Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
1.John & Marilyn Ollet 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.	Reject Plan Change
2.George Schwass 1424 Oppose	2.1 1424.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10	The submitter seeks that all work around PC10 be stopped until submissions are independently heard
3. Mike Meskimmon 1425 Oppose	3.1 1425.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10	Reject Plan Change
4. Karl L Polascheil & Sue Stroud 1426 Oppose	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 Plan Change
5. Eric Malcolm Baird 1427 Oppose	5.1 1427.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10	Reject Plan Change
6. Robert John Yeatman 1428 Oppose	6.1 1428.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10	Reject Plan Change
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.	Reject Plan Change
8. Sandra Van Tulder 1430 Oppose	8.1 1430.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter does not agree with the way their rates are being spent	Reject Plan Change
9. Geoff Mitchell	9.1 1431.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes PC10 due to loss of	Reject Plan Change

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
1431 Oppose			rural amenity	
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.	Reject Plan Change
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	Reject Plan Change
1433	11.2 1433.2	Noise	The submitter opposes PC10 on noise grounds	Reject Plan Change
1433	11.3 1433.3	Building heights	The submitter opposes PC10 due to the height of buildings	Reject Plan Change
12. Mark and Angela Harris 1434 Oppose	12.1 1434.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10	Reject Plan Change
13. Paul & Claire Harris 1435 Oppose	13.1 1435.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10	Reject Plan Change
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 Plan Change
1436	14.2 1436.2	Trains and Railway Line	The submitter opposes the railway line sidings as there was no prior knowledge of these or information on time frames for	Reject Plan Change.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
			hours of operation.	
1436	14.3 1436.3	Building Height	The submitter opposes PC10 due to concern over the size of the buildings.	Reject Plan Change.
1436	14.4 1436.4	Private Property & Lifestyle	The submitter also opposes PC10 as they moved to the area for the lifestyle but the dust and noise has affected the quite lifestyle.	Reject Plan Change.
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	Not stipulated
1437	15.2 1437.2	Pollution - Air, Lighting & Visual	The submitter opposes PC10 due to lighting pollution from street lights and building lighting	Not stipulated
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	Not stipulated
1437	15.4 1437.4	Infrastructure Roading, 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	Not stipulated

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
			vehicles.	
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	Not stipulated
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. The submitter states that Council has ignored the outcomes of prior mediation.	That there be no change made to the existing business zoning.
1438	16.2 1438.2	Trains and Railway Line	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.	That there be no railway sidings
1438	16.3 1438.3	Infrastructure Roading, Traffic, Water supply	The submitter opposes access off Railway Road	That there be no access points to Railway Road. No closing of Railway Road. The standard of Jones Road is upgraded and improvements made to the intersection at the State Highway.
1338	16.4 1438.4	Building Heights	The submitter opposes any changes to recession planes and building heights.	That there be no change made to the existing recession plane requirements or building height.
17. Christopher James Schicker 1439	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	No further development of the 49 ha. Council honour the outcomes from prior mediation and meet with Armack Drive residents.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
Oppose			development	Remove rail siding over Railway Road.
1439	17.2 1439.2	Noise	The submitter opposes PC10 on noise grounds	No further development of the 49 ha. Council honour the outcomes from prior mediation and meet with Armack Drive residents.
1439	17.3 1439.3	Trains & Railway Line, Traffic	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	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.
1439	17.4 1439.4	Pollution - Air, Lighting & Visual	The submitter opposes PC10 on increased lighting grounds, recession plane and the removal of the existing hedge	No further development of the 49 ha. Council honour the outcomes from prior mediation and meet with Armack Drive residents.
1439	17.5 1439.5	Private Property & Lifestyle	The submitter is concerned outcomes of mediation haven't been honoured in regard to rural amenities, lifestyle and citizen wellbeing	No further development of the 49 ha. Council honour the outcomes from prior mediation and meet with Armack Drive residents.
18. Susan Avril Chaney 1440 Oppose	18.1 1440.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes the expansion of Izone	Reject Plan Change
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,	Reject Plan Change Remove existing rail siding
1440	18.3 1440.3	Infrastructure Roading, 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	Reject Plan Change

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
			roundabout will work in such congested area.	
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	Reject Plan Change. Make SR1 area into a recreational area.
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	Reject Plan Change
20. Judith and Allan Harris 1442 Oppose	20.1 1442.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10	Reject Plan Change
21. Mark R Newman 1443 Oppose	21.1 1443.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10 and does not want any change in their outlook or lifestyle.	Not stipulated
1443	21.2 1443.2	Trains & Railway Line	The submitter opposes any rail use.	Not stipulated
1443	21.3 1443.3	Building Heights	The submitter opposes PC 10 due to the potential tall buildings	Not stipulated
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.	Reject Plan Change
1444	22.2 1444.2	Private Property & Lifestyle	The submitter objects to all of PC10 as it is too close to Armack Drive.	Reject Plan Change
1444	22.3 1444.3	Trains & Railway Line	The submitter opposes any rail sidings.	Reject Plan Change
23. Hazel E Cuff 1445	23.1 1445.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes PC10 as it is too close to Armack Drive.	To rethink the whole proposal Remove existing rail siding

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates Summary		Decision Requested	
Oppose				
24. Caroline Mary Saunders 1446 Oppose	24.1 1446.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter is opposed to all of PC10	Leave area as it exists
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.	Not to continue with the expansion of Izone along Railway Road. Increase landscaping to an appropriate height.
1447	25.2 1447.2	Noise,	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	Not to continue with the expansion of Izone along Railway Road.
1447	25.3 1447.3	Infrastructure Roading, 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. The submitter opposes the railway siding on account of little or no consultation in regards to the same.	Upgrade and finish the roading improvement works on Jones Road
26. New Zealand Fire Service 1448 Not Stipulated	26.1 1448.1	Infrastructure Roading, Traffic, Water Supply	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	Submitter seeks assurance that the NZ Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 will be met.
27. Andrew	27.1 1449.1	Noise, Lifestyle	The submitter opposes the PC10 on noise	Reject Plan Change

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
Derek Harris 1449 Oppose			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.	
1449	27.2 1449.2	Pollution - Air, Lighting & Visual	The submitter opposes PC10 as the lights are too bright at night	Reject Plan Change
1449	27.3 1449.3	Infrastructure Roading, Traffic, Water Supply	The submitter opposes PC10 as he is concerned about the state of Jones Road and its footpaths.	Reject Plan Change
28. MR K J & S Masson 1450 Oppose	28.1 1450.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter opposes PC10 due to lack of information	That more information is provided about what is happening at Izone.
1450	28.2 1450.2	Trains & Railway Line	The submitter opposes Railway wagons being shunted at 1.00am or 2.00am	Not stipulated
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	Reject Plan Change
1451	29.2 1451.2	Noise	The submitter opposes PC10 because of the increased noise.	Reject Plan Change
1451	29.3 1451.3	Trains & Railway Line	The submitter opposes PC10 as she does not want any rail sidings	Reject Plan Change
1451	29.4 1451.4	Pollution - Air, Lighting & Visual	The submitter opposes the position of Izone as when the nor west blows it sends pollution from Izone over all of Rolleston. The submitter also opposes PC10 on grounds of visual pollution from the large	Reject Plan Change

Name & Position on Plan Change		nission oint	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
				buildings obstructing views of the Southern Alps.	
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 Plan Change
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.	Reject Plan Change
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.	Reject Plan Change
1452	30.3	1452.3	Infrastructure Roading, Traffic, Soils	The submitter comments that the TIA Report by Traffic Design group is very comprehensive and very easy to follow for the layman. 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.	Reject Plan Change
1452	30.4	1452.4	Entire Plan Change	The submitter discusses the Izone timeline and states that the decision of PC5 was	Reject Plan Change

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submi Poi		Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
				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 the less discerning Industrialist.	
1452	30.5 1	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.	Reject Plan Change
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	That an ecological survey be undertaken.
31. AH International Ltd 1453 Oppose	31.1	1453.1	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 development on the neighbouring land. This will potentially cause a diminution in value and enjoyment of the submitter's property.	Maintain status quo by not rezoning the property
1453	31.2 1	1453.2	Infrastructure Roading, Traffic, Water, Supply	The submitter opposes the Plan Change due to the impact it will have upon the sole accessway to a portion of the submitters land.	Maintain status quo by not rezoning the property

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
32. Selwyn Community Board 1454 Support in Part	32.1 1454.1	Entire Plan Change	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.	Approval of the Plan change with the following amendments: O Delete rules 16.6.5.4, 16.6.5.6 Add rule 18.3.1.2 - Any structure exceeding 15m in the Business 2A Zone shall comply with Rule 16.6.3.
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 15m to 40%. 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 building/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 sot it entirely meets the reflectivity requirement of rule 16.6.3.2	Approval of the Plan change with the following amendments: Delete rules 16.6.5.4, 16.6.5.6 Add rule 18.3.1.2 - Any structure exceeding 15m in the Business 2A Zone shall comply with Rule 16.6.3.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Submission Point	Aspect of Plan Change to which Submission Relates	Summary	Decision Requested
			new rule to be added under amendment 55 and rule 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.	
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 development on the neighbouring land. This will potentially cause a diminution in value and enjoyment of the property.	Maintain status quo by not rezoning the property
34. Rolleston Square Ltd 1456 Support	34.1 1456.1	Entire Plan Change	The submitter supports PC10	PC10 be approved.
35. Lewis Gaire Herdman Thompson 1457 Oppose (Late submission received on the 31.12.09)	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.	That there be no further extension to Izone and that there be tighter controls for noise and dust etc.
1457	35.2	Building Heights	The submitter opposes PC10 as the area is no place for tall buildings	That the allowable building height be reduced
1457	35.3	Infrastructure Roading,	The submitter opposes any access on to	That there be no access to Railway Road and that

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	Decision Requested
		Traffic, Water, Supply	Railway Road.	this road is kept open and sealed.

Key:

PC: Plan Change

TIA: Traffic Impact Assessment