

## 2. PROPOSED SELWYN DISTRICT PROPOSED PLAN – VOLUME 2: RURAL FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

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

The purpose of this report is to seek the Council's confirmation of the attached Further Submissions to the Selwyn District Proposed Plan Volume 2: Rural. These further submissions focus on cross boundary issues and consistency between plans, along the mutual boundary.

The further submissions must be lodged with the Selwyn District Council by 5pm on 10 October 2002.

### STATUTORY FRAMEWORK

The basis for making submissions and further submissions across territorial boundaries is Section 74(2)(c), which requires Councils changing their plans to have regard to the extent to which the change needs to be consistent with the plans or proposed plans of adjoining territorial authorities.

Section 75(1)(h) requires a district plan to make provision for matters to be set out, Part II of the Second Schedule. The district plan shall state "The processes to be used to deal with issues which cross territorial boundaries..."

It is however, still the discretion of other Councils as to how they may view the relationship.

### FURTHER SUBMISSIONS

Further submissions have been made, particularly on residential density and subdivision alongside the mutual boundary between Selwyn District and Christchurch City, around townships, and on the Port Hills.

### GROWTH OF TOWNSHIPS OF RURAL AREA

Residential density and subdivision-objectives, policies and methods:

- Policy 1 which sets out maximum residential density ratios in the rural zone, proposes an inconsistent density on the Port Hills compared to that of Christchurch City. Submissions are opposed when they support Selwyn Proposed Plan standard of 1 residential unit per 40 hectares, while Christchurch City allows 1 residential unit per 100 hectares in the Rural Hills zone. Similarly, submissions supporting the rule (1.13) concerning residential density on the Port Hills is opposed.
- Policy 3 proposes a maximum residential density of 1 house per hectare in the rural zone immediately around townships in Selwyn District. Submissions supporting this are opposed or opposed in part around the townships of Prebbleton, and West Melton in particular because this does not encourage efficient compact development along the mutual Selwyn District and Christchurch City boundary. This is particularly so where the distance around townships is 1km and encroaches over the city boundary to the north, north-east of Prebbleton.

However, submissions are supported or supported in part where they propose a higher density and range of section sizes around Prebbleton in particular.

### SUBDIVISION

Subdivision to 2.5 hectare blocks would also create inconsistencies along the boundary between Selwyn District and the City. Such development would also adversely affect the rural-urban contrast between the City and the townships. Therefore this submission is opposed.

Similarly, subdivision standards are opposed where these are inconsistent with the City in particular on the Port Hills and in the rural area around townships and Prebbleton on Selwyn District's and the City's mutual boundary.

### PLANNING MAPS

Rezoning requests from rural to residential around West Melton and Pebbleton and Templeton on the planning maps are also opposed particularly in the direction of the City boundary.

## **DEBON HOLDINGS LIMITED**

The City lodged a reference on Plan Change 54 to Selwyn District Transitional Plan (Paparua section) where land was sought for reasoning from rural to rural residential nearly on the opposite side of the road to Templeton. While this reference to Debon Holdings Limited was withdrawn, further submissions opposing rural residential development are now proposed.

This matter was reported to the Regulatory and Consents Committee on 12 July 2002 and the recommendations confirmed by the Council on 25 July 2002. When Environment Canterbury withdrew its reference to the Environment Court, there was significant risk that the City Council could lose this particular case if it proceeded alone, and staff resources could be more effectively engaged on other pressing issues. However, the Council's decision, was to lodge a further submission on Selwyn District Council's Proposed Plan Volume 2: Rural, reaffirming the Council's position opposing such dispersed development along the mutual boundary. This is better done in the context of the overall philosophy of sustainable development, and the integrated management of the effects across territorial boundaries.

### **Staff**

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

### **Chairman's**

**Recommendation:** That the attached further submissions be approved and forwarded to Selwyn District Council.