



# **Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**

**Plan Change 59**

**Summary of Submissions received by Marlborough District Council  
by Submitter Number**

**November 2011**



## Numerical index of Submitters for Plan Change 59

Submitter #	Submitter	Address
1	Chippies Vineyard Limited ( Chris Wilson)	PO Box 51 Blenheim 7240
2	St Leonards Limited ( Chris Wilson)	PO Box 51 Blenheim 7240
3	Woodhouse - Trevor & Shirley	50 New Renwick Road Burleigh Blenheim 7201
4	Stratford - Jacqueline	2 Ridgetop Rise RD 2 Blenheim 7272
5	Rodgers - Wendelena	48 New Renwick Road Burleigh Blenheim 7201
6	Stratford - Kerry	2 Ridgetop Rise RD 2 Blenheim 7272
7	Paul - Simon	47 Forest Park Drive Blenheim 7201
8	Johnson - Edward George	86A New Renwick Road Blenheim 7201
9	New Zealand Aviation Museum Trust ( Brian Greenall)	PO Box 641 Blenheim 7240
10	Adams - Prudence	32a Boyce Street Renwick 7204
11	Sinclair - John	8a Manor Place Redwoodtown Blenheim 7201
12	Adye - Angela Wilhelmina	1 Richardson Avenue Blenheim 7201
13	Macnee - Niki	3 Richardson Avenue Blenheim 7201
14	Bushell - Jonathon Bernard	14a Richardson Avenue Burleigh Blenheim 7201
15	Quickfall - Tony	PO Box 1593 Nelson 7040
16	Ham - Paul	29 Hillside Terrace Blenheim 7201
17	Gleeson - Phillip	92 Ben Morven Road RD 2 Blenheim
18	Blenheim Indoor Sports Limited - Battys Road ( A Brian Fitzpatrick)	25 Goodman Street Blenheim 7201
19	Carlton Corlett Trust ( P J Radich)	Radich Law PO Box 842 Blenheim
20	Fyfe - Ian	12 Monro Street Blenheim 7201
21	Verkaaik - Gerard & Joy	41 New Renwick Road Blenheim
22	Ayson - Ross Barclay Stewart	9 Pope Crescent Witherlea Blenheim 7201
23	Marlborough Aero Club Incorporated ( Quentin A M Davies)	Gascoigne Wicks PO Box 2 Blenheim 7240
24	Latimer - Icilma Dorothy	PO Box 818 Blenheim 7240

25	O'Connor - Christopher David	10 Covent Gardens Blenheim 7201
26	Bennett - Debbie Anne	40 Green Lane RD 2 Blenheim 7272
27	Marlborough Car Club Incorporated ( Barry Voss)	Box 473 Blenheim 7432
28	New Zealand Fire Service Commission ( Alexander Strawbridge)	Beca Carter Hollings & Ferner Ltd PO Box 3942 Wellington 6140
29	O'Hagan - Patrick & Carey	22 Green Lane RD 2 Blenheim
30	Sounds Air Travel & Tourism Ltd ( Andrew Crawford)	PO Box 116 Picton 7250
31	Wither Hills Vineyards Marlborough Limited ( Antoinette Golden)	Russell McVeagh PO Box 8 Shortland Street Auckland 1140
32	Antique Aero Engineering Ltd ( Wayne Tantrum)	95 Aerodrome Road Omaka Airfield Blenheim 7272
33	Sounds Aero Maintenance Ltd ( Craig Anderson)	PO Box 650 Blenheim
34	Lowe - Jennifer	C/O Sounds Aero Maintenance Ltd PO Box 650 Blenheim 7240
35	Cowan - Clifford Charles	36 Green Lane RD 2 Blenheim 7272
36	May - Veronica	C/- Ayson & Partners Limited PO Box 256 Blenheim 7240
37	Marlborough Helicopters Limited ( Owen Dodson)	PO Box 731 Blenheim 7240
38	Marris - John Ernest & Alison Lillion	114 New Renwick Road RD 2 Blenheim 7272
39	McIntyre - Jay	35a Arthur Baker Place Redwoodtown Blenheim 7201
40	Orphan - Graham	43a Murphys Road Springlands Blenheim 7201
41	Collins - Trevor	PO Box 28 Spring Creek 7244
42	Jones - David & Bridget	3 Cook Ridge Waikawa Bay
43	Wilkie - Craig	106A New Renwick Road Blenheim
44	Simcox Construction Ltd ( Antony Clark)	14 Taylor Pass Road Blenheim 7201
45	Wagenvoort - Marinus	7 Richardson Avenue Burleigh Blenheim 7201
46	Jones - Dai	72 New Renwick Road Blenheim
47	Ridge Air Limited ( Paul Williams)	Rmco Ltd PO Box 820 Blenheim 7240
48	Jones - Grosvenor & Margaret	67 New Renwick Road Blenheim 7201
49	Harris - Roger Ferris Hedley	210 Oakwood Lane Witherlea Blenheim 7201

# ***Submission Summary - Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan - Plan Change 59 - Colonial Vineyard Limited - By Submitter #***

## **Chippies Vineyard Limited ( Chris Wilson) - Submitter #: 1**

### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

*Submission:* Submitted in support of the proposed plan change.

*Relief sought:* Approve the proposed plan change. (Inferred)

## **St Leonards Limited ( Chris Wilson) - Submitter #: 2**

### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

*Submission:* Submitted in support of the proposed plan change.

*Relief sought:* Approve the proposed plan change. (Inferred)

## **Trevor & Shirley Woodhouse - Submitter #: 3**

### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

*Submission:* Opposed to proposed plan change based on lack of information regarding services and effects on traffic volumes.  
Asked what effect the plan change would have on rates for properties supporting the additional infrastructure required for the proposed development.

*Relief sought:* Decline the proposed plan change based on insufficient information. (Inferred)

### **Submission 3.0 - Services**

*Submission:* Asked how sewage disposal will be managed as nearby properties are on septic tanks. Rubbish collection - this submitter pays (rated?) for landfill but does not have rubbish collection. Asked what effect the proposed development will have on water pressure in the vicinity.

*Relief sought:* Would like to see more information regarding the above matters.

### **Submission 4.0 - Traffic**

*Submission:* Concerned regarding the increase in traffic volumes resulting from the proposed development and the resulting difficulty exiting property onto New Renwick Road.

*Relief sought:* Decline the proposed plan change based on insufficient information. (Inferred)

## **Jacqueline Stratford - Submitter #: 4**

### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

*Submission:* Supports the provision for the additional residential zoned land adjoining the existing urban boundary as it is a natural extension to the urban periphery. This development will meet demand for expected residential growth without fragmenting the population.

*Relief sought:* Approve the plan change as proposed.

**Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

*Submission:* Rejects potential for reverse sensitivity due to proximity to Omaka Airfield as this has not occurred with the Taylor Pass subdivision development. Of view that any cross boundary effects can be mitigated.

*Relief sought:* Approve the plan change as proposed.

**Submission 3.0 - Services**

*Submission:* SMUGP has not identified any constraints re roading or access and the development can be connected to service networks without the need for an upgrade of infrastructure. .

*Relief sought:* Approve the plan change as proposed.

**Wendelena Rodgers - Submitter #: 5**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

*Submission:* Strongly oppose the proposed plan change. The proposed site is good flat arable fertile land at the edge of town and should be protected. This block of land is at the edge of town, next to an airfield, close to several vineyards and has limited road access.

*Relief sought:* Decline the proposed plan change. (Inferred) Keep it in vineyard or, if that is not viable anymore because of down-turn in the wine industry; or not viable because of lack of frost fans, I would suggest horticulture, agriculture, any "culture" except for BRICKS and CEMENT culture.

**Submission 3.0 - Services**

*Submission:* Questioned whether the water supply system can accommodate the additional demand Generated by the proposed development. Currently the overall pressure is adequate although it fluctuates during the summer months. The Burleigh Bridge West residents want to keep it his way.

*Relief sought:* Decline the proposed plan change. (Inferred) Keep it in vineyard or, if that is not viable anymore because of down-turn in the wine industry; or not viable because of lack of frost fans, I would suggest horticulture, agriculture, any "culture" except for BRICKS and CEMENT culture.

**Submission 4.0 - Traffic**

*Submission:* Access to this site is via New Renwick from all directions, this road is already choked at certain times. The extra traffic movements will be dangerous and unacceptable to ratepayers living on New Renwick Road east of the Richardson Avenue/Batty's Road intersection.

*Relief sought:* Decline the proposed plan change. (Inferred)

**Submission 5.0 - Noise**

*Submission:* Burleigh had become a very noisy place to live. Vineyard gas guns, frost fans, helicopters, heavy traffic and noise generated from the Omaka Aerodrome. The alfresco lifestyle is inhibited by the noise. Sound proofing the housing in the proposed development will not overcome these issues. The first generation house buyers may not complain but the next generation buyers will. An urban jungle does not belong here. *Wrong place, wrong use.*

*Relief sought:* Decline the proposed plan change. (Inferred)

**Kerry Stratford - Submitter #: 6**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

*Submission:* Supports the provision for the additional residential zoned land adjoining the existing urban boundary as it is a natural extension to the urban periphery. This development will meet demand for expected residential growth without fragmenting the population. Believes any cross boundary effects such as reverse sensitivity to rural activities are able to be satisfactorily mitigated.

*Relief sought:* Approve the plan change as proposed.

**Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** Rejects the proximity of Omaka Aerodrome as an issue of significance. The Taylor Pass subdivision is well established and obviously not inhibiting the Airfield's activities.

**Relief sought:** Reject Colonial Vineyards application to rezone.

**Simon Paul - Submitter #: 7**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Strongly oppose the proposed plan change. The development will lead to noise complaints from new residents against Omaka Aero Club activities and the associated business operating from the aerodrome. These business operators have invested significantly in the aerodrome and in turn contribute to the Marlborough economy. Additionally the bi-annual air show injects millions into the local economy.

**Relief sought:** Reject Colonial Vineyards application to rezone.

**Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** Strongly oppose the proposed plan change. The development will lead to noise complaints from new residents against Omaka Aero Club activities and the associated business operating from the aerodrome. The report (pages 34-35) with the application is misleading and inaccurate in regards to the use of runway 01/19. This runway will always be the runway of choice into the prevailing sea breeze which occurs in late spring and summer. Additionally aircraft taking off and landing on runway 01/19 are a further 50 metres to the North West than depicted in figure 5 of the report. The typical circuit pattern is incorrect. The proposed acoustic insulation will only work when all exterior windows and doors are closed. In summer residents have windows and doors open and enjoying an outdoor lifestyle, only to be disrupted by aircraft legitimately flying overhead.

**Relief sought:** Decline the proposed plan change.

**Edward George Johnson - Submitter #: 8**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Submitted in opposition to the proposed plan change. There is no requirement for an additional 300 houses in the area because the Taylor Pass development has not been filled. The proposal glosses over the impact of no reticulated sewage, the distance from any shops and the proximity to Omaka Aerodrome.

**Relief sought:** That plan change 59 is rejected and the land remains as Rural 3.

**New Zealand Aviation Museum Trust ( Brian Greenall) - Submitter #: 9**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** The Trust members have personal experience of the likely long term effects on well entrenched aviation precincts as urban areas encroach on their "space", resulting in pressure on pre-existing operations and growth and development. See this as a distinct possibility for the Omaka aviation precinct.

**Relief sought:** To not allow the application as detailed, but to instead consider more appropriate uses for the land in question which provide better assurance for the long term future of the Omaka Aviation precinct and better cohesion to the Urban Growth strategy relating to fringe development.

We would confirm our request that the Council not allow the application to proceed as detailed. Given the location of the land, its proximity to the Omaka Aviation Precinct, and the inappropriateness of the development to the graduation of the boundary between urban and rural environments, let alone its impact on the existing Burleigh area, we ask that the Council not allow the proposal but rather implement its overall growth strategy and consequent potential rezoning, being option (iv) and (b) listed on page 27 of the application.

**Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** Point 1: Future development of the precinct will include an increased emphasis on light aviation

related industry, restoration of classic aircraft, including high powered piston engine aircraft and a variety of aircraft movements on the field.

Mandatory acoustic insulation is a positive commitment, however this relates only to the internal environment and not the location in general.

Point 2: There is existing resource consent on the land to the south of the proposed development for aviation use, to ensure the viability and growth of the Omaka Aviation Precinct. This land is well suited to aviation/light industry and, as discussed in the Urban Growth Strategy (page 167), it is important to protect such land for future employment use that can provide special location attributes important to particular businesses. This is apposite to the highly skilled, small scale aviation industry currently being developed in the Omaka Aviation Precinct, and which does not draw heavily on available infrastructure, services or access.

Point 3: There is a definite commitment for growth at the Omaka Aviation Precinct. The light aviation and aviation restoration industries are growing and the classic car museum is now part of the complex. This has increased the manufacturing sector and upgrade local skill base. This proposed development would have a reverse sensitivity effect on this aviation precinct.

**Relief sought:** To not allow the application as detailed, but to instead consider more appropriate uses for the land in question which provide better assurance for the long term future of the Omaka Aviation precinct and better cohesion to the Urban Growth strategy relating to fringe development.

We would confirm our request that the Council not allow the application to proceed as detailed. Given the location of the land, its proximity to the Omaka Aviation Precinct, and the inappropriateness of the development to the graduation of the boundary between urban and rural environments, let alone its impact on the existing Burleigh area, we ask that the Council not allow the proposal but rather implement its overall growth strategy and consequent potential rezoning, being option (iv) and (b) listed on page 27 of the application.

#### **Submission 3.0 - Services**

**Submission:** The proposed high density development has no place in the transitional zone between urban and rural environments and should be in an area adjacent to all services, i.e. water, sewage, power, schools, community facilities and public transport. None of these are contemplated in the area adjacent to the proposed development.

**Relief sought:** To not allow the application as detailed, but to instead consider more appropriate uses for the land in question which provide better assurance for the long term future of the Omaka Aviation precinct and better cohesion to the Urban Growth strategy relating to fringe development.

We would confirm our request that the Council not allow the application to proceed as detailed. Given the location of the land, its proximity to the Omaka Aviation Precinct, and the inappropriateness of the development to the graduation of the boundary between urban and rural environments, let alone its impact on the existing Burleigh area, we ask that the Council not allow the proposal but rather implement its overall growth strategy and consequent potential rezoning, being option (iv) and (b) listed on page 27 of the application.

#### **Submission 6.0 - Consultation**

**Submission:** A letter written to the previous owners of the land prior to the formation of Colonial Vineyards Ltd has been provided as an appendix to the application indicating support for the application. No authority has been given by the New Zealand Aviation Museum Trust to Colonial vineyards Ltd to use this letter in support of the application. The letter relates to a previous development proposal and not to the current application.

**Relief sought:** To not allow the application as detailed, but to instead consider more appropriate uses for the land in question which provide better assurance for the long term future of the Omaka Aviation precinct and better cohesion to the Urban Growth strategy relating to fringe development.

We would confirm our request that the Council not allow the application to proceed as detailed. Given the location of the land, its proximity to the Omaka Aviation Precinct, and the inappropriateness of the development to the graduation of the boundary between urban and rural environments, let alone its impact on the existing Burleigh area, we ask that the Council not allow the proposal but rather implement its overall growth strategy and consequent potential rezoning, being option (iv) and (b) listed on page 27 of the application.



## **Prudence Adams - Submitter #: 10**

### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Submission in support of the proposed plan change to provide a suitable, practical area to extend the towns urban areas.

**Relief sought:** Approve the Colonial Vineyard Limited proposed plan change.

### **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** Does not view the potential for adverse effect on Omaka Airfield as an issue because anywhere in Marlborough is under a flight path and this airfield is used less frequently than the main one.

**Relief sought:** Approve the Colonial Vineyard Limited proposed plan change.

## **John Sinclair - Submitter #: 11**

### **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** Point 1: Oppose the proposed plan because of the site's proximity to Omaka Aerodrome. The noise of the aircraft will have an unavoidable impact on the residential development. The diminished quality of lifestyle will lead to complaints that could in turn lead to the closure of the aerodrome. There is precedent for this at other locations.

Point 2: The aerodrome provides/accommodates the following:

- 13 businesses employing 35-40 people
- \$15-20 million invested
- A maintenance base for a number of prominent small airlines
- The air show bringing thousands to Blenheim every two years
- A number of clubs with a combined membership of over 350 ratepayers.

In 2010 there were 7 helicopters and 69 aircraft based at Omaka and a further 200 helicopters used for frost fighting. Daily, aircraft depart at or before daylight and during frost events aircraft depart all hours night and day. The noise generated by activities at Omaka is not compatible with the proposed adjacent residential development.

Point 3: Marlborough District Council is guarantor of the Aviation Heritage Centre's loan (\$1.5M) and the proposal puts that public money at risk.

**Relief sought:** I wish to submit two options that may be helpful but please note that both are conditional upon the Hegley Noise contour being peer reviewed and the 55dBA contour line not encroaching on the proposed subdivision.  
Option 1: Change the zoning to residential conditional upon a no complaints covenants (see below).  
Option 2: Change the zoning to industrial.

### **Submission 5.0 - Noise**

**Submission:** Point 1: Questioned the effectiveness of the proposed acoustic insulation given that during the summer months Blenheim residents enjoy an outdoor residential lifestyle. Requested more information on how this mitigation will be effective when people are outdoors on their properties.

Stated the Marlborough Aero Club receives numerous complaints over the summer months from people living at the new Council subdivision east of Omaka complain about aircraft noise.

Point 2: The noise contour shows the proposed subdivision is outside the 55dBA area but that does not mean that noise will not be a nuisance. The noise level in decibels alone does not dictate the obtrusiveness and annoyance of sound. The frequency and type of noise, even though it may be within an acceptable decibel noise level, is a significant factor on noise annoyance.

It is incorrect to say there are no flooding issues. Every time Blenheim gets significant rain the north side of the vineyard floods across New Renwick road and a large puddle collects on the northwest corner remaining there for weeks.

**Relief sought:** No Complaints Covenant  
That a "no complaints" covenant shall be registered against the certificates of title of all lots in the subdivision and that a copy of this covenant shall be submitted to the Marlborough District Council and lodged with the District Land Registrar for registration on the titles. The notice shall be

registered at the applicant's expense and shall read as follows:

"The current and future owners of the lots in the subdivision (specific lot numbers) shall be informed that this property is located in a productive rural area and adjacent to a fully functioning airfield where noise from aircraft and ancillary activities can be experienced at all hours of day and night.

Where land use activities on the airfield and in the surrounding area are carried out in accordance with the relevant district plan requirements and/or resource consents, the property owner, or their successor in title shall not:

(a) Bring any proceedings for damages, negligence, nuisance, trespass or interference arising from the use of that land or the airspace above and around it; or

(b) Make nor lodge; nor

(c) Be party to; nor

(d) Finance nor contribute to the cost of;

any application, proceeding or appeal (either pursuant to the Resource Management Act 1991 or otherwise) designed or intended to limit, prohibit or restrict the continuation of the operations of any activity on surrounding land, including any action to require the surrounding landowners/occupiers to modify the airfield or its established flight paths or rural operations carried out on their land."

### **Angela Wilhelmina Adye - Submitter #: 12**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Loss of visual amenity. The proposed development will remove the view of the Wither Hills and Richmond Range from the submitter's property. The density and affordability aspects of the proposed development may result in a lower socio economic residential area. This may adversely impact on the safety and security of existing residences which would have to mitigate this effect at the owners cost. Although the proposal is preferable to industrial or piecemeal development.

**Relief sought:** That the land be retained as Rural Zone. That council undertake a similar in depth study of the alternative Battys Road site. If the zone change is approved by Council that the rezoning be confined to medium density. If the zone change is approved that Council is stringent in enforcing the enhancements such as green areas and renewable energy. If the zone change is approved that Richardson Avenue is not linked to the roading which is part of the development.

#### **Submission 4.0 - Traffic**

Richardson Avenue is a quiet and safe avenue. Exiting onto New Renwick Road is currently difficult and increased traffic would make it dangerous. Linking the avenue to other roads may encourage undesirable traffic (boy racers) and impact on the quiet enjoyment, security and safety of the area.

**Relief sought:** If the zone change is approved that Richardson Avenue is not linked to the roading which is part of the development.

### **Niki Macnee - Submitter #: 13**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Submitted in support of the proposed plan change. This will add value to the area. Prefer sections to be a good mixture of sizes between 400sqm to 1000sqm.

**Relief sought:** Is approval to the plan change with consideration to section size & amenities to the area and to the quality of housing.

#### **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** The Omaka Airfield is an asset to the area and makes it a special place to live. Would be disappointed if people complained about this facility and hoped that such people would not purchase property in the area.

**Relief sought:** Is approval to the plan change with consideration to section size & amenities to the area and to the quality of housing.

**Submission 3.0 - Services**

**Submission:** This will add value to the existing Residential Rural zoned properties and will add to the properties with the change to mains sewer & rubbish collections.

**Relief sought:** Is approval to the plan change with consideration to section size & amenities to the area and to the quality of housing.

**Jonathon Bernard Bushell - Submitter #: 14**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Support the proposed plan change in all aspects, the site has many attributes that make it ideal for subdivision.

Attributes include proximity to schools, the CBD, the Taylor River, the aviation museum and wineries.

The sewage infrastructure is close by and makes for a relatively easy connection.

Colonial Vineyard currently has residential zoning on two boundaries which causes issues in running the property as a vineyard with ongoing noise and spray issues.

**Relief sought:** Approve the proposed plan change. (Inferred)

**Tony Quickfall - Submitter #: 15**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

This submitter identified the following corrections to numbering errors in the application.

1. Part of Plan change submitted on: Appendix 1, proposed amendments.
2. Submissions and reasons: Some of the numbering in the proposed change is incorrect. This should be corrected in order to provide accurate references.

**Relief sought:** Appendix 1: Proposed amendments

1. Amend reference on page 53 to "4.8 methods of implementation" to read "19.8 Methods of Implementation".
2. Amend numbering references for new policies 1.17 and 1.18 on page 54 to new policy 1.18 and 1.19 respectively.
3. Amend reference on page 54 to "4.9 methods of implementation" to "23.6 methods of implementation".

**Paul Ham - Submitter #: 16**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Support the plan change in its entirety

**Relief sought:** Approve the proposed plan change

**Phillip Gleeson - Submitter #: 17**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** The proposed plan change responds to Councils identified need to rezone land for more residential growth and will provide affordable housing. This site is a natural extension of the existing urban housing.

**Relief sought:** Approve the plan change as approved.

**Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** Does not accept there is a potential for conflict of interest due to the sites proximity to the Omaka Aerodrome.

*Relief sought:* Approve the plan change as approved.

### **Blenheim Indoor Sports Limited - Battys Road ( A Brian Fitzpatrick) - Submitter #: 18**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

*Submission:* Point 1: There is a need to provide affordable housing.  
Point 2: The area is a logical extension to the existing urban boundary, it is not prime agricultural/horticultural land and so suited to the proposed purpose. No major infrastructure upgrades will be required.  
Point 3: Council should promote development that has the potential to lead to growth and will support business.

*Relief sought:* Approve the plan change.

### **Carlton Corlett Trust ( P J Radich) - Submitter #: 19**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

*Submission:* This submitter opposes the proposed plan change as it will allow residential uses to the southern boundary of the subject site.  
The land adjacent to the southern boundary is owned by the Carlton Corlett Trust. The trust considers the most appropriate future use of its land to be a mixture of light industrial, warehousing, commercial type uses and perhaps some component of large format retailing. The proposed residential activity may limit the appropriate use of the submitter's land unless steps are taken to avoid this eventuality.  
The trust anticipates its land will be used by users who have connection with aviation or avionics. The presence and continuing use of the Omaka Aerodrome ought not to be impeded.

*Relief sought:* The submission of the Carlton Corlett Trust will be met if:

- (a) The proposed Plan Change includes a requirement that there shall be an isolation strip of appropriate width (Say 20 metres) to the north of the southern boundary of the land the subject of the proposed Plan Change
- (b) This isolation strip should be required to be planted so as to create a visual barrier and, to the extent practicable, a vegetative acoustic barrier to the south of the land the subject of the proposed Plan Change.
- (c) No residential activity would be permitted in the isolation strip.
- (d) Additionally, there should be rules of such a kind that require residential users of property within the area the subject of the proposed Plan Change to acknowledge that they accept the effects of noise and otherwise which may emanate from land to the south if such land is to be used as the submitter contemplates it will.
- (e) Additionally, prospective users of the land the subject of the Plan Change should be required to accept a reverse sensitivities covenant. This would require such users to acknowledge the importance of the Omaka Aerodrome and the importance of its continued use and development and agree not to make any objections on account of noise, traffic, or other effects arising out of the use and development of Omaka Aerodrome.
- (f) Generally if the effect of the proposed Plan Change is not to impede or threaten to impede the likely future of the land of the submitter and the continuing use and development of Omaka Aerodrome and all necessary provisions are incorporated into the Plan Change to achieve this outcome, then the opposition of the submitter to the proposed Plan Change will be satisfied.

### **Ian Fyfe - Submitter #: 20**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

*Submission:* This submitted opposes the proposed plan change unless noise and nuisance covenants and/or special Residential zone rules are imposed as part of the plan change and future consents to prevent future complaints regarding noise, dust and nuisance associated with historic and usual activities undertaken on adjacent rural 3 zoned land.  
The level of noise and nuisance from adjacent intensive rural activities has not been researched or defined therefore the statement in the application that cross boundary

effects can be mitigated is unsupported by evidence.

**Relief sought:** Decline the proposed plan change in its current form as no research has been done on reverse sensitivity with the neighbouring Rural 3 zone which in this particular area has high levels of activity with its intensive viticulture and higher frost risk. If you approve the application then it must include covenants on the title and special zone rules that prevent complaints or action being taken from property owners regarding normal and historic land use in Rural 3 land. It is not acceptable for the applicant to make some vague offer on page 40 of the submission to offer specific conditions at the time of subdivision. By then it will be too late. Purchasers need to be aware of the potential noise and nuisance, reverse sensitivity issues associated with this site.

### **Gerard & Joy Verkaaik - Submitter #: 21**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Point 1: The need to optimise returns on a struggling investment ought not to be a driver to establish an isolated enclave of urban housing that borders an active airfield.

Point 2: The need for acoustic insulation should signal that this site is not ideal for residential development. The proposed development could compromise the future of the Omaka Aerodrome due to complaints from residents.

Point 3: At best the site should be used for low density small holdings for those seeking rural lifestyle close to town, similar to that which exists along Battys Road. The proposal for high density low cost housing constitutes poor planning, the area is isolated from service centres and would put stress on the Battys Road and New Renwick Road.

**Relief sought:** Opposed to this change in the resource management plan in this form.

#### **Submission 3.0 - Services**

**Submission:** Currently there is no reticulated service to this site. Residents consent should be required before any infrastructure upgrade that you impact upon their rates.

**Relief sought:** Decline the proposed plan change

### **Ross Barclay Stewart Ayson - Submitter #: 22**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** The subject area is a natural extension to the urban periphery particularly as the Urban Growth Strategy did not identify any constraints re roading or access. The proposed development can connect to existing infrastructure without major upgrades. The development will meet future demand for residential growth. The sites proximity to Omaka Aerodrome is of no significance. The Council subdivision at Taylor Pass is now established without causing problems for airfield activities. The cross boundary effects will be able to be mitigated. Currently there is spray drift, potential for wind machines, bird bangers, shotguns, helicopters on frosty nights. All this will disappear when the site is developed for residential activity. This land is not prone to liquefaction.

**Relief sought:** I would like to see Council approve the plan change as proposed as it can only be good for Blenheim's continuing growth.

### **Marlborough Aero Club Incorporated ( Quentin A M Davies) - Submitter #: 23**

#### **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** The subject land is not suitable for noise sensitive activities such as residential development owing to noise from ongoing planes and helicopter activities at the Omaka Aerodrome. The proposed development will conflict with aerodrome activities. The Omaka Aerodrome is a regionally significant infrastructure; it provides services to Marlborough not provided by other aerodromes. These services could not be relocated without substantial cost and overcoming opposition. See the submission for the list of activities.

The proposed mitigation method (acoustic insulation) will not be effective while

residents are outside or have their door and windows open. It will not prevent noise sensitive residents from complaining nor residents with ineffective sound insulation. There has been no analysis of helicopter movements especially during frost fighting events. NZS6807:1994 "Noise management and land use planning for helicopter landing areas" has not been addressed in the application.

**Relief sought:** Marlborough Aero Club Incorporated seeks the following decision from the local authority:  
(a) Declining the Plan Change application.  
(b) If the Plan Change is not refused, imposing such conditions to fully mitigate reverse sensitivity effects on Omaka aerodrome

#### **Icilma Dorothy Latimer - Submitter #: 24**

##### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** This submitter opposed the proposed plan change because of loss of rural character from the area.

**Relief sought:** For the Council to decline the proposed plan change..

#### **Christopher David O'Connor - Submitter #: 25**

##### **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** This submitter opposed the proposed plan change because of the sites proximity to the Omaka Aerodrome. He questioned the effectiveness of the proposed mitigation measure in terms of the acoustic insulation on the basis that the kiwi lifestyle includes outdoor residential activities. Activities such as gardening, barbecuing, etc, tend to take place over the weekend at a time when the aerodrome is at its busiest. The use of runway 01-19 means the aircraft are directly overhead on arrival/departure. Also more war-bird type aircraft which have noisier higher performance engines are located at Omaka. This aerodrome accommodates a growing number of aviation and tourism businesses and is important to the local economy. Personal experience of working at airports in conflict with local residents, the airport always suffered the consequences.

**Relief sought:** Council should reject this application in its entirety.

#### **Debbie Anne Bennett - Submitter #: 26**

##### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Concerned regarding the proposed high density of lower cost housing for this site. This will result in an increased crime rate, increased pressure on roading and consequently a loss in property value for the area overall.

**Relief sought:** The development would be a great asset to the area if housing number were way lower and better quality of housing making for a nice layout, which would create a better feel for neighbours already living in the area. By lowering the amount of houses would also lower the amount of traffic volumes.

#### **Marlborough Car Club Incorporated ( Barry Voss) - Submitter #: 27**

##### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** High density residential activity inappropriate at boundaries between the residential land and land zoned rural or used for other activities such as the car club.

**Relief sought:** If the proposal is approved then in addition to the noise insulation requirements in Appendix G the developer ensure that the activities of the car club are acknowledged and appropriate provisions by way of rules/covenants/are in place to address issues of reverse sensitivity. This could include:  
1) That Appendix G of the Plan Change incorporates additional requirements for noise attenuation for properties proximate to the car club site or adjoining the zone boundaries.

- 2) That the high density residential development be restricted in the margins of the zone to limit reverse sensitivity issues and conflict with users on adjoining land.
- 3) That consideration be given to the layout of the proposal to minimise conflicts with adjoining users.

### **New Zealand Fire Service Commission ( Alexander Strawbridge) - Submitter #: 28**

#### **Submission 3.0 - Services**

**Submission:** Supports the provision of a reticulated water system compliant with the SNZ PAS 4509:2008 NZ Fire Service Fire fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.

That if proposed access ways are narrower than 4 metres in width and greater than 135 metres in length to New Zealand Fire Service be consulted on the provision of access to these lots.

**Relief sought:** That, if the Plan Change is granted, the proposed rezoned area be serviced with a reticulated water supply that meets the requirements of *SNZ PAS 4509:2008 NZ Fire Service Fire fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice* for both provision of sufficient access and fire fighting water, in compliance with Council's Code of Practice for Subdivision and Development.

### **Patrick & Carey O'Hagan - Submitter #: 29**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Submission includes figures and graphics to demonstrate that the:  
Proposed site is unsuitable for residential development;  
The local property market is depressed and has a housing inventory in excess of both the current and long term national averages;  
The substance of the proposals appear to be based on a false premise (i.e. immediate need for 'affordable' housing) and are contrary to our understanding of good town planning practice. (Refer to submission for technical matters.)

**Relief sought:** We thus conclude that Plan Change 59 is without merit as same:

- (a) does not promote sustainable management of natural and physical resources (Resource Management Act 1991 Sections 5 and 7(b)).
- (b) will both detract from and permanently undermine the existing amenity values (Resource Management Act 1991 sections 5 and 7(c));
- (c) will both detract from and permanently undermine the existing quality of environment (Resource Management Act 1991 section 5 and 7(f)) and
- (d) Is wasteful of tourist potential and the finite amount of optimum viticulture land (Resource Management Act 1991 sections 5 and 7(g))

As a consequence of all of the above, we object to Plan Change 59 and are confident that our local council, Marlborough District Council, will eject the applicant's private request to amend the District Plan.

### **Sounds Air Travel & Tourism Ltd ( Andrew Crawford) - Submitter #: 30**

#### **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** Point 1: The airfield has been operating since 1928.  
Point 2: The noise levels generated from day to day activity of the airfield are grossly incompatible with a residential development, day and night.  
Point 3: Previous planning applications have been refused. Omaka has become busier in this intervening period especially with the development of the Aviation heritage centre and the growth of several aircraft maintenance companies. The airfield and the Aviation heritage Centre are strong strategic assets to the Marlborough region.  
Point 4: Sounds Air is a local business that has all its maintenance carried out at Omaka Airfield. To have any restrictions, noise or operational, will have an extreme adverse effect to this business.

**Relief sought:** Decline the proposed plan change.  
If the plan change is not refused impose conditions to fully mitigate the reverse sensitivity effects on Omaka Airfield and its users and tenants.

## Wither Hills Vineyards Marlborough Limited ( Antoinette Golden) - Submitter #: 31

### Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change

**Submission:** Wither Hills opposes the proposed plan change in its entirety.

Point 1: PC59 is so deficient that it arguably does not meet statutory requirements – s32, Schedules 1 and 4 of the Resource Management Act 1991.

Point 2: Rezoning the site to enable a subdivision development of up to 300 residential units adjacent to an otherwise primarily rural landscape is inappropriate and does not promote the sustainable management of this land.

Point 3: PC59 is heavily reliant on the draft Southern Marlborough Urban Growth Strategy. This reliance is inappropriate and unreasonable for the following reasons:

- (a) The strategy is still in draft and should be given very little weight;
- (b) The draft strategy is not a statutory document, even when finalised its weight will be limited;
- (c) The draft strategy simply identified the PC59 site as one of numerous potential locations for development;
- (d) The draft strategy is not an appropriate substitute for the analysis required as part of this private plan change process; and
- (e) The draft strategy cannot form part of PC59's section 32 assessment.

Point 4: PC59 fails to provide a comprehensive assessment of effects. It fails to address the following matters:

- (a) The effect the proposed rezoning will have on the amount of productive rural land in the district;
- (b) The effect any development will have on the rural character amenity of the area;
- (c) Whether the change in land use from rural to residential is the most efficient use of land, resources and infrastructure;
- (d) Technical matters including traffic, infrastructure, planning and urban design. The proposal appends no technical reports or assessments, meaning that the appropriateness of PC59 is left largely untested; and
- (e) PC59 provides no planning framework, such as policies and rules, to address how the adverse environmental effects of the plan change will be avoided, remedied or mitigated.

Point 5: PC59 does not adequately address the myriad of reverse sensitivity issues arising out of changing the site's use from rural to intensive residential. The assessment is limited to reverse sensitivity arising out of the proximity to the aerodrome. There is no proper assessment of the reverse sensitivity effects associated with locating intensive residential activities close to vineyards, wineries, and other rural activities such as frost fans, spray drift, nuisance from leaves, traffic effect etc.

Point 6: The proponent of PC59 did not engage in adequate consultation prior to notification, e.g. Wither Hills a land owner and vineyard operator in the area was unaware of PC59 prior to notification. The majority of consultation was undertaken in the context of the SMUGP by Council's consultants and not by the proponent. This is inappropriate.

Point 7: The issues raised in the opposing submissions to the Colonial Vineyards portion of NMUGP have not been addressed by the Colonial Vineyards Limited in a meaningful way.

Point 8: The PC59 application does not include a comprehensive analysis of the actual proposal. It does not define the final form of the development or set out design controls, staging requirements, infrastructure assessments or indicate the density of the development. It is inappropriate to seek such a major shift in zoning without providing a comprehensive statutory, technical and planning assessment at the plan change stage.

**Relief sought:** Wither Hills seeks that PC59 be declined in its entirety.

## Antique Aero Engineering Ltd ( Wayne Tantrum) - Submitter #: 32

### Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome

**Submission:** Point 1: The airfield has been operating since 1928.

Point 2: The noise levels generated from day to day activity of the airfield are grossly incompatible with a residential development, day and night.

Point 3: Previous planning applications have been refused. Omaka has become busier in this intervening period especially with the development of the Aviation heritage centre and the growth of several aircraft maintenance companies. The airfield and the Aviation heritage Centre are strong strategic assets to the Marlborough region.

Point 4: Antique Aero Engineering is an aircraft and restoration facility specialising in First and Second World War aircraft. To have any restrictions, noise or operational, will



have an extreme adverse effect to this business. There are very few airfields in the country which would allow them to operate.

**Relief sought:** Decline the plan change application.  
If the plan change is not refused impose conditions to fully mitigate the reverse sensitivity effects on Omaka Airfield and its users and tenants.

### **Sounds Aero Maintenance Ltd ( Craig Anderson) - Submitter #: 33**

#### **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** Point 1: The airfield has been operating since 1928.  
Point 2: The noise levels generated from day to day activity of the airfield are grossly incompatible with a residential development, day and night.  
Point 3: Previous planning applications have been refused. Omaka has become busier in this intervening period especially with the development of the Aviation heritage centre and the growth of several aircraft maintenance companies. The airfield and the Aviation Heritage Centre are strong strategic assets to the Marlborough region.  
Point 4: Sounds Aero Engineering Ltd is an aircraft maintenance company based on the airfield at Omaka. To have any restrictions, noise or operational, will have an extreme adverse effect to this business. PC59 is strongly opposed.

**Relief sought:** Decline the plan change application.  
If the plan change is not refused impose conditions to fully mitigate the reverse sensitivity effects on Omaka Airfield and its users and tenants.

### **Jennifer Lowe - Submitter #: 34**

#### **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** Point 1: The noise generated by typical airfield activity will be incompatible with a residential development. Residential activity should not be located at the proposed site.  
Point 2: Omaka is a busy airfield and a base for hundreds of aircraft. Its activities attract visitors from all over New Zealand and the World. It supports several businesses and employs scores of people. It is a valuable asset to the Marlborough region. To have any restrictions, noise or operational, will have an extreme adverse effect on the airfield's visitors, customers, tenants, businesses, employees and the local economy. As an employee on the airfield the submitter is concerned her livelihood will be in jeopardy. PC59 is strongly opposed.

**Relief sought:** Decline the plan change application.  
If the plan change is not declined, impose strict conditions to ensure no restrictions can be placed on the airfield activity in future.

### **Clifford Charles Cowan - Submitter #: 35**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Opposed to PC59  
Point 1: There will be an impact on local infrastructure, e.g. roading, water, traffic congestion.  
Point 2: Terraced and cheaper housing will introduce more crime to the area and potentially lower property values in the area. There is already sufficient lower cost housing in Blenheim.  
Point 3: There is a high risk of potential flooding from the soil built Taylor dam. The Taylor River stop banks would spill uncontrolled water in the area of the proposed site. There are historic flood paths across the eastern portion of this site (known to the old Marlborough Catchment Board). Opposed to PC59

**Relief sought:** To disallow the Colonial Vineyard Ltd changing the area into a Residential zoned area.  
To be returned to rural usage as there is sufficient lower cost housing in Blenheim urban.

### **Veronica May - Submitter #: 36**

**Submission 3.0 - Services**

**Submission:** The existing urban Residential 2 zoned properties in the Burleigh area are not reticulated, contrary to public expectation that Urban residential zoned properties are fully serviced. The Urban Residential zone provides for minimum allotment sizes down to 400m<sup>2</sup> indicating reticulation was anticipated, but this has not eventuated. Should the proposed plan change be successful Council will ensure the new development is reticulated. There have been two previous opportunities to reticulate the Burleigh properties (Renwick and Marlborough ridge pipelines). Don't allow this to happen a third time.

**Relief sought:** That Council proceed to grant the proposed plan change but ensure that Council can effectively join forces with the future developers of the Colonial Vineyard site to make provision for the wastewater/sewage reticulation of the existing Urban residential 2 zoned properties in the Burleigh area.

**Marlborough Helicopters Limited (Owen Dodson) - Submitter #: 37**

**Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** The proposal fails to address reverse sensitivity effects on Omaka.

Point 1: The Hegley modelling provides an unrealistic and inadequate 55dBa footprint for Omaka. The airfield needs to be recognised as a regionally significant asset to protect its long term future as developments encroach on the area.

Point 2: In terms of the integration of the development with Omaka, having aviation themed road names and sculptures and access to the onsite café is irrelevant window dressing. It will not secure the future of Omaka.

Point 3: Any benefit from the acoustic insulation will only be realised when residents are inside with the doors and windows closed. This will not prevent complaints about the airfield. The submitter has increased its fleet to 4 helicopters with the possibility of another larger one. The hours of operation are typically antisocial and depend on the nature of the activity, e.g. crop protection, infrastructure fault support, support for emergencies, aerial surveys and pest control.

Point 4: The submitter requires operational flexibility, any attempt to stifle this flexibility or to restrict activities carried out at the airfield has the potential to hinder growth and development of this business and jeopardise its long term viability.

**Relief sought:** Decline the plan change until long term protection of Omaka can be guaranteed. If the plan change is not refused, imposing such conditions to fully mitigate reverse effects on Omaka. This could take the form of a caveat on each certificate of title that states the owner/occupier waives any right to complain about aircraft operations.

**John Ernest & Alison Lillion Marris - Submitter #: 38**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** This submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety. The submitter has operated a vineyard on the adjacent property for 34 years. The proposed development will create reverse sensitivities especially during the frost fighting season, for which a helicopter is used for this purpose. This will impinge on the submitter's right to farm.

**Relief sought:** We seek, for the above reasons, Council to make a decision to decline the application in total. In the event that Council do accept this plan change then we would like to see clauses and conditions that take into account the reverse sensitivities mentioned above as well as conditions that will protect the viability and operational status of Omaka Aerodrome.

**Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

The application states that the concept plans included in the application do not form part of the plan change, but were developed to refine zoning and to ensure that development can be practically undertaken.

Although the plans show no roads heading south, there is nothing to stop the development designing this proposed subdivision to do just that. This would then cause expansion further south and thus threaten the very existence of Omaka Aerodrome.

Omaka Aerodrome is at the centre of helicopter dispatches for frost fighting and vineyard spraying. Any development or activity that threatens the existence of Omaka Aerodrome

causes a threat to the operation and vitality of all vineyards that are serviced from Omaka. This would threaten the viability of all of the submitters vineyard properties, not just the one near Omaka Aerodrome and this potential development site.

**Relief sought:** We seek, for the above reasons, Council to make a decision to decline the application in total. In the event that Council do accept this plan change then we would like to see clauses and conditions that take into account the reverse sensitivities mentioned above as well as conditions that will protect the viability and operational status of Omaka Aerodrome.

### **Jay McIntyre - Submitter #: 39**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** This submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.  
Point 1: The submitter owns aircraft hangers on the airpark adjacent to the Omaka Aviation Heritage Centre. He established his business on the expectation that Omaka Aerodrome has a secure and active future. Confidence in Omaka would see more aircraft owners and aviation businesses attracted over time, bringing diversity and strengthening the economic viability of the aerodrome. The proposed residential development undermines this confidence.  
What is the greater economic and social benefit for Marlborough? Housing in this location when alternatives are available, or allowing aviation at Omaka to grow, attracting businesses, supporting local industry and contributing as an economic generator, as well as a recreational and tourism resource?

**Relief sought:** We urge Marlborough District Council to reject the proposal from Colonial Vineyards.

### **Graham Orphan - Submitter #: 40**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** This submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.  
Point 1: The submitter owns aircraft hangers on the airpark adjacent to the Omaka Aviation Heritage Centre. He established his business on the expectation that Omaka Aerodrome has a secure and active future. Confidence in Omaka would see more aircraft owners and aviation businesses attracted over time, bringing diversity and strengthening the economic viability of the aerodrome. The proposed residential development undermines this confidence.  
What is the greater economic and social benefit for Marlborough? Housing in this location when alternatives are available, or allowing aviation at Omaka to grow, attracting businesses, supporting local industry and contributing as an economic generator, as well as a recreational and tourism resource?

**Relief sought:** We urge Marlborough District Council to reject the proposal from Colonial Vineyards.

### **Trevor Collins - Submitter #: 41**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** This submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.  
Point 1: The submitter owns aircraft hangers on the airpark adjacent to the Omaka Aviation Heritage Centre. He established his business on the expectation that Omaka Aerodrome has a secure and active future. Confidence in Omaka would see more aircraft owners and aviation businesses attracted over time, bringing diversity and strengthening the economic viability of the aerodrome. The proposed residential development undermines this confidence.  
What is the greater economic and social benefit for Marlborough? Housing in this location when alternatives are available, or allowing aviation at Omaka to grow, attracting businesses, supporting local industry and contributing as an economic generator, as well as a recreational and tourism resource?

**Relief sought:** We urge Marlborough District Council to reject the proposal from Colonial Vineyards.

## David & Bridget Jones - Submitter #: 42

### Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change

**Submission:** This submitter opposes the plan change in its entirety.  
Point 1: The submitter owns aircraft hangers on the airpark adjacent to the Omaka Aviation Heritage Centre. He established his business on the expectation that Omaka Aerodrome has a secure and active future. Confidence in Omaka would see more aircraft owners and aviation businesses attracted over time, bringing diversity and strengthening the economic viability of the aerodrome. The proposed residential development undermines this confidence.  
What is the greater economic and social benefit for Marlborough? Housing in this location when alternatives are available, or allowing aviation at Omaka to grow, attracting businesses, supporting local industry and contributing as an economic generator, as well as a recreational and tourism resource?

**Relief sought:** Decline the proposed plan change

## Craig Wilkie - Submitter #: 43

### Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change

**Submission:** Point 1: It is inappropriate to re-zone this particular piece of Rural zoned land to Urban residential 1 and Urban residential 2 as it is contrary to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan, which has been published as Council policy.  
Point 2: The proposed development will dramatically alter the semi-rural nature of the area and would have a significant and undesirable effect on the submitter's home environment.  
Point 3: The encroachment of urban development towards Omaka airfield would be another major departure from the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan. Residential activity directly below the approach/climb out area of one of the major runways at Omaka is a compromise to safety for pilots and residents alike.

**Relief sought:** Decline the application to rezone.

## Simcox Construction Ltd ( Antony Clark) - Submitter #: 44

### Submission 2.0 - Noise

**Submission:** Point 1: This submitter is not opposed to the proposed plan change. It wishes to safeguard the Omaka Aerodrome and associated activities and facilities for current operations and the continuation and future development of this unique asset to Marlborough.  
Point 2: There has been an eroding effect on traditional activities as rural areas are transformed into lifestyle blocks and traditional farming activities become a nuisance or annoyance to new neighbouring inhabitants.  
Point 3: What guarantees are there that pressure from new residents will not seek to limit the activity of "noisy" aircraft or the "nuisance" of the air show as visitors invade their neighbourhood. Complaints will follow if clear and concise safeguards are not set in place to protect the social and economic benefits that the Omaka Aerodrome.

**Relief sought:** Approve the proposed plan change subject to safeguarding the use and associated activity of the aerodrome and precinct. (Inferred)

## Marinus Wagenvoort - Submitter #: 45

### Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change

**Submission:** This submitter opposes the proposed plan change in its entirety.  
The present zoning of Burleigh with residential units mostly between 600 and 1000 metres has served as a buffer between residential and rural land for 60 years. In that time the subject land has been productively used for agricultural purposes and latterly as a vineyard. This buffer has allowed the development of Omaka Aerodrome, Omaka Marae and the Wither Hills winery to proceed unhindered.  
There are few positives that any rezoning allowing the potential for medium to high density residential development will have on the present residents. The main access road will be busier; the visual outlook and the semi-rural lifestyle will be compromised as

will the other current positive aspects to living in the area. Any provision of green spaces will do little to soften the impact of the changing landscape. A rezoning of rural 3 to Rural Residential would be a more natural and practical progression than rezoning to residential 1 and 2, which places smaller residential units at the edge of the Rural 3 zone.

This plan change sets the basis for continued urban sprawl onto cultivatable land at a time when such land should be protected. The value of the land lies in its potential for food production, not to be tied up in perpetuity as a housing estate.

**Relief sought:** That the status quo prevails and the zoning remains unchanged at Rural 3, thus retaining the vineyard, or alternatively using the land for horticulture or cropping.  
A less preferred, but reluctantly acceptable alternative decision would be –  
That the present zoning change from rural 3 to rural residential allowing for 3000 – 6000 square metre residential units to be developed, each unit to contain an on-site effluent digesting system to utilise treated waste water for on-site irrigation.

## **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** There are four main sources of noise nuisance for the land the subject of the proposed plan change:

- (a) Frost fans located to the south of Omaka Aerodrome, amplified by the natural amphitheatre effect created by the Wither Hills.
- (b) Wither Hills Winery, particularly at Harvest time and carried on the natural westerly airflow prevalent at that time.
- (c) Frost fighting helicopters
- (d) Aircraft operations at Omaka Aerodrome.

The proposed acoustical insulation will help alleviate the effects of (a)- (c) above but not (d).

In the 55 years this submitter has lived in the area he has heard of complaints mostly related to flying activities taking place mainly during the weekends when residents are engaged in outdoor activities at home.

Noise contouring will not resolve this problem as the annoyance relates more to frequency and persistence of noise rather than the intensity of it.

Previously the majority of Burleigh residents bought their properties because of location and so mostly accepted any intrusion of aircraft or other rural noise. In an area developed specifically around affordable properties, location is less of a factor and as such noise acceptance will not be as forthcoming. There remains the possibility a group of like minded residents could challenge the activities at Omaka Aerodrome with the aim of curbing aviation activities. Similar to western Springs Raceway in Auckland and Ruapuna Raceway in Christchurch.

**Relief sought:** That the status quo prevails and the zoning remains unchanged at Rural 3, thus retaining the vineyard, or alternatively using the land for horticulture or cropping.  
A less preferred, but reluctantly acceptable alternative decision would be –  
That the present zoning change from rural 3 to rural residential allowing for 3000 – 6000 square metre residential units to be developed, each unit to contain an on-site effluent digesting system to utilise treated waste water for on-site irrigation.

## **Submission 3.0 - Services**

**Submission:** The water supply to Burleigh has been a major issue over the past 50 years. The problem regarding water pressure has only recently been resolved. A 400% increase in consumers connected to this water main raises concerns regarding the sufficiency of the water supply to maintain the current level of water pressure. The water supply to Burleigh has been a major issue over the past 50 years. The problem regarding water pressure has only recently been resolved. A 400% increase in consumers connected to this water main raises concerns regarding the sufficiency of the water supply to maintain the current level of water pressure.

**Relief sought:** That the status quo prevails and the zoning remains unchanged at Rural 3, thus retaining the vineyard, or alternatively using the land for horticulture or cropping.  
A less preferred, but reluctantly acceptable alternative decision would be –  
That the present zoning change from rural 3 to rural residential allowing for 3000 – 6000 square metre residential units to be developed, each unit to contain an on-site effluent digesting system to utilise treated waste water for on-site irrigation.

**Submission 4.0 - Traffic**

**Submission:** With a projected 3,000 extra traffic movements the density of traffic along New Renwick Road, particularly between Battys Road and Maxwell Road, will reach dangerous levels. This stretch of road features a school bus stop, the entrance to the Burleigh Industrial estate and a relatively narrow bridge. The addition of teenagers/children cycling to school adds further concern.

**Relief sought:** That the status quo prevails and the zoning remains unchanged at Rural 3, thus retaining the vineyard, or alternatively using the land for horticulture or cropping. A less preferred, but reluctantly acceptable alternative decision would be – That the present zoning change from rural 3 to rural residential allowing for 3000 – 6000 square metre residential units to be developed, each unit to contain an on-site effluent digesting system to utilise treated waste water for on-site irrigation.

**Dai Jones - Submitter #: 46**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Point 1: Provision for growth can be provided for without this subdivision.  
Point 2: The proposal document is inadequate; the details within it are vague.  
Point 3: The proposal will lead to poor outcomes of undesirable poor quality housing and communities.  
Point 4: Scarce and critical soil should be safeguarded.

**Relief sought:** Reject the plan change. (Inferred)

**Submission 2.0 - Noise**

**Submission:** Point 1: Noise control construction is not functionally practicable. It relies on keeping a house closed up and that is not allowed under the NZ Building Code. Council's Building Control Department advise that the best form of noise control is distance, the more the better.

**Relief sought:** Reject the plan change. (Inferred)

**Ridge Air Limited ( Paul Williams) - Submitter #: 47**

**Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Point 1: The submitter company owns 3 helicopters and 3 fixed wing aircraft and offers a full range of aircraft services. Many flight operations take in the early morning or late evening, e.g. flights for frost control, aerial spraying and a current contract to ferry Eagle Air maintenance crew around the country as and when required.  
Point 2: The Omaka airfield provides services to Marlborough which are not provided by other facilities in the region. It is a base for frost fighting, fire fighting, civil defence operations, police and search and rescue, and rescue operations.  
Point 3: The use of Omaka airfield has been increasing over recent years. The effect on current activities needs to be considered and allowance made for continued growth of activities and frequency of air traffic. The proposed residential development is not only incompatible with existing activities at Omaka airfield but it will ultimately limit increased growth in activity from the aerodrome.  
Point 4: The reverse sensitivity issues between the proposed development and Omaka airfield activities have been oversimplified. The proposed acoustic insulation is an oversimplistic approach that will not provide enough mitigation or certainty that reverse sensitivity effects do not occur.  
Point 5: The proposed mitigation does not address the potential reverse sensitivity effect of aircraft transiting to and from the Omaka airfield and operations at the airfield itself during hours incompatible with residential activities.  
Point 6: The diagram of the Omaka runway 01/19 landing vector, as transiting past the south-east corner of the Colonial vineyards site, oversimplifies the issue. For example, pilots practising emergency procedures need some leeway on approach angles. There is also a safety aspect in the event of mechanical failure during take-off or landings. For safety reasons it is imperative that a green belt is retained around airfields so that a minimum of 170 metres altitude can be attained before flying over or near housing.  
Point 7: The most certain method to limit reverse sensitivity is to provide a satisfactory buffer to sensitive activities such as residential occupation.  
Point 8: There are other areas on the periphery of Blenheim that could provide for

future residential needs.

Point 9: Council is the guarantor of the Aviation heritage Centres loan. Granting Plan change 59 will place that investment at risk. A cautious approach needs to be taken in terms of Councils risk and the investment of those who have promoted the centre.

**Relief sought:** To decline Plan Change 59 in its entirety and in so doing maintain the existing buffer of land and activities between urban residential and airfield activities.

### **Grosvenor & Margaret Jones - Submitter #: 48**

#### **Submission 1.0 - Whole Plan Change**

**Submission:** Point 1: The proposal is outside Councils stated aims. Information is vague, out of date and inaccurate.

Point 2: Cheap sections produce undesirable poor quality housing and communities.

Point 3: No consideration has been given to location, costs or community facilities such as schools, playing field or roading upgrades.

Point 4: Noise control construction is not practically possible; it will not stop people from complaining. Wigram airfield in Christchurch is such an example.

Point 5: It is important to keep rural land.

**Relief sought:** Decline.

### **Roger Ferris Hedley Harris - Submitter #: 49**

#### **Submission 2.0 - Omaka Aerodrome**

**Submission:** The proposed residential development is a threat to the continued use of the historic airfield.

Figure 3 showing the noise contour surrounding Omaka is inaccurate.

Figure 5 showing the extended runway 01/19 gives an inaccurate impression of aircraft flight paths.

The proposed acoustic insulation will not be sufficient to eliminate noise complaints.

The Revised Development Concept Layout Options 1 and 2 leave the way open to link future developments to the south of the proposed development area. This will further encroach onto the Omaka airfields buffer zone.

**Relief sought:** A definitive NO to any form of residential development that will or could result in any sort of restriction to the operations of Omaka airfield as it currently exists. Omaka is a historic airfield that has operated continually for the best part of a century and must be staunchly protected now and into the future.