

RMA FORM 5

Submission on the Proposed Plan Change 82 to the Operative Selwyn District Plan

Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

To: Selwyn District Council

Note to person making submission

You can make this submission by filling in an online submission form which you can find on Council's website at www.selwyn.govt.nz/pc82

The submission period for the Proposed Plan Change 82 closes at **5pm Monday 9 May 2022**.

Your submission (or part of your submission) may be struck out if the Council is satisfied that at least one of the following applies to the submission (or part of the submission):

- It is frivolous or vexatious.
- It discloses no reasonable or relevant case.
- It would be an abuse of the hearing process to allow the submission (or the part) to be taken further.
- It contains offensive language.
- It is supported only by material that purports to be independent expert evidence, but has been prepared by a person who is not independent or who does not have sufficient specialised knowledge or skill to give expert advice on the matter.

1. Submitter details

Please note: all fields marked with an asterisk (*) are compulsory.

Name of submitter(s)* Malcolm DOUGLAS & Jan DOUGLAS

Submitter address* 113 Edwards Road, R.D. 7

City/Town* CHRISTCHURCH Postcode* 7677

Contact name (if different from above) _____

Contact organisation (if different from above) _____

Contact email address malcolm.d.douglas@gmail.com

Contact address (if different from above) _____

City/Town _____ Postcode _____

Contact phone number 0210589650

Please note that by making a submission your personal details, including your name and addresses, will be made publicly available in accordance with the Resource Management Act 1991. This is because, under the Act, any further submission supporting or opposing your submission must be forwarded to you as well as to the Council.

While all information in your submission will be included in papers which are available to the media and the public, your submission will be used only for the purpose of the Plan Change Process.

2. Trade competition declaration*

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

☐ Yes ☒ No

If yes: I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

(a) adversely effects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

☐ Yes ☐ No

Note: If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through the submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by clause 6(4) of Part 1 of Schedule 1 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

3. Hearing options*

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission? If you choose yes, you can choose not to speak when the hearing date is advertised.

☒ Yes ☐ No

If others are making a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing? You can change your mind once the hearing has been advertised.

☐ Yes ☒ No

4. Submission details*

☒ Yes, I am enclosing further supporting information to this submission form.

Provision to which my/our submission relates: <small>(Please specify the Objective, Policy, Rule, Rule Requirement, Assessment Matter, Mapping feature or other reference your submission relates to)</small>	My position on this provision is: <small>(Select one option)</small>	The reasons for my/our submission are: <small>(Please give details)</small>	The decision I/we want Council to make: <small>(Please specify if you want the provision to be retained, amended or deleted, eg Amend – change the activity status to non-complying)</small>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose in part <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose in full <input type="checkbox"/> Support in part <input type="checkbox"/> Support in full	PLEASE SEE ATTACHED FIVE (5) PAGES OF SUBMISSIONS.	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose in part <input type="checkbox"/> Oppose in full <input type="checkbox"/> Support in part <input type="checkbox"/> Support in full		

Signature of submitter (or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter) M. Douglas / Douglas Date 01/05/22.

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

Please return this form no later than **5pm Monday 9 May 2022**. You can:

- scan and email it to submissions@selwyn.govt.nz (Subject line: Proposed Plan Change 82)
- post it to Selwyn District Council, Freepost 104 653, PO Box 90, Rolleston 7643, Attention: Proposed Plan Change 82
- deliver it to a Council service centre in Darfield, Lincoln, Leeston or Rolleston.

I oppose any further large areas of rezoning to the south side of Dunns Crossing Road until that road and surrounding roads are upgraded to manage the obvious very large increase in vehicular traffic which would result.

The increase in traffic volume will also see the SDC need to lower the speed limits in Dunns Crossing Road and surrounding roads, resulting in even slower vehicular movements and even more traffic congestion at peak times especially.

The intersection of Dunns Crossing with Main South Roads is already a safety hazard and despite whatever improvements are made, the increase in traffic volumes will cause even more delays than at present with drivers becoming impatient. That result through impatience will cause more accidents.

Any new urban growth should be in such a way as to facilitate an efficient and effective public transport service. To my knowledge there is no such public transport network planned. Hundreds of additional private vehicle movements from/around the proposed PC site will cause even more congestion for vehicles leaving / returning to Rolleston each day, than what there is at present; at present one only has to be in a car at times to witness such congestion! It is very bad already and will be even more so if this PC is accepted at this time.

Lastly, the petitioners for this Plan Change will indeed benefit greatly financially; the ratepayers certainly won't, just the opposite! The necessary engineering of the road work networks won't be a cost to these petitioners, but clearly will chiefly fall on the tax payers, ratepayers of this district.

I accept that over the next few years, the SDC will eventually perhaps be able to overcome the matters which I have raised. I accept that these matters in themselves are probably insufficient to reject the Plan Change BUT **must be considered** in conjunction with all of the other aspects submitters opposing will raise and the **accumulation** will indeed be sufficient for rejection.

This Plan Change could be held in abeyance until the matters of a suitable, efficient and effective transport network has not only been planned, accepted and financed to accommodate said Plan Change **but be in operation**; clearly this will be several years hence!

I oppose this Plan Change.

.....

If you live in any of the new current subdivisions in Rolleston to the west of the township you will be well aware of the existing water supply restraints and low water pressures. Every summer there are various complaints on the Rolleston Community Facebook page about how pitiful the water pressure to their homes has decreased. I recall one person saying that they could urinate a stronger flow

than what they are getting from the town water supply! I am sure that the SDC is well aware of such concerns. Add several hundred households to this existing supply and such would be an horrific adverse result. Yes, there are private irrigation wells which could be utilised in due course perhaps BUT that will result in a need for RESOURCE CONSENT from Ecan which allowing for objections and the likes, and following their usual patterns, could take years to incorporate.

An increase of several hundred homes as this Plan Change will cause to occur if successful, would mean existing property owners will be even more deprived of a satisfactory service.

I accept that over the next few years, the SDC will eventually perhaps be able to overcome the matters which I have raised. I accept that these matters in themselves are probably insufficient to reject the Plan Change BUT **must be considered** in conjunction with all of the other aspects submitters opposing will raise and the **accumulation** will indeed be sufficient for rejection.

This Plan Change could be held in abeyance until the matters of a suitable, efficient and effective water supply has not only been planned, accepted, approved and financed to accommodate said Plan Change **but be in operation**; clearly this will be several years hence!

I oppose this Plan Change.

.....

Community Facilities: PC2/82

Medical facilities in Rolleston are already at capacity or near so. Add the prospect of hundreds/thousands of additional people moving to live here as a result of this proposed Plan Change, and where will they go for medical help? The capacity of the ambulance service to assist in medical events would be stretched just too far also. The fire brigade is staffed by volunteers. These volunteers attend call-outs during normal business hours with the willing co-operation of their employers. They attend fires, medical events, disasters and such sometimes on a daily basis. Will such willingness continue with employers finding their business in today's climate is not as financial as it once was? Will such willingness continue with employers having to burden the cost of more frequent call-outs of their staff to attend such incidents because clearly an additional population growth propounded by this Plan Change will bring hundreds/thousands of additional residents here and with the resultant call out on their employees.

The West Rolleston School and other nearby schools are just about at capacity. This Plan Change does not address such an issue.

I accept that over the next few years, the SDC will eventually perhaps be able to overcome the matters which I have raised. I accept that these matters in themselves are probably insufficient to reject the Plan Change BUT **must be considered** in conjunction with all of the other aspects submitters opposing will raise and the **accumulation** will indeed be sufficient for rejection.

This Plan Change could be held in abeyance until the matters of a suitable, efficient and effective community facilities have not only been planned, financed to accommodate said Plan Change but be in operation; clearly this will be several years hence!

I oppose this Plan Change.

.....

Quality of the Environment: PC/82

This application for a Plan Change seems to not address this aspect. If approved there will be a massive impact on our environment and that of other nearby residents. While the houses are being built, the noise from such building, associated heavy duty vehicles transporting materials to and from will be massive. Our small farm property in Edwards Road currently has no nearby neighbours and is our haven of peace. Clearly this will be shattered if the Plan Change succeeds.

We have lived on our property for over 45 years. My wife has a medical condition which is severely affected by dust particles. Our attempts to have our shingled road tar sealed because particularly of this health problem, were not accepted by the Selwyn District Council. We had 200 metres either side of our home tar sealed at a cost to ourselves of several thousand dollars. Since then her health has improved to a marked degree. Clearly dust from the building site will severely aggravate this condition. I would ask that if this Plan Change is to go ahead, then a condition be entered that the developers provide sufficient barriers and carry out such mitigating means as the use of water, to protect the health of my wife, myself and other nearby residents. Also that the whole of Edwards Road be widened for ease of 2 way traffic and the whole road fully sealed at the developers total cost. **A less expensive way would be for the developers to include our property (which is the only one really close to the site) in the ambit of the Plan Change so that we too could subdivide and quit the area.**

I submit too that there has been no mention of the adverse effect of the hundreds of private motor vehicles (of carbon and greenhouse gas emissions,) which this Plan Change will attract, into the environment, and how these will be diluted.

I accept that the developers will eventually perhaps be able to overcome the matters which I have raised. I accept that these matters in themselves are probably insufficient to reject the Plan Change BUT **must be considered** in conjunction with all of the other aspects submitters opposing will raise and the **accumulation** will indeed be sufficient for rejection.

I oppose this Plan Change.

.....

Sewage. PC82/82

When the Selwyn District Pines Water Treatment plant was notified, I made strong objections. Eventually the SDC and my wife and I entered into a binding contract that if we could show at any stage that our home well/water supply was contaminated by E coli arising from the operation of said plant, then we would be either given an even deeper well or connected to a reticulated water supply at the expense of said SDC. Well it didn't take long. I was easily able to prove such contamination. The SDC eventually went to the expense of providing a brand new reticulated water supply to our home.

Yes, I appreciate that the PWTP has no doubt improved the efficiency of their plant since BUT!

The treated effluent is eventually sprayed by irrigators onto land the location of which is well known. This has been occurring now for many years. Surely this treated effluent cannot be 100% free of E coli etc. Nothing is absolutely perfect as I was able to prove earlier despite their claims. It must be leaching into the sub strata and if it isn't currently, then it soon will be. The PWTP has had many new connections in recent months; Lincoln, Burnham plus others. It is well known locally that the site has just about reached its saturation level. ***Where can the SDC expand to, or move to? It had already moved from the Helpet Park site to the current PWTP site. One simple solution would be to move the spraying operation to the many hectares of land currently being used by the farmers and subject to this Plan Change!*** Would mostly just need some trenching and piping to achieve! Of course this would not be as financially viable for the proposers of this Plan Change but would be for the SDC and ratepayers.

So, I strongly oppose this Plan Change also on the grounds that the area is not only currently and in the near future, not suitable for housing as I have demonstrated, but **it has a very real valuable alternative use for part of the SDC sewage treatment facility!**

I oppose this Plan Change.

.....

Residential and Business Development. PC82/82

An earlier Plan Change, PC73, was considered in great depth by a Commissioner and eventually the SDC. The land subject of PC73 is adjacent to PC 81 and PC82. The Commissioner's recommendation to PC73 was to reject such Plan Change and indeed such recommendation was accepted by a meeting of the SDC and PC73 was rejected. I just can't for the life of me see how PC 81 and PC 82 cannot also be rejected as all circumstances surrounding PC 73 are also relevant to PC 81 and PC 82!

The Canterbury Regional Council, Environment Canterbury, and the Christchurch City Council, all opposed PC 73 on such grounds as PC 73 would not add significantly to the development capacity or contribute to a well-functioning urban environment, nor had PC 73 demonstrated that it was or

would be, well connected and therefore did not give effect to the various provisions in the NPS-UD. Also that PC 73 did not give effect to the CRPS as the site is outside of the areas identified for development of the CRPS.

The land covered by the proposed Plan Changes 81 and 82 would clearly take away the existing gradual buffer between the suburban, to the semi-rural, and then to the straight rural nature of land that was fully intended to be of such buffering to the betterment of that area and people of the town of Rolleston. Plan Changes 81 and 82 would leave such lands like isolated islands.

I have a copy of the extensive correspondence relating to PC 73 including the legal matters considered by the Commissioner when making his decision to reject PC 73. I do not see the need for me to recount such correspondence but presume that it is available for the current Commissioner to view. Because the land identified in PC 81 and PC 82 borders the land on PC 73, and all matters pertaining to PC 73 clearly additionally pertain to PC 81 and PC 82, then I submit that PC 81 and PC 82 must also be rejected.

I oppose this Plan Change.

.....