if not stated above): RC 245009

Name of Applicant (state full name): CORNERSTONE ROLLESTON TRUST

Application Site Address: 999 GOULDS ROAD ROLLESTON

Description of Proposed Activity: CHURCH / COMMUNITY CENTRE

3. Submission Details

- I / We: ☐ Support all or part of the application
☐ Oppose all or part of the application
☒ Are neutral towards all or part of the application

The specific parts of the application that my / our submission relates to are: (give details, continue on a separate sheet)

SEE ATTACHED.

The reasons for my / our submission are:

AFFECTED PARTY ON BOTH NORTHERN AND
SOUTHERN PROPERTY BOUNDARIES

The decision I / We would like the Council to make is: (give details including, if relevant, the parts of the application you wish to have amended and the general nature of any conditions sought.)

SET CONDITIONS TO LIMIT AND MITIGATE
REVERSE SENSITIVITIES AND THEIR AFFECTS
-SEE ATTACHED.

4. Submission at the Hearing

- ☒ I / We wish to speak in support of my / our submission.
- ☐ I / We do not wish to speak in support of my / our submission.
- ☐ If others make a similar submission I / We will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.
- ☒ Pursuant to section 100A of the Resource Management Act 1991 I / We request that the Council delegate its functions, powers, and duties required to hear and decide the application to one or more hearings commissioners who are not members of the Council. (Please note that if you make such a request you may be liable to meet or contribute to the costs of the commissioner(s). Requests can also be made separately in writing no later than 5 working days after the close of submissions.)

5. Signature

(Of submitter(s) or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter(s))

Signature: 

Date: 29. 10. 24

Signature:

Date:

Note: A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

6. Privacy Information

The personal information requested in the form is being collected by Selwyn District Council so that we can process your application. This information is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. This information will be held by the Council. You may ask to check and correct any of this personal information if you wish. The personal information collected will not be shared with any departments of the Council not involved in processing your application. However under the Official Information and Meetings Act 1987 this information may be made available on request to parties within and outside the Council.

7. Important Information

1. The Council must receive this submission before the closing date and time for submissions on this application.
2. You must also send a copy of this submission to the applicant as soon as reasonably practicable, at the applicant's address for service.
3. All submitters will be advised of hearing details at least 10 working days before the hearing. If you change your mind about whether you wish to speak at the hearing, please contact the Council by telephone on 347-2868 or by email at planninginfo@selwyn.govt.nz
4. Only those submitters who indicate that they wish to speak at the hearing will be sent a copy of the planning report.

For Office Use Only

Received at the Office on at am / pm

Submissions: Application Reference
RC 245 009

Please find my submissions attached.
Both my blocks, 995 Goulds Road
and 1005-07 Goulds Road have the
same zoning as the Church block
and will no doubt be eventually sub-
divided for medium density housing.

I want to make it clear from the
outset that I do not oppose this
application; but I do have concerns
the principal one being: short to
medium term affect on my two
potable water supplies, both 150mm
bores containing submersible pumps
in fairly close proximity to the churches
proposed sealed parking areas behind
the proposed building. The stormwater
run off worries me as I will later
outline.

Letter Unknown author, 3/5/24

Objective B1.2.2

'Activities on land and the surface of water in the Selwyn District:

Do not adversely affect ground or surface water resources;

and Policy B1 2.7. (Adverse affect on ground water).

Unfortunately I do not agree with the author that: 'The proposed church will not adversely affect ground or surface water resources. Both 995 Goulds Road and 1005-07 Goulds Road are owned by me and their water supply is via a 150mm well bore on each property. At 995 Goulds that bore is approximately 20 metres deep (66ft from memory). The submersible pump was replaced this year and there is a good head of water. At 1005-07

Goulds Road the 150 mm bore was drilled in the 1990's and I believe it is 42 metres deep.

Although high pressure town supply is available at the gates I prefer not to avail myself of this facility as I don't want chlorinated water, nor does my tenant(s).

I have owned both properties for 40 years and 38 years respectively.

Unfortunately the properties houses are some distance back from Goulds Road necessitating considerable expenses to bring mains reticulated water supply in, and I have this year replaced my own submersible pump at a cost of \$5,400 approx.

The last identical pump lasted 22 years. The current one should see me out as I am 70!

Unfortunately the Church plans for stormwater disposal show three soak pits almost in a direct North / South line with my two wells. The most Southerly one appears about 10 metres from the Southern boundary. The pit in the North East corner of the block is barely inside the boundary. (See Kim Sanders Consulting for Civil Engineering and Construction Plan cc/1, Sewer Carpark Dimension Topographical Survey and Earthworks Plan of 03/23). The layover of the Siteworks plan (including aerial Appendix A Page 5) by Kim Sanders cc/2 of 03/23 gives a good idea of how close the 'twin pits' are to my home well at 995 Goulds Road.

It is situated in the Eastern side of the shed adjacent to the house almost exactly where a circle appears on the plan with what could be the number 45 in it ie (45).

My own bore is quite shallow at around 20 metres and the churches soak pits appear to be on the 'upstream' side of the water flow underground which is West to East. I note that a 60 litre storage trap for hydrocarbons is included in this 'twin pit'. The run off will also include oil byproducts and tyre rubber particles from over 100 vehicles.

Could this storm water go out onto Goulds Road please? I note that in the last 5 years a large

Soak pit was constructed outside my property boundary to take stormwater piped from the East side of Goulds Road. This new Pit straddles my entrance way at 995 Goulds. Is there capacity in it to take the Carpark run off? I am not concerned about the buildings run off, but worry about adverse affects on my water quality, from the carpark(s).

My well at 1005/07 Goulds is deeper but still falls on a line drawn between each well and the carpark soak pits, approximately.

Finally on parking, the Church is identified as having a capacity maximum of 1,284 people. This is mentioned at the Summary of

Compliance matters (TRANS-REQ 11 Cycle Parks and facilities). It doesn't provide the correct required cycle parks.

In relation to car parks how are 113 car parks going to support 1284 people? Even if each car has 4 occupants (an unlikely average - will be lower); the church will be short of car parks to the tune of 208 if on site parking is envisaged. $(1284 \div 4 = 321 - 113(\text{provision}) = 208$ short. Even allowing for some 'spill over' additional parking further west of the sealed parking area, it looks to me that both my road frontages will be inundated with parked vehicles. Last summer almost the total area of the front of the block that will

disappear under the building footprint was covered regularly with 80 - 100 vehicles, usually on Sundays. Human nature being what it is, many will park on the Road. One only has to look at Maddisons Eatery just South on Goulds Road to see the vehicles on the Goulds Road frontage despite the fact that a short walk from the Preschool parking area on Rangitira St would avoid this. (Available all weekend but seldom used, making it harder to exit East Maddison Road because of the visual obstruction). Already there is little time to react at my 995 Goulds Road driveway to vehicles exiting East Maddisons Road since the East Maddisons Road realignment. (The

new shorter distance equals less reaction time for me coming and going from home. (Try coming out of my driveway and travelling 300 metres North to turn into 1005-07). Do people think I put my left hand blinker on to turn out of my own driveway? So much for trying to prewarn them of my imminent left turn! Parked cars will make the East Maddisons Road intersection more difficult to see.

Further on the question of parking the 'Summary of Compliance matters Under the Proposed Partly operative Selwyn District Plan Review' at unnumbered page '7'; TRANS-REQ15 Opening Spaces, the author states the following at paragraph 2: 'We also

highlight that there is a further 7m of width available between the edge of the formed carriageway and the site boundary, where a vehicle could wait to enter the site without obstructing through traffic. Moreover, a vehicle waiting at this location would not obstruct any passing pedestrians as there is no footpath on this side of Goulds Road.

This assessment seems to ignore the Decision Report of Commissioner Graham Taylor's of 21.8.24 at page 7 (41), Pedestrian Access, where he refers to the Church agreeing to a foot path extension across their frontage at their expense. Mountfort planning confirms this in their 29.9.24 letter at Paragraph 1. (David Mountfort

Planning consultant)

In an earlier letter of 13.2.24 Mr Mountfort seeks to confirm a lower limit of design capacity of the Church as being 700 people not 1284. However the intention to not use the the two large spaces of auditorium and foyer at the same time, are just that INTENTIONS! This seems a poor basis on which to assess parking and traffic issues for the purposes of a sensible Resource consent. Surely the upper figure should be used as it is a definite possibility over the life of this building.

Already over the past week on 27.10.24 Sunday, over 40 vehicles were parked for an evening service.

on Monday 28.10.24 15 vehicles were present for a morning meeting.

The consultants estimates of 10 vehicle movements a day are at wide variance with actuality! (Even before the building starts).

With regard to noise. I am pleased to see Mountfort Plannings letter of 29.9.2024 and particularly 7. Erecting acoustic fences along the Northern and Southern boundaries with my own properties. These however need to encompass the entire length of each boundary not a length of 100 meter which had been discussed with me previously. I ask that this be made a condition of the Resource consent if possible. This expense should be carried in full by the church as

it is apparent that the noise at my boundaries will exceed 50dBA along both boundaries and future subdivision will no doubt occur, along their entirety.

I do not wish to remove the Northern Shelter belt at 995 Goulds; it is my last aid to privacy! I am prepared to have that shelter belt topped at the Church's expense including cleaning up all slash on both side of the boundary, if they so choose. This would aid in protecting the new fence. I am also open to trim back on the church Northern boundary with myself (1005-1007 Goulds), by negotiation as we have previously agreed on occasions.

I wish the Church all the best with this project, and Gods Speed.
L.S. Hite