

**SUBMISSION ON OUR SPACE 2018-2048**  
**CONSULTATION DOCUMENT FOR THE REVIEW OF THE GREATER CHRISTCHURCH**  
**SETTLEMENT PATTERN – NOVEMBER 2018**

To: Our SPACE Consultation  
Greater Christchurch Partnership  
PO Box 73012  
Christchurch 8154  
Email: [ourspace@greaterchristchurch.org.nz](mailto:ourspace@greaterchristchurch.org.nz)

Submission by: M. Springer

Hearing of  
Submissions: The submitter does wish to be heard in support of their submissions.

---

**1. Introduction**

The submitter is the owner of 1.2 ha of land on the north side of Prebbleton fronting Springs Road. The land contains a single dwelling with established planting and is adjoined on the south and east sides by Residential Zoning and activity (Living X) with the rail trail and residential zoning across Springs Road to the West. Part of the site (title) is also within the Prebbleton Preferred Growth Area (Appendix 31 of Selwyn District Plan – Annexure v). The land has been variously inside and outside of the Metropolitan Urban Limits (MUL). When Proposed Plan Change No. 1 to the Regional Policy Statement was prepared and notified the property was severed by the MUL and the Council subsequently adopted this limit in setting the boundary for the Prebbleton Structure Plan which was reflected in Plan Change No. 21 to the Selwyn District Plan – Management of Growth at Prebbleton (Refer Site Plan – Attach 1).

When the decision (version) of Plan Change No. 1 was released, the MUL had moved to the south of the subject property excluding all the property from the MUL. This was not done on the basis of any submission lodged to PC1, a matter which appears to be recognised by the Council when in correspondence (December 2011) it noted (Refer Attach 2):

*“In investigating her property further as a result of early stages or preparing PC21 (proposed plan change for Prebbleton) and reviewing the new operative Chapter12A, it has come to my attention that the decision version of Change 1, and*

*Chapter 12A as a consequence, has moved the MUL to the south of Margaret's property excluding it in its entirety.*

*I have sought clarification from ECan as to why this was ever formalised as there is no commentary or direction that I am aware of within the decision issued on Change 1. This apparent error has the consequence of excluding Margaret's land in its entirety and making the Structure Plan and the SDP 'Preferred Growth Option' (SDP – Appendix 31) for the township inconsistent with Chapter 12A. The reason I believe it to be an error is that Change 1 MUL adopted the 'preferred Growth Option' for Prebbleton settled by the Court. The notified version of Change 1 reflected this and in doing so incorporated the lower half of Margaret's property. I am investigating a number of options to remedy this issue while I await a response from ECan".*

In addition correspondence with the Council (June 2008) indicated that where possible the MUL should follow the property boundaries and that the boundary of the MUL may not be appropriate in servicing the site (Refer Attach 3).

## **2. General Submission**

It is accepted that the Councils have made progress with integrated planning for the utility systems that they are responsible for, and related funding, since the Urban Limit lines were first introduced. The Councils are in the best position to judge whether service network extensions are feasible, in negotiation with landowners and applicants. The development process needs flexibility. The PIB/Urban Limit lines as currently prescribed are likely in some places to inhibit efficient, economic land development, and cannot be justified by a need to protect and manage the coordination of infrastructure with land development. This is the case in respect of the submitters land.

The submitter requests that the plan be amended to increase the amount of readily developable land that can be made available for development and that a move to higher densities of housing be supported and facilitated but not required or directed through statutory plans. This would be achieved by placing the infrastructure limit around the full extent of the submitter's title.

## **3. Subject Land**

The submitter seeks to have the subject land incorporated into an appropriate urban development area and argues that the inclusion of all of the submitters land within an urban category is appropriate and will make a useful contribution to housing opportunity, choice and residential activity in Greater Christchurch and the Selwyn District. In terms of the suitability of the land for the purpose proposed the following is noted;

- (1) The land is in large part within the urban environment of Prebbleton and the Preferred Prebbleton Growth Plan.
- (2) The land is a small block largely adjoining or facing urban zoning and activity.
- (3) The site has no value in terms of making any sustainable contribution to 'rural' or farming activities and is now isolated and constrained by the urban zoning at Prebbleton.
- (4) The land can be serviced.
- (5) There are no geotechnical constraints to development of the land.
- (6) The land adjoins the major road network and a regular public bus service passes the site. The site is also now located within the Springs Road (Prebbleton village centre) 50km speed zone.
- (7) The land is within walking distance of the convenience shopping and amenities at Prebbleton (200m).
- (8) The land is located within 200m of the primary school at Prebbleton.
- (9) That the inclusion of this land for residential use will not impact adversely on the management or staging of development in Prebbleton.
- (10) That approximately half of the site was located within the MUL and the boundary of the Prebbleton Structure Plan, but was deleted without explanation or justifying submission. It is contended largely, in accordance with the Council letter (June 2008) that the whole site should be within the appropriate urban zone.

When regard is had to the concept of a 10 minute neighbourhood for the Key Centres (Fig 19 of the Our Space Document) then the subject land satisfies that outcome better than much of the existing urban land at Prebbleton.

The subject land does not represent an isolated or disjointed urban zoning or development opportunity but is located in area that contains urban infrastructure, amenity and services. Development of the land for the purpose sought should be encouraged in order to provide infrastructure efficiency and a compact and sustainable urban area at Prebbleton. It is located closer to the facilities and amenities of Prebbleton than many of the areas identified for residential growth in the town.

The submitter thanks you for your consideration of this submission. The submitter is available to meet with Council Officers at any time.

M Springer  
529 Springs Road  
Prebbleton  
Email: [margspringer@hotmail.com](mailto:margspringer@hotmail.com)

Dated: 29 November 2018



---

Signature

**Attachments:**

- (i) Aerial photograph
- (ii) Correspondence December 2011
- (iii) Correspondence June 2008
- (iv) Current Zoning Map
- (v) Prebbleton Preferred Growth Area Plan