

From: [Plan Change 66](#)
To: simonfthomas@mac.com
Cc: [Submissions](#)
Subject: Copy of your submission on Proposed Plan Change 64
Date: Tuesday, 23 February 2021 3:22:06 p.m.

Submitter ID: PC66-0002

Submitter Name: Simon Fraser Thomas
Submitter Address: 776 Maddisons Road
City/Town: Rolleston
Postcode: 7675
Contact Name:
Contact Organisation:
Contact Address: 776 Maddisons Road
City/Town: Rolleston
Postcode: 7675
Contact Email: simonfthomas@mac.com
Contact Phone Number: 021677283

[Trade Competition Declaration](#)

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.

No

If yes: I am directly affected by an effect of the subject matter of the submission that

(a) adversely effects the environment; and

(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition.

No

[Hearing Options](#)

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?

If you choose yes, you can choose not to speak when the hearing date is advertised.

Yes

If others are making a similar submission would you consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing?

Yes

Point 1

Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

My position on this provisions is:

Oppose

The reasons for my/our submission are:

With regards "uncertainty" it's enough at this stage to repeat the Applicants words on p12 of the Request for Change - "In the absence of a detailed development proposal, there is some uncertainty as to the built form and layout that will be developed, and therefore some uncertainty as to potential landscape and rural character effects". The community cannot reasonably be asked to submit on an undeveloped proposal that may have even greater detrimental impacts than the "moderate-high" ones already honestly admitted to in the Landscape and Visual Effects Assessment.

With regards Environmental Effects (which embraces amenity)

On p12 of the Request for Change the applicant states that the " assessment concludes that the effects of the additional traffic generated by the Plan Change site upon the surrounding transport network have been assessed and found to generally be acceptable". This assessment is based on the assumption that traffic would travel via Hoskyns Road or Jones Road, with no access via Maddisons Road. However the applicant infers that they will apply for access via Maddisons Road in the future - p8 of the Integrated Traffic Assessment states "

28. It is also proposed to make the site subject to assessment criteria regarding access to Maddisons Road. The extent to which access may be sought to that road is not known at present, so it is proposed to amend the operative District Plan Roding Chapter to make access (be it a road access, accessway or vehicle crossing) Restricted Discretionary." . This will no doubt be pushed through after the proposed addition to the industrial estate is established. Another fait accompli when they do and again rural residents/ratepayers will have no matching funds to challenge (see later).

With regards Economic Effects (also embraces amenity).

A cost on p13 of the Request for Change "Potential impacts on roading and servicing infrastructure, though it is anticipated that any upgrades that might be required would be funded by the developer". When as surely this will be proved wrong if this application succeeds and access to Maddison's Road is allowed and it will result in a huge loss of amenity to not only local rural residents but many many more rural residents opened up daily to the no doubt many heavy articulated trucks thundering by. And the District and all its ratepayers will have to face the huge cost of widening all of Maddisons and some adjoining roads and then ongoing maintenance for every future years thereafter, that is, forever. Very much like the current Jones Road situation. Let it stop there!

I can't help but see this as another example of big business buying land (and no doubt adjoining land to reduce "local" objection) before securing the correct zoning and then spending largely for what might then be termed a fait accompli and beyond the means of those individual citizens who's hard earned amenity value will be greatly diminished, in this case rural amenity, and beyond the means of those affected to challenge with expensive so called "expert" backup. The short term effect with long term consequences, is the creeping industrialization of our countryside.

The decision I/we want Council to make:

We seek that the Application be declined and the Applicant be asked to reapply when the uncertainty is removed.

Failing that, we seek an undertaking by the Applicant and recorded in any approval that :

- a. the landscape mitigation along the northern boundary will include a bund of at least 2,5m in height, together with Landscape Treatment Four (rather than Landscape Treatment One)
- b. the landscape mitigation along the eastern boundary will retain the existing shelter belt, together with Landscape Treatment Four
- c. that there will be no Resource Consent made for access to/from Maddisons Road for 20 years at least and any subsequent transfer of title for any reason will include reference to that.

From: [Simon Thomas](#)
To: [Submissions](#)
Subject: PC66-0002 Additional information Re: Copy of your submission on Proposed Plan Change 66
Date: Tuesday, 23 February 2021 3:54:14 p.m.

Hi Emma

The web form did not record the Provisions to which my/our submission relates:

"The whole application, in essence because of inadequate recognition of:

1. RMA Purposes and Principals 7(c) "the maintenance and enhancement of amenity values"

2. The uncertainty of some Section 32 assessments in relation Environmental and Economic Effects."

Can you please update my submission to reflect the above.