

## 9. SELWYN DISTRICT PLANS

<b>Officer responsible</b> Team Leader, Planning Policy	<b>Author</b> Diana Plesovs, Senior Planner, DDI 941-8805
--	--

The purpose for this report is to seek the Council's confirmation of the submissions and further submissions to the Selwyn District Proposed Plans and the Plan Change 73 (McFarlane Group/Aylesford Management Ltd) to the Selwyn District Transitional Plan. The submissions (tabled at this meeting) focus on cross boundary issues, with the adjoining Selwyn District Council.

### INTRODUCTION

Selwyn District Council has notified its proposed plan in two parts and at different times:

Volume 1: Townships, and  
Volume 2: Rural

Submissions have already been lodged to both Selwyn District Proposed Plans and Change 73, signed by the Urban Development Policy Leader. It appears there is no longer delegated authority for staff to lodge submissions on plans and changes in adjoining territorial authorities.

Advice from the Legal Services Manager, Peter Mitchell, is that the submissions should be ratified by the Council, a process that has been carried out in the past. A Hearings Panel has already seen the submissions.

Section 74(2)(c) of the Resource Management Act 1991, requires Councils that are changing their plans, "to have regard to the extent to which the changes need to be consistent with the plans of adjoining territorial authorities". The basis of the city's submissions then, is that there should be some consistency in plan provisions between Christchurch City and Selwyn District. However, it is recognised that Selwyn District still has the discretion as to how it may view the relationship between its plan and that of the City's.

### VOLUME 1: TOWNSHIPS

Submissions and further submissions have been made on the following matters: (a) Growth of Townships, (b) Christchurch International Airport Flight Path Noise Contour Protection, and (c) Traffic.

#### (a) Growth of Townships

The city's further submissions oppose several requests for some form of residential rezoning around Prebbleton and West Melton. If some, or all, of these were accepted by Selwyn District Council, these major expansions would have likely impacts on the outcomes of the city's objectives and policies on urban consolidation, peripheral urban development, rural land resources, infrastructure and rural amenity values. Some of these proposals are within 1 km of the city's boundary.

#### (b) Christchurch International Airport Flight Path Noise Contour Protection

Maintaining and protecting the Christchurch International Airport Flight Path Noise Contour of 50 Ldn dBA from further residential development, particularly in relation to township growth at Rolleston is supported. Although the airport flight path noise contour is subject to a reference under Christchurch City's Proposed City Plan, in the meantime standards and restrictions on residential development should remain consistent in adjoining districts. Wording changes are sought to clarify the point that residential development has more than a minor effect under the flight path.

The Christchurch City Council is making submissions on the airport noise issue because it is a cross boundary issue. The Christchurch International Airport Company is also making its own submissions.

#### (c) Traffic

The City Council supports the provisions in the proposed plan, that acknowledge the potential adverse cross boundary impacts of new residential or business development on the city's road network.

## **VOLUME 2: RURAL**

Submissions have been made on the following matters: (a) Growth of Townships, (b) Christchurch International Airport Flight Path Noise Contours, (c) Port Hills, (d) Subdivision, (e) Council reserves, (f) Financial Contributions.

### **(a) Growth of Townships**

The Selwyn District Council's proposed objectives, policies and methods promoting "consolidation" of residential development in and around townships are supported. Residential development contiguous to existing living zones, at living zone densities, will provide for the efficient use of infrastructure for example. As in Christchurch City, consolidation is designed to avoid sporadic residential development in the rural area on the boundary of both territorial authorities and designed to maintain rural amenity, character and separation between settlements. However, the proposed plan provision for development of 1 ha minimum lots, around Prebbleton in particular, is opposed. This pattern of dispersed development could create inefficiencies in servicing and transport, and be inconsistent with the Proposed City Plan provisions of 4ha minimum subdivision requirement on the mutual territorial boundary.

The consolidation of townships largely or wholly on one side of a strategic route or the other is supported, to protect the efficiency of major transport routes.

### **(b) Christchurch International Airport Flight Path Noise Contours**

Recognition of the need for uncompromised operation, and maintaining consistent airport flight path noise contours for Christchurch International Airport in the rural area is supported.

### **(c) Port Hills**

The recognition of the Port Hills as an outstanding natural feature and landscape is supported.

However, the subdivision standard of one residential unit per 40 hectares is opposed. The adjoining city subdivision standard for the Rural H Zone is one residential unit per 100 ha. The Rural H Zone generally extends from the base to the crest of the Port Hills, recognising the hills outstanding natural features and designed to minimise adverse effects from residential development on one of the most important visual amenities of the city.

### **(d) Subdivision**

A minimum subdivision standard less than 4 ha in the vicinity of both districts' mutual boundary on the plains, is not supported. The 4ha rule should be consistent across administrative boundaries in order to retain the rural area's character and amenity.

### **(e) Council Reserves**

Tree planting restrictions on City Council owned and administered reserves in Selwyn District, are seen as unnecessary as this would not allow for naturally regenerating native forest. The recently revised Summit Road Protection Act 2001 (released after public notification of Volume 2) addresses the issue of the tree planting on the Summit Road. Restrictions to minimise shading from trees, on Port Hills reserves would be difficult to administer and would require the City Council to obtain resource consents for much of its tree planting in reserves on the Port Hills. The restrictions are also seen as unnecessary as those reserves will eventually have native forest cover created either by natural regeneration or by restoration planting. Therefore these restrictions are opposed.

Restrictions on signs are also opposed where they would require a resource consent for reserves identification and interpretation, identifying walkways, historic sites etc.

### **(f) Financial Contributions**

Financial contributions to purchase reserves and/or upgrade recreational facilities, which can also be used by Christchurch residents are supported as well as public access to lakes, rivers and other recreation areas.

## **Further Submissions on Volume 2 Rural**

These have yet to be called for, although it expected the City Council will be concerned with similar issues.

### **PROPOSED CHANGE 73 - MCFARLANE GROUP/AYLESFORD MANAGEMENT LIMITED**

This proposed change promotes a form of rural residential development on two blocks 0.4 km and 1.1 kms west of Prebbleton containing 5000m<sup>2</sup> lots and 1.8 ha lots. These are considerably less than the 4 ha on the adjoining city boundary and are therefore not considered consistent with the consolidation objective of Selwyn District's proposed plans, nor consistent with that of the city.

The City Council presented evidence to an independent Commissioner on 15 April 2002 opposing the developments on the basis that recognition was needed of cross boundary issues, relating to what appears to be essentially sporadic urban development in a rural area, across an administrative boundary. It is important to note Selwyn District Council supported the City Council's urban growth Objective 6.3 which recognises peripheral urban development can have adverse effects on water, versatile soils and other natural and physical resources. Selwyn District requested the objective be amended to include adverse impacts on peripheral urban development on rural amenity. The City Council amended the objective accordingly.

A decision on this Plan Change is awaited.

#### **Staff**

**Recommendation:** That the submissions and further submissions be confirmed.

#### **Recommendation**

**from the Chair:** For discussion.