

IN THE MATTER

of the Resource
Management Act 1991

AND

IN THE MATTER

of Proposed Plan Change
10 to the Selwyn District
Plan

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE COMMISSIONER**

Proposed Plan Change 10 is to provide for a further extension to the business area of IZone at Rolleston. IZone was established in 2001 with approximately 85ha of land available for development. Since then there has been a considerable take-up of land with demand running at approximately 16ha per year. Plan Change 5 was processed in 2008 to provide an additional 56ha of land bringing the total to 141ha. Demand for land continues and Proposed Plan Change No. 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement anticipates further expansion of Industrial Zoned land. The ECan decision accepting the Commissioner's recommendations on Proposed Change No. 1, among other things, includes an additional 269ha incorporating the land subject to Proposed Plan Change 10. The relevant part of that decision is not subject to appeal although I understand some appeals seek abandonment of the Change altogether.

Proposed Plan Change 10 provides for the rezoning of approximately 49ha of rural land north-west of the existing IZone with a new Business 2A Zoning and for the replacement of the existing Business 2 Zoning at IZone with Business 2A Zoning. This change is to be achieved by the adoption of a single Outline Development Plan over the whole new zone and changing some aspects of the District Plan relating to such matters as internal recession planes, reflectivity rules, building height thresholds, landscaping requirements together with other consequential changes. The Council's concern is to reflect better the activities establishing at IZone and to ensure the most efficient and sustainable use of the land resource at IZone.

The plan change was publicly notified on 14 November 2009 and some 35 submissions were received.

THE HEARING

This was conducted at the Selwyn District Council Headquarters, 2 Norman Kirk Drive, Rolleston on 12-13 April 2010. At the hearing I was assisted by Ben Rhodes, Resource Management Planner for the Selwyn District Council. Mr Rhodes was the author of the report prepared in accordance with Section 42A of the Act.

The following parties were presented or tabled submissions at the hearing:

The Selwyn District Council (for the Proposed Plan Change)

Mr Paul Rogers (Legal Counsel)

Dr Steven Chiles (Acoustic Engineer)

Mr Ian Craig (Urban Designer)

Mr Tony Penny (Traffic Engineer)

The Selwyn Central Community (Submitter) Board represented by Mark Alexander

Susan Chaney (Submitter)

Kevin Chaney (Submitter)

Marilyn Ollett (Submitter)

Chris Stricker (Submitter)

Gaire Thompson (Submitter)

Solid Energy (Submitter) represented by Maree Baker (Legal Counsel)

Paul and Clare Harris, Alan and Judith Harris and Mark and Angela Harris
(Submitters by letter)

Mr Rhodes' section 42A report had been pre-circulated and it was therefore treated as read.

Mr Rogers opened with submissions for the Selwyn District Council. After outlining the case for the plan change, Mr Rogers traversed the relevant statutory framework for assessing it. He outlined Part 2 of the Act, specifically section 5, the methodology for decision making having been set out in **North Shore CC v Auckland RC** [1997] NZRMA59. He went on to traverse section 32 quoting the case of **NZRPG Management Ltd v Western Bay of Plenty DC** A026/08, paragraph 100. He observed that the key question to determine was whether leaving the District Plan unmodified or adopting it subject to the modifications recommended by his witnesses to address submitters' concerns would better serve the purpose of the Act.

Mr Rogers identified the significant issues as those relating to:

- Demand for IZone land;

- Economic benefits associated with the plan change; and
- The conflicting considerations and their scale and degree relating to noise, landscape and amenity, traffic and transportation and infrastructure being avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Land within IZone is highly sought after and there is no evidence that this demand is likely to drop. IZone is expected to provide a much extended employment base for the growing town of Rolleston which will be able to develop with less dependence on commuting to Christchurch. The noise issues seem to arise from night time noise associated with the existing Western Milk Products site and rail activities in relation to this. By all accounts, this is an existing problem and it is to be dealt with under the enforcement provisions of the Act. The Rural Residential development of Armack Drive is the source of complaints about this activity and there are concerns that the extended IZone will result in further rail activity exacerbating this adverse effect. Dr Chiles has recommended a noise standard. Mr Craig has covered visual matters and Mr Penny, traffic and transportation issues.

Mr Rogers explained that there were no significant changes advocated to the Objectives and Policies of the District Plan* and for that reason any analysis in terms of section 32 largely involved considering the effectiveness of the plan change in achieving the settled policy elements of the plan. He indicated that the evidence he would call showed that the plan change achieved this; he said it would:

- Ensure comprehensively planned (as opposed to piecemeal) development;

* Those changes proposed include necessary references to the new Business 2A Zoning. Where necessary and an amendment to Policy B3.4.5 to refer to the provision of the Business 2A Zoning to cater, among other things, for business activities requiring a large land footprint. These changes do not alter the thrust of the policy elements of the District Plan.

- Provide for the mitigation of adverse effects to an acceptable level to ensure the achievement of the purpose of the Act;
- Provide certainty as to the future of the land;
- Provide significant benefits to Rolleston in terms of employment and growth; and
- Provide a simplified planning framework.

Mr Rogers considered that nothing in the submissions had countered the analysis of benefits and costs outlined in the section 32 analysis. Those elements of concern voiced by submitters for the most part were effects that were minor enough to be able to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Doctor Stephen Chiles is an Acoustics Engineer. He has been engaged by the Selwyn District Council to assess the potential noise effects resulting from the proposed expansion of IZone. Rule 22.4.1.1 sets the noise limit from activities within IZone. Dr Chiles considers that this should jointly protect residents in the Rural Zone from sleep disturbance, maintaining good night time amenity and will result in reasonable day time amenity at nearby residences. He evaluated activities in relation to a proposed loop line (within the rail designation and outside the plan change area) and spur line. He observed that since all rail activity on existing and future spur lines is subject to the general noise limits, this should ensure that railway noise remains at an acceptable level. To meet the existing standards, spur line activity at night time would require resource consent, adverse effects could be considered and appropriate conditions imposed. This restriction indirectly would limit activity on the rail loops within the designated rail corridor outside the plan change area, because activity on them depended upon the ability to access the spur line.

Mr Craig expanded upon the visual impact assessment in the plan change specifically addressing matters raised in the various submissions. He addressed such issues as the proximity of industrial activity to the Armack Drive area and the need for a buffer rural amenity and landscape, height appearance and reflectivity of buildings, effectiveness of screening and the changes proposed to the recession plane control. He recommended some changes to achieve improved mitigation of adverse effects in these areas. He did not believe there should be any change to the reflectivity controls: it was appropriate that the Council should be able to review the reflectivity of the whole building if it exceeded 15m in height.

Mr Penny enlarged upon the issues in the transport assessment and addressed a number of issues raised by submitters. While he concluded that the transport needs of Proposed Plan Change 10 would not have significant long term effects on the transportation system he recommended that a section of Railway Road should be sealed and that Jones Road be augmented with a footpath and improved road markings.

The Selwyn Community Board was represented by **Mark Alexander**. The Board generally supports the plan change as notified. Mr Alexander supported increased height limits as long as there was reflectivity control of buildings over 15m high. He did, however feel that no provision should be made for exemptions from this provision, preferring non-complying status for that. Mr Alexander did not believe the point had been addressed sufficiently by Mr Craig. He felt that the non-complying status should apply to even slender structures such as masts or poles. Mr Alexander produced a number of photographs to illustrate the points he made.

Mr Schicker has resided at 23 Armack Drive since 1999 prior to the development of IZone. He did not oppose the plan change in principle but indicated that the imposition of mitigation measures, the monitoring of them and subsequent enforcement was critical. While there had been some appreciated minor improvements, there are problems relating to noise, light spill, construction work and the inclusion of the rail siding. He acknowledged that the siding lay outside the IZone boundary but its presence was there because of IZone. Noise from shunting trains at night is disturbing and the Westland Milk Powder storage building reflects the noise back toward Armack Drive. A second rail siding would exacerbate the problem. Mr Schicker was critical of the condition of Jones Road which had worn line markings and a deteriorating surface. He said that the development of IZone had slowly eroded the rural outlook and peacefulness of Armack Drive. The residents needed protection such as an earth bund and double glazing.

Susan Chaney and her husband purchased their property in Armack Drive late in 1983. Around 1991 they purchased a further 8ha on Wards Road. Mrs Chaney expressed concern at the way IZone had developed piece by piece whereby nearby residents could not address a comprehensive overall image of the development. Railway siding structure activity was causing adverse noise effects and the prospect of a further siding with increased rail activity was alarming. She felt that the residential amenity for Armack Drive residents was gradually being eroded.

Mr Kevin Chaney presented a number of documents to illustrate the iterative process of consultation and mediation that had occurred and which residents had found confusing. The Council had gone ahead despite knowing the views of the residents. They wished to have an

effective buffer and he considered that this would need to be at least 1km in width. The residents were opposed to any access from Railway Road.

Mrs Marilyn Ollett and her husband John have lived on the north side of Armack Drive since June 2005. They have been sympathetic to the development of IZone but she explained that the situation had changed markedly since the introduction of the rail spur and its associated night time noise. Mrs Ollett considered that Dr Chiles had understated the problem. There had been no prior history of trains stopping and the sound of shunting activity with idling engines and clashing of couplings which continued erratically for 45 to 60 minutes at night. While Mr and Mrs Ollett live 400m from the existing spur line, they are consistently woken two or three times a week. Another spur line would make it worse. Mrs Ollett sought a curfew on all rail activity within, entering or leaving IZone to ensure that night time noise (between 22.00 and 06.30hrs) stayed within acceptable limits. She realised that existing night time noise on the spur line did not meet the standards in the district plan and that this had been taken up between the District Council and Westland Milk products. She and her husband would be strongly opposed to the granting of any consent to breach that standard.

Ms Lorraine Tolhoek who lives in the rural area near IZone spoke in support of her original submission. She began by correcting some of the paragraph numbering in the section 42A report. She is particularly concerned at the effect the expansion of IZone would have on native ground based fauna which, unlike birds could not escape from bulldozers. She felt there had been no acknowledgement of this effect. Mrs Tolhoek considers that the health of the environment must go hand-in-glove with progress. She did not believe the plan change

clearly showed the need for an extension of the business zone or the creation of a new Business 2A Zoning.

Ms M Baker presented submissions on behalf of Solid Energy New Zealand Limited. She expressed a degree of support for the proposed extension to IZone but the company's main concern was to support the change to Business 2A Zoning and the introduction of a revised Outline Development Plan. This would recognise and provide for the larger scale activities which occur in this area. The focused amenity and roading upgrades will benefit Solid Energy and its employees. Ms Baker suggested some amendments to proposed Rules 16.6.5.4-6 relating to building reflectivity. This, she said would avoid some confusion.

A letter was tabled from **Paul and Claire Harris** of 90/1 Wards Road, Alan and **Judith Harris** of 90/2 Wards Road and **Mark and Angela Harris** of 9b Ward Road. Their lifestyles had been adversely affected by the Westland Dairy and associated railway siding because of noise, lighting and the visual impact of the buildings and railway rolling stock. They asked for the following matters to be considered:

1. Noise to be kept to a minimum between the hours of 7pm and 7am and during weekends, including shunting.
2. Building heights to be lower for those sections that have a boundary on Railway Road.
3. All lighting to be kept to a minimum and to be directed down as much as possible.
4. As much planting of trees either side of the railway as possible and for this to be got underway as soon as possible to allow for growth to start straightaway rather than waiting until after the buildings have been completed.

5. That all the ongoing restrictions detailed within the Plan Change will be strictly adhered to and that the Council will actively monitor these.

In speaking to his report, Mr Rhodes said that after having heard the submissions he maintained his position that the proposal would amount to efficient use of the land and would achieve the purpose of the Act. He did not see any reason to provide for a non-complying activity status for reflectivity. The area had once been a walnut farm subject to pesticides and had not been an ideal environment for ground based fauna. He felt that if the rules relating to noise were adhered to this would prevent night time rail activity on the spur line within the IZone site. This, in turn would mean the shunting activity on the siding could not occur at night.

In reply, Mr Rogers explained that it was understandable that people were concerned at changes to their current environment. However, the changes that were occurring were going through the proper process. Various competing considerations of different scales and degrees had to be considered in balance.

Mr Rogers identified noise as the most serious issue. He indicated that the issue of the Westland Dairy rail spur line activity was the subject of enforcement action and is beyond the ambit of the plan change. However Dr Chiles had taken it as a guide for serious consideration for Plan Change 10. Dr Chiles had responded that the noise from idling engines was low frequency sound not effectively mitigated by bunds or double glazing. The night time control of noise in the District Plan for the spur line, when adhered to, would be effective in controlling rail siding activity.

Mr Rogers indicated that the condition of Jones Road was beyond the ambit of the plan change and so was the intersection with the State Highway. Mr Craig had responded that there should be no need to change the rules in relation to building reflectivity. A restricted discretionary activity was sufficient to ensure there were no adverse effects. He cited the CRT seed store as a good example compared with bright finished silos. Mr Alexander's photos had shown that trees and hedgerows could be effective.

Mr Rogers conceded that Rule 24.1.3.9 should be altered to ensure that the secondary landscape strip in Precinct 3 would be planted before any development work in that area occurred. Leyland Cyprus from the first year would achieve 1m growth each year and this should benefit Armack Drive residents. The applicant is also agreed to new rules requiring the upgrading of the Hoskyns Road/Jones Road intersection at a specific development threshold. Mr Chaney had described the various meetings and mediations that had occurred expressing a lack of confidence in the Council's performance. Mr Rogers said no agreement as to what would happen in IZone is on record, Mr Chaney had withdrawn his and there had been no recorded mediated agreement.

MR THOMPSON'S LATE SUBMISSION

Mr Gaire Thompson owns land at the corner of West Melton and Railway Road. He lodged a late submission in opposition. A decision has to be made as to whether or not to accept a late submission and as that very much depends upon the circumstances leading to the lateness I was willing to hear from Mr Thompson subject also to comments from Mr Rogers. Mr Thompson's concerns are very similar to those expressed by other submitters. He did not want Railway Road to be closed. The circumstances leading to his late submission seemed obscure. It is clear that Mr Thompson was notified at his Nelson address on the rating roll.

There was some question as to whether a person working with him should have passed on the mail but there were no compelling circumstances described to me. The submission was received on 31 December 2009 and the closing date was 17 December 2009. The submission was significantly late and Mr Rogers submitted strongly that it should not be accepted. As it happens, one of Mr Thompson's concerns is that Railway Road might be subject to closure. This would be subject to a separate public process in which Mr Thompson could be involved. His other concerns are similar to those from submitters in Armack Drive and well covered by them. That being the case, I am moved to refuse to accept Mr Thompson's late submission.

DISCUSSION

As I have explained many of the concerns of the submitters are outside the ambit of the application. Such matters as the intersection with the State Highway fall into this category. I did examine the condition of Jones Road and found at least one pothole, an uneven surface and faded road markings. Any expansion of IZone will increase the use of Jones Road and although I can make a reference to these concerns. It is of significance that Mr Penny has recommended that some action be taken. I note that it is intended to budget for an upgrade of Jones Road next year and it would be prudent for the Council to upgrade the road and complete a continuous section of footprint between Hoskyns Road and IZone Drive once subdivision occurs in the precinct 3 area.

The telling issue is noise and light spill with their potential to affect residents in Armack Drive. On my site visit I observed and listened to the shunting of rolling stock from the railway siding onto the spur line into the Westland Milk Products site. Should this occur in the early hours of the morning I can well understand that it would disturb nearby residents. I take the point, however, that if the relevant noise standard within IZone (which is currently

being breached) is adhered to, the problem should be addressed. If the standard cannot be met it would be subject to a resource consent which no doubt would be contested. The noise standard would apply to any further spur line into IZone. Likewise I understand that it was found that some lighting resulted in light spill which did not meet the relevant standard. This has now been rectified and it is my understanding that the existing standard will be appropriate for the extended IZone.

I agree with Mr Craig that there should be no change to the rules regarding reflectivity.

The key considerations that must be made in assessing a plan change are set out in sections 31, 32, 74, 75 and 76 of the Act and having considered the requirements of those sections an overall judgement must be made in terms of section 5.

Section 31 sets out the functions of territorial authorities which includes the establishment, implementation and review of objectives, policies and methods such as those proposed in Plan Change 10. Section 32 requires an evaluation of alternatives, benefits and costs. The assessment undertaken by the Council finds that leaving the land zoned as rural is a missed opportunity for the development of relatively low quality rural land into a quality business hub. This, the analysis finds would better achieve the purpose of the Act than leaving rural zoning in place. Further, the consolidation of business activities in one location will allow for the efficient provision of services.

The plan change does not propose any significant changes to objectives and policies and for that reason the relevant examination is to judge whether the proposed rules are the most appropriate for achieving the relevant objectives and policies. Policies B4.3.62 to B4.3.65

give appropriate support to the methods now proposed. Furthermore, the change to Business 2A zoning more closely reflects the nature of activities that are moving into IZone and the use of Outline Development Plans will assist with the integration of development. All in all a more appropriate and enabling environment is likely to be the outcome. The plan change will therefore assist the Council to achieve the functions outlined in section 31. Furthermore, the matters the Council is required to consider in section 74 including Proposed Change No. 1 to the to the Regional Policy Statement do not lead to a contrary view. The Plan Change is consistent with section 75 and section 76 of the Act.

For these reasons, I have concluded that Plan Change 10 will achieve the purpose of the Act by enabling the wider community to provide for its economic wellbeing at the same time as meeting the appropriate environmental tests. I do not doubt the need for further provision of business zoned land being in mind the rapid take-up of the current land. In my overall judgement therefore, I believe Plan change 10 is consistent with section 5 of the Act.

CONCLUSION

The hearing of submissions did not elicit any concerns that should lead to the rejection of the plan change. Some very real concerns have been expressed about noise from shunting activity but as I understand the situation, the current example of that is in breach of the rules of the District Plan. The existing controls are appropriate as long as they are adhered to. That is a matter for enforcement and not one for this plan change. The changes to the scheduled amendments recommended by Dr Chiles, Mr Craig and Mr Penny and outlined in Mr Rhodes' report together with those proposed by Mr Rogers are appropriate. These changes are as follows:

- **Changes to Amendments 49, 50, 52 and 81**

Amendment 49

Amend the following in relation to potential breaks in the secondary planting strip from any future rail sidings.

- (1) Rule 17.6.1 (Amendment 49 under Plan Change 10) to the following:

*“The establishment of a road or rail crossing requiring a break in the existing primary shelterbelt **or future secondary planting strip** required by Landscape Treatment Three in Rule 24.1.3.13 along the Railway Road frontage of the Business 2A zone shall be restricted discretionary activity.”*

Amendment 50

- (2) Amend rule 17.6.2 (Amendment 50 under Plan Change 10)

Add the words **“or future secondary planting strip”** after “existing primary shelterbelt” in clause 17.6.2.1, 17.6.2.2 and 17.6.2.4.

Amendment 52

- (3) Amend Reasons for Rules (page C17-005) (Amendment 52 under Plan Change 10)

*“The Business 2A zone is screened from the land to the west through the existing primary shelterbelt along Railway Road. **In time, this screening will be supplemented by a secondary planting strip required by Landscape Treatment Three in Rule 24.1.3.13, which will form a second shelterbelt.** The creation of breaks within **these** shelterbelts for road and rail crossings are identified to occur on the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 22 of the District Plan. Rule 17.6.1 recognises that while such breaks in the existing primary shelterbelt **and future secondary planting strip** are appropriate to create access for road and rail linkages, such breaks will allow views into the Business 2A zone from that land to the west to a limited extent, and as such the*

potential adverse effects of such breaks in this screening needs to be considered.”

Amendment 81

- (4) Amend last sentence in Note to Rule 24.1.3.13 (Amendment 81 under Plan Change 10)

“Refer to Rule 17.6.1 in respect of road or rail crossings that require breaks in the existing primary shelterbelt or future secondary planting strip along Railway Road.”

▪ **Changes to Amendment 81**

In relation to the visual concerns of submitters, I recommend that the secondary planting strip proposed to the west side of Railway Road as part of landscape treatment 3 be grown to a minimum height of 8m.

Amend Rule 24.1.3.13 (Amendment 81 under Plan Change 10)

Landscape Treatment three

- (d) *The secondary planting strip shall achieve, once matured, a minimum width of 2.5metres and a minimum height of 8m.*

▪ **Changes to Amendment 41**

The existing rules around recession planes can be read that no recession plan is required along Railway Road. This was not intended and as such the following amendments are recommended.

Amend Rule 16.7.1 (Amendment 41 under Plan Change 10)

Add clause 3:

“3. Recession Plane B – applies to the road boundary of Railway Road where it directly adjoins the Business 2A zone.”

▪ **Changes to Rule 22.3.1**

That the introductory wording to Rule 22.3.1.1 be changed from:

Applying at the boundary of any site adjoining the Rural zone to

Applying at any point within the boundary of any site in the Rural zone, excluding road, waterway and railway reserves:

▪ **Insert new Rule 24.1.3.21**

In order to reduce noise and dust effects at the proposed road access to Railway Road the following amendment is recommended:

Insert new Rule 24.1.3.21 as follows:

In the Business 2A Zone at the time subdivision consent is sought for the creation of the new road within precinct 3 as depicted on the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 22 Railway Road shall be sealed to a point 50m north west of the zone boundary and 10m to the south east of the new access road.

▪ **Changes to Amendment 87**

Amendment 87

Insert new Rule 24.1.3.19 as follows:

In the Business 2A Zone at the time that the first subdivision consent is sought for land contained within Precinct 3, the secondary landscaping strip required by

Landscape Treatment 3 must be planted prior to the commencement of works associated with the above subdivisions consent.

RECOMMENDATION

For the reasons expressed above, I **recommend** that Plan Change 10 subject to the amendments outlined above be confirmed. To a limited extent it may be said that in nearly all cases there has been some movement to alleviate the concerns of submitters. However, in nearly each case opposition was expressed to the plan change as a whole with submitters wishing for it to be abandoned. In those cases, the recommendation is for the submission to be rejected. Accordingly, the submissions should be accepted, accepted in part, rejected or rejected in part as outlined below.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
1. John & Marilyn Ollett 1423 Oppose	1.1 1423.1	Entire Plan Change.	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 and states that the plan change is not transparent enough. <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject. The procedures adopted have met the relevant requirements of the Act and the types of activities proposed to occupy the land are not generally known at plan change stage.
2. George Schwass 1424 Oppose	2.1 1424.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 <i>The submitter seeks that all work around PC10 be stopped until submissions are independently heard</i>	Reject – no work has been undertaken that would preempt the proper consideration of the Plan Change.
3. Mike Meskimmon 1425 Oppose	3.1 1425.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject - for the reasons described above.
4. Karl L Polascheil & Sue Stroud	4.1 1426.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter states that they bought in the area for a lifestyle change and not to have a business zone and its associated effects near by.	Reject – the Plan Change is the product of a comprehensive analysis of effects and appropriate mitigation is included.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
1426 Oppose			<i>Reject Plan Change</i>	
aa5. Eric Malcolm Baird 1427 Oppose	5.1 1427.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject for the reasons given above.
6. Robert John Yeatman 1428 Oppose	6.1 1428.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject for the reasons given above.
7. Grant Miller 1429 Oppose	7.1 1429.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes all of PC10 as there is not enough information, too close to Christmas, and not enough facts. <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: the Plan Change has been the subject of prior consultation and a pre-hearing meeting. See also the reasons given for submitter 1423.
8. Sandra Van Tulder 1430	8.1 1430.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter does not agree with the way their rates are being spent	Reject: this is not a relevant consideration.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
Oppose			<i>Reject Plan Change</i>	
9. Geoff Mitchell 1431 Oppose	9.1 1431.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes PC10 due to loss of rural amenity <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: while there will be some loss of rural amenity significant and appropriate mitigation measures are included in the Plan Change.
10 Neil & Kirstie Hamilton 1432 Oppose	10.1 1432.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes PC10 because it is too close to a residential subdivision that has existed for 25 years. <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject for the reasons given above.
11. Graham John Sweetman 1433 Oppose	11.1 1433.1	Private Property & Lifestyle	The submitter opposes PC10 because it is too close to Armack Drive <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject for the reasons given above.
1433	11.2 1433.2	Noise	The submitter opposes PC10 on noise grounds <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject the existing noise standards are appropriate when adhered to.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
1433	11.3 1433.3	Building heights	The submitter opposes PC10 due to the height of buildings <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: The height controls in combination with reflectivity provisions are appropriate.
12. Mark and Angela Harris 1434 Oppose	12.1 1434.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: the Plan Change is an appropriate response to the need to provide for development and appropriate mitigation measures are provided.
13. Paul & Claire Harris 1435 Oppose	13.1 1435.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject for the reasons given above.
14. Barry Grant 1436 Oppose	14.1 1436.1	Noise	The submitter opposes PC10 due to noise levels at night and day from construction activities, heavy vehicle movement, reversing alarms, ongoing industrial and commercial activities, burglar alarms, heavy plant operation and increased railway activity.	Reject appropriate mitigation measures are already in place in relation to noise.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<i>Reject Plan Change</i>	
1436	14.2 1436.2	Trains and Railway Line	<p>The submitter opposes the railway line sidings as there was no prior knowledge of these or information on time frames for hours of operation.</p> <p><i>Reject Plan Change</i></p>	Reject: the existing sidings are in accord with the existing rail designation. The spur line is within the existing zoned land. As long as the existing noise standards are adhered to for the spur line and any future spur line noise from shunting activities will be effectively controlled in terms of timing.
1436	14.3 1436.3	Building Height	<p>The submitter opposes PC10 due to concern over the size of the buildings.</p> <p><i>Reject Plan Change</i></p>	Reject: it is necessary to provide for very large buildings and central to the purpose of the zone.
1436	14.4 1436.4	Private Property & Lifestyle	<p>The submitter also opposes PC10 as they moved to the area for the lifestyle but the dust and noise has affected the quiet lifestyle.</p> <p><i>Reject Plan Change</i></p>	Reject: the Plan Change as modified includes appropriate mitigation measures.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
15. Warwick John Robinson 1437 Oppose	15.1 1437.1	Noise	The submitter opposes PC10 due noise from construction activities, heavy vehicle movement, reversing alarms, ongoing industrial and commercial activities, burglar alarms, heavy plant operation and increased rail activities <i>Not stipulated</i>	Reject: as long as the existing noise controls are adhered to sufficient mitigation will be in place.
1437	15.2 1437.2	Pollution - Air, Lighting & Visual	The submitter opposes PC10 due to lighting pollution from street lights and building lighting <i>Not stipulated</i>	Reject: it is acknowledged that light spill problems have been encountered and there have been found to be breaches of the standard in the District Plan. If the rules are met light spill will not be a problem.
1437	15.3 1437.3	Building Heights	The submitter opposes PC10 due to the visual pollution and destruction of landscape values caused by large unsightly buildings above the tree lines	Reject: the provisions for controlling reflectivity of taller buildings are appropriate. The planting measures now proposed will assist in mitigating these effects.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<i>Not stipulated</i>	
1437	15.4 1437.4	Infrastructure Roding, Traffic, Water supply	The submitter opposes PC10 due to the inadequate and substandard roading servicing the IZone development and surrounding areas. The submitter is also concerned about the potential increase in traffic movements particularly by heavy vehicles. <i>Not stipulated</i>	Reject in part: these matters have been given expert attention and appropriate measures are now proposed. See discussion in main body of report.
1437	15.6 1437.5	Private Property & Lifestyle	The submitter opposes PC10 as it will have an adverse impact on property values and a further detrimental impact upon lifestyle and amenity values of adjacent properties <i>Not stipulated</i>	Reject in part: with the modifications recommended and adherence to the existing rules adverse impacts will be suitably mitigated.
16. Kevin Chaney 1438 Oppose	16.1 1438.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes any change to the existing business zoning and the proposed rezoning of 49ha of rural land to business.	Reject: the changes are necessary to cope with the requirements of businesses moving to IZone.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<p>The submitter states that Council has ignored the outcomes of prior mediation.</p> <p><i>That there be no change made to the existing business zoning.</i></p>	There does not appear to have been a Court decision confirming a mediated outcome.
1438	16.2 1438.2	Trains and Railway Line	<p>The submitter opposes the railway siding under construction and its use as it was done without consultation with residents and would cause noise issues from ground vibrations, shunting, engine noise, banging and squealing of breaks. The submitter also has concerns with the heavy vehicle traffic generated and the associated noise with this traffic.</p> <p><i>That there be no railway sidings</i></p>	Reject in part: The existing rail siding is outside the ambit of the Plan Change as would be any further work on the railway reserve. However, a problem with noise does exist and if the existing controls currently being breached are enforced, adequate mitigation should be achieved.
1438	16.3 1438.3	Infrastructure Roothing, Traffic, Water supply	<p>The submitter opposes access off Railway Road</p> <p>That there be no access points to Railway Road.</p> <p>No closing of Railway Road.</p>	Reject: although the closure of Railway Road would go some way to alleviating noise and dust problems, this cannot be part of the plan change process.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			The standard of Jones Road is upgraded and improvements made to the intersection at the State Highway.	Reject in part: it is not possible to require State Highway work as part of this Plan Change. These are recommendations re Jones Road.
1338	16.4 1438.4	Building Heights	The submitter opposes any changes to recession planes and building heights. <i>That there be no change made to the existing recession plane requirements or building height.</i>	Reject: the changes are necessary to manage the types of activities currently being established but adequate mitigation is also proposed to mitigate any effects outside the zone.
17. Christopher James Schicker 1439 Oppose	17.1 1439.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes PC10 as it is not in line with what was agreed through mediation for the original IZone development No further development of the 49 ha. Council honour the outcomes from prior mediation and meet with Armack Drive residents. Remove rail siding over Railway Road.	Reject: see comments on 1438 above. However, the measures now proposed will help protect rural areas from adverse effects. The existing rail siding is not able to be addressed as part of this Plan Change but noise from it is acknowledged. This matter is the subject of enforcement action to ensure existing rules are adhered to.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
1439	17.2 1439.2	Noise	<p>The submitter opposes PC10 on noise grounds</p> <p>No further development of the 49 ha.</p> <p>Council honour the outcomes from prior mediation and meet with Armack Drive residents.</p>	Reject: see discussion above.
1439	17.3 1439.3	Trains & Railway Line, Traffic	<p>The submitter opposes any railway sidings. In mediation on original IZone development there was agreement that there would be no railway siding, no access to Railway Road, and Jones Road would be upgraded</p> <p>No further development of the 49 ha.</p> <p>Council honour the outcomes from prior mediation and meet with Armack Drive residents.</p> <p><i>Remove rail siding over Railway Road.</i></p>	Reject: see discussion above.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
1439	17.4 1439.4	Pollution - Air, Lighting & Visual	<p>The submitter opposes PC10 on increased lighting grounds, recession plane and the removal of the existing hedge</p> <p><i>No further development of the 49 ha. Council honour the outcomes from prior mediation and meet with Armack Drive residents.</i></p>	Reject: see discussion on 1437 and 1438 above.
1439	17.5 1439.5	Private Property & Lifestyle	<p>The submitter is concerned outcomes of mediation haven't been honoured in regard to rural amenities, lifestyle and citizen wellbeing</p> <p><i>No further development of the 49 ha. Council honour the outcomes from prior mediation and meet with Armack Drive</i></p>	Reject: as above.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<i>residents.</i>	
18. Susan Avril Chaney 1440 Oppose	18.1 1440.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes the expansion of IZone <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: there is well documented need for the expansion of IZone.
1440	18.2 1440.2	Noise	The submitter opposes Plan Change on the grounds that there will be cumulative noise effects from trains and shunting, truck and trailer units, exhaust noise, airbrakes, <i>Reject Plan Change</i> <i>Remove existing rail siding</i>	Reject: however, a noise problem is acknowledged and is being addressed. The actual loop sidings are outside the Plan Change but the spur line is subject to noise control.
1440	18.3 1440.3	Infrastructure Roding, Traffic, Water Supply	The submitter objects to the impression given of Jones Road. The yellow lines are hardly visible and she does not believe a roundabout will work in such congested area.	Reject in part: the condition of Jones Road is acknowledged and subject to some recommendations. This matter is peripheral to and strictly not part of the Plan Change.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<i>Reject Plan Change</i>	
1440	18.4 1440.4	Zoning	The submitter states that with mainly 4ha blocks in the area west of Rolleston, there are many horse and riders and there is a conflict of interest between them truck and trailer units at present <i>Reject Plan Change. Make SR1 area into a recreational area</i>	Reject: traffic surveys undertaken during peak times show that few heavy vehicles come from areas west of IZone and those that did arrive came via Hoskyns Road. None were recorded from south of Jones Road apart from those via State Highway One. There are other generators but IZone's component is expected to be very small indeed.
19. Frits Van Tulder 1441 Oppose	19.1 1441.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter doesn't agree with their rates being spent this way <i>Reject Plan Change.</i>	Reject: this matter is not relevant in terms of the Resource Management Act.
20. Judith and Allan Harris 1442 Oppose	20.1 1442.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: see reasons above.
21. Mark R	21.1 1443.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 and	Reject for the reasons given above.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
Newman 1443 Oppose			does not want any change in their outlook or lifestyle. <i>Not stipulated</i>	
1443	21.2 1443.2	Trains & Railway Line	The submitter opposes any rail use. <i>Not stipulated</i>	Reject: rail use is essential and noise from shunting activity effectively will be subject to control. See discussion on 1438 above.
1443	21.3 1443.3	Building Heights	The submitter opposes PC 10 due to the potential tall buildings <i>Not stipulated</i>	Reject in part: visual effects of taller buildings will be mitigated by the rules relating to reflectivity and early planting parallel with Railway Road.
22. Michael and Anne Forrester 1444 Oppose	22.1 1444.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 and states it was too close to Christmas. <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: public notification commenced on 14 November and submissions closed on 17 December. This met all the requirements of the Resource Management Act.
1444	22.2 1444.2	Private Property & Lifestyle	The submitter objects to all of PC10 as it is too close to Armack Drive.	Reject: the nearest dwelling in Armack Drive is 290m and detailed measures are proposed to protect the amenity of this area.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<i>Reject Plan Change</i>	
1444	22.3 1444.3	Trains & Railway Line	The submitter opposes any rail sidings. <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: Rail connection is essential. Unacceptable noise from existing siding activity is acknowledged, however the existing rule when met should be effective.
23. Hazel E Cuff 1445 Oppose	23.1 1445.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes PC10 as it is too close to Armack Drive. <i>To rethink the whole proposal</i> <i>Remove existing rail siding</i>	Reject: see reasons given above.
24. Caroline Mary Saunders 1446 Oppose	24.1 1446.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 <i>Leave area as it exists</i>	Reject: for reasons given above.
25. Jacqueline Anne Woollard 1447 Oppose	25.1 1447.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to the entire PC10 due to the environmental and economical effect on adjoining properties.	Reject in part: for reasons given above. Increased landscape activity is proposed: see amended rules.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<p><i>Not to continue with the expansion of IZone along Railway Road.</i></p> <p><i>Increase landscaping to an appropriate height.</i></p>	
1447	25.2 1447.2	Noise	<p>The submitter opposes PC10 as they brought into a quiet community in which to bring up their family but now they have to contend with noise from IZone</p> <p><i>Not to continue with the expansion of IZone along Railway Road.</i></p>	Reject: problems with noise appears to be because existing rules are being breached by spur line activity which is outside the ambit of the Plan Change.
1447	25.3 1447.3	Infrastructure Roding, Traffic, Water Supply, Rail	The submitter opposes the PC10 as there are problems with the roading, especially lack of parking space on Jones Road, which is dangerous as trucks park on the sides of the road, reducing visibility.	Reject in part: see recommendations on Jones Road. The railway siding is not the subject of the Plan Change but see earlier comments on noise.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<p>The submitter opposes the railway siding on account of little or no consultation in regard to the same.</p> <p><i>Upgrade and finish the roading improvement works on Jones Road</i></p>	
26. New Zealand Fire Service 1448 Not Stipulated	26.1 1448.1	Infrastructure Roding, Traffic, Water Supply	<p>The submitter acknowledges that the reticulated water supply is being extended to service the proposed additional area but states that it is important that this reticulated supply meets the requirements of the NZ Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008</p> <p><i>Submitter seeks assurance that the NZ Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 will be met.</i></p>	Accept. The submitters' concerns will be met. The Council's Policy W211 requires water supply reticulation for new subdivisions to be installed to the standard prescribed.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
27. Andrew Derek Harris 1449 Oppose	27.1 1449.1	Noise, Lifestyle	The submitter opposes the PC10 on noise grounds which the submitter states are now worse than when they moved in. The submitter also opposes PC10 as it will result in the loss of their chosen lifestyle.	Reject: it is acknowledged that noise from railway activity on the existing spur line has been in breach of the appropriate standard. This matter is beyond the scope of the Plan Change but the existing standard, when met provides an appropriate level of mitigation.
1449	27.2 1449.2	Pollution - Air, Lighting & Visual	The submitter opposes PC10 as the lights are too bright at night <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: it is acknowledged that some lighting has been in breach of District Plan requirements. This, however is a matter for enforcement of the relevant standard which is appropriate.
1449	27.3 1449.3	Infrastructure Roothing, Traffic, Water Supply	The submitter opposes PC10 as he is concerned about the state of Jones Road and its footpaths <i>. Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: this is outside the ambit of the Plan Change but see recommendations in the discussion re Jones Road.
28. MR K J & S Masson 1450	28.1 1450.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes PC10 due to lack of information	Reject: the nature of the Plan Change process is that information about future uses is not available but standards are in place in anticipation of a variety of

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
Oppose			<i>That more information is provided about what is happening at IZone.</i>	diverse activities.
1450	28.2 1450.2	Trains & Railway Line	The submitter opposes Railway wagons being shunted at 1.00am or 2.00am <i>Not stipulated</i>	Reject: however adherence to the relevant standard should put this matter right – see discussion on 1438 and in main body of this report.
29. Neroli Harris 1451 Oppose	29.1 1451.1	Private Property & Lifestyle	The submitter opposes PC10 as it will result in the loss of their chosen lifestyle. The submitter states that they want their children to grow up in the lifestyle that they bought into, not with the changes proposed in PC10 <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: however, the recommendation is for improved mitigation through changes to the rules.
1451	29.2 1451.2	Noise	The submitter opposes PC10 because of the increased noise.	Reject: however, see discussion on noise from shunting activity in the main body of this report and 1438 above.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<i>Reject Plan Change</i>	
1451	29.3 1451.3	Trains & Railway Line	<p>The submitter opposes PC10 as she does not want any rail sidings</p> <p><i>Reject Plan Change</i></p>	Reject: see discussion above.
1451	29.4 1451.4	Pollution - Air, Lighting & Visual	<p>The submitter opposes the position of IZone as when the nor west blows it sends pollution from IZone over all of Rolleston.</p> <p>The submitter also opposes PC10 on grounds of visual pollution from the large buildings obstructing views of the Southern Alps.</p> <p><i>Reject Plan Change</i></p>	Reject: it is very important to provide for large buildings. The effect of taller buildings will be mitigated by the reflectivity controls and early screen planting now proposed.
1451	29.5 1451.5	Infrastructure Roading, Traffic, Water Supply	The submitter opposes PC10 on traffic issues particularly the fact that trucks do not stop at stop signs when they come out of IZone and also the state of Jones Road.	Reject: the plan change process has to assume that drivers will obey traffic rules.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<i>Reject Plan Change</i>	
30. Lorraine Margaret Tolhoek 1452 Oppose	30.1 1452.1	Zoning	The submitter states that there is no evidence provided to support the proposed rezoning of rural land to B2A. <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: there is evidence of a steady demand for space within IZone.
1452	30.2 1452.2	Building Heights	The submitter states that there is no evidence provided to support a change of building height and the definition of building height. Buildings of 20m in height can be seen from the Jones Road/Weedons Ross Road intersection. The submitter is also against the proposed changes to the recession planes. <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject: there is a need to provide for taller buildings already and that will require a resource consent above 15m. The effects of these will be mitigated by the reflectivity provisions.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
1452	30.3 1452.3	Infrastructure Roothing, Traffic, Soils	<p>The submitter comments that the TIA Report by Traffic Design group is very comprehensive and very easy to follow for the layman.</p> <p>The submitter also disagrees that the soils are of a low quality and the proposed Plan Change does not contain enough information on the issue of soil quality.</p> <p><i>Reject Plan Change</i></p>	<p>Reject in part:</p> <p>The comments on the TDG report are noted.</p> <p>The soils are not of such high quality that farming activities would be a more efficient use of the resource than business activities.</p>
1452	30.4 1452.4	Entire Plan Change	<p>The submitter discusses the IZone timeline and states that the decision of PC5 was notified in April 09 and to start consulting with residents in July 09 for PC10 seems unbelievable. The submitter also states that the introduction of a new B2A zone which will be a more permissive industrial zone will lead to a lower standard of aesthetic and amenity values and will appeal to</p>	<p>No decision is required in relation to this point. While the introduction of Plan Change 10 closely follows Plan Change 5, further expansions of IZone have been signalled for a considerable period of time. The new B2A zone is not necessarily more permissive, it is more closely directed at the types of activities for which demand is apparent.</p>

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			the less discerning Industrialist. <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	
1452	30.5 1452.5	Private Property & Lifestyle	The submitter states that the Council Community Plan supports a rural theme for the district and that an industrial area does not appear to be in keeping with the Community Plan or the District Plan. <i>Reject Plan Change</i>	Reject. While the community plan is not a statutory or regulatory document it reflects balance envisaging a strong economy complementary to social, cultural and physical environment.
1452	30.6 1452.6	Biodiversity	The submitter states that the area has a high bio-diversity and an ecological survey should be undertaken with particular attention to geckos and skinks <i>That an ecological survey be undertaken.</i>	Reject: When weighed amongst various assessment criteria the proposed plan change area has relatively low ecological value.
31. AH	31.1 1453.1	Private Property &	The submitter opposes the rezoning in PC10.	Reject. Maintenance of the status quo is not consistent

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
International Ltd 1453 Oppose		Lifestyle	<p>The submitter states that their property has a rural aspect which will be compromised as a consequence of business/industrial use and development on the neighbouring land. This will potentially cause a diminution in value and enjoyment of the submitter's property.</p> <p><i>Maintain status quo by not rezoning the property</i></p>	with the Objectives and Policies of the District Plan which, among other things, are directed at managing change of the type that is anticipated by Plan Change 10. This is directed at enabling such change at the same time as mitigating the effects of the change.
1453	31.2 1453.2	Infrastructure Roding, Traffic, Water, Supply	<p>The submitter opposes the Plan Change due to the impact it will have upon the sole accessway to a portion of the submitters land.</p> <p><i>Maintain status quo by not rezoning the property</i></p>	No action required. Any road closure will have to follow its own public procedure and is not part of Plan Change 10.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
32. Selwyn Community Board 1454 Support in Part	32.1 1454.1	Entire Plan Change	<p>The submitter generally supports the Plan Change as notified to rezone 49ha of rural land and to introduce a new business 2A zone across the whole of IZone.</p> <p><i>Approval of the Plan change with the following amendments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Delete rules 16.6.5.4, 16.6.5.6</i> <i>Add rule 18.3.1.2 - Any structure exceeding 15m in the Business 2A Zone shall comply with Rule 16.6.3.</i> 	Reject in part: the rules proposed relating to reflectivity of buildings are considered to be appropriate.
1454	32.2 1454.2	Building Heights	The submitter supports amendment 37 and rules 16.6.3, 16.6.3.1 & 16.6.3.2, which the submitter requested through the Draft PC process. The amendment and rules seek a restricted discretionary status for buildings over 15m but under 20m and to restrict the reflectivity of building materials on all parts of a building over	Reject in part. The rules proposed relating to the reflectivity of buildings over 15m in height area considered to be appropriate.

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<p>15m to 40%.</p> <p>The submitter opposes proposed Rules 16.6.5.4, 16.6.5.5 and 16.6.5.6. The submitter states that there should be no discretion regarding the reflectivity of taller buildings/structures. If any part of a taller building/structure has a high reflectivity value then that will draw the eye of any observer to the building/structure and highlight the presence of the building/structure. If allowed to have a taller building/structure in the B2A zone the zone the building or structure should be constructed and maintained so it entirely meets the reflectivity requirement of rule 16.6.3.2</p> <p>The submitter also seeks the addition of a new rule to be added under amendment 55 and rule</p>	

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			<p>18.3.1. They seek the new rule to be 18.3.1.2 and it should state that “Any structure exceeding 15m in the Business 2A Zone shall comply with Rule 16.6.3”. The submitter believes any structure exceeding 15m should comply with the reflectivity requirements to reduce its visual impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p><i>Approval of the Plan change with the following amendments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Delete rules 16.6.5.4, 16.6.5.6</i> <p><i>Add rule 18.3.1.2 - Any structure exceeding 15m in the Business 2A Zone shall comply with Rule 16.6.3.</i></p>	
33. Alan J FAMILTON 1455 Oppose	33.1 1455.1	Private Property & Lifestyle	The submitter opposes the rezoning in PC10. The submitter states that their property has a rural aspect which will be compromised as a consequence of business/industrial use and	Reject. The changes proposed are the expected outcome of the exercise of the settled Objectives and Policies of the District Plan which envisage changes such as those proposed while mitigating the effects of

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
			development on the neighbouring land. This will potentially cause a diminution in value and enjoyment of the property. <i>Maintain status quo by not rezoning the property</i>	such changes.
34. Rolleston Square Ltd 1456 Support	34.1 1456.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter supports PC10 <i>PC10 be approved.</i>	Accept the submission.
35. Lewis Gaire Herdman Thompson 1457 Oppose <i>(Late submission received on the</i>	35.1 1457.1	Noise	The submitter opposes PC10 on noise grounds. The submitter states that what should be a peaceful rural area is becoming excessively noisy. This is particularly so on still nights when noise carries a long way. <i>That there be no further extension to IZone and</i>	Late submission not accepted .

SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

Plan Change 10 – Rezoning 49ha of rural land for business purposes and to introduce a new Business 2A Zone at Rolleston

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary and Decision Requested	Recommended Decision and Reasons (to be read in conjunction with the above discussion)
31.12.09)			<i>that there be tighter controls for noise and dust etc.</i>	
1457	35.2	Building Heights	The submitter opposes PC10 as the area is no place for tall buildings <i>That the allowable building height be reduced</i>	Late submission not accepted .
1457	35.3	Infrastructure Roothing, Traffic, Water, Supply	The submitter opposes any access on to Railway Road. <i>That there be no access to Railway Road and that this road is kept open and sealed.</i>	Late submission not accepted .

Key:

PC: Plan Change
TIA: Traffic Impact Assessment



M J G Garland
Commissioner

Date: 14 May, 2010