

Resource Management Act 1991

Selwyn District Plan

Township Volume

Report on Submissions relating to Plan Change 5

Report Number: 080005:

To: Hearing Commissioner: Mike Garland

From: Tim Harris

Hearing Dates: 17 and 18 December 2008

Attachments

Attachment A	Urban Design
Attachment B	Traffic Report
Attachment C	Property Valuation Effects
Attachment D	Outline Development Plan
Attachment E	Amendments to the District Plan
Attachment F	Existing Izone
Attachment G	Existing Plan Provisions
Attachment H	Index of submitters

Key:

PC:	Plan Change
PC1:	Proposed Change No.1
SDC:	Selwyn District Council
ODP:	Outline Development Plan
TIA:	Traffic Impact Assessment
RPS:	Regional Policy Statement
CRETS:	Christchurch Rolleston and Environs Traffic Study

This report analyses submissions made on part of the District Plan for Selwyn District (SDP).. The report is prepared under Section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (I). The purpose of the report is to assist the Hearing Commissioners in evaluating and deciding on submissions made on the SDP and to assist submitters in understanding how their submission affects the planning process. The report may include recommendations to accept or reject points made in submissions and to make amendments to the SDP. These recommendations are the opinions of the Reporting Officer(s) only. The Hearing Commissioners will decide on each submission after hearing and considering all relevant submissions, the Officer's Report(s) and the Council's functions and duties under RMA.

Introduction

1. My full name is Tim Harris. I am the Planning Manager for the Selwyn District Council. I hold the qualifications of Master of Regional and Resource Planning with Distinction from the University of Otago and I am a full member of the New Zealand Planning Institute. I have worked in the field of planning and resource management for the last 13 years. During that time I have worked both in the private sector and for local government including being the Environmental Services Manager for Banks Peninsula District Council and the Manager for Resource Management at Christchurch City Council. I am familiar with the Selwyn District and its resource management issues and the Selwyn District Plan (SDP).
2. I have been requested by Selwyn District Council to prepare and present evidence on submissions made on Plan Change 5 (PC5).

Ambit of My Evidence

3. This evidence:
 - a) Sets out the background, development and overall planning rationale and justification for PC5;
 - b) Its relationship with the Greater Christchurch Urban Development Strategy ("the UDS");
 - c) Summarises and comments on the expert evidence attached to this report; and
 - c) Sets out a recommendation (accept or reject in whole or part) for each submission point.

Background

- 4 The Selwyn District Council's Strategic Plan 1997 identified the need for industry growth and the development of a broad range of employment opportunities within the District. Council's Economic Development Strategy (Selwyn District Council August 2000) identified the need for the development of an industrial park at Rolleston as one of its objectives (pp. 5 and 6).
5. Following this strategic mandate from the Council the Izone project was initiated in answer to the increasing lack of reasonably priced industrial land in the greater Christchurch area. As demand continued to outstrip supply, particularly for large lots, the Selwyn District Council identified this large tract of land as being suitable for an industrial application. In April 2001 the Council purchased of 130 hectares at Rolleston for an Industrial Park and appointed a Board of individuals with specific skills in property.
6. The existing Izone comprises approximately 71 hectares. Lots incorporating up to Stage 3 have been sold. Stage 4 of the development has proceeded resulting in an additional 27 lots for sale. The current rate of sales of lots is 15-20ha per annum. At that rate of land uptake the existing industrial land at Izone will be exhausted in 3-4 years.
7. The following table gives a summary of milestones in the development of Izone.

April 2002	- Agreement signed with The Warehouse for the sale and purchase of 7.012 hectares with an allowance for a further expansion of 3.000 hectares.
------------	--

December 2002	- purchase of a further 0.44 hectares to improve road access and aesthetics for Izone;
---------------	--

February	- Plan Change 60 made operative, which allows for
----------	---

2003	Rolleston to grow from then population of 3,000 to 14,000;
June 2003	- opening of The Warehouse distribution centre;
June 2003	- sale of remaining 3.0 hectares of business 2 zoned land
August 2003	- purchase of 18.00 hectares in Hoskyns Road which provided Izone with new road access opportunities from the existing 130 hectares;
December 2004	- release of decision on Variation 2 which zoned an additional 72 hectares of the original 130 hectares as Business 2 zoned land.
February 2005	– Two appeals lodged in Environment Court against zoning;
October 2005	– Both appeals resolved by agreement;
June 2006	– Stage 2 of 5.0 hectares commenced and completed in October
December 2006	– completion of Selwyn District Council upgrade to Jones Road;

Overview of Plan Change

8. Selwyn District Council proposes changes to the Selwyn District Plan by rezoning some 56 Ha of land at Hoskyns Road, Rolleston from the existing Rural Zone to Business 2 to provide for industrial business activities. The proposed zone presently applies over adjacent land to the west and south. In addition to the rules that apply to Business Zones generally there are some site specific controls proposed that will apply to the subject site. In addition, the plan change incorporates a requirement for development over the land in question to be in accordance with a specific Outline Development Plan to be included at Appendix 33 to the District Plan.
9. Rules relating to the abovementioned Outline Development Plan will control the location of main road connections to and within the extension to the Business 2 Zone, as well as introducing a requirement for landscaping along the boundary with the Rural zoned properties to the north and the upgrading of Hoskyns Road.
10. In response to submissions a number of other changes are also suggested. These include additional Amenity Hubs, the upgrading of Hoskyns Rd including the off-road shared pedestrian/cycle path, In addition further plans are proposed to be included at Appendix 33 and these relates to the Hoskyns Rd upgrading and the cross sections of roads within the area to be rezoned.
11. The Plan Change was notified on the 16th of August 2008 and submissions closed on the 15th September 2008. Some 52 submissions were received with 50 of those expressing opposition to the plan change. A range of views were expressed focussing on the perceived adverse effects of the expansion. These centred on rural amenity, property values, visual pollution, traffic generation, and the like more details on these submissions are provided for later in this report.

Plan Change 1 to Regional Policy Statement

12. Plan Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement (PC1), while being a statutory planning document still in development¹, is an important part of understanding the rationale for this Plan Change. PC1 has its origins in an overarching strategic approach for managing development in the greater Christchurch area termed the Urban Development Strategy for Greater Christchurch (UDS).
13. The UDS vision is for a greater Christchurch for the residents of the area (living south of the Ashley River and north of the Selwyn River, and the Strategy partners, Environment Canterbury, the Christchurch City Council, Selwyn and Waimakariri District Councils and the New Zealand Transport Agency (formerly Transit New Zealand).
14. The Strategy provides the primary strategic direction for the Greater Christchurch area, including the location of future housing, development of social and retail activity centres, areas for new employment and integration with transport networks. It also establishes a basis for all organisations, not just the Strategy partners, and the community to work collaboratively to manage growth.
15. PC1 is a primary implementation mechanism for the UDS. PC1 moves from the current quasi-laissez faire regime to an allocative regime for urban development. While PC1 does not zone land or contain rules it does use maps in conjunction with the policies to guide development in sustainable locations making use of existing infrastructure and transportation linkages. PC1 identified two areas for business growth adjacent to the existing Izone Park. One of these is called SR2 which relates directly to the Plan Change that is the subject of this report.
16. PC1 then provides a framework for Plan Change applications to District Plans and it is into this framework and context that Plan Change 5 relates. Further details of the

¹ Submissions and further submissions have been lodged in respect of this Plan change and hearings are anticipated in March 2009.

outline development plan and the design requirements of PC1 and there expression in Plan Change 5 is provided by Mr Craig in Attachment A.

The Existing Plan Provisions

17. Plan Change 5 essentially follows the suite of Plan Change provisions that currently apply to the existing Izone. Fundamentally this involves listing a number of activities which require some sort of resource consent process to allow for their establishment and a series of effects based standards designed to avoid and mitigate adverse effects that are generated by activities within Izone. These are provided in Attachment G.

The Expert Evidence

18. A number of expert reports have been commissioned to address the issues that have been raised in submissions. These are provided in full in the attachments to this report. I have read this evidence and concur with it. The authors of this evidence will be in attendance during the hearing both to present the evidence and to answer any questions from the Commissioner.
19. **Ian Craig** an urban designer has prepared evidence which relates to urban design and visual matters. This evidence is attached in Attachment A. Mr Craig addresses the submissions and presents a number of suggestions to deal with the concerns raised.
20. Mr Craig provides an in-depth analysis of the visual impact of the expanded Izone from a number of different perspectives. Having considered in detail submissions raising matters related to urban design, visual impacts, and undertaken a visual assessment based on likely outcomes of the development controls, Mr Craig is of the view that the Plan Change should be advanced generally as notified but with the following recommended changes:
 - Addition of amenity hub locations on the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 33 (refer Paragraph 4.11 of Mr Craig's report);

- Addition of definition of amenity hub and related rules for the establishment of an amenity hub (refer Paragraph 4.10 of Mr Craig's report);
 - Addition of illustrative road cross sections into Appendix 33 and a related rule;
 - Addition indicating these road treatments should typically be followed (refer paragraph 4.22 of Mr Craig's report);
 - Addition of words to rules ensuring that subdivision design will promote lots (and associated buildings) that front onto Hoskyns Road (refer Paragraph 6.45 of Mr. Craig's report); and
 - • Addition of a new rule requiring planting on the western side of Hoskyns Road.
21. To help demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed changes arising from the visual assessment Mr Craig has prepared Attachment Fourteen (to his evidence) that shows the effectiveness of fronting the buildings to Hoskyns Road, adding a line of planting onto the berm, and extending the screen planting.
22. **Mr Penny** addresses traffic and transportation issues raised in the submissions made on Plan Change 5. His evidence is attached in Attachment B. Mr Penny that Selwyn District Council takes the following actions to address the concerns of submitters
- Require the upgrading of the Jones Road/Hoskyns Road intersection and the section of Hoskyns Road from Jones Road to the new IZone access road;
 - Require the upgrading of Hoskyns Road/Maddisons Road including a median island; and
 - Require the monitoring the traffic volume on Maddisons Road east of Hoskyns Road at six monthly intervals

23. Mr Penny's view is that if these actions are completed then there are no traffic or transportation grounds for rejecting the Plan Change.
24. **Mr Dunbar** evidence assesses the potential affect on the values of properties in the vicinity of the proposed rezoning. Mr Dunbar's evidence is contained in Attachment C.
25. Mr Dunbar comes to the conclusion that any potential impact on the value of rural residential lifestyle properties will be reduced and mitigated by a number of factors including the existence of the existing Izone which has become part of the accepted environment and which will also act as a buffer to properties to the west. Mr. Dunbar goes on to suggest that the existing shelter belts and the proposed design controls will effectively negate any adverse visual impact.
26. The Table below summarises the suggested changes that are recommended in response to the issues that have been raised in submissions (Amendments 1-15 are set out in the original application).

DESCRIPTION OF CHANGES MADE TO THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE DISTRICT PLAN FROM THOSE ORIGINALLY NOTIFIED.
Amendment 16. The landscaping recommended by Mr Craig on that portion of Hoskyns Rd near the Maddisons Rd intersection has been included within the rule and illustrated on the ODP. This has been amended to address visual impact concerns raised by various submitters.
Amendment 17. This is a new condition which requires landscape plantings along Hoskyns Rd within the road berm as recommended by Mr Craig to address visual impact concerns raised by various submitters.
Amendment 18. This is a new condition that relates to the upgrading of Hoskyns road which the Council intends to undertake as part of the

rezoning. This is an interim step to the ultimate upgrading proposed under CRETS. A plan of the upgrade works is to be included at Appendix 33 of the DP. This condition has been developed to address the intention signalled by Council in the Plan Change as notified and in response to traffic issues raised by submitters.

Amendment 19. This is a new condition to give effect to the recommendation by Mr Craig regarding the inclusion of an amenity hub area which was signalled in the ODP Report that accompanied the notified Plan Change. The condition also responds to issues raised by ECAN regarding connectivity.

Amendment 20. This is a new condition to give effect to the recommendation by Mr Craig regarding the nature of the road design within the rezoned area which was signalled in the ODP Report that accompanied the notified Plan Change. The condition also responds to issues raised by ECAN regarding connectivity and providing for walking and cycling within the area.

Amendment 21. This is a new assessment matter to support Amendment 19 above which relates to the establishment of an amenity hub over the area to be rezoned.

Amendment 22. This is a new assessment matter to give effect to the recommendation by Mr Craig to help ensure that buildings face the road which is seen as a positive measure in terms of visual amenity. This condition responds to visual impact concerns raised by submitters.

Amendment 23. This has been added to through additional items being included on the Outline Development Plan such as the Amenity Hub locations, the upgrading of Hoskyns Rd including the off-road shared pedestrian/cycle path, the second road connection to Hoskyns Rd if the possibility arises, the extension of the specific landscaping control, and the correction to the relevant landscaping rule in the District Plan (as notified the rule was incorrect). In addition further plans are proposed to be included at Appendix 33 and these relates to the Hoskyns Rd upgrading and the cross sections of roads within the area to be rezoned.

Amendment 24. This is a new definition for ‘Amenity Hub’ to be included in the District Plan to support Amendment 19 above.

The following table provides an assessment of each submission.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<i>1. Sarah Vivienne Booth</i>	<i>The submitter states that the proposal will have a negative impact on high quality residential housing through noise, lights and visual effects.</i>	<i>Further expansion on the SR1 and SR2 zones be declined.</i>
<i>Further submission</i>	<i>K Mallon</i>	<i>support</i>

Assessment

Mr Craig in Attachment A provides an in-depth analysis of the visual impact of the expanded Izone from a number of different perspectives. Having considered in detail submissions raising matters related to urban design, visual impact, and undertaken a visual assessment based on likely outcomes of the development controls, Mr Craig is of the view that the Plan Change should be advanced generally as notified but with the following recommended changes:

Addition of amenity hub locations on the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 33 (refer Paragraph 4.11 of Mr Craig's report);

Addition of definition of amenity hub and related rules for the establishment of an amenity hub (refer Paragraph 4.10 of Mr Craig's report);

Addition of illustrative road cross sections into Appendix 33 and a related rule;

Addition indicating these road treatments should typically be followed (refer paragraph 4.22 of Mr Craig's report);

Addition of words to rules ensuring that subdivision design will promote lots (and associated

buildings) that front onto Hoskyns Road (refer Paragraph 6.45 of Mr. Craig's report); and

Addition of a new rule requiring planting on the western side of Hoskyns Road.

Noise is dealt with by rules in the District Plan :

a) Applying at the boundary of any site adjoining the Rural Zone:

- 7.30am – 8.00pm 60dBA L10
- 8.00pm – 7.30am 40dBA L10
- 7.30am – 8.00pm 80dBA Lmax
- 8.00pm – 7.30am 65dBA Lmax

dBa is a measurement of the loudness of sound. To give the submitter some comparisons here some common activities and their sound loudness.

Threshold of Hearing.....	0 dBA
Quiet Room.....	45 dBA
Conversation.....	55 dBA
Car (50 mph at 50 ft).....	65 dBA
End Loader (In Good Cab).....	75 dBA
Haul Truck (In Good Cab).....	85 dBA
Crusher.....	95 dBA
Old Dozer (No Cab).....	105 dBA
Air Track Drill (No Controls).....	115 dBA

Similarly, light spill controlled in the District Plan.

5. Light Spill

Any lighting shall not exceed:

- a) 10 lux spill on to any part of any adjoining property within the same Business zone.*
- b) 3 lux spill (horizontal or vertical) on to any part of any adjoining property in the Rural Zone which has a common boundary with the Business 2 Zone at Izone*

Lux measure of the *apparent* intensity of light hitting or passing through a surface and again to

provide some illustration to the submitter I provide the following examples.

Illuminance	Example
10 ⁻⁵ lux	Light from the brightest star (Sirius) ^[2]
10 ⁻⁴ lux	Total starlight , overcast sky ^[2]
0.002 lux	Moonless clear night sky with airglow ^[2]
0.01 lux	Quarter moon
0.27 lux	Full moon on a clear night ^{[2][3]}
1 lux	Full moon overhead at tropical latitudes ^[4]
3.4 lux	Dark limit of civil twilight under a clear sky ^[5]
50 lux	Family living room ^[6]
80 lux	Hallway/toilet ^[7]
100 lux	Very dark overcast day ^[2]
320 lux	Recommended office lighting (Australia) ^[8]
400 lux	Sunrise or sunset on a clear day. Well-lit office area.
32,000–130,000 lux	Direct sunlight
My view is that these controls are reasonable and hopefully alleviate the submitters concerns.	

Recommendation

That the submission and the further submission in support be **rejected**

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
2. Rolleston Square Limited Support	<i>Support proposal in entirety.</i>	<i>PC is accepted in full.</i>
Further submission	<i>K Mallon</i>	<i>oppose</i>

Assessment

The submitter provides support to the Plan Change and while his submission does not expand on his reasons for this support, I understand that he intends to present a statement at the hearing.

Recommendation

Accept in part to the extent that the plan change proceeds with the recommended changes.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
3. Callum Logan Oppose	<i>No evidence exists in the supporting documentation to ensure Izone expansion is of long term benefit to the community. The submitter states that it seems SDC's "live and work" vision is not currently being realised with existing businesses struggling to employ adequate staff, and little evidence of local employment. The submitter suggests this is due to a mismatch of jobs on offer compared to the economic and demographic profile of the catchment of Rolleston. Statistics would indicate that Rolleston and surrounding residents are least deprived, implying they are well paid, well educated and skilled. They are unlikely to be attracted to industrial employment. Further evidence that</i>	<i>Consider submission and respond to issues raised.</i>

	<p><i>contradicts the vision of “live and work’ is the daily movement of Designline workers from Ashburton. This indicates IZone is not sustainable.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter states that the quest for short term development profits and an increased rats takes is at a cost of long term sustainability of business in Izone and local employment options. There is a long term governance role to ensure the right businesses that benefit our community are selected for IZone. An IZone governance group could be a mixture of council and local residents and their purpose would be to approve or decline businesses wanting to set up in IZone. Multi criteria used which considered, how may local jobs, skilled or unskilled work, heavy road users etc.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter states that traffic volumes will increase, which is an added costs to road maintenance, create congestion, increase in accidents and noise.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter states that the entry/exit onto Hoskyns Road should not be created as it will make it easier for heavy vehicles to travel down secondary country roads (e.g. Maddisons Road).</i></p> <p><i>The submitter states that the subject site is a naturally open space with rural vistas and low skylines. Softening business zones with a landscaping strip will do little to reduce the visual pollution created by 15m high buildings and 25m high structures. Consideration needs to be given to lighter businesses being located on the periphery.</i></p> <p><i>The neighbour consultation conducted to date and their support for SR1 and SR2 is not objective given negotiations with SDC and the pecuniary interest they have. SDC’s negotiations with these parties have left them in a difficult position given that ECAN are not supportive of rezoning their lands.</i></p>	
--	--	--

<i>Further submissions</i>	<i>Stephanie Ashleigh</i> <i>Anita Breyholtz</i> <i>Pewter Bullock</i> <i>Chisholm Projects Ltd</i> <i>K Mallon</i>	<i>Support</i> <i>Support</i> <i>Support</i> <i>Oppose</i> <i>Support</i>
----------------------------	---	---

Assessment

The submitter raises a number of points. Firstly the socio-economic and the long term benefit to the community are raised.

Councils Economic Development Strategy (Selwyn District Council August 2000) identifies the development of an industrial park at Rolleston as one of its objectives (pp. 5 and 6) The vision of this strategy was to “provide means and opportunity for people in Selwyn District to achieve an enhanced quality of life” (p6). While this vision is obviously difficult to gauge Izone has to date been successful in its operation and while I would agree with the submitter that currently it may not be a large generator of jobs for people in Selwyn District it certainly has not had a negative impact on employment in the District. One of the objectives of the Council is to attract and accommodate a wide range of employment opportunities in the District and over time my view is that Izone has the potential to contribute to this.

In regard to Design Line my view is that while there may be some movement of workers from Ashburton over time there remains a strong incentive for those people and others like them commuting from other locations to Izone, to relocate into Selwyn District. Rolleston has a population projection of over 18000 people (Selwyn District 66 000) by 2041. Council’s strategy and policy teams are currently actively developing plans on how and where Council is going to accommodate this growth. My view is that Izone has a real potential to become a noteworthy area for employment in the medium to long term.

The submitter discusses the need for a management group for Izone while I would suggest that this might be outside the scope of what this process is able to take into account I could comment that currently Izone is managed by a group of people that have been chosen because of their specific business skills. Their focus is obviously about making Izone a commercial success. How Izone integrates into the surrounding environment is largely achieved through the planning processes that it is required to move through. The Plan Change application and the assessment of submissions and

concerns raised have in my view been comprehensive.

The issues with regard visual matters have been addressed in the visual assessment by Ian Craig a copy of which is attached to this report. I understand that his view is that the visual impacts will not be significant, a view which I concur with. However he has made a series of recommendations that further addresses issues raised in submissions.

In relation to the comments about the height of structures I do note that the definition of building includes chimney stacks and that 'structures' are defined quite narrowly. Accordingly, there will be very little development that is permitted to go to the 25m height. Indeed this height is specifically designed for utility structures (telephone towers and the like).

In regard to some limitations on the type of industries that can establish in Izone, I would comment that Part C Section 13 sets out the status of activities for the Business Zones (see Attachment G). These rules effectively specify a range of heavier industrial activities with the associated generation of adverse effects and provide for them as controlled, discretionary and non complying activities. Further control is provided in number of other rules contained in the business sections of the District Plan. Accordingly there will be some control over the location and the establishment of these types of activities.

The issue the submitter raises in respect of Hoskyns Rd has been addressed in Traffic Design Groups evidence (Mr. Penny) that I attach to this report. His conclusions are that the upgrading pursuant CETS will effectively make the State Highway and Jones Road more attractive to heavy vehicles. Some suggested amendments to the Maddisons Jones and Hoskyns Roads intersections will also act as a disincentive to the use of Maddisons Road.

Recommendation

That the submissions be **accepted in part** to the extent that the traffic issues that he raises have been addressed in the recommendations.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
4. Voyna Crofts Oppose	<i>Submitter poses numerous questions: The submitter seeks evidence to support the Council's</i>	<i>Reject the proposal to</i>

	<p><i>claims that the Industrial area needs to be expanded; how much existing Izone has been sold, how many sites have been built on, how many businesses are actually up and running, has the Council had to buy back any of the land sold, is the land being sold to actual businesses or speculators, how many sites have been unsold?</i></p> <p><i>Has the Council taken every step to ensure every ratepayer knows about the proposed expansion? The submitter states that there has been insufficient and unclear notification of the Council's intention in all aspects of their proposal.</i></p> <p><i>Has Council had any regard for what the actual ratepayers want in their District? If so how?</i></p> <p><i>The Council says one of the main reasons of expanding the Industrial Zone is to create more jobs for locals. How many businesses are actually employing local people? How does the Council know if the local people want to or have any intention to work in IZone? Have the people of Rolleston and surrounding areas been asked?</i></p> <p><i>The Council have bans in place to stop people lighting open fires, yet high chimneys may be built. This will create uncontrolled pollution.</i></p> <p><i>What Plans are in place to stop Izone from expanding further?</i></p> <p><i>After the expanded rezoning, the Council will have no control of the type of industrial activities there. What will Council do to soften the blow for the rural lifestyle properties? Is compensation proposed?</i></p> <p><i>Water: How will the expansion impact on the water table?</i></p>	<i>expand IZone.</i>
Further submission	K Mallon	Support

Assessment

To my knowledge the Council has not had to buy back any land, and I am unsure if any of the present sites have been on-sold. Appendix F provides a description of the existing sites in Izone. I understand that in response to some speculative buying and selling in the first few years of Izone a clause has now been placed in the buy sell agreement which restricts this.

In my view the Council has followed due process in terms of the notification of this Plan Change. The Council consults the rate payers in a myriad of different processes including the Long Term Council Community Plan, structure plans, and strategic plans. This Plan Change processes also invokes its own statutory consultation process.

Council's Economic Development Strategy (Selwyn District Council August 2000) identifies the development of an industrial park at Rolleston as one of its objectives (pp. 5 and 6). The vision of this strategy is to "provide means and opportunity for people in Selwyn District to achieve an enhanced quality of life" (p6).

While this vision is obviously difficult to measure Izone, has to date, been successful in its operation and while I would agree with the submitter that currently it may not be a large generator of jobs for people in Selwyn District it certainly has not had a negative impact on employment in the District. One of the objectives of the Council is to attract and accommodate a wide range of employment opportunities in the District and over time, in my opinion, Izone has the potential to contribute to significantly to this.

The total height of buildings which would include chimney stacks is 15m in my opinion in the context of the existing zone this will not contribute to the visual pollution. A full visual assessment is provided by Ian Craig see Attachment A.

Izone do have some aspirations for further expansion if demand warrants. However this would be subject to a separate process. Currently Ecan do not support further expansion of Izone beyond indicated in PC1.

Part C Section 13 of the District Plan sets out the status of activities for the Business Zones (see Attachment G). These rules effectively specify a range of heavier industrial activities with the

associated generation of adverse effects and provide for them as controlled, discretionary and non complying activities. Accordingly those listed activities would be subject to a separate resource consent process if they were establishing within Izone. Further control is provided in number of other rules contained in the business sections of the District Plan, for instance the hazardous substance rules would require a resource consent for any activity involved in the manufacture of any hazardous substances, as defined in the Hazardous Substances and New Organisms Act 1996.

It is not considered that there will be any adverse effects on the water table. A stormwater consent is currently being sought from Ecan.

Recommendation

That the Council **rejects** the requests.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
5. ECan Supports intentions	<i>The submitter states that the TIA submitted with the Plan Change identifies road and intersection improvements necessary to Hoskyns Road and Jones Road to mitigate and remedy the effects of the proposed business activity that will arise as a result of the Plan Change. These include providing a separate pedestrian and cycle route from the Hoskyns Road/Jones Road intersection to the application site. The implementation of these measures, however, has not been included in the ODP nor in the additions to the District Plan. The ODP also does not include specifications for the internal roading network through which walking and cycling will be provided for. The Plan Change and ODP therefore fails to provide adequately and with certainty, for connectivity with surrounding areas by a variety of transport modes. They also fail to provide, with certainty, for the off site roading improvements necessary for the safe and efficient operation of the District transportation network. Plan Change inconsistent with Objectives and</i>	<i>That the ODP and/or District Plan be amended to explicitly provide for: i)The Hoskyns Road upgrade as set out in theTIA. ii) The Hoskyns Road/Jones Road intersection Upgrade as set out in the TIA. iii) Roding specifications for the internal roads as set out in the ODP. iv)Details of how</i>

	<p><i>Policies of the District Plan and Canterbury Regional Policy Statement.</i></p> <p><i>Options are identified in the Stormwater Management Assessment submitted with the Plan Change for the management of stormwater but implementation of these measures has not been included in the ODP. The environmental effects of the stormwater management measures have also not been fully considered. The failure to provide for the implementation of stormwater management measures and to consider their environmental effects fails to provide certainty to developers and the community on the delivery and development of the extended IZone business area. Also fails to adequately have regard to Part II of the RMA. Plan Change therefore inconsistent with District Plan and fails to give effect to the CRPS and inconsistent with the NRRP.</i></p>	<p><i>the off road shared pedestrian/cycle path along Hoskyns Road will be integrated with the pedestrian and cycling network.</i></p> <p><i>v)Details of measures to be provided to reduce pedestrian/motor vehicle conflict within the development and in the surrounding transport network.</i></p> <p><i>Details of stormwater disposal including land required for stormwater treatment, retention and drainage paths, and which shall include an assessment of the environmental effects of the</i></p>
--	---	---

		<i>disposal system be included in the ODP or included in the District Plan.</i>
<i>Further submissions</i>	<i>Rolleston Square Ltd K Mallon</i>	<i>Support Oppose</i>

Assessment

The Council has met with the submitter and most if not all of the of the concerns raised in the submission have been addressed.

The ODP and/or District Plan has been amended to provide for:

- The Hoskyns Road upgrade as set out in the TIA.
- The Hoskyns Road/Jones Road intersection Upgrade as set out in the TIA.
- Road specifications for the internal roads as set out in the ODP.
- Details of how the off road shared pedestrian/cycle path along Hoskyns Road will be integrated with the pedestrian and cycling network.
- Details of measures to be provided to reduce pedestrian/motor vehicle conflict within the development and in the surrounding transport network is proposed to be addressed by an existing assessment matter during any subsequent subdivision.

Furthermore details of stormwater disposal including land required for stormwater treatment, retention and drainage paths, and which shall include an assessment of the environmental effects of the disposal system has been included in the ODP. I understand that the submitter will be present at the hearing if further clarification is required.

Recommendation

That the Council **accepts** the submissions and **rejects** the further submission in opposition.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<p>6 Selwyn Central Community Board Generally supports Plan Change 5 and proposed amendments 1 – 18 of the District Plan.</p>	<p><i>The submitter states that the AEE does not adequately address the effects of increased heavy vehicular movements on the surrounding rural and rural residential community. The TIA and ODP assumes that the heavy vehicle movements generated by the IZone Development will use S.H.1 to access Christchurch City. Anecdotal evidence from residents in the Weedons area indicates that the existing IZone development has produced an increase in number of vehicles using Maddisons Road to access Christchurch City. AEE & TIA does not address this.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter also states that the ODP suggests that there may be future development of the Izone B2 zone across Hoskyns Road and that Hoskyns Road may be integrated as a key road within Izone. The submitter states that these statements are outside the scope of the proposed Plan Change. The Izone development should occur within the area bounded by Jones Rod, Railway Road, West Melton Road and Hoskyns Road until such time as the land in this area is fully developed.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter opposes the assumption made in the ODP that “further roads in addition to those shown may be required....it would be highly desirable to provide at least one further connection to Hoskyns Road from the proposed boulevard, somewhere along its length. This should be by way of a road with a secondary road cross section as first preference”.</i></p>	<p><i>Access to Hoskyns Road be restricted to one new intersection, with that intersection being located somewhere between Jones Road and Maddisons Road. Applicant be required to upgrade the section of Hoskyns Road between Jones Road and Maddsions Road to District Arterial standards. Upgrade intersection of Hoskyns Road and Maddisons Road due to increased vehicle movements generated by</i></p>

	<i>The submitter is concerned that there is no restriction on the number of lots or size of lot that will have access to Hoskyns Road and requests that an appropriate restriction be added to limit the number of access points to Hoskyns Road.</i>	<i>development. - Number of lots with automatic access to Hoskyns Road be restricted and/or the number of access points to Hoskyns Road be restricted to the number of access points that would be generated if this length of road frontage was subdivided to the rural residential standard.</i>
Further submission	K Mallon	oppose

Assessment

The impact of traffic generation on the surrounding rural road network is a recurring theme and a major concern to many of the submitters. The evidence attached to this report from Traffic Design Group (Mr. Penny Attachment B) addresses this issue in some depth. I note the recommendation from that evidence:

Require the upgrading of the Jones Road/Hoskyns Road intersection and the section of Hoskyns Road from Jones Road to the new IZone access road as specified in the TAR.

(ii) Require the upgrading of Hoskyns Road/Maddisons Road including a median island

(iii) Require the monitoring the traffic volume on Maddisons Road east of Hoskyns Road at six monthly intervals

I concur with these recommendations and on that basis I believe that this part of the submitters request can be accepted.

In regard to the issue of access to Hoskyns Rd. Mr Craig's assessment is that to actively discourage accesses onto Hoskyns road will have some negative impact on urban design and connectivity and I agree with that view. . The amended Outline Development Plan (Attachment D) shows an indicative road connection to Hoskyns Road, (as an arrow) and I would be supportive of the Plan Change being advanced as it is on this matter.

In regard to the submitters concerns about the future expansion of Izone I would agree that the current proposal needs to be assessed on its merits and any future expansion of Izone beyond that under discussion through this application should be ignored.

Recommendation

That the submission be **accepted in part** to the extent that the recommendation and the proposed amendments accord with the relief sought

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
7 MB Watson, NW Watson, M P Watson and A C V Brown Oppose	<p><i>The submitter states that the proposed Plan Change does not give effect to the RPS and that the proposed Plan Change places significant weight on proposed Change 1 to the RPS which is in its infancy, and that the land subject to the PC is the subject of a number of submissions in opposition to its inclusion within the Urban Limits of Rolleston as set out in Plan Change 1 to the RPS.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter also states that the PC is inconsistent with the objectives and policies in the SDP and that the PC will result in adverse effects on the environment which are not capable of being satisfactorily avoided, remedied or mitigated.</i></p> <p><i>PC contrary to the purpose and principles of the RMA</i></p>	<i>That the plan change be rejected in its entirety.</i>

<i>Further Submissions</i>	<i>Chisholm Projects Ltd K Mallon</i>	<i>Oppose Support</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>My first comment is that I would agree limited weight can be given to PC1 to the Regional Policy statement as submissions have yet to be heard and decisions reached. Nevertheless the area that is the subject of this plan change is within the area that PC1 indicates will used for future industrial growth. As I indicated above I do not believe that PC1 can be ignored altogether.</p> <p>I do not agree that the proposal is inconsistent with the District Plan Objectives and Policies.</p> <p>Specific policies relating to the growth of Rolleston Township are provided at Part 2.4 Section 4.3 III (iv)xvi of the Plan. Those policies that apply to the proposal include:</p> <p><i>“1. Avoid rezoning land for new residential or business development (other than Business 2 zoning), west of SH1 and the South Island Main Trunk Line (SIMTL)</i></p> <p><i>Encourage land rezoned for new business development to adjoin an existing Business zone of similar character, where sites are available and appropriate for the proposed activity.</i></p> <p><i>Encourage additional Business 2 zones to locate west of SH1, preferably adjoining the existing Business 2 zone.”</i></p> <p>My view that the proposal is consistent with this policy framework.</p> <p>The interpretation of the purpose of the Resource Management Act can be varied but on the whole my view that this proposal is reasonably well aligned to those objectives.</p> <p>My understanding of the purpose of the Act (in very simple terms) is that it is about enabling people to provide for their wellbeing’s (social, economic and cultural) while at the same time addressing wider impacts on the environment in the present and future.</p> <p>I consider that the economic well being of a number of different people including employers and</p>		

employees involved in activities that are establishing in Izone will be provided for. The issue is, and its one that that is raised in various ways through most of the submissions, is what will the impact of that be on the wider environment. My view is (supported by the various experts) is that the measures that are proposed including the upgrading of the surrounding road network and the various rules, restrictions and plans that seek to mitigate the adverse effects of development will be sufficient to address the any negative impacts from subsequent development in Izone.

Recommendation

That the submission and the further submission in support be **rejected** and the further submission in opposition be **accepted**

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<p>8 National Investment Trust Opposes in part</p>	<p><i>The submitter states that large scale retail activities are only indirectly addressed in Rule 22.12 of the SDP. The submitter states that this classification is too permissive. Rule 22.12.1 should provide that retailing of the type referred to in the rule is non-complying and any retailing not complying with that rule be prohibited.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter states that PC1 to the RPS identified that land subject to the Plan Change as being potentially suitable for business land. However there is no proposed S32 analysis for PC1 which provides any justification for its inclusion in PC1.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter states that PC1 incorrectly estimates the future demand for business, commercial and bulk retail activity in greater Christchurch and that there is in fact greater demand for such activities than predicted in PC1. The submitter states that the Plan Change site is inappropriate for these activities and they should be provided for elsewhere.</i></p> <p><i>For a range of planning and traffic reasons use of Izone for bulk retail, business and commercial activities is contrary to sound resource management practice and will result in unacceptable adverse effects.</i></p>	<p><i>Restrict the proposed zoning to industrial activities</i></p> <p><i>Provide plan provisions which either prohibit or make non-complying bulk retail business or commercial activities</i></p> <p><i>Such other or alternative relief as may be required to meet the concern of the submitter.</i></p>

	<i>PC is contrary to the intent of PC1 and Part II of the Act.</i>	
Further Submissions	<i>Chisholm Projects Ltd</i> <i>Rolleston Square Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i> <i>Support</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>Rule 22.12.1.1 makes any retail activity which occupies more than 20% of the gross floor area of a building or more than 2000m² whichever is the lesser a discretionary activity. The submitter is requesting that this restriction is increased.</p> <p>I consider that the establishment of large retail activities at Izone in the near future would potentially create some issues, not least the impact on the surrounding road network. However I consider that the restrictions mean that any retail activity would be largely ancillary to the predominant industrial activity on the site.</p> <p>In my view the discretionary activity status for resource consent for an activity that exceeded this standard would allow effects such as reverse sensitivity and the impact on that road network to be taken into account. Accordingly, while I concur that this is a reasonable issue to consider my view is that the current provisions address it in a reasonable and justifiable way.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That the submissions are rejected and the further submission in opposition be accepted.</p>		
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
9 Kevin Mallon <i>Oppose</i>	<i>The submitter states that the PC will take away almost all their pleasures associated with the rural lifestyle and will have adverse impacts in terms of:</i> <i>Increase vehicular traffic. S.H is becoming clogged, traffic travelling to and from the extended IZone will be forced to use alternative routes to their destinations. TIA suggests that the majority of the traffic will use S.H.1.</i>	<i>Strike out proposal</i>

	<p><i>Little work done on traffic travelling directly to the Main West Coast Road or attempting to head more north and bypass Christchurch. It is impossible to believe that this traffic will not proceed directly down Hoskyns Road if heading west or down Maddisons, Jones, Knights or Newtons Road if heading north. This will adversely impact on residents.</i></p> <p><i>Traffic flows pass Weedons school will increase and children will be put at risk. Speed also appears to have increased.</i></p> <p><i>Industrial park will seek to employ low waged staff who cannot afford to live in Rolleston. Neither the existing IZone nor the PC will have a major effect on the employment prospects of the people in Rolleston and its environs.</i></p> <p><i>New industrial area will depress property values.</i></p> <p><i>The Plan Change will allow for structures up to 15 – 25m. Landscaping will not hide such structures. The potential for visual pollution over an already stunning rural landscape is significant, the ability to mitigate this is negligible.</i></p> <p><i>Ambient light will escape and create light pollution. This will be detrimental to nocturnal animals, birds etc. The regulations in the Plan Change do not go far enough on limiting lighting pollution.</i></p> <p><i>PC site will promote criminal activity. The Council proposal does not discuss this in any way.</i></p> <p><i>Proposal will increase the level of noise as a result of factories, additional traffic and railway activity.</i></p> <p><i>By zoning the site as B2 the residents effectively have to live with whatever activity wants to use the space, we have given away our right to understand the consequences of the activity. Council has already brought the land that is affected by the PC, this implies</i></p>	
--	---	--

	<i>that they expect the PC to proceed and that the rights of the residents will not be taken into account.</i>	
Further Submissions	<i>Chisholm Projects Ltd Cockburn Trust</i>	<i>Oppose Support</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>The submitter raises a number of issues most of which are addressed in reports by Mr. Craig's and Mr Penny's which address visual and traffic matters, respectively. I have read their evidence and support the conclusions that they have reached. Those conclusions include a number of recommendations that will address aspects of the submission.</p> <p>One further way of addressing traffic moving down Maddisons road would be to reverse the stop signs of the current cross roads. This would effectively make travelling down Maddisons Road unattractive. However this could generate an adverse reaction to the local users of Maddisons Road but it is something that the Commissioner may want to consider.</p> <p>I also understand that the Council has recently attempted to lower the speed limit around Weedons School but was unsuccessful mainly because of a lack of police resources to monitor and administer that reduction.</p> <p>I can't necessarily see the direct linkage between criminal activity and the expansion of Izone but would welcome some elaboration on this issue at the hearing.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>I recommend that the submission and the further submission in support be rejected and the further submission in opposition be accepted.</p>		
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<i>10 M L Boughan &</i>	<i>The submitter states that insufficient notice about the</i>	<i>Izone area not be</i>

<p><i>M A Rodgers</i> <i>Oppose</i></p>	<p><i>Plan Change was given. Submitter concerned that Council has already purchased the properties up to Maddisons Road before objections have been heard. Submitter has concerns over</i> <i>Noise pollution</i> <i>Light Pollution</i> <i>Air Pollution</i> <i>Visual Pollution – buildings, chimneys etc. Landscaping not sufficient to screen from the road.</i> <i>Devaluation of properties</i> <i>Dangers associated with Heavy traffic, such as threat to wildlife, vibrations, dust, will inhibit children from cycling and walking to school with added traffic, trucks will use rural roads. Problems areas identified as being Maddisons corner, Hoskyns and West Melton corner.</i> <i>Loss of good quality soils</i> <i>Job Opportunities – minimum wage jobs provided</i> <i>Adverse impacts on Weedons School - traffic</i></p>	<p><i>expanded at all.</i></p>
<p><i>Further Submissions</i></p>	<p><i>Chisholm Projects Ltd</i> <i>Cockburn Trust</i> <i>K Mallon</i></p>	<p><i>Oppose</i> <i>Support</i> <i>Support</i></p>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>In regard to the notice issue that is raised I consider that the Plan Change went through the correct statutory process in regard to notification. Notwithstanding that I do accept that there has been some criticism over the lack of pre-notification consultation and the Council is aware of that issue.</p> <p>I do not consider that the purchase of the properties is a significant consideration in this process. Irrespective of ownership the same issues would have been needed to be taken into account in the application and in this report.</p> <p>In regard to the other issues that the submitter raises such as noise, light, visual pollution and traffic matters these are addressed in the attached evidence. A number of recommendations are made to address matters raised in submissions. These matters include the upgrading of Hoskyns Road and the</p>		

additional landscaping may address some of the submitters concerns.

Loss in the value of properties is also addressed in a report by Mark Dunbar which I have attached in Attachment C. I note that his conclusions are that there will not be a fall in property values if this proposal proceeds.

I have already put forward the view there will be a positive effect on the range of job opportunities available at Izone if this proposal proceeds. While I would acknowledge that there is probably a limited range of job types currently available that situation can only improve with the expansion.

I have also briefly discussed the perceived 'misfit' between the type of jobs being offered at Izone and the socio economic levels in the surroundings environs. Nevertheless I have pointed out that Rolleston and the Selwyn District is changing. With a projected population of 18 000 for Rolleston 2041 I would suggest that this gap may be significantly reduced.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission and the further submissions in support be **rejected** and the further submission in opposition be **accepted**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<i>11. Dr Simon Causer Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change in current form. Wishes to compile submission at later date.</i>	<i>Withdrawal/major revision of PC.</i>
<i>Further submission</i>	<i>Dr Simon Causer</i>	<i>Support</i>

Assessment

The submitter did not supply any details in the original submission but instead lodged a further submission raising a number of issues. These include: visual pollution; traffic matters; and light and noise pollution. The submitter goes on to suggest a number of constraints that he asks be placed on development if the decision is made to proceed with the Plan Change. These include : no vehicle access on to Hoskyns Road; screening on all external boundaries; a reduction in height for buildings and structures to 8m and 12m respectively; and the introduction of a third party monitoring process to assess the impact on the quality of life.

The submitter makes some good points however the fact that they are made in a further submission means that they have not been subject to a further submission process in my opinion this makes them legally difficult to take into account. I do note that most of the issues have been raised in other submissions and they are ones that have been addressed in some detail in other parts of this evidence.

The idea of some ongoing monitoring of effects I believe has considerable merit. However I am unsure how this might be incorporated into the Plan Change and it may be that this is an issue that could be further explored outside of this process.

Recommendation

No recommendation

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
12. S E Harris <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change. Wishes to compile submission at later date.</i>	<i>Reversal or major review of PC.</i>

Assessment

No assessment possible because of lack of reasons in the submission

Recommendation

That the submission be **rejected**

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
13. R & Y Lomond <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated.</i>

Assessment

No assessment able to be given.

Recommendation

That the submission be **accepted in part**

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
14. M A Newton <i>Oppose</i>	<i>The Submitter states that the PC will lower the value of their property and adversely impact on the peace and quiet of the rural area. Increase in pollution and odours.</i>	<i>Not to extend ECans proposed SR1 and SR2, including Cockburn's farm and some of the land owned by the Withams.</i>
Further Submissions	Chisholm Projects Ltd K Mallon	Oppose Support
<p>Assessment</p> <p>Any loss in the value of properties is addressed in a report by Mark Dunbar which I have attached in Attachment C. I note that his conclusions are that there will not be a fall in property values if this proposal proceeds.</p> <p>In terms of the other issues that have been raised these have been addressed in reports attached to this report the conclusions of which I largely concur with. A number of changes are proposed that hopefully alleviate some of the submitters concerns</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>I recommend that the submission and the further submission in support be rejected and the further submission in opposition be accepted</p>		
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
15. K Emson <i>Oppose</i>	<i>The submitter states that the proposal will change to the detriment the area in which they have chosen to live. Will adversely impact on quiet county roads and adverse pollution in every sense. Plan Change out of character</i>	<i>Reject Plan Change.</i>

	<i>with area.</i>	
Further submissions	Cockburn Trust K Mallon	Support Support

Assessment

I have already addressed most of the issues raised here in other parts of this evidence and they are addressed in reports attached to this report the conclusions of which I largely concur with. A number of changes are proposed that hopefully alleviate some of the submitters concerns.

In terms of the character of the area, I would comment that the proposal is adjacent to the existing Izone business park which has become an accepted part of the existing environment. Its expansion north east to Hoskyns Road does in my view create a natural boundary, and with suitable landscaping and the other controls that are proposed my view is that it will not have a detrimental impact on the character of the surrounding area.

Recommendation

I recommend that the submission and the further submissions in support be **rejected**

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
16. T Emson Oppose	<i>The submitter states that the proposal will change to the detriment the area in which they have chosen to live.</i> <i>Will adversely impact on quiet county roads and adverse pollution in every sense. Plan Change out of character with area.</i>	<i>Reject Plan Change.</i>

Assessment

I have already addressed most of the issues raised here in other parts of this evidence and they are addressed in reports attached to this report the conclusions of which I largely concur with. A number of changes are proposed that hopefully alleviate some of the submitters concerns. These recommendations relate to further screening and the upgrading of the existing road network.

Recommendation

I recommend that the submission be **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<i>17. R J & R F Blackmore on behalf of Alloway Alpacas Ltd</i>	<i>Submitter concerned over traffic on Hoskyns Road, pollution, extreme change in environment. Will detrimentally impact on rural environment.</i>	<i>To stop further changes to zoning in Hoskyns Road.</i>
<i>Further submission</i>	<i>K Mallon</i>	<i>support</i>

Assessment

I would draw submitter's attention to the evidence of Mr. Penny which is attached in Attachment B in respect of the traffic matters that are raised. Mr Penny is of the view that these issues will be effectively addressed through the proposed upgrades to Hoskyns Road and its intersections with Maddisons and Jones Roads. Furthermore Mr. Penny is of the view that the planned upgrading of the wider road network will further addresses these issues.

Mr. Craig in Attachment A gives a comprehensive analysis of design and visual impact of the rezoning. Mr Craig goes on to provide a series of recommendations to address the issues raised in this and other submissions:

Addition of amenity hub locations on the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 33 (refer Paragraph 4.11 of Mr Craig's report);

Addition of definition of amenity hub and related rules for the establishment of an amenity hub (refer Paragraph 4.10 of Mr Craig's report);

Addition of illustrative road cross sections into Appendix 33 and a related rule;

Addition indicating these road treatments should typically be followed (refer paragraph 4.22 of Mr Craig's report);

Addition of words to rules ensuring that subdivision design will promote lots (and associated

buildings) that front onto Hoskyns Road (refer Paragraph 6.45 of Mr. Craig's report); and

Addition of a new rule requiring planting on the western side of Hoskyns Road.

It is considered that suggestion may address some of the submitters concerns

Recommendation

I recommend that the submission and the further submission in support be **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<i>18. A M Smart Oppose</i>	<i>The submitter is concerned about the lack of TIA for Maddisons Road which allows direct access from Izone to the airport and west to Christchurch City. No assessment of impact of development on the Weedons Community.</i>	<i>Withdraw PC. SDC to investigate Traffic Impact on the existing rural character and lifestyle of Weedons District.</i>
<i>Further submission</i>	<i>K Mallon</i>	<i>support</i>

Assessment

The impact of traffic generation on the surrounding rural road network is a recurring theme and a major concern to many of the submitters. I agree with the submitter that the location of the airport does not necessarily encourage those road users leaving Izone on route to the airport to use the main arterial routes. Nevertheless the evidence attached to this report from Traffic Design Group (Mr Penny Attachment B) addresses this issue in some depth, and I note the recommendation from that evidence

Require the upgrading of the Jones Road/Hoskyns Road intersection and the section of Hoskyns Road from Jones Road to the new IZone access road as specified in the TAR.

(ii) Require the upgrading of Hoskyns Road/Maddisons Road including a

median island

(iii) Require the monitoring the traffic volume on Maddisons Road east of Hoskyns Road at six monthly intervals

On the basis of these recommendations Mr Penny comes to a view that the impact of the expanded Izone on the local road network will not be significant.

Recommendation

I recommend that the submission and the further submission in support be **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
19. D M Harris <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>

Assessment

No assessment able to be given.

Recommendation

That the submission be **accepted in part**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
20. Weedons School <i>Oppose</i>	<i>The submitter states that they have concerns over the impact of increased traffic and the effect on Weedons School.</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
Further submission	K Mallon	support

Assessment

Below I include a section from Mr Penny's expert evidence:

Weedons School and other submitters have expressed concerns regarding the potentially adverse impacts of increased traffic volumes on the school during drop off and pick up times and for children travelling to the school on foot or by bicycle.

63. The proposed expansion of IZone is not expected to add any light or heavy traffic volumes to the section of Weedons Ross Road immediately adjacent to the school, as this section is not on any convenient route to or from IZone.

64. Under the proposed CRETTS road hierarchy Weedons Ross Road is identified as a future District Arterial and will eventually connect to a proposed interchange with SH1. Because of this role, the traffic volume on Weedons Ross Road is expected to increase in the future although this is unrelated to the expansion of IZone.

Discussion

65. At such time as Weedons Ross Road is upgraded to District Arterial status, SDC may wish to review the change in traffic volumes and the operational and safety implications for Weedons School.

66. This review could include consideration of the access provisions for the school, the design of the accesses, the provision of on and off street parking and drop off/pick up activities and the appropriateness of the existing 100km/h rural speed limit.

Mr Penny does not consider that the expansion of Izone will increase the traffic safety issues at Weedons school and I defer to his expertise on this matter. However I do acknowledge that this is a hugely important issue and while the probability of an incident occurring may be low the consequences are extreme. Accordingly, I endorse an approach that includes monitoring of traffic movements in the proximity of the School and support Mr. Penny's comments in relation to a review of access and the speed limits.

Recommendation

The recommendation is to **accept in part** the submissions to the extent that the suggested measures addresses the issues raised.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
21. R & K Young Oppose	<i>Proposal will alter their lifestyle. Oppose Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>

Assessment

I would disagree with the submitter. The expert evidence that forms part of this assessment I believe is unambiguous in its conclusions that the negative impact on the surrounding area will be minimal.

One issue that do have a small degree of reservation over is that of traffic. However again the traffic evidence does strongly suggest that the actual numbers along the rural network (Maddisons Knights Roads etc) are not being generated by Izone. The evidence also suggests that the future upgrade of the road network will increasingly make the arterial more attractive thereby lessening the impact on the minor rural routes.

A number of changes have been recommended to address some of the concerns that are raised and this may provide some relief for the submitter

Recommendation

The recommendation is to **accept in part** to the extent that the suggested measures addresses the issues raised in the submission.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
22. A W & N M Taylor <i>Oppose</i>	<i>The submitter states that there would seem to be a high amount of industrial land already zoned that is not utilised.</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>

Assessment

The details of the submission are not explicit. In regard to the type of industrial activities I have attached a graphical representation in Attachment F that gives an indication of the land that is currently being used in Izone.

In regard to the need for more industrial land my only comment would be that Izone is a commercially driven arm of Council and it would not in my view be proposing further expansion if there was not demand.

Recommendation

No relief sought.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
23. D & A McDonald	<i>The submitter is concerned about: road safety – type and amount of traffic generated and potential harmful traffic through small roads Increase in noise/dirt pollution Destruction of rural aspect Degradation of property values.</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
Further Submissions	Chisholm Projects Ltd K Mallon	Oppose Support
<p>Assessment</p> <p>I would draw submitter's attention to the evidence of Mr. Penny which is attached in Attachment B in respect of the traffic matters that are raised. Mr Penny is of the view that these issues will be effectively addressed through the proposed upgrades to Hoskyns Road and its intersections with Maddisons and Jones Roads. Furthermore Mr. Penny is of the view that the Planned upgrading of the wider road network will further addresses these issues.</p> <p>Mr. Craig in Attachment A gives a comprehensive analysis of design and visual impacts of the rezoning. Mr Craig goes on to provide a series of recommendations to address the issues raised in this and other submissions.</p> <p>Mr Dunbar in Attachment C provides a view that any potential impact on the value of rural residential lifestyle properties will be reduced and mitigated by a number of factors including the existence of the existing Izone which has become part of the accepted environment and which will also act as a buffer to properties to the west. Mr. Dunbar goes on to suggest that the existing shelter belts and the proposed design controls will effectively negate any adverse visual impact.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>The recommendation is to accept in part the submissions to the extent that the suggested measures addresses the issues raised.</p>		
Name & Position on	Summary	Decision

Plan Change		Requested
24Weedons Residents Association Inc Oppose	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
Assessment <p>No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.</p> Recommendation <p>The recommendation is to accept in part the submissions to the extent that the suggested measures addresses the issues raised.</p>		
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
25. D & M Powell Oppose	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
Assessment <p>No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.</p> Recommendation <p>That the submission is rejected</p>		
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
26. F P Dowle Oppose	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
Further submission	<i>F P Dowle</i>	<i>support</i>
Assessment <p>The submitter did not supply any details in the original submission but instead has lodged a further submission raising a number of issues that primarily focus on the traffic effects of the proposal.</p>		

The submitter requests a number of decisions including a more robust Traffic Impact Assessment with assessment of the social costs on the roads in Weedons and Templeton. No access from Izone onto Hoskyns Road. A traffic Management Plan More Pedestrian and cycle facilities and speed reduction on the surrounding road network.

The submitter makes some good points however the fact that they are made in a further submission means that they have not been subject to a further submission process and from a legal perspective may be difficult to take into account. I do note that most of the issues have been raised in other submissions and they are ones that have been addressed in some detail in other parts of this evidence.

I can direct the submitter to the traffic assessment attached in Attachment B and encourage him to attend the hearing.

Recommendation

That the submission and the further submission in support are **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
27. A J & E Wilson <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change. Will comment at hearing.</i>	<i>Reject proposal</i>

Assessment

No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.

Recommendation

That the submission is **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
28. S S Lowe <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>

Assessment

No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I

think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.

Recommendation

That the submission is **rejected**

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
29. B & A Jackson Oppose	<i>The submitter states that this is a country area where people live to enjoy a country lifestyle and carry out farming type activities. The PC will vastly increase visual pollution, air pollution, light pollution, increase noise and traffic. No amount of landscaping can hide the 15-25m structures or block industrial noise. The submitter goes on to state that the argument for increased employment is flawed and there is already vacant industrial land in town where the work force live. The PC does not bring any benefits to the residents affected by it.</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
Further Submissions	Chisholm Projects Ltd Cockburn Trust K Mallon	Oppose Support Support

Assessment

I would draw submitter's attention to the evidence of Mr. Craig in Attachment A which gives a comprehensive analysis of design and visual impacts of the proposed rezoning. Mr Craig goes on to provide a series of recommendations to address the issues raised in this and other submissions.

In respect of the submitters concerns over the economic benefits of the proposal I can comment that Council's Economic Development Strategy (Selwyn District Council August 2000) identified the development of an industrial park at Rolleston as one of its objectives (pp. 5 and 6) The vision of this strategy was to "provide means and opportunity for people in Selwyn District to achieve an enhanced quality of life" (p6). While this vision is obviously difficult to gauge Izone has to date been successful in it operation and while I would agree with the submitter that currently it may not be a large

generator of jobs for people in Selwyn District it certainly has not had a negative impact on employment in the District. One of the objectives of the Council is to attract and accommodate a wide range of employment opportunities in the District and over time my view is that Izone has the potential to contribute to this.

The uptake of Izone land has been consistent and at the current rate there will be no land available in the existing Izone in around 3 years.

Recommendation

That the submission and further submissions in support be **rejected** and the further submission in opposition is **accepted**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<i>A J McCord</i> <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>PC be rejected in entirety</i>

Assessment

No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.

Recommendation

That the submission is **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<i>31. A M McCord</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change on the following grounds:</i> <i>-Dangerous large traffic;</i> <i>Speed;</i> <i>- School traffic, volume going by.</i>	<i>PC be rejected</i>
<i>Further submission</i>	<i>K Mallon</i>	<i>support</i>

Assessment

I would draw the attention of the submitter to Mr Penny's evidence attached in Attachment B:

Weedons School and other submitters have expressed concerns regarding the potentially adverse impacts of increased traffic volumes on the school during drop off and pick up times and for children travelling to the school on foot or by bicycle.

63. The proposed expansion of IZone is not expected to add any light or heavy traffic volumes to the section of Weedons Ross Road immediately adjacent to the school, as this section is not on any convenient route to or from IZone.

64. Under the proposed CRETS road hierarchy Weedons Ross Road is identified as a future District Arterial and will eventually connect to a proposed interchange with SH1. Because of this role, the traffic volume on Weedons Ross Road is expected to increase in the future although this is unrelated to the expansion of IZone.

Discussion

65. At such time as Weedons Ross Road is upgraded to District Arterial status, SDC may wish to review the change in traffic volumes and the operational and safety implications for Weedons School.

66. This review could include consideration of the access provisions for the school, the design of the accesses, the provision of on and off street parking and drop off/pick up activities and the appropriateness of the existing 100km/h rural speed limit.

Mr Penny does not consider that the expansion of Izone will increase the traffic safety issues at Weedons school. I defer to his expertise on this matter. However I do acknowledge that this is a hugely important issue and while the probability of an incident occurring may be low the consequences are extreme. Accordingly, I endorse an approach that includes monitoring of traffic movements in the proximity of the School and support Mr. Penny's comments in relation to a review of access and the speed limits.

Mr Penny also provide analysis of the other traffic issues that the submitter raises and provides some recommendations that may go some way to addressing these concerns.

Recommendation

That the submission and the further submission in support are **rejected**.

Name & Position on	Summary	Decision
--------------------	---------	----------

Plan Change		Requested
32 H Deverson, Peter Tyson and Wendy Kennard Oppose	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That the submission is rejected</p>		
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
33. R Greenwood Oppose	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That the submission is rejected</p>		
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
34. Solid Energy New Zealand Ltd Support	<i>SENZ support the change of this area from Rural to B2 as it is consistent with the surrounding land uses and there is a definite need for additional land to be zoned B2 in the Rolleston Area. The Plan Change will ensure the efficient use of existing infrastructure supporting the existing business and the appropriate expansion of that infrastructure to support additional business in the adjacent area.</i>	<i>Approve the PPC - Ensure due consideration is given to upgrading Hoskyns Road when demand requires it, and</i>

	<i>SENZ also notes that in respect of infrastructure (Hoskyns Road in particular), there is likely to be a increase in use of Hoskyns Road. SENZ would support the upgrade of Hoskyns road.</i>	<i>that the corresponding roading provisions ion the Plan enable such an upgrade.</i>
Further submission	<i>Gillman Wheelans Limited K Mallon</i>	<i>Support Oppose</i>

Assessment

The submitter offers general support for the Plan Change and in particular requests the upgrading of Hoskyns Road.

Recommendation

That the submissions in support be **accepted** and the further submission in opposition be **rejected**

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
35.R S Paton Not stated	<i>The submitter seeks that the rezoning of the Inner Plains Land that IZone Plan Change relates to is deferred until the road network is upgraded to take the increased volume of light and heavy traffic from IZone Park.</i>	<i>Delay the Plan Change until the roading network is upgraded.</i>

Assessment

The traffic report has indicated that the existing road network has an existing capacity that would be able to manage the traffic generated from an expanded Izone. The suggested upgrading to the road network will happen in a series of stages.

The upgrading of Hoskyns Road and the intersection of that road and Jones and Maddisons Roads will be concurrent with the development of the expanded Izone, if it proceeds. The upgrade of the wider road network will happen over a number of years. This is described in some detail in Mr Penny's evidence (Attachment B) in paragraphs 39 to 45.

My understanding of this evidence is that this wider set of upgrades described in the CRETS traffic

study while being desirable are not a precondition to Mr. Penny's conclusions that:

74. It is recommended that SDC take the following actions to address the concerns of submitters in relation to Plan Change 5:

Require the upgrading of the Jones Road/Hoskyns Road intersection and the section of Hoskyns Road from Jones Road to the new IZone access road as specified in the TAR.

Require the upgrading of Hoskyns Road/Maddisons Road including a median island

Require the monitoring the traffic volume on Maddisons Road east of Hoskyns Road at six monthly intervals

75. If the above are actioned, then I believe there are no traffic or transportation grounds for rejecting the Plan Change

On this basis I do not believe that a delay can be justified.

Recommendation

That the submission be **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
36. C A Melvin & D C Auld <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>

Assessment

No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.

Recommendation

That the submission is **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
37. L M Tolhoek <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>

Assessment

No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.

Recommendation

That the submission is **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
38. P W Tolhoek <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Decline the proposed Plan Change</i>

Assessment

No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.

Recommendation

That the submission is **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
39 A H & W A Jones <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>

Assessment

No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.

Recommendation

That the submission is **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
40. W & A Walker <i>Oppose</i>	<i>The submitter states that the PC will result in a creep of industrial zoning heading up Hoskyns Road.</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>

	<p><i>The submitter states that the “reasons for request 1. 7 – 1.9” (page 2 of Proposed Plan Page) are flawed. The Council may say the land has been sold but a lot of what has been sold is back on the market without buildings. Submitter objects to another road joining Hoskyns Road as this will change traffic flows – increasing trucks and cars on both Hoskyns and Maddisons Road.</i></p> <p><i>Loss of enjoyment of country lifestyle.</i></p> <p><i>Increase in light, visual, noise and air pollution.</i></p> <p><i>Concerned about 24hr operations.</i></p> <p><i>Loss in property value.</i></p>	
<i>Further submission</i>	<i>K Mallon</i>	<i>support</i>

Assessment

The submitter draws attention and casts doubts on the reason for the plan change request which essentially is demand for Izone business land. I have no reason to doubt the commercial reasons behind the request for the Plan Change. Land sales have exceeded expectations and on current projections will exceed supply within two years.

Mr. Craig in Attachment A gives a comprehensive analysis of design and visual impacts of the rezoning. Mr Craig goes on to provide a series of recommendations to address the issues raised in this and other submissions.

Mr Dunbar in Attachment C provides a view that any potential impact on the value of rural residential lifestyle properties will be reduced and mitigated by a number of factors including the existence of the existing Izone which has become part of the accepted environment and which will also act as a buffer to properties to the west. Mr. Dunbar goes on to suggest that the existing shelter belts and the proposed design controls will effectively negate any adverse visual impact.

The traffic evidence attached in Attachment B has indicated that the existing road network has an existing capacity that would be able to manage the traffic generated from an expanded Izone. The suggested upgrading to the road network will happen in a series of stages.

The upgrading of Hoskyns Road and the intersection of that road and Jones and Maddisons Roads

will be concurrent with the development of the expanded Izone, if it proceeds. The upgrade of the wider road network will happen over a number of years. This is described in some detail in Mr Penny's evidence (Attachment B) in paragraphs 39 to 45.

My understanding of this evidence is that this wider set of upgrades described in the CRETS traffic study while being desirable are not a precondition to Mr. Penny's conclusions that:

74. It is recommended that SDC take the following actions to address the concerns of submitters in relation to Plan Change 5:

Require the upgrading of the Jones Road/Hoskyns Road intersection and the section of Hoskyns Road from Jones Road to the new IZone access road as specified in the TAR.

Require the upgrading of Hoskyns Road/Maddisons Road including a median island

Require the monitoring the traffic volume on Maddisons Road east of Hoskyns Road at six monthly intervals

75. If the above are actioned, then I believe there are no traffic or transportation grounds for rejecting the Plan Change.

I concur with the evidence in these reports.

Recommendation

That the submission be **accepted in part** to the extent that the recommendations in relation to traffic and visual matters address the submitters concerns.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
41. G & S Titmuss Oppose	<p><i>The submitter states that they do not wish to see Izone expand to Hoskyns Road because of potential visual, noise and smell pollution intruding into the rural area of Weedons. The submitter goes on to raise concerns about an increase in truck traffic along Maddisons Road and Weedons Ross Road and then to SH1 and CHCH. The truck traffic will create the need and cost of upgrading Hoskyns Road and will be dangerous at times of drop off and pick up at Weedons School.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter does not feel that the principle of Izone creating extra employment is valid. Jobs will be minimal and temporary. Further investigation should be carried out to create an additional business area near Burnham.</i></p>	<p><i>PC be rejected.</i></p>

<i>Further submission</i>	<i>K Mallon</i>	<i>support</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>After considering the evidence from Mr Craig my view is that the visual effects will not be significant. Air quality effects are predominately an Ecan function and while Selwyn District did provide a set of rules to address this issue in an earlier version of its District Plan it has decided that this issue is better dealt with by those with the requisite technical expertise and that section of the Plan has been removed. I would point out that many of activities that may have associated odour issues will be require a resource consent to establish these activities include :</p> <p>Mining or quarrying;</p> <p>Correction facility;</p> <p>Treatment or disposal of solid or liquid waste delivered or conveyed onto the site.</p> <p>Any activity that requires an offensive trade licence issued under the Health Act 1956;</p> <p>Audible bird-scaring devices;</p> <p>Forestry;</p> <p>Mineral exploration;</p> <p>Processing, composting or disposal on to land of any organic matter</p> <p>Visitor accommodation;</p> <p>Hospitality activities.</p> <p>Meat processing;</p> <p>Cement manufacture;</p> <p>Hot mix, asphalt paving manufacture;</p> <p>Glass or fibreglass manufacture;</p> <p>Foundry processes, electroplating works, melting of metal, steel manufacture and galvanising;</p> <p>Natural gas, oil or petroleum distillation or refining;</p> <p>Manufacture of hardboard, chipboard or particle board;</p> <p>Timber treatment;</p> <p>Thermal power generation;</p> <p>Any other industry using the combustion of coal, wood or any other bio-mass for space heating or as a source of energy.</p> <p>In my view it would be appropriate for that process to take into account any potential nuisance effects</p>		

arising from dust, odour, smoke and noise.

With regard to Burnham, that is a possibility that I have not had the opportunity to explore fully, but I would comment that given the existing infrastructure at Izone, the availability and accessibility of major transport linkages, the existing business park, and this applications alignment with the Plan Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement (albeit subject to submissions and decisions) make Izone in my view a appropriate location for business expansion.

Recommendation

That the submissions be **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<i>42 N J Boshier</i> <i>Oppose</i>	<i>The submitter states that there has been a lack of consultation with local affected residents, lack of transparency and honesty on behalf of SDC regarding the Plan. The submitter goes onto state that there will be an adverse impact on Weedons area property and amenity values and an increase in noise, visual and air pollution and traffic impacts.</i>	<i>PC be rejected</i>
<i>Further submission</i>	<i>K Mallon</i>	<i>support</i>

Assessment

I have already commented on the consultation issue, and while I am clear that the statutory requirements were met I acknowledge that many consider that a more comprehensive pre-application consultation process should have occurred, and I have some sympathies with this view and it one that has been brought to the Councils attention.

The property value issue is the subject of expert evidence attached to this report and as I have indicated this evidence suggests that there will be no decrease in property values.

The traffic evidence attached in Attachment B has indicated that the existing road network has an existing capacity that would be able to manage the traffic generated from an expanded Izone. The suggested upgrading to the road network will happen in a series of stages.

The upgrading of Hoskyns Road and the intersection of that road and Jones and Maddisons Roads will be concurrent with the development of the expanded Izone, if it proceeds. The roading upgrade of the wider road network will happen over a number of years. This is described in some detail in Mr Penny's evidence (Attachment B) in paragraphs 39 to 45.

My understanding of this evidence is that this wider set of upgrades described in the CRETS traffic study while being desirable are not a precondition to Mr. Penny's conclusions, with which I agree, which are:

74. It is recommended that SDC take the following actions to address the concerns of submitters in relation to Plan Change 5:

Require the upgrading of the Jones Road/Hoskyns Road intersection and the section of Hoskyns Road from Jones Road to the new IZone access road as specified in the TAR.

Require the upgrading of Hoskyns Road/Maddisons Road including a median island

Require the monitoring the traffic volume on Maddisons Road east of Hoskyns Road at six monthly intervals

75. If the above are actioned, then I believe there are no traffic or transportation grounds for rejecting the Plan Change.

After considering the evidence from Mr Craig my view is that the visual effects will not be significant. Air quality effects are predominately an Ecan function and while Selwyn District did provide a set of rules to address this issue in an earlier version of its District Plan it has decided that this issue is better dealt with by those with the requisite technical expertise and that section of the Plan has been removed. I would point out that many of activities that may have associated odour issues will be require a resource consent to establish these activities include :

Mining or quarrying;

Correction facility;

Treatment or disposal of solid or liquid waste delivered or conveyed onto the site.

Any activity that requires an offensive trade licence issued under the Health Act 1956;

Audible bird-scaring devices;

Forestry;

Mineral exploration;

Processing, composting or disposal on to land of any organic matter

Visitor accommodation;

Hospitality activities.

Meat processing;

Cement manufacture;

Hot mix, asphalt paving manufacture;

Glass or fibreglass manufacture;

Foundry processes, electroplating works, melting of metal, steel manufacture and galvanising;

Natural gas, oil or petroleum distillation or refining;

Manufacture of hardboard, chipboard or particle board;

Timber treatment;

Thermal power generation;

Any other industry using the combustion of coal, wood or any other

bio-mass for space heating or as a source of energy.

In my view it would be appropriate for that process to take into account any potential nuisance effects arising from dust, odour, smoke and noise.

Recommendation

That the submissions be **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
43. P A Boshier	<i>The submitter states that there has been a lack of consultation with local affected residents, lack of transparency and honesty on behalf of SDC regarding the Plan. The submitter goes onto state that there will be an adverse impact on Weedons area property and amenity values and an increase in noise, visual and air pollution and traffic impacts.</i>	<i>PC be rejected</i>
Further submission	K Mallon	support

Assessment

I have already commented on the consultation issue, and while I am clear that the statutory

requirements were met I acknowledge that many consider that a more comprehensive pre-application consultation process should have occurred. I have some sympathies with this view and it one that has been brought to the Councils attention.

The property value issue is the subject of expert evidence attached to this report and as I have indicated this evidence suggests that there will be no decrease in property values.

Recommendation

That the submissions be **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
44. M Veitch <i>Oppose</i>	<i>The submitter states that the land noted for rezoning is significantly larger than the land area required for B2 zoning. There is a significant land area between Templeton and Hornby that is seemly wasteland. The quality of soil is very poor, it is adjacent to the main road and railway line. In contrast the southern end of Cockburn's property is highly fertile and should not be used for B2 purposes.</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
Further submission	K Mallon	<i>support</i>

Assessment

I have no reason to doubt the commercial reasons behind the request for the plan change. Land sales have exceeded expectations and on current projections will exceed supply within two years.

In regard to the land between Hornby and Templeton similar comments would apply to those that I made in relation to Burnham (see assessment 41 Titmuss).

Recommendation

No relief sought but from the contents of the submission I would suggest that the submitter is seeking that the Plan Change be declined. An outcome I do not support.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<p>45. A Brown & H Hanna Oppose</p>	<p><i>The submitter opposes the Plan Change on the following grounds:</i></p> <p><i>Maddisons Road is a natural break between a business and/or industrial zone and the surrounding rural and rural residential properties.</i></p> <p><i>Extension to Izone have been promulgated very late in the process and without adequate consultation with residents that will be affected by the changes.</i></p> <p><i>It is more logical and consistent with roading patterns and current land usage (and likely usage given the impacts of locating adjacent to a S.H) to have business and industrial zoning running alongside and parallel to the S.H and in a north/south direction rather than encroaching to the west.</i></p> <p><i>Potential for adverse impacts on the quality of life of rural residents if the business/industrial zone is allows to move further down Hoskyns Road beyond Maddisons Road and the amenity values f the rural residential area should not be impacted on in this way.</i></p> <p><i>Council has a duty to protect and enhance amenity values. Proposal contrary to this.</i></p>	<p><i>Reject Plan Change so far as it seeks to rezone land on Hoskyns Road, beyond Maddisons Road, for business and or industrial uses.</i></p>
<p>Further submission</p>	<p>K Mallon</p>	<p>support</p>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>I have already commented on the consultation issue, and while I am clear that the statutory requirements were met I acknowledge that many consider that a more comprehensive pre-application consultation process should have occurred. I have some sympathies with this view and it one that has been brought to the Councils attention.</p> <p>I would not support ribbon style industrial development along the State Highway which in my view would not represent a sustainable use of infrastructure. Multiple accesses onto the State Highway</p>		

would also potentially have some negative impact on the functioning and safety of this major arterial route.

Mr Penny provides some assessment and recommendations on the matters raised in the submission in his evidence attached in Attachment B with which I agree.

Mr Craig provides an in depth analysis of the visual impacts of the expanded Izone from a number of different perspectives., Mr Craig is of the view that the Plan Change should be advanced generally as notified but with the following recommended changes:

Addition of amenity hub locations on the Outline Development Plan at Appendix 33 (refer Paragraph 4.11 of Mr Craig's report);

Addition of definition of amenity hub and related rules for the establishment of an amenity hub (refer Paragraph 4.10 of Mr Craig's report);

Addition of illustrative road cross sections into Appendix 33 and a related rule;

Addition indicating these road treatments should typically be followed (refer paragraph 4.22 of Mr Craig's report);

Addition of words to rules ensuring that subdivision design will promote lots (and associated buildings) that front onto Hoskyns Road (refer Paragraph 6.45 of Mr. Craig's report); and

- Addition of a new rule requiring planting on the western side of Hoskyns Road.

Some of these recommendations may address the submitters concerns

Recommendation

The recommendation is to **reject** the submission and the further submission in support.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
46. K. R. J & T. L Inns Oppose	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That the submission is accept in part ..</p>		
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
47. M J & G A Rothwell Oppose NB/ late submission. Received by Council on 17th September 2008.	<i>Oppose the Plan Change</i>	<i>No road for industrial estate</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others. I would draw the submitter's attention to the visual assessment by Mr. Craig and the traffic assessment completed by Mr. Penny both of which are attached to this report.</p> <p>This submission was lodged several days after the closing of submissions.</p> <p>Recommendations</p> <p>That the late submission be accepted</p>		

That the submission is **rejected**

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
<p>48. K A Godfrey & R L Thomas Oppose</p>	<p><i>The submitter states that they believe the Council has chosen the boundaries for development unwisely. There appears to be land along the railway line and heading south towards Burnham more appropriate for commercial development as it would not impinge upon a residential/farming neighbourhood.</i></p> <p><i>The submitter also raises concerns over the increase in traffic along Hoskyns Road and Madisons Road owing to Hoskyns and Weedons Rodd Road being direct routes to the West Coast highway. By expanding the industrial zone along Hoskyns Road the Council is effectively condoning the increase in noise and exhaust pollution.</i></p> <p><i>Value of residential land will drop</i></p> <p><i>Manufacturing and other business will create noise, effluent and smoke/fumes which will detrimentally impacts on quality and health of environment.</i></p> <p><i>Recently renovated home. Council never advised of zoning changes. Will Council reimburse us?</i></p> <p><i>- Also concerned about longer term strategy to rezone Cockburn and Witham land.</i></p>	<p><i>Council not proceed with rezoning</i></p>
<p>Further submission</p>	<p>K Mallon</p>	<p>support</p>

Assessment

I acknowledge the concerns of the submitter and would direct them to the series of recommendations in Attachment E that might address some of their concerns.

Mr Penny addresses traffic and transportation issues raised in the submissions made on Plan Change 5. His evidence is attached in Attachment B. Mr Penny that Selwyn District Council take the

following actions to address the concerns of submitters

- Require the upgrading of the Jones Road/Hoskyns Road intersection and the section of Hoskyns Road from Jones Road to the new IZone access road;
- Require the upgrading of Hoskyns Road/Maddisons Road including a median island; and
- Require the monitoring the traffic volume on Maddisons Road east of Hoskyns Road at six monthly intervals

Mr Penny's view is that if these actions are completed then there are no traffic or transportation grounds for rejecting the Plan Change.

Mr Dunbar evidence assesses the potential affect on the values of properties in the vicinity of the proposed rezoning. Mr Dunbar's evidence is contained in Attachment C.

Mr Dunbar comes to the conclusion that any potential impact on the value of rural residential lifestyle properties will be reduced and mitigated by a number of factors including the existence of the existing Izone which has become part of the accepted environment and which will also act as a buffer to properties to the west. Mr. Dunbar goes on to suggest that the existing shelter belts and the proposed design controls will effectively negate any adverse visual impact.

With regard to Burnham, that is a possibility that I have not had the opportunity to explore fully, but I would comment that given the existing infrastructure at Izone, the availability and accessibility of major transport linkages, the existing business park, and this applications alignment with the Plan Change 1 to the Regional Policy Statement (albeit subject to submissions and decisions) make Izone in my view a appropriate location for business expansion.

Recommendation

That the submissions be **rejected**.

Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
49.J McKim <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Wish to make an oral submission against PC.</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That the submission is accept in part ..</p>		
Name & Position on Plan Change	Summary	Decision Requested
50. M A Luxton <i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose Plan Change.</i>	<i>Not stipulated</i>
<p>Assessment</p> <p>No reasons are provided in the submission so it is difficult to comment with any certainty. However I think that it would be reasonable to assume that the submitters concerns are similar to others.</p> <p>Recommendation</p> <p>That the submission is accept in part .</p>		