

## Plan Change 23 - Airport Noise Contours Summary of Decisions Sought

### Introduction

The period for making submissions to Plan Change 23 to the District Plan closed on 13 April 2010. This is the second stage of the public submission process where people have the opportunity to make further submissions.

Further submissions give the opportunity for the public to either support or oppose the submissions received and summarised or aspects of these submissions. Please note it is not another opportunity to make fresh submissions on the Plan Change itself, as a further submission can only relate to a submission which has already been lodged.

The further submission Form 6 is available at all Council offices and online at:

<http://www.selwyn.govt.nz/services/planning/planning-forms/submission-forms-pdfs/submission-forms>

### THE SUMMARY

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Wishes to be heard?
Shona Robb	S1	D1	Support	Approve the Plan Change as the revised Airport Noise Contours now affects only 10m of the front of their property	Not Stated
Leslie Ronald Bain	S2	D1	Support	Approve the Plan Change to replace the existing Christchurch International Airport air noise contours with the revised air noise contours	No
Marilyn McClure & Graeme Hubbard	S3	D1	Support	The rezoning of our land being returned to that of our neighbours to Living 1B, which was the zoning we shared with them prior to the noise contour being imposed on us by Plan Change 60.	Yes
Phillip Neil Russell	S4	D1	Support	We ask that our land zoning (L2A) be returned to that of our neighbours (L1B), which was the zoning we shared with them prior to the Airport Noise Contour being imposed on us by Plan Change 60.	Yes
Maria Jane Rutherford	S5	D1	Support	Please adopt the proposed changes they at least are less draconian and rigorous than the existing contour boundaries.	No
Christopher Eamon White	S6	D1	Support	That the council adopts the changes, approve the plan changes and amend the relevant policies and objectives in the plan, as necessary to fully implement this intelligent compromise.	No
Annmaree Elizabeth Hofmeester & Hendrickus James Hofmeester	S7	D1	Support	We request that our land zoning (L2A) be returned to that of our neighbours (L1B), which was previously the zoning we shared with them as part of the Shearalea Subdivision prior to the airport noise contour being imposed on us by Plan Change 60.	Yes
Neil Maurice Comyns & Suzanne Mary Light	S8	D1	Oppose	Not to revise/widen noise contours to cover our property - 358 East Maddisons Road - PT RS 4836 Blk XVI Rolleston. Keep contours as they are.	No

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Wishes to be heard?
	S8	D2	Oppose	The widening of the noise contours will cover our property and we believe this will affect any future potential development of our land. To this end our property will become less valuable. We are concerned for the future use of our land and property.	
	S8	D3	Oppose	We were never made aware or had any notification with regard to Proposed Change 1 to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement in 2007.	
Selwyn Central Community Board	S9	D1	Support	That Plan Change 23 be approved.	Yes
Canterbury Regional Council	S10	D1	Support	That the Plan Change be approved.	Yes
Wayne Harper & Nelda Ridden	S11	D1	Support	Adoption of proposed Plan Change 23	Not Stated
	S11	D2	Amend	To have the LZ (Deferred) area of our land currently under the 50dBA Ldn contour rezoned to L1B when Plan Change 23 is adopted.	Not stated
Foster Holdings Ltd	S12	D1	Support	The submitter seeks that the Plan Change be approved.	Yes
Donald Stranack Cottle Wright	S13	D1	Support	Strongly support Plan Change 23 Appendix 3.	Yes
Margit Muller & David Watson	S14	D1	Support	The submitter would like the SDC to rezone their land (Living 2A) to the same as their neighbour (Living 1B) which was the same as their neighbour prior to the Airport Noise Contour being imposed on them by Plan Change 60.	No
Jenny Butt	S15	D1	Oppose	Provide a mechanism through objectives, policies and rules, whereby exceptions can be considered and the appropriate weight given to the existing character of the receiving environment when determining the merits of activities sensitive to noise within the air/noise contour. Without such a mechanism, the air-noise contours become an influential tool that over-rides the effects-based arguments that would ordinarily carry significant weight in any other location outside the air/noise contour. Furthermore, without the ability for such exceptions to be considered, the ability to apply discretion when deciding on activities that are not permitted becomes severely limited.	Yes
Angelene Lorna Holton	S16	D1	Support	General support	Yes
Christchurch International Airport Ltd (CIAL)	S17	D1	Support	Adopt PC23 in its entirety	Yes

Submitter	Submission No.	Decision No.	Request	Decision Sought	Wishes to be heard?
Mary & Maurice Fletcher	S18	D1	Oppose	<p>We understand that if this Plan Change is approved, a note will be placed on a LIM for our property recording that the noise contours affect our property and the associated restrictions on development. We also understand from discussions with council staff that our submission is unlikely to change anything, as it is merely to be in accordance with the Regional Policy Statement. This is hardly a consultative process. We are concerned that such a major change to future property rights, through the Regional Council process should have been imposed with only public notification through the newspapers and that individual property owners affected by the Regional Plan change were not notified. It is disappointing that Selwyn District Council did not see fit to assist its ratepayers as part of this process. The review of the noise contours needs to acknowledge the existing dwellings within the Contour and their right to amenity of their properties. This may be by decreasing the noise limits, which are substantially higher than the existing noise. We would also seek deletion of the controls of further residential development of the land.</p> <p>It is considered that requirements for noise insulation of new dwellings would provide for the quiet night time noise standards that should apply in a rural area. We would be happy to discuss with Council staff how they have balanced the wishes of the Airport Company with the amenity issues of their ratepayers. We have lived at our property at Trents Road for over 30 years and definitely cannot be considered in the category of people that have come to the nuisance.</p>	Yes