



**MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan

# Plan Change 68 – Urban Growth Area Five

Submissions Received by Marlborough District Council

September 2013

Submission on Plan Change 64 -  
Blenheim Growth Area One - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan



MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

1. Submitter Details

Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address   
  
 Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home   
Fax  Mobile

Address for Service   
(if different from above)   
 Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)  Date

2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

This submission refers to plan changes 64 to 70 inclusive  
Reference is to the use of versatile soils for sub-division  
and housing construction

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

I object to the plan changes (64 to 70) from several points  
of view.

- 1 Affordable housing - issue is not being addressed
- 2 Loss of land for future food production
- 3 The needless plan change for such a large area
- 4 Revoke sensitivity for existing and future rural uses.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

MDC should actively encourage development of multi-story  
(3-4 levels only) of apartment type housing.  
MDC should withdraw plan changes (64 to 70) and concentrate  
new sub-division to Renwick where steady land is  
available with ample recreation areas

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Submission on Plan Change 69 -  
Blenheim Growth Area Six - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name   
Organisation (if applicable)   
Contact Person (if applicable)   
Postal Address   
  
 Post Code   
Email   
Telephone Business  Home   
Fax  Mobile   
Address for Service   
(if different from above)   
 Post Code   
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)   
Date

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No


**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:



5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

ALL

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

NO DEVELOPMENT ON UNDIVIDED HIGH  
QUALITY SOILS

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

REJECT PLAN CHANGE

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*



**Submission on Plan Change 70 -  
Blenheim Growth Area Seven - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**

**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address   
  
 Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home   
Fax  Mobile

Address for Service   
(if different from above)   
 Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)  Date

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No


**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:



5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

All of Plan Changes 64 → 71

Specific Plan Change 70 (+71 - roading)

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

Ass attached. - Appendix 3

I support proposed Plan changes 64 - 71

I specifically support Plan Change 70 (+71)


Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

That the areas proposed by way of Plan Changes 64 - 71 are rezoned from Rural B to Urban Residential 2.

That specifically the areas covered by Plan Change 70 is rezoned from Rural 3 to either large lot Residential (600m<sup>2</sup> - 800m<sup>2</sup>) or Urban Res 2 as proposed.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary



### Appendix 3

#### Proposed rezoning (Plan Change 70)- Details of submission Jill Bunting

I enclose:

- Appendix 1 Lots in area proposed for rezoning under Plan Change 70
- Appendix 2 (aerial of area)
- Photos of some of housing in David St and Severne St which indicates how residential it actually is and also how when an area is rurally zoned un managed development by incremental "one-off" resource consents can result in appalling design and structure to an area

This area covered by Proposed Plan Change 70 is close to Springlands shopping centre which has a café, a supermarket and comprehensive medical centre, and a Speights Ale house. It is also within easy walking distance of Springlands Kindergarten, Bunnings and Pak and Save. It has Bohally Intermediate and Marlborough Girls College within cycling/walking distance and via Lakings Rd is connected for active transport (walking and cycling) via the Taylor River pathway to Town (15mins walk away from our house) and Marlborough Boys College is accessible largely off road.

With the exception of land occupied by the Brooks Family Trusts -(Angela Johnson (daughter) in Battys Rd- 2 houses on the piece of the land she occupies- one a recycled house shifted there in the last 12 months) Susan Ramsay(daughter) in Severne St, Yuri Cohen (son)in Severne St - house is on the parent title of his father Ian Brooks- as are 3 other houses)all the land is subdivided into what is essentially residential sizes. (see appendix 1) and owned by individuals under separate titles.

There has been no commercial food production on this land in at least the past 20years-probably longer- the sheep used for grazing are essentially mowers and are not stocked in sufficient numbers due to the very small size of the blocks and proximity to neighbouring people and dogs to say that they are there as part of an economic farming venture.

The area is serviced by town sewerage and water and has the ability to cope with stormwater due to the permeable nature of the underlying Wairau gravels- liquefaction drilling showed the gravels under the topsoil were 15m deep on our property (24 Severne St)- and the presence of streams and drains which make up part of Councils drainage systems (and which in most cases Council has easements over) already cope with the existing stormwater.


It makes very good sense to rezone this area correctly into what it already is- a residential zone close to all amenities which will also then result in better checks and balances to ensure that some of the practices that occur in this area and are not able to be prevented because of its current rural zoning (see photos of David St -1,2,3) can be better managed. It is a beautiful area and it is a pity that this rezoning was not done as recommended at the time of Variation 38 (which did not go ahead because it was election year and the panel at the time felt that some of the other provisions of Variation 38 were too controversial in an election year so against recommendation from the planners at the time threw the whole variation out.)





The rezoning of this area was extensively consulted on during the urban growth study and the recommendation from that process was that there were no show stoppers and rezoning should occur. This has been further enhanced by the test drilling that has proven that the area proposed is not subject to liquefaction and is all original ground.





Appendix 1





Lot 2 DP 10461

MIDDLE RENWICK ROAD

Lot 1 DP 304127

Lot 2 DP 304127

Lot 1 DP 6554

Lot 1 DP 422890

Lot 2 DP 1625

LAKINGS ROAD

Lot 2 DP 955

Sheps Park

Lot 1 DP 397198

SEVERNE STREET

Lot 1 DP 1216

Lot 2 DP 1216

Lot 3 DP 1216

← Yuri Cohen

Lot 2 DP 304124

Lot 1 DP 413007

Lot 2 DP 1608

Jan Brooks

Lot 1 DP 11725

Susan Ransy

Lot 50 DP 676

Lot 2 DP 3383

Lot 2 DP 318524

Lot 9 DP 1216

Brooks

Lot 10 DP 1216

Lot 1 DP 341860

Lot 54 DP 676

Lot 11 DP 1216

Lot 2 DP 341860

Lot 51 DP 676

Lot 52 DP 676

Lot 53 DP 676

Lot 1 DP 11709

DAVID STREET

Lot 1 DP 321807

Lot 58 DP 676

Lot 59 DP 676

Lot 60 DP 676

Lot 61 DP 676

The accompanying material has been released by Council from its information repositories. Council does not accept any responsibility for the initial and ongoing accuracy to the material. It is the responsibility of the recipient to make such checks as the recipient considers appropriate to ensure accuracy. Services layers are schematic only and actual positions and level should be confirmed from Council's hard copy records.

RECEIVED

22 AUG 2013

MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

1:3,000



10/03/2010



Seville St Eastern side looking from western side



RECEIVED  
22 AUG 2013  
MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

All houses in this photo currently zoned Rural 3 - 1800 m<sup>2</sup> lots (or less) (7 houses)

①



DAVID ST - 2 houses on lot (1050 m<sup>2</sup>) "family flat" Rural 3 zoned.



2



DAVID ST - converted garage approx 800 m<sup>2</sup>. Rural 3 zone



DAVID ST - approx 950 m<sup>2</sup> - no legal title, 2 carparks + junk





BATTY'S ROAD - 2 houses on lot "family flat" Rural 3  
(older house obscured by trees to right)



RECEIVED

22 AUG 2013

H  
CIL



RURAL 3 ZONED 9 Lots granted 2012. (lots from 1600m<sup>2</sup>  
- 4100m<sup>2</sup>)

RECEIVED

22 AUG 2013

MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL



24 SEVERNE ST - RESOURCE CONSENT FOR LARGE LOTS.



64-69

**Submission on Plan Change 68~~5~~  
Blenheim Growth Area Five - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address

Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home

Fax  Mobile

Address for Service

(if different from above)

Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)  Date

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

Plan Changes: 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

Opposed in full on the grounds the Marlborough district and its future economy can ill afford to see these highly productive areas of land swallowed by urbanisation. Particular change 68 because of its high water table.  
The Old Renwick Road provides an excellent boundary between urban and rural activities.

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

That it review its decision and develop the Blenheim city on the poorer soil types to the south of its present boundaries.

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**Submission on Plan Change 67 -  
Blenheim Growth Area Four - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name	MAURICE DOUGLAS CRESSWELL			
Organisation (if applicable)				
Contact Person (if applicable)	MAURICE CRESSWELL			
Postal Address	6 Blicks Lane R.D. 2			
	Blenheim			
		Post Code	7272	
Email	thosecresswells@stra.co.nz			
Telephone	Business	Home	035785658	
	Fax	Mobile	0274339521	
Address for Service	6 Blicks Lane RD2			
(if different from above)	Blenheim			
		Post Code	7272	
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)	M. D. Cresswell		Date	30th Aug 2013

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes' to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No


**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:



5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

Plan Changes 64-65-66-67-68-69

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

This is good Productive Horticulture land  
and a shame to be wasted for Housing.  
I do not support these changes.  
Do not wish to be rated off our property

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

RECEIVED

26 AUG 2013

MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL



MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL

Submission on Plan Change 64 - Blenheim Growth Area One - Rezoning to the Wairau/Atwatare Resource Management Plan

Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

1. Submitter Details

Full Name: Gregory Michael Smith


Organisation (if applicable): DeLuxe Properties Limited

Contact Person (if applicable): Greg Smith

Postal Address: P O Box 749  
Blenheim  
Post Code: 720

Email: greg@deluxegroup.co.nz

Telephone Business: 35,783,310 Home:   
Fax: 35,783,314 Mobile: 274,492,404

Address for Service:   
(if different from above):   
Post Code:   
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter):  Date: 14/8/13

2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:



**5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:**

The Re-Zoning of land for future residential growth

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)**

Our company is a Property Development company which relies on land to have a Residential Zoning so that we are able to create new residential housing developments. As a land owner and Company we fully support this Plan change along with the other Plan changes to open up more land for the purpose of residential development. In our view there should always be land available and Zoned for some 10 years supply in advance. This effectively will keep a lid on both the raw land price that we pay prior to development and will reflect in the price the consumer pays when sections are released to the market. Like most things the market prices are determined by supply and demand.

Right now there is a real shortage of quality sections in areas other than Taylor Pass Road. In the next 18 months the pressure is going to become even more evident as there is nothing coming on stream and existing sections are slowly being snapped up. I believe that in next year the building sector will potentially suffer as we await for new development to proceed. We have already lost a lot of tradespeople to Australia and Christchurch and we can't afford to lose more due to the building sector not having sufficient land to build on.

Continued on separate page ...

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)**

A speedy process so that the building sector does not get adversely affected with a lack of available sections to build on.


*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

Greg Smith - Submission continued .. Plan Change 64

The Springlands area of Blenheim has always been very popular to live. People like the fertile land as they are able to develop fantastic gardens both for vegetables and for peace and tranquillity. Being able to grow your own vegetables and being more self-sufficient is a major advantage to any family. I personally live in Dry Hills. For us to successfully establish a vegetable garden we ended up importing several truckloads of soil from Springlands. Also the Springlands area does not require the amount of irrigation that many other parts of town requires. This must be a considerable saving in the longer term when it comes to both the pumping and supply of water.

In much of the planning which was done by Urbanism Plus there was a strong emphasis on connectivity. To the west of Adams Lane and Murphy's Road, opportunities have been lost over the years as planning did not allow for connecting roads and services to the east. I understand the need for having a main grid roading system to connect all of the varying areas which are planned, however it is also important to many people that smaller intimate areas with cul-de-sacs and the likes are also allowed, as many people don't want to live on main thoroughfares.

Much thought and consultation with property owners will be needed to make sure that existing storm-water ditches, which in many cases separate ownership, are best utilised for the likes of Road Reserve / berms and are carefully planned for. Also consideration needs to be given to existing right-of-ways etc so that they don't become obsolete or remain in no-mans-land. I have given considerable thought to these issues for Plan Change 64 and I believe that I have solutions from the outset. I would like the opportunity to discuss these issues before any final roading plans are proposed should this Plan change be approved.



**Mark Caldwell-8225**

---

**From:** Alasdair Drew & Cherie Maffey [enchantedfarm@farmside.co.nz]

**Sent:** Sunday, 1 September 2013 9:21 a.m.

**To:** Plan Change Urban Growth

**Subject:** Blenheim expansion

## **Re Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan and Blenheim's Expansion**

proposed by council, to spread Blenheim to the north and west (areas 64 to 69) as this will be over highly fertile, productive land.

at in town planning terms this is a very poor proposal. **Blenheim's expansion should logically be to the south-west on poorer soils.**

Alasdair Drew,  
Northbank  
Marlborough

RECEIVED  
MCO  
19 AUG 2013  
MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Submission on Plan Change 68 - 64-65-67-66-69-70  
Blenheim Growth Area Five - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Atawere Resource Management Plan



Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

1. Submitter Details

Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address   
  
 Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home   
Fax  Mobile

Address for Service   
(if different from above)   
 Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)   
Date

2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No ✓

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No ✓

*BUT I WOULD LIKE TO KNOW IT HAS BEEN READ.*

If you answered 'Yes' to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496  
Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

6. My submission is: *(state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)*

SEE SEPARATE SHEET.

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

7. The decision I seek from Council is: *(where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)*

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*



In re cent times earthquake activity has made it again obvious that subsurface movement is normal for this part of the planet surface. As it cannot be opposed we must learn to live with it and use whatever means available to reduce the adverse effects. So to build domestic housing on the most stable ground makes sense.

However, it is also becoming more probable, that within the lives of those recently born, the rise in population numbers worldwide will make more than the present two billion people extreemly hungry. The expected seawater flooding of fertile coastal land and the extreemes of frequent adverse weather events increase the necessity to preserve soil capable of growing food. The prospect of war over water and food is real.

Therefore, on balance, all the proposed plan and zone changes must be opposed.

Knowledge gained from the Christchurch quakes must be considered to allow building to the east of Blenheim. Liquifaction could be reduced if provisions in the home building codes would include the necessity of ground compaction, deep piling, and wooden construction.

Media induced panic and sensation must not prevail.

The future need for food is greater than the present need for cheap, individual, housing.



Submission on Plan Change 64 - 71  
Blenheim Growth Area One - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan



Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

1. Submitter Details

Full Name: PAUL GIBSON + ROS GIBSON (and others) *see attached*

Organisation (if applicable):

Contact Person (if applicable): PAUL GIBSON

Postal Address: 60 OLD RENWICK ROAD  
BLENHEIM 7201  
Post Code: 7201

Email: rosipaul@ihug.co.nz

Telephone Business: 578 4229 Home: 03 578 9711  
Fax: Mobile:

Address for Service:  
(if different from above):  
Post Code:

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter): Paul Gibson Date: 30/08/2013

2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes' to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?

Yes  No *see attached*

4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

See attached submission

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

See attached submission

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

Properties at 56, 58, 58A and 60 Old Benwick Road to be re-zoned Urban Residential 2 and included in either PC64 or PC68 - see attached submission.

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*





60 Old Renwick Road  
Blenheim  
30 August 2013

**Submission on Proposed Plan Changes  
PC 64 & PC 68**

This submission is made by Paul and Ros Gibson. We have a property at 60 Old Renwick Road. It is presently zoned Rural 3. The area to be rezoned under Plan Change 68 lies on our north boundary. The area to be rezoned under Plan Change 64 lies on our west boundary. A copy of the rezoning plan is **attached**.

This submission is also made on behalf of Brian Hayton and Sharee Stark (58A Old Renwick Road); Ron and Kitty Davis (58 Old Renwick Road); and Ian and Joanne Campbell (56 Old Renwick Road). Together, our four properties form a rectangle bordered by the PC 68 & PC 64 areas. A plan showing our properties is **attached**.

We wish to include the above four properties in either PC 64 or PC 68, to be rezoned Urban Residential 2.

**Earlier consultation**

In earlier consultation, we had made a submission that the relevant land in our area should be included in the land to be rezoned (land has already been developed into residential lots from 44 Old Renwick Road to 60 Old Renwick Road, on the northern side of the road).

We had submitted that, in the interests of coherence and consistency of the District Plan, there was no sense in leaving an area of land which had already been developed as a residential area, outside a new residential zoning. In fact, it would have left us in an island of rural zoned land, surrounded by residential zonings (Old Renwick Road residential area to the south, and newly zoned residential area to the west, north and east).

The same concern applied in respect of the Bridgen property (92 Old Renwick Road), and the Hedley property (30 Roseneath Lane), which would similarly have been left as islands of rural zoning, surrounded by residential area. An Opus plan showing these properties is **attached**. In that regard, the Bridgen property now forms part of the land to be rezoned under PC 64. And the Hedley property forms part of the land to be rezoned under PC 66.

I made enquiries with Council staff (Jamie Lyall), to ask why our properties had not been included in the areas now proposed for rezoning, whereas the Bridgen and Hedley properties had been. I was advised that this was because our properties are closer to a watercourse, raising geotechnical concerns set out in the 2013 Opus report on which the proposed rezoning is based. However, as submitted below, the concerns expressed in the report do not apply to our properties, in any way that should exclude our properties from rezoning.

**Opus Report – Blenheim Urban Growth Study Stage 2 (geotechnical evaluation – interpretive report)**

This report is dated February 2013. A copy has been provided to us by Council staff.

In the report, the areas presently subject to PC 64 & PC 68 (and part of PC 65) were shown as the area marked Na:Nb (Figure 1 of the report – copy attached).

The report makes it clear that the issues for our property are not liquefaction-induced ground subsidence. At para 6.6.1 of the report, it states:

*There is potential for shallow liquefaction in much of the areas under consideration for urban growth land use re-zoning. ...*

***The amounts of ground subsidence given above are not sufficient to warrant wholesale exclusions on development. One approach could be to exclude areas with an identified liquefaction potential from being zoned for development, however excluding land on this basis would also exclude much of the area in the vicinity of Blenheim.***

*An alternate pragmatic approach could be to allow development in these areas (except areas that are subject to lateral spreading as discussed below), but put in place planning rules to ensure that the development takes into consideration this low consequential subsidence from liquefaction. [emphasis added]*

In that regard, the relevant planning rules are to be put in place under Plan Change 71.

Rather, the issue for the land to be rezoned relates to lateral spreading. By way of background, general matters relating to lateral spreading are discussed in the report at para 5.5.4. The report states:

*Lateral spreading occurs predominantly in the vicinity of free surfaces such as water courses where the liquefied soil can laterally displace towards the water course ... Lateral spreading can extend to 200m or more from water courses but it is typically more severe nearer the river. ... Experience from the 2010 Darfield and 2011 Christchurch earthquakes shows the **ground damage due to lateral spreading reduces at a distance greater than 130m from a river or stream.** Figure 3 shows the study areas and the proximity to nearby rivers and streams. The extent of lateral spreading is a function of both the depth of the stream or channel and the depth of the liquefiable soils. [emphasis added]*

By way of further background, but referring in particular to area Na:Nb (which surrounds our properties to the west, north and east), the report (at para 5.5.4) states:

*Liquefaction in this area may lead to lateral spreading of the land towards nearby streams and drains although **the effects are likely to be limited given the relatively thin deposits of liquefiable material.** The effects of lateral spreading are likely to be most significant at the eastern end of this area, where the land is underlain by thicker deposits of liquefiable material and where water courses run in close proximity to the north eastern and southern boundaries ... [emphasis added]*

Turning then to the analysis and recommendations relating to land use planning, para 6.6.2 relating to lateral spreading states:

*It would be prudent to not zone for intensive development the areas susceptible to lateral spreading, such as the north eastern part of Area Na:Nb ...*

***The liquefaction hazard is generally low in the remaining areas (the central and western parts of Area Na:Nb ... ) There is potential for shallow liquefaction to occur, but this is not considered significant enough to preclude development of those areas. [emphasis added]***

#### **MDC Environment Committee meeting dated 21 March 2013 – staff report**

This report has been prepared on the basis of the Opus Report. A copy is **attached**. In it, Council engineer Mr Morris makes a number of comments and recommendations. With reference to 'Lateral Spreading', the report (at para 11) states:

***11. A number of the areas are bounded by waterways and risk buffer assigned. It is possible that at some distance from the indicated margins it may be economic to provide measures to control movement and this could be covered in the Policies and rules drafted in the Plan change with some considered technical advice. [emphasis added]***

Then in the 'Summary' (at para's 23 – 26), the report makes the following recommendations:

***23. It is considered that land in the 50 metre and 100 metre buffers noted on Figure 3 of the Opus interpretive report be excluded from consideration.***

***24. The land in the 100 – 200 metre buffers be subject of controls addressing lateral spread.***

...

***26. For the most part development should be able to proceed within well-defined control rules. [emphasis added]***

#### **Comment and analysis**

The Opus report notes that there is the potential for shallow liquefaction to occur in much of the area available for rezoning, and more generally, much of the area in the vicinity of Blenheim. But as noted at para 6.6.1 of the report, this is not considered significant enough to preclude development and rezoning in the study areas.

Lateral spreading is the issue for present purposes. In that regard, the background parts of the Opus report make it clear that the risk is a function of four factors: the slope of the ground; the thickness of liquefiable soils; the depth of any relevant watercourse; and the distance from the watercourse.

Looking at the most particular recommendation in the report (at para 6.6.2), our property is nowhere near the north-eastern part of Area Na:Nb – where the hazard and risk is higher because of close proximity to a river; nor is it anywhere near the eastern end of Area Na:Nb – where the hazard and risk is higher because of the thickness of liquefiable soils; nor near the southern boundary of Area Na:Nb where there is a permanent flowing body of water clearly adjacent. Put the other way, our property could not be more central in Area Na:Nb – where the risk is stated to be generally low.

Accordingly, on the basis of the Opus report, the liquefaction hazard relating to our property cannot be considered significant enough to preclude development.

The Opus report (at para 5.5.4, noted above) makes it quite clear that ground damage due to lateral spreading reduces at a distance greater than 130m from a river or stream. **Attached** is a plan (provided by Council staff) showing a buffer zone of 130m from the spring source associated with Caseys Creek (the relevant reference point identified by Council). If this 130m buffer measurement is used, then the Davis, Campbell, Hayton and Gibson properties all lie outside the affected area (as would the Thompson property to be rezoned under PC 68, and the existing residential properties on the south side of Old Renwick Road.) This would leave our properties able to be included in the area to be rezoned, subject in any event to the relevant planning controls to be imposed under PC 71.

In any event, the Opus report does not recommend exclusion of development up to 130m, or up to any specific distance. Rather, it is a matter of risk assessment, having regard to the risk factors – ground slope, depth of liquefiable soils, and depth of watercourse at any given location.

The Council report supports this conclusion. In the report prepared by Mr Morris, by way of summary, the report expressly states that development should be able to proceed within the 100 – 200m buffer, subject to appropriate controls. This makes good sense, having regard to the relevant risk factors in the area of our properties: the ground is quite flat; the thickness of the liquefiable soils is low; and the depth of the watercourse is low. So that means that development should be able to proceed outside the recommended 100m buffer. A copy of a plan is **attached**, showing a 100m radius from the relevant creek source. All four of our properties are well outside the radius.

In relation to the above matter, we were told by Council staff that our property has been excluded from the rezoning, on the basis that it is within 200m of the spring associated with Caseys Creek – see plan **attached** (provided by Council staff – not as part of the Opus report).

However, a 200m ‘buffer’ should not be, and cannot be, applied as an inflexible measure, for the following reasons.

1. In the first place, the Opus report does not refer to the 200m buffer as being a rigid area for exclusion. Rather, a series of risk buffers are contemplated – 50m; 100m; and 200m. No particular exclusion zone is recommended.
2. The Council engineer understands that the 200m radius is not to be rigidly applied. As noted, Mr Morris recommends a 100m exclusion area, with development to be allowed in the 100m – 200m buffer, subject to appropriate rules and controls.
3. The present proposal for rezoning then applies Mr Morris’ recommendations. Looking at Area Na:Nb set out in Figure 3 of the Opus report (copy **attached**), this shows a very significant area on the northern boundary of Area Na:Nb which is well within the 200m buffer. Most of that area has not been changed, and remains in the area to be rezoned under PC 68.
4. Looking further at the Area Na:Nb, this also shows a large area at the eastern end and north-eastern corner (near Waipuna Street) well within the 200m buffer. This area is assessed as high risk in the Opus report, because of the thickness of the liquefiable soils and the proximity to the Opawa River. Despite that, and despite an area in the very north-eastern corner having been removed from the area now to be rezoned under PC68, there is still a large pocket of land at the eastern end of Area Na:Nb which is well within the 200m buffer. In fact, some of the land is well within a 100m buffer, and a 50m buffer seems to have been applied – this may be consistent with the minimum 50m buffer referred to in the Opus



report – see Figure 3, noted above. Yet that land in this area remains included in the area to be re-zoned under PC68. This would plainly not be possible, if 200m was to be applied as the applicable buffer.

5. Looking then at other properties, the Thompson property on Old Renwick Road (which sits on our northern boundary) is well within the 200m radius, but is included in the area to be rezoned under PC 68. To be clear, there is more land within the 200m buffer zone on the Thompson property, than would be included in the same buffer area on the Davis, Hayton, Campbell, or Gibson properties.
6. And then to the west, it is quite apparent from the plan set out in Figure 3 that the Hedley property, and properties both the north and south of the Hedley property, lie within 200m of Fultons Creek. Yet the Hedley property in Roseneath Lane, and the properties on both sides, have been included in the area to be rezoned under PC 66.

On the above basis, there is nothing in the Opus report, nor in the Council staff report, which would justify a 200m exclusion buffer.

Accordingly, our properties should not be excluded from the rezoning proposal – they are all over 100m from the relevant creek source (consistent with Council's internal engineering staff report), and all lie outside a 130m radius from the relevant point (consistent with the most relevant distance specified in the Opus report).

By way of final observation, allowing our 4 properties to be rezoned would put our properties in the same position as the residential development in Waipuna Street, and elsewhere on the southern side of Old Renwick Road near to our properties (near to the racecourse and to Casey's Creek as it runs east). In all cases, residential development has occurred, notwithstanding being in the general proximity of a watercourse, and the appropriate zoning would be given for the existing residential use.

For the sake of completeness, there is no issue about the drain area running between the Gibson and Hayton properties. In that respect, there is no spring in this area – the drain just carries run-off in the winter months. There is no material difference between this drain area, and the drain running through the middle of the area to be rezoned PC 64 (Greg Smith – Deluxe Group), or the Cooper / Morrison drain running through the middle of the area to be rezoned PC 68. The drain running between the Gibson and Hayton properties is dry for approximately nine months a year. This is why the spring source for Caseys Creek has been used as the appropriate radius point by Council staff.

With respect to on-going rating burden, we understand that Council's approach will be that the existing basis for levies will continue to apply to rezoned land, until the relevant land is further subdivided and developed. We ask that this should apply to our properties also, if Council accepts this submission, on the basis of existing Council service provision (no public water supply nor public drainage is reticulated to our properties).

### **Submission**

For all of the above reasons, we ask that the four relevant properties at 56, 58, 58A and 60 Old Renwick Road, are included in the areas to be rezoned under either PC 64 or PC 68.

We wish to be heard in respect of this submission.

Signed:

Paul and Ros Gibson:

Paul Gibson (for self and wife)

Brian Hayton and Sharee Stark:



S A Stark

Ron and Kitty Davis:



Ron & Kitty Davis

Ian and Joanne Campbell (by their duly authorized neighbour and agent):

Ron & Kitty

Ron & Kitty Davis




# Notices

## Public Notice of Proposed Plan Changes to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan

In accordance with the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, Marlborough District Council has prepared the following plan changes to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan:

Amend the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan by rezoning areas from Rural 3 to Urban Residential 2 to accommodate future urban growth and facilitate the residential development of the sites. The rezoning includes associated provisions to guide residential development.

Plan Change No.	Subject
64	North of Old Renwick Road approximately 350m east of Thomsons Ford Road - 22.2 hectares.
65	North of Old Renwick Road, bisected by Thomsons Ford Road - 39 hectares.
66	Between Old Renwick and Middle Renwick Road (SH 6). Adjoined by Rene Street and the Westwood retail area on its western boundary - 44.6 hectares.
67	North of Old Renwick Road and adjoins Blicks Lane to the west - 33.2 hectares.
68	North of Old Renwick Road to the west of Waipuna Street - 20.5 hectares.
69	Between Old Renwick Road and Middle Renwick Road (SH 6). Adjoined by Rene Street and the Westwood retail area on its eastern boundary - 32.2 hectares.
70	Vicinity of Battys Road, Severne Street and David Street - 18.2 hectares.
71	Introduces new provisions relating to subsoil investigations and road layouts that will apply to subdivision and development of land generally covered by Plan Changes 64-70.






# Notices

## Public Notice of Proposed Plan Changes to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan

In accordance with the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991, Marlborough District Council has prepared the following plan changes to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan:


Amend the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan by rezoning areas from Rural 3 to Urban Residential 2 to accommodate future urban growth and facilitate the residential development of the sites. The rezoning includes associated provisions to guide residential development.

Plan Change No.	Subject
64	North of Old Renwick Road approximately 350m east of Thomsons Ford Road - 22.2 hectares.
65	North of Old Renwick Road, bisected by Thomsons Ford Road - 39 hectares.
66	Between Old Renwick and Middle Renwick Road (SH 6). Adjoined by Rene Street and the Westwood retail area on its western boundary - 44.6 hectares.
67	North of Old Renwick Road and adjoins Blicks Lane to the west - 33.2 hectares.
68	North of Old Renwick Road to the west of Waipuna Street - 20.5 hectares.
69	Between Old Renwick Road and Middle Renwick Road (SH 6). Adjoined by Rene Street and the Westwood retail area on its eastern boundary - 32.2 hectares.
70	Vicinity of Battys Road, Severne Street and David Street - 18.2 hectares.
71	Introduces new provisions relating to subsoil investigations and road layouts that will apply to subdivision and development of land generally covered by Plan Changes 64-70.





Bridges



**Legend**

- Stage 2 Growth Strategy Areas
- Site Investigations
  - + Borehole
  - ▽ CPT

<i>Prepared For:</i>	<i>Prepared By:</i>	<i>Title:</i> Site location map	
		<i>Project:</i> Blenheim Urban Growth Study Stage 2	
		<i>Scale:</i> 1:20,000	<i>Date:</i> Feb 2013



**Meeting of the ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE  
to be held in the Council Chambers, District Administration Building, Seymour Street,  
on THURSDAY, 21 MARCH 2013 commencing at 1.30 pm**

**Committee**

Clr P J S Jerram (Chairperson)  
 Clr T E Hook (Deputy)  
 Clr J A Arbuckle  
 Clr G S Barsanti  
 Clr D W R Dew  
 Clr G I T Evans  
 Clr D D Oddie  
 Mr E R Beech (Rural representative)  
 Mr R Smith (lwi representative)

**Departmental Head** Mr H Versteegh (Manager, Regulatory Department)

**Staff** Kathy Payne (Committee Secretary)

**In Public**

		Pages
1.	Confirmation of Sub-Committee Business .....	1
2.	Water Resources Update and Report on Consent Restrictions .....	2
3.	Update on Argentine Ant Programme.....	3
4.	Chilean Needlegrass Regional Programme - Challenges and Future Direction .....	4-6
5.	Soil properties in the Kaituna/Havelock and Linkwater Districts - Technical Report.....	7-8
6.	Geo-technical Investigations 2012 - Urban Growth Stage 2 .....	9-11
7.	Urban Growth Strategy .....	12-14
8.	Plan Change 61 and Plan Change 26 Minor Amendments .....	15
9.	Plan Changes 27 and 62 – New Dairy Farm Plan Change .....	16-17
10.	Improving our Resource Management System .....	18
11.	Resource Management Plan Review Sub-Committee .....	19-30
12.	Who Should Pay for Animal Control? .....	31-34
13.	Information Package .....	35

## **6. Geo-technical Investigations 2012 - Urban Growth Stage 2**

---

(Clr Dew) (Report prepared Neil Morris)

M225-M01-02

### **Purpose**

1. The purpose of this item is to report the results of the geo-technical investigations carried out in the period October - November 2012

### **Authority to Act**

2. Under the Local Government Act 2002 (the Act) Council has the authority to give effect to the decisions it makes under the Act, subject to sufficient consideration of all options.

### **Investigation Objective**

3. The objective of the investigations was to characterise the soils in selected areas on the north and west periphery of the Blenheim urban area for consideration for urban use.

### **Factual Findings**

4. The investigations comprised 27 borehole, 18 Cone Penetrometer Tests (CPT), a shear wave velocity test and laboratory examination of sediment size, distribution and characterisation.<sup>1</sup>
5. The bores vary in depth but are generally about 15 metres, the CPT generally reached refusal around 2 metres where compact gravel layers were encountered.
6. The report is 217 pages in length showing the individual logs.

### **Interpretative Findings**

7. The findings are contained in a separate document<sup>ii</sup> drawing from the factual report and some key aspects are commented on here. This report has been circulated to Councillors.

### **Consolidation of Soils**

8. Areas 6 and 8 have properties making them susceptible to settlement over time by imposed surcharge from, for instance, buildings. An evaluation of this would be required to be made as part of any development proposal to ensure that allowance can be made for buildings, in particular.

### **Seismically Induced Subsidence**

9. The relatively high water table in the localities of Na:Nb, Areas 1,3,4, 5 and 6 along with the presence of susceptible soils is expected to cause subsidence to varying degrees. Area 8 appears to be the least susceptible as the water table is at a greater depth than the other sites. The estimated settlement under three design scenarios is set out in Table 2 below; for development approval there will be a need for controlling provisions to ensure these effects are properly catered for.

### **Area 6**

10. The land in this area is the most problematical given the level of the water table and the bounding water courses. Lateral translation is a risk for much of the area and while there may be engineering solutions it is noted that these have not, in the Christchurch experience, been entertained because of the anticipated cost.

## Lateral Spreading

11. A number of the areas are bounded by waterways and risk buffers assigned. It is possible that at some distance from the indicated margins it may be economic to provide measures to control movement and this could be covered in the Policies and rules drafted in the Plan change with some considered technical advice.



## Developmental Standards

12. There are no specific standards prescribed for the development of land in this context; however, having regard for the strong similarities between some areas of eastern Christchurch and the areas under consideration here the guidelines of the Department of Building and Housing<sup>iii</sup> are seen to be particularly pertinent.

13. An extract from the guideline provides:

**Table 1 - DBH Guideline**

Technical Category	Deformation Limits Vertical Settlement		Implications for Foundations
	Service Limit State	Ultimate Limit State	
1	15	25	Standard NZS 3604
2	50	100	DBH Enhanced Solutions
3	> 50	> 100	Pile, Ground Improvement

14. The two criterion, "Service Limit State" and "Ultimate Limit State", are descriptors of performance in the ordinary course of the life of buildings and in the event of reaching design loading.
15. The investigation reports the following in Table 3 of the Interpretative Report:

**Table 2 - Opus Predicted Settlements**

Return Period Event	Predicted Seismic Subsidence (millimetres)						
	Area Na-Nb	Area 1	Area 3	Area 4	Area 5	Area 6	Area 8
1 in 500 years	0-50	0-50	0-56	0-50	0-25	0-25	0-25
1 in 1000 years	0-50	0-50	0-65	0-55	0-25	0-45	0-25
1 in 2500 years	0-50	0-50	0-65	0-60	0-25	0-65	0-25

## Comments

16. Using the DBH classification for seismic subsidence set out in Table 1 above, Table 2 above highlights those parts for Areas 5, 6 and 8 that align with the DBH recommendations for the ultimate limit state. That is to say that for the design event the settlement would be acceptable. What is not established in this project is whether the soils will meet service loading requirements or if some treatment would be required, for instance cutting out and replacing weaker soils.
17. It must be particularly kept in mind that for Area 6 it is severely compromised by the risk of lateral translation.
18. Accordingly there remains a need to determine by way of detailed investigation what remediation work might be required to meet the service limit state in each case.



19. The other areas appear to meet the ultimate limit state for category 2 (DBH Enhanced Solutions) and similarly there would be a need for investigation to meet the service limit state.
20. The forgoing has also to take account of the probable compression induced settlement which combined with the liquefaction settlement may be limiting as noted particularly for Area 8.
21. It is thought pertinent to keep in mind an observation of the Christchurch Royal Commission in this context:  
*"...remained incumbent ... to ensure that any earthquake risk associated with the land subject to development and/or subdivision plans was considered, and where necessary managed and/or mitigated. Where appropriate, applicants should have been required to undertake geotechnical investigations or other hazard assessment and if, as a result of those inquiries, risk was found to be present, mitigation actions should have been identified and monitored."*  
At Volume 7 - 5.8 para. 3<sup>iv</sup>

### Note

22. The southern portion of Area 5 is the subject of a Resource Consent application, the hearing of this matter has not been held at the time of this report.

### Summary

23. It is considered that land in the 50 metre and 100 metre buffers noted on Figure 3 of the Opus Interpretative report be excluded from consideration.
24. The land in the 100-200 metre buffers be subject of controls addressing lateral spread.
25. The data indicates that soil characteristics exhibit properties requiring remedial treatment generally and in some instances may be uneconomic (e.g. lateral constraint).
26. For the most part development should be able to proceed within well-defined control rules.

### RECOMMENDED

That the "Blenheim Urban Growth Study Stage 2 - Interpretive Report" be received.

---

<sup>i</sup> Williams, Mason & Brabhaharan 2013. *Blenheim Urban Growth Study Stage 2 Factual Report*. Opus International Consultants Limited. 217 pages.

<sup>ii</sup> Mason and Brabhaharan, 2013. *Blenheim Urban Growth Study Stage 2 Interpretive Report*. Opus International Consultants Limited.

<sup>iii</sup> Department for Building and Housing, 2012. *Guidelines for the investigation and assessment of subdivisions on the flat in Canterbury*. Version 2 September 2012.

<sup>iv</sup> Canterbury Earthquakes Royal Commission, *Roles and Responsibilities*. Volume 7





Cooper and Morrison Drain

Cooper & Morrison

Casoy's Drain A & Outlet  
Casoy's Creek

OLD RENWICK ROAD

MCLAUCHLAN STREET

GLENROY CRESCENT


MOWAT STREET

Total length 200.38 m

100 m

200m buffer





Cooper and Morrison Drain

Cooper & Morrison

Casey's Drain A & Outlet  
Casey's Creek

OLD RENWICK ROAD

MCLAUGHLAN

GLENROY CR

MOWAT S

130 m buffer

2





130m buffer zone/radius





100m buffer zone / radius





50m radius or buffer zone





Prepared For:

Prepared By:

Title:

Site areas and proximity of waterways

Project:

Blenheim Urban Growth Study  
Stage 2

Scale:

1:20,000

Date:

Feb 2013

Project No:

5C2128.01

Figure:

3



**MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**



**OPUS**



**Submission on Plan Change 67 -  
Blenheim Growth Area Four - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name	Maxwell Logan Gifford		
Organisation (if applicable)			
Contact Person (if applicable)	Max Gifford		
Postal Address	198 Hammerichs Rd. R.D.3		
	Blenheim		
		Post Code	7273
Email	max.marita26@xtra.co.nz		
Telephone	Business	Home	
	35,702,241		
	Fax	Mobile	274,865,228
Address for Service	As above		
(if different from above)			
		Post Code	
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)			Date
			10/08/2013

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

**5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:**

All land North of Old Renwick Rd. Plan changes 64-65- 67-68

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)**

I strongly object to some of New Zealand's most productive soils being lost forever to building sites. My property neighbors some of this land so I know what can be produced from it.  
There are far better sites to build on, such as the Burleigh area or Renwick.  
Has any effort been made to find another site for Omaka Airport as this would make a large area available for development

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)**

Abandon this plan change and put more effort into finding other sites as suggested above.  
Try listening to local opinion instead of Auckland advisors who do not understand local concerns.

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**Submission on Plan Change 68 -  
Blenheim Growth Area Five - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address   
  
 Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home   
Fax  Mobile

Address for Service   
(if different from above)   
 Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)  Date

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No


If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496  
Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:





5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

All parts of the proposed plan change

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

I oppose the proposed plan change in its entirety  
see attached explanation

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

Is To leave the land in its current form & use

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

Additional explanation and reason for opposing plan change 68

- (1) It provides for urban development to sprawl onto some of the most highly productive land on the wairau plains, which should be preserved for food production
- (2) The land also has a high water table which makes it more expensive to develop for Residential purposes possibly requiring more pumping stations.
- (3) Its proximity (300to 400m) from the Wairau fault line.
- (4) The probability of serious damage to buildings and infrastructure in the event of an earthquake of similar size (7.1 magnitude) or greater than the September 4<sup>th</sup> 2010 that struck Canterbury may not be able to be repaired or would be extremely costly.

This submission to be expanded on at the hearing.

**Mark Caldwell-8225**

---

**From:** Tony Orman [boto@slingshot.co.nz]

**Sent:** Friday, 30 August 2013 1:57 p.m.

**To:** Plan Change Urban Growth

**Subject:** Submission

## **watere Resource Management Plan**

with sound town planning practice and as proposed by consultants UrbanPlus and shortsightedly adopted by the Marlborough District Council, to make the way by plan changes for Blenheim to expand to the north and west over the region's best productive land.

proposal. Public debate has shown community concern about the idea.

s and appendices show the land designated by proposals for urban growth is highly productive land which has been valuable for cropping, horticulture and pasture in the past. Landcare Research work has highlighted the folly of allowing urban sprawl to absorb highly productive land. In Marlborough much of Blenheim has been built on productive fertile alluvium. It must stop now. There are other options such as the lower Wither Hills and Taylor Pass area to make attractive residential development without swallowing up the best soils.

The costs of sewage and storm water etc on such level land will be a further burden on ratepayers.

Likely world wide shortages of food allied with disruption by political unrest, means productive lands must be retained as rural and for production for future generations.

Tom Harrison BEM  
Former Marlborough mayor

Ph 578 1297




**Submission on Plan Change 68 -  
Blenheim Growth Area Five - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**



Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address   
  
 Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home   
Fax  Mobile

Address for Service   
(if different from above)   
 Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)  Date

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

Plan change 68.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

LOT 1 DP 1150 BLK XVI Cloudy Bay SD

We support the change in zoning but only if our whole property is encompassed in the plan.

The current zones cuts the property into a size where the remaining Rural Zone is not a viable option to keep operational.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

Adopt plan change 68 with all of the above lot included.

If not in a whole parcel - we don't support this change.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

**Submission on Plan Change 64 -  
Blenheim Growth Area One - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name	Anthony John Hawke		
Organisation (if applicable)			
Contact Person (if applicable)			
Postal Address	27 Thomsons Ford Road		
	RD 2		
	Blenheim	Post Code	7027
Email	tony@gilberthaymes.co.nz		
Telephone	Business	Home	
	Fax	Mobile	
Address for Service	Gilbert Haymes & Associates Ltd (Tony Hawke)		
(if different from above)	P O Box 380		
	Blenheim - Attention: A J Hawke	Post Code	7024
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)		Date	30/08/2013

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:



**5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:**

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**6. My submission is:** *(state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)*

Support the plan change to allow for additional areas for residential development.

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**7. The decision I seek from Council is:** *(where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)*

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

## SUBMISSION

### MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL - PLAN CHANGE 64

#### **Overview (p4):**

The Overview states that, "Council's intention is that the rating status of the land within the Plan Change areas will not change until actual development occurs".

The submitter considers this as an open statement, and wants certainty that the rating status will not change until actual development occurs on their property, therefore, confirmation from Council that it relates to development on individual properties, and not when development starts in a specific Plan Change area.

#### **5.8 Plan Change 71 – Chapter 23 Subdivision and Development:**

Policy 1.8 – "Where indicative roading layouts are shown on the planning maps, the roading network proposed at the time of subdivision development shall be in general accordance with the layout".

The indicative location of the road off the western side of Thomsons Ford Road, is not practical as it bisects two property boundaries. It is unlikely that the property on the southern side of the proposed road will be further subdivided because of the restriction of the transmission line running through this property. The indicative road position needs to be moved further north so it is located within one property.

Is compensation to be paid where a developer is not getting the full potential use of a road through their property because of the indicative roading layout

#### **Appendix 5 – Essential Street Connections:**

In 1.1 Introduction, the proposed road design is based on one firm of planners' ideas, ie Urbanismplus. The rationale behind street designs has evolved over the years, where the initial towns within New Zealand were laid out in a grid pattern, followed by curved streets, and cul-de-sacs. Street layout design has reverted back to more of a grid pattern. What design will next be in vogue?

Along with this new thinking, there seems to be a trend to avoid rear allotments where no reason is stated in the assessment. It is interesting to note that Council's subdivision at Forest Park is continuing to be developed with a large number of rear allotments, and it seems rather hypocritical that Council are prepared to put rear allotments in place for their subdivisions, as it allows for a cheaper roading layout, while insisting on private land owners adopting a more expensive roading pattern.

It is also to be noted that new subdivisions within the Auckland area are adopting a mixture of a more intensive roading pattern, road curves and cul-de-sacs, generally to match the topography. Alternative road location options should be left available to developers.

**Appendix 6 – Blenheim Urban Growth Division of Infrastructure – Proposed Plan Changes  
64-71:**

This section is brief in content, but alludes to the fact that an “accepted services plan” is to be drawn up by Council to establish the infrastructure requirements for the various Plan Change areas.

The submitter is concerned with the lack of content within this section to be able to make valued comments, and that consultation with the land owners may be overlooked in the formulation of this plan. For example, the plan indicates that “roads will vary in width and design, depending on their role for the wider area, rather than what would be built just for a small area on its own”.

Will the land owner that is required to construct a wider road carriageway be compensated for the additional costs to build the larger road?

In areas 2 and 4, it is noted that stormwater retention areas are proposed, however, there is no indication as to what form these retention areas will take, or how compensation will be formulated for the land owners on which these retention areas are located.

It is the submitter’s concern that the plans within this Appendix will be adopted without formal consultation with potentially affected land owners, and therefore, we wish for a confirmation from Council stating that these services plans are indicative only, and further consultation with land owners will be undertaken, formulating compensation etc prior to implementing infrastructural changes.

Relief sought, that Appendix 6 be withdrawn from this document and a more complete assessment be made available for submissions when completed.



# Submission on Plan Change 64 - Blenheim Growth Area One - Rezoning to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan



MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

RECEIVED

30 AUG 2013

MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL

Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

## 1. Submitter Details

Full Name	Peter Graham James and Maryanne Therese James		
Organisation (if applicable)			
Contact Person (if applicable)			
Postal Address	38 Old Renwick Road		
	Blenheim		
		Post Code	7 0 2 0
Email	tony@gilberthaymes.co.nz		
Telephone	Business	Home	
	Fax	Mobile	
Address for Service	Gilbert Haymes & Associates Ltd (Tony Hawke)		
(if different from above)	P O Box 380		
	Blenheim - Attention: A J Hawke		Post Code 7 0 2 4
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)			Date 30/08/2013

## 2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

## 3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

## 4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

**5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:**

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**6. My submission is:** *(state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)*

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**7. The decision I seek from Council is:** *(where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)*

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

## SUBMISSION

### MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL - PLAN CHANGE 64

The submitter supports Council in the rezoning of land to allow for future Urban Residential Development.

#### **Overview (p4):**

The Overview states that, “Council’s intention is that the rating status of the land within the Plan Change areas will not change until actual development occurs”.

The submitter considers this as an open statement, and wants certainty that the rating status will not change until actual development occurs on their property, therefore, confirmation from Council that it relates to development on individual properties, and not when development starts in a specific Plan Change area.

#### **3.8 Growth Area 5 (Plan Change 68) – page 26:**

The description of the adjoining land to this area is not strictly correct. It states that “the land adjoining to the south has Urban Residential 2 zoning on the opposite side of Old Renwick Road”, when in fact, part of the land on the southern side of Old Renwick Road is the Racecourse, which has a Rural 3 zoning.

Leaving an ‘island’ of Rural 3 zoned land between Old Renwick Road and the newly zoned Residential 2 land will limit the use of the rural land, and possibly threaten its current use which is viticulture.

The submitter requests that this land be zoned ‘Large Lot Residential’, with a minimum allotment area of 3000m<sup>2</sup>, and with a deferred Residential 2 zoning subject to more land stability tests being undertaken. If the land (or parts of) proves suitable for Residential 2 zoning it should be zoned as such.

#### **5.8 Plan Change 71 – Chapter 23 Subdivision and Development:**

Policy 1.8 – “Where indicative roading layouts are shown on the planning maps, the roading network proposed at the time of subdivision development shall be in general accordance with the layout”.

In the commentary to Plan Change 68 it has already highlighted that roading into the proposed Residential 2 zoned area is quite restrictive, and the indicative road layout from Old Renwick Road is over a strip of land owned by a landowner whose properties are not being re-zoned, therefore, may not be interested in allowing a new road over that property. The alternative road location off Old Renwick Road will be through land to remain Rural 3, which would make that option costs prohibitive if the land adjoining that portion of road cannot be developed more intensively.

The decision sought is that the indicative road layout within Plan Change 68 be reconsidered if Large Lot Residential or Residential 2 zoning is not achievable over the land currently to remain zoned as Rural 3.



Page 48 weighs up the benefit / costs to implement Policy 1.8 which states, “requires developer to comply with specified layouts which may not be the most economic for individual developers”.

Is compensation to be paid where a developer is not getting the full potential use of a road through their property because of the indicative roading layout?

#### **Appendix 4 – Opus Geotechnical Evaluation:**

Sec 5.5.4- Liquefaction Induced Ground Damage- In this section the author makes comment on lateral spreading in the vicinity of free surfaces such as water courses “Lateral spreading can extend to 200m or more from water courses but typically more severe nearer the river”. It goes on outline the experience from Darfield and Christchurch earthquakes, which “shows the ground damage due to lateral spreading reduces at a distance greater than 130m from a river or stream”.

Figure 3 shows the study areas and the proximity to nearby rivers and streams, with waterway buffer areas set aside at various intervals from those identified features.

The submitters property fronts Casey’s Creek and an area 200m north of the creek has been excluded from the residential zone because of potential lateral spreading, without a significant amount of ground testing being undertaken. Further an area of land adjoining Waipuna Street has been included within the residential zone when it is within 200m of the Opawa River. Where is the consistency in Councils reasoning? Why have Council chosen the 200m distance from the creek?

Sec 6.6.2- Liquefaction-Induced Ground Damage, states that the development areas are “underlain by alluvial gravel soils with only thin deposits of loose sand and silt layers overlying the gravels. Liquefaction of these sands and silts can occur in modest earthquake events which are used for design of normal buildings”.

An area of land in the northeastern part of Area Na:Nb has been identified as susceptible to liquefaction and lateral spreading, stating “these areas subject to liquefaction and natural spreading can be used for less intensive land uses such as parks and gardens or agriculture. This could be achieved by appropriate zoning of the land through district planning measures”.

The submitter considers that the ground testing undertaken in this area is incomplete, and intends to undertake further testing to gain a clearer picture of the land profile, with the aim of identifying land within this area as suitable for residential use (see attached letter from Davidson Group, who have been engaged to give an opinion on the findings of the Opus report along with additional soil testing). Following the recent earthquakes in Seddon it appears that the soils in this area reacted differently to the Christchurch soil types? Was this a modest earthquake event?

Outcome sought: Additional testing be undertaken in the area shown to have potential for lateral spread so that a more reasoned decision can be made as to an acceptable distance from Casey’s Creek where residential development can take place.

## **Appendix 5 – Essential Street Connections:**

In 1.1 Introduction, the proposed road design is based on one firm of planners' ideas, ie Urbanismplus. The rationale behind street designs has evolved over the years, where the initial towns within New Zealand were laid out in a grid pattern, followed by curved streets, and cul-de-sacs, and latterly, curves and cul-de-sacs. Design has now reverted back to more of a grid pattern for various reasons. What design will next be in vogue?

Along with this new thinking, there seems to be a trend to avoid rear allotments where no reason is stated in the assessment. It is interesting to note that Council's subdivision at Forest Park is continuing to be developed with a large number of rear allotments, and it seems rather hypocritical that Council are prepared to put rear allotments in place for their subdivisions, as it allows for a cheaper roading layout, while insisting on private land owners adopting a more expensive roading pattern.

It is also to be noted that new subdivisions within the Auckland area are adopting a mixture of a more intensive roading pattern, road curves and cul-de-sacs, generally to match the topography. Alternative road location options should be left available to developers.

## **Appendix 6 – Blenheim Urban Growth Division of Infrastructure – Proposed Plan Changes 64-71:**

This section is brief in content, but alludes to the fact that an "accepted services plan" is to be drawn up by Council to establish the infrastructure requirements for the various Plan Change areas.

The submitter is concerned with the lack of content within this section, and that consultation with the land owner may be overlooked in the formulation of this plan. For example, the plan indicates that "roads will vary in width and design, depending on their role for the wider area, rather than what would be built just for a small area on its own".

Will the land owner that is required to construct a wider road carriageway be compensated for the additional costs to build the larger road?

It is the submitter's concern that the plans within this Appendix will be adopted without formal consultation with potentially affected land owners, and therefore, we wish for a confirmation from Council stating that these services plans are indicative only, and further consultation with land owners will be undertaken, formulating compensation etc prior to implementing infrastructural changes.

**Our Ref: 25356**

30 August 2013

PG and MT James Family Trust  
C/- P O Box 776  
**BLLENHEIM 7240**

**ATTN:** Mr P James

re: **ENGINEERING REVIEW OF LAND STABILITY, 38 OLD RENWICK ROAD, BLLENHEIM**

We refer to our discussions to date and our desktop review of existing subsurface information relevant to your land, being Lots 6 and 7 DP 3536 on the north side of Old Renwick Road opposite the Blenheim racecourse.

You are obviously concerned about the risks that have been publicly expressed surrounding liquefaction and lateral spread issues and how these may pertain to your land. The Opus work commissioned by Council provides general guidance on such issues but cannot be said to be site-specific in terms of the lateral spread hazard at your property.

To date we have reviewed the Opus reports and results as made publicly available by Council following the Blenheim Urban Growth Study Stage 2 investigations, together with well logs from your property and nearby. The results are variable, and, significantly, show that the 'best' ground is adjacent to Caseys Creek (Opus BH 115) at the property immediately to the east of you. The Opus liquefaction assessment indicated susceptible soils at typically 2 to 4 metres below ground level (i.e. a shallow thin layer) and small amounts of settlement in a large seismic event. Those suspect soils below the water table do not appear in BH 115.

We have developed the following methodology for the next stage of geotechnical assessment of the lateral spread risk associated with Caseys Creek.

- (i) A grid of test pits for investigation of the shallow soils within 100 m of Caseys Creek to determine if shallow suspect soils exist.
- (ii) Take samples for laboratory testing and have analysed for liquefaction parameters.
- (iii) Plot soils information and results onto surveyed cross sections.
- (iv) Form an opinion on the liquefaction and lateral spread risk and determine what further testing and/or specialist advice may be appropriate.



Davidson Ayson House, 4 Nelson St  
PO Box 256, Blenheim 7240, NZ  
T: 03 579 2099 / F: 03 578 7028  
E: service@DavidsonGroup.co.nz  
W: DavidsonGroup.co.nz

**Principals**

Ross Davis, BE, CPEng, MIPENZ  
Stephen Sheat, BE, CPEng, MIPENZ  
Leigh McGlynn, BE, CPEng, MIPENZ



The ultimate outcomes from this process may include the determination of a suitable setback distance for buildings, and/or recommendations for resilient types of foundations and structures, and/or consideration of physical treatments to reduce or eliminate the risk itself. The potential value of the land for residential sections may justify substantial works and hence a large portion of the land in the vicinity of the waterway could foreseeably be or be made suitable for housing.

Thank you for involving us in your project and we look forward to being of assistance.

**DAVIDSON GROUP LTD**



**R W Davis**

RWD:LM

**COPY TO:** Gilbert Haymes & Associates Ltd  
P O Box 380  
**BLenheim 7240**

**ATTN:** Mr T Hawke

**Submission on Plan Change 66 -  
Blenheim Growth Area Three - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**



**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name H. E. F and C. M. T. JONES

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable) C. M. T. JONES

Postal Address 183 OLD RENWICK ROAD  
BLenheim

Post Code 7272

Email

Telephone Business  Home

Fax  Mobile

Address for Service ANGELA JONES  
(if different from above) 123 DAVID STREET  
BLenheim

Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter) X C.M.T. Jones Date 25.8.2013

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

THE ENTIRE PLAN CHANGES  
NUMBERS 65 TO 71

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

OUR PROPERTY IS INCLUDED IN COUNCIL PROPERTY  
NUMBERS 255317; 186909; 255918. IT IS DESCRIBED  
AS LOTS 1 AND LOTS 2 D.P. 321132  
OUR PROPERTY IS SHOWN IN PLAN CHANGE  
AREA 66. WE SUPPORT THE PROPOSED PLAN  
CHANGE SUBJECT TO THE CONDITION NOTED  
UNDER QUESTION 7.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

COUNCIL TO APPROVE THE PLAN CHANGE  
SUBJECT TO NO RESIDENTIAL TYPE RATING  
TO BE IMPOSED UNTIL AND UNLESS WE  
DEVELOP OUR LAND FOR RESIDENTIAL  
SUBDIVISION.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary



Submission on Plan Changes 64 to 71  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan



Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

1. Submitter Details

Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address   
  
 Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home   
Fax  Mobile

Address for Service   
(if different from above)   
 Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)   
Date

*Submitter and duly authorised agent*

2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496  
Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

**Kapiti Views Trust**

**[Mr J Marris as Trustee]**

**Submissions on Plan Changes 64 to 71 continued.**

The same submissions have been made to each of Plan Changes 64 to 71

**5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:**

Each of the Plan Changes 64 to 71 in their entirety.

**6. My submission is:**

- i. That we oppose the development of the land to the north of Blenheim for residential use as proposed in Plan Changes 64, 65, 67 and 68 as it is an inappropriate land use. The land is part of the highly productive versatile soil resource which is a finite resource.
- ii. Rezoning will have effects on adjoining land in terms of reverse sensitivity of residential activities and likely consequential restrictions on existing lawful rural activities.
- iii. Rezoning this land is not efficient or capable of giving effect to the Marlborough District Council responsibilities for District Planning in terms of the Resource Management Act 1991 [the Act].
- iv. The evaluation of this land for residential use is inadequate and incomplete. The risks associated with the use of this land for residential activity are such that it should not be utilised without properly investigating, eliminating, avoiding or mitigating those risks.
- v. The economic costs associated with the use and the cost of development in terms of opportunity cost and development of this land do not justify its use for residential purposes as it is not economically efficient or viable.
- vi. The evaluation of alternatives is incomplete and inadequate and should have focused on land that is less productive and which can accommodate the change.

- vii. It is considered that Plan Changes 64, 65, 67 and 68 will not be able to deliver new residential land in a timely or cost effective manner to meet demand. The reason for this is due to fragmented ownership, lack of and cost of infrastructure along with basic unsustainability.
- viii. Furthermore, it is considered that the various servicing constraints/costs and geotechnical risks will cause the resultant sections to be unaffordable to the bulk of the population.
- ix. The feasibility of developing residential sections on this basis is considered to be expensive. The Council's own assessment of the zone levies for each of the development areas (dated 27 June 2013 -see **attached**) shows that the levy per lot ranges from \$23,600 to \$28,700, compared to \$12,773 for the Council's subdivision in southern Blenheim. This excludes the Development Contributions of approximately \$22,500 per lot, land costs, design costs, engineering assessment costs, construction costs and other professional fees. Even if developed, it is considered highly likely that the sections developed will be tagged with consent notices identifying the risks of liquefaction – which is likely to impact on insurance and costs.
- x. The Plan Changes significantly downplay the adverse effects associated with the loss of high quality and versatile soils. The Plan Changes state that these effects are inevitable; despite the fact the areas south, southwest and west of Blenheim do not contain versatile soils. See Appendix 9. The Plan Changes state that in many cases the future use of the soils for food production has already been compromised and that the loss is only 2.18% (209.6ha) of the versatile soils in the Rural 3 zone. The Plan Changes state that many of the parcels are in smaller holdings of less than 2 hectares (Appendix 9) No mitigation measures are proposed. Furthermore, as set out under 1(d) below, the proposed Plan Changes also significantly downplay the impact of the rezoning on existing highly productive activities both within the Plan Change areas and outside of them. Many existing highly productive activities will find themselves a lot closer to residential activities than they do currently. The loss of highly productive land is a significant resource management issue to this Region and also a key “assessment principle” clearly downplayed.



- xii. The Plan Change if approved will result in the expansion of residential land immediately adjacent to productive farmed land and / or industrial land. There is no apparent scope for an urban – rural interface to allow for a progression from urban to rural residential to rural that is effective in preventing or mitigating reverse sensitivity issues.
- xiii. Further if the Plan Change proceeds as proposed and a new 'line in the sand' is created for residential expansion then it will only be a matter of time before landowners on rural land adjacent to the newly zoned and developed residential land seek to subdivide and create rural residential allotments. This form of incremental creep will result in a further loss of productive land.
- xiv. The Plan Change is fundamentally flawed in not providing for a urban – rural interface.
- xv. We oppose Plan Change 71 as we consider that any area to be zoned should have been assessed prior to rather than post rezoning in respect to suitability for foundations. The testing proposed will be most expensive and covers all of the Plan Change areas. Plan Change 71 may also impact on the provision of services, especially in high water table areas such as in proposed plan change areas 64, 65, 67 and 68.
- xvi. The Plan Change documents are very clear about the urgent need to make provision for new land for residential growth which is agreed.
- xvii. For this reason and this reason alone we support the inclusion of Plan Changes 66, 69 and 70 in part. This land is in close proximity to the present town and has adjoining supporting services. It has been subject to substantial engineering and geo technical evaluation and is proven suitable for development. The Plan Changes state that current vacant residential land is only able to meet a short supply of 2-5 years. The EMS report on Residential Availability recommends "urgent action" is undertaken to address this shortage. Beyond that, approximately 1,500 new sections are reportedly required to the year 2031.

- xvii. The Trust contends that land to the west, southwest and south of Blenheim on less versatile soils is available at a lower cost per section to develop. Use of this land for residential purposes will at least mitigate the expansion on to the more versatile soils of the northwest of Blenheim as proposed in Plan Changes 66, 69 and 70.
- xviii. Furthermore in terms of affordability, the Plan Change states:

*“Land availability has also been a key focus for recent central government initiatives to improve the affordability of housing. Under this scenario the provision of sufficient appropriately zoned land is intended to ensure section prices are not inflated by a shortage of suitable land”.*
- xix. In regard to reverse sensitivity the Plan Changes, specifically Plan Change 69, fundamentally ignore existing business activities on land adjacent to proposed residential development (including, in particular the operation of a PAK'nSAVE food warehouse within the Westwood retail area).
- xx. The Plan Changes do not properly recognise or provide for potential reverse sensitivity effects that could arise from enabling residential activity to establish in close proximity to existing food warehouse operation. To that extent, Plan Change 69 fails to control the potential effects of the use of the subject land for residential purposes as an appropriate interface has not been achieved with complementary rezoning of adjoining land, to achieve integrated management in inter-zonal situations such as this.
- xxi. They fail to achieve the integrated management of the effects of use, development or protection of land and associated natural and physical resources of the District as required by section 31 of the Act;
- xxii. They fail to meet the requirements of section 32 of the Act, in that the proposed policies and rules are not the most appropriate method for achieving the Act's purpose nor are they the most efficient and effective means for achieving the District Plan's objectives;
- xxiii. The Changes will not assist the Council to carry out its statutory functions in order to achieve the purpose of the Act.

**7. The decision I seek from Council is:**

- i. To reject [or place on hold pending a wider District Plan review] the Plan Changes proposed for Plan Changes 64, 65, 67 and 68.
- ii. To properly investigate alternatives including the land to the south, west and southwest or other location on soils of lower value and less versatility which can be affordably and efficiently developed.
- iii. To reject or modify Plan Change 71 to give effect to this submission.
- iv. To support, in part, the plan changes proposed for Plan Changes 66, 69 and 70.
- v. To recognise and promote sustainable solutions to the problem of the shortage of residential land.
- vi. Such other relief as may be required to give effect to this submission, including consequential amendments to objectives, policies and rules of the District Plan that address the matters raised by Foodstuffs and Outer Limits [in their submissions] and reverse sensitivities of other business's and activities likely to be effected by the Plan Changes.



### Development Contributions (DC's)

Development contributions pay for upgrade requirements based on capacity.  
 Eg. As land within the urban areas is developed, capacity supplies across the local network are required.

### Development Contributions (DC's)

DC's are assessed on a household equivalent use (HEU's)  
 Eg. 2 units on one lot (cross street) equals 2 DC's

Category	Amount
• Sewerage	\$1,100
• Stormwater	\$650
• Water	\$1,250
• Community	\$2,800
• Reserves	\$50,130 (22% of total)
• Total	\$25,550

Therefore, they contribute \$11,425 per lot

### Zone Levies (ZL's)

Zone Levies provide for the cost to connect a new area to the existing infrastructure.

These costs can occur within the new zone and adjacent to the new zone.

The levies provide for work within the network that would not be required if development of the adjacent area was not occurring.

Without levies there would be very poor connectivity and inefficient infrastructure.

The costs are calculated on a per hectare basis.

### Multi vs Single land ownership

Council coordinates and manages multi-ownership developments to achieve an efficient and cost effective infrastructure installation to downstream customers to the benefit of the upstream landowner.

Zone levies provide a proportional share of infrastructure costs when land is in multiple ownership.

A = 1 lots - 6% + B = 2 lots - 2% + C = 17 lots - 15% = Total 10% levies to be collected proportionally.

If the land is in single ownership then all of the infrastructure costs are the responsibility of the land owner.

### Area Assessments

The levy amount is directly related to the cost of infrastructure necessary to service an area efficiently.

The levy varies due to the individual requirements for each area.

The levy range for the proposed plan change areas is \$29,603 – \$28,656 per lot.

The average levy for the proposed areas is \$25,991 per lot.

The estimated zone levy for Betty's Road is \$16,893 per lot.

Equivalent costs for Council's proposed plan change on Taylor's Road developments are \$12,773 per lot.

It is noted that the proposed plan change will be a 1:1 ratio of development to 1:1:1 ratio of development.

Total zone levy costs for the plan change areas is \$42.5 M.

### Points of Note -DC Review

February 2013 Discussion Paper - DIA


- DC's are one of a number of ways for TAs to fund the capital cost of infrastructure - others include rates, financial contributions under the RMA, user charges or central government grants and funding assistance.
- DC's and levies have the purpose of recouping some of the capital costs incurred by a TA when building or expanding the capacity of infrastructure that is needed to serve a new development.
- Properly structured DC approaches promote efficient use of infrastructure and fund by reflecting the true cost of developing a particular area due to geographical characteristics - this will affect land value.
- DC's discourage inefficient, poorly integrated and poorly coordinated development by reflecting true costs of "wrong" developments.
- The ideal DC approach requires detailed calculations of existing and future demands on each infrastructure type on a development by development basis, fully considering costs and benefits to multiple parties.

**Discussion**

Proposed areas and exclusions  
 Costs centres for subdivision  
 Development Contributions and  
 Zone Levies  
 Examples

**Background**

- 2009 - South Marlborough Urban Growth Strategy (SMUGS) commenced as part of Growing Marlborough Strategy
- 2010 - Land identified in the East for growth areas E1, E2 and SF
- 2011 - Christchurch earthquakes prompted soil testing
- 2012 - Results identified the land in the east as unsuitable
- 2012 - Revised growth strategy identified areas in the west and north
- 2013 - Geotechnical testing confirmed suitable areas
- 2013 - Growing Marlborough Strategy released
- 2013 - Areas proposed for plan change 6A-7C to be rezoned from rural to residential




**Exclusions - Area N (Na-Nb) and David Street**

- Blue crossed area - Proposed Growth Area
- Red area - Removed due to geotechnical evaluation



**7 Proposed Plan Change Areas - PC 64-71**



**Development Economics**

The land subdivision process consists of a number of elements

- Land costs - determined by purchase price for developed land
- Design fees - Engineers, planners and consultants costs
- Construction costs - Pipes, poles, infrastructure - via tender
- Professional fees - Lawyers, Real Estate, etc
- Council fees -

**Purpose**

The purpose of Development Contributions and Zone Levies is to achieve financial equity between existing ratepayers and developers. They also ensure quality infrastructure with good connectivity is achieved.

Developers pay the proportionate capital expenditure costs of providing network and community infrastructure.

**Definition**

**Development Contributions (DC's)**  
 Designed to recover Council expenditure in providing for growth.

**Financial Contributions - Zone Levies (ZL's)**  
 Cover the costs of work within the zone and the cost of connecting to the wider Council network.

ZL's include an equal life apportionment of costs shared across a multi-developer area.

Submission on Plan Change 64 - 71 (whole lot)  
Blenheim Growth Area One - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan



Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

1. Submitter Details

Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address

Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home

Fax  Mobile

Address for Service

(if different from above)

Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)  Date

2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No


4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:





5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

All.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

Absolute objection to all

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

To not use up good-fertile farmland,  
for any other purpose,  
Would suggest going east, follow-  
ing on Witherlea foot hills,


Continue on a separate sheet if necessary



**Submission on Plan Change 64 -  
Blenheim Growth Area One - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**MARLBOROUGH  
DISTRICT COUNCIL**



**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name	Murray Ian Locke and Carol Margaret Locke		
Organisation (if applicable)			
Contact Person (if applicable)			
Postal Address	44 Old Renwick Road		
	Blenheim		
		Post Code	7020
Email	tony@gilberthaymes.co.nz		
Telephone	Business	Home	
	Fax	Mobile	
Address for Service	Gilbert Haymes & Associates Ltd (Tony Hawke)		
(if different from above)	P O Box 380		
	Blenheim - Attention: A J Hawke		Post Code 7024
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)			Date 30/08/2013

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

**5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:**

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**6. My submission is:** *(state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)*

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**7. The decision I seek from Council is:** *(where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)*

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*



## SUBMISSION

### MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL - PLAN CHANGE 64

The submitter supports Council in the rezoning of land to allow for future Urban Residential Development.

#### **Overview (p4):**

The Overview states that, “Council’s intention is that the rating status of the land within the Plan Change areas will not change until actual development occurs”.

The submitter considers this as an open statement, and wants certainty that the rating status will not change until actual development occurs on their property, therefore, confirmation from Council that it relates to development on individual properties, and not when development starts in a specific Plan Change area.

#### **3.8 Growth Area 5 (Plan Change 68) – page 26:**

Leaving an ‘island’ of Rural 3 zoned land between Old Renwick Road and the newly zoned Residential 2 land will limit the use of the rural land, and possibly threaten its current use which is viticulture.

The submitter requests that this land be zoned ‘Large Lot Residential’, with a minimum allotment area of 3000m<sup>2</sup>, and with a deferred Residential 2 zoning subject to more land stability tests being undertaken. If the land (or parts of) proves suitable for Residential 2 zoning it should be zoned as such.

#### **5.8 Plan Change 71 – Chapter 23 Subdivision and Development:**

Policy 1.8 – “Where indicative roading layouts are shown on the planning maps, the roading network proposed at the time of subdivision development shall be in general accordance with the layout”.

Page 48 weighs up the benefit / costs to implement Policy 1.8 which states, “requires developer to comply with specified layouts which may not be the most economic for individual developers”.

Is compensation to be paid where a developer is not getting the full potential use of a road through their property because of the indicative roading layout?

#### **Appendix 4 – Opus Geotechnical Evaluation:**

Sec 5.5.4- Liquefaction Induced Ground Damage- In this section the author makes comment on lateral spreading in the vicinity of free surfaces such as water courses “Lateral spreading can extend to 200m or more from water courses but typically more severe nearer the river”. It goes on outline the experience from Darfield and Christchurch earthquakes, which “shows the ground damage due to lateral spreading reduces at a distance greater than 130m from a river or stream”.

Figure 3 shows the study areas and the proximity to nearby rivers and streams, with waterway buffer areas set aside at various intervals from those identified features.

The submitters property fronts Casey's Creek and an area 200m north of the creek has been excluded from the residential zone because of potential lateral spreading, without a significant amount of ground testing being undertaken. Further an area of land adjoining Waipuna Street has been included within the residential zone when it is within 200m of the Opawa River. Where is the consistency in Councils reasoning? Why have Council chosen the 200m distance from the creek?

Sec 6.6.2- Liquefaction-Induced Ground Damage, states that the development areas are "underlain by alluvial gravel soils with only thin deposits of loose sand and silt layers overlying the gravels. Liquefaction of these sands and silts can occur in modest earthquake events which are used for design of normal buildings".

An area of land in the northeastern part of Area Na:Nb has been identified as susceptible to liquefaction and lateral spreading, stating "these areas subject to liquefaction and natural spreading can be used for less intensive land uses such as parks and gardens or agriculture. This could be achieved by appropriate zoning of the land through district planning measures".

The submitter considers that the ground testing undertaken in this area is incomplete, and intends to undertake further testing to gain a clearer picture of the land profile, with the aim of identifying land within this area as suitable for residential use. Following the recent earthquakes in Seddon it appears that the soils in this area reacted differently to the Christchurch soil types? Was this a modest earthquake event?

Outcome sought: Additional testing be undertaken in the area shown to have potential for lateral spread so that a more reasoned decision can be made as to an acceptable distance from Casey's Creek where residential development can take place.

## **Appendix 5 – Essential Street Connections:**

In 1.1 Introduction, the proposed road design is based on one firm of planners' ideas, ie Urbanismplus. The rationale behind street designs has evolved over the years, where the initial towns within New Zealand were laid out in a grid pattern, followed by curved streets, and cul-de-sacs, and latterly, curves and cul-de-sacs. Design has now reverted back to more of a grid pattern for various reasons. What design will next be in vogue?

Along with this new thinking, there seems to be a trend to avoid rear allotments where no reason is stated in the assessment. It is interesting to note that Council's subdivision at Forest Park is continuing to be developed with a large number of rear allotments, and it seems rather hypocritical that Council are prepared to put rear allotments in place for their subdivisions, as it allows for a cheaper roading layout, while insisting on private land owners adopting a more expensive roading pattern.

It is also to be noted that new subdivisions within the Auckland area are adopting a mixture of a more intensive roading pattern, road curves and cul-de-sacs, generally to match the topography. Alternative road location options should be left available to developers.

#### **Appendix 6 – Blenheim Urban Growth Division of Infrastructure – Proposed Plan Changes 64-71:**

This section is brief in content, but alludes to the fact that an “accepted services plan” is to be drawn up by Council to establish the infrastructure requirements for the various Plan Change areas.

The submitter is concerned with the lack of content within this section, and that consultation with the land owner may be overlooked in the formulation of this plan. For example, the plan indicates that “roads will vary in width and design, depending on their role for the wider area, rather than what would be built just for a small area on its own”.

Will the land owner that is required to construct a wider road carriageway be compensated for the additional costs to build the larger road?

The submitter also notes that west of his property Council proposes to pipe Casey’s Creek. Their house is situated approximately 5 metres from the bank of Casey’s Creek, and tree, landscaping and beautification of the creek has been undertaken in this locality. In addition, bird life, including tui, is prevalent in this section of the creek. Will all this work be undone with potential upgrading?

The submitter also notes that west of their property Council proposes to pipe Casey’s Creek. This will result in concentrated run-off from roof collection and hardstand areas, directed to this pipeline which will result in a more concentrated surge of water into Casey’s Creek. What effect will this have on the submitters land ?

It is the submitter’s concern that the plans within this Appendix will be adopted without formal consultation with potentially affected land owners, and therefore, we wish for a confirmation from Council stating that these services plans are indicative only, and further consultation with land owners will be undertaken, formulating compensation etc prior to implementing infrastructural changes.

Recommendation: Supply more information within Appendix 6 and put out for further public consultation.



**Mark Caldwell-8225**

---

**From:** Alison Mackenzie [alisonmackenzie@ruralinzone.net]

**Sent:** Saturday, 31 August 2013 7:59 a.m.

**To:** Plan Change Urban Growth

**Subject:** Submission

## **Submission on Proposed Plan Changes Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**

use of good intensive farmland for expanding Blenheim onto and in this case areas delineated as areas 64 to 69. To rezone this residential from rural would be a retrograde step. Blenheim's expansion should be on lesser fertile land. The areas 64 to 69 is highly productive rural land that has shown to be extremely fertile by its past cropping or horticulture.

High quality land needs protection as Marlborough's supply is limited. Given international unrest, likely to escalate, it could well be areas like Marlborough will depend more and more on local production. We have a duty to future generations to protect the best soils from urban sprawl.

Alison Mckenzie,  
Waihopai Doiwns  
R D 6  
Blenheim  
Ph 572 4411



---

To: Marlborough District Council

Submission on: Plan Changes 64-71 to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan – Blenheim Urban Growth Plan Changes

From: Marlborough Province of Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Date: 30 September 2013

Contact: Michael Bennett  
Policy Advisor  
Federated Farmers of New Zealand

PO Box 1992  
Christchurch

P: 03 357 9452  
M: 027 551 1629  
E: [mbennett@fedfarm.org.nz](mailto:mbennett@fedfarm.org.nz)

**Federated Farmers would like to be heard in support of this submission**

## DECISIONS SOUGHT

Note the support of Federated Farmers for the efforts of Marlborough District Council to achieve sustainable urban growth in and around Blenheim.

Note the overall concern of Federated Farmers over the loss of highly productive land to production arising from Proposed Plan Changes 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71.

Note that in case of any doubt, decisions sought in this submission apply to each of Plan Changes 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71 to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan.

Allow some urban development on areas prone to liquefaction to the east or southeast of Blenheim, subject to suitable standards of geotechnical testing, and if necessary, land remediation, and higher standards of construction.

Provide for on-going review of the acceptance framework for land development based on the Royal Commission report and other information that continues to come to be made available following the Christchurch earthquakes.

Recognise that placement and design of subdivision is not the only mechanism to address reverse sensitivity effects and that other options are also available.

To prevent more the values of remaining highly productive land being compromised, include specific mechanisms to manage reverse sensitivity effects, including covenants on sections allocated near land that is intended to remain in primary production.

In making decisions on Plan Changes 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71, have regard to the current and future values of highly productive land to current and future generations, both within and outside Marlborough.

Take a balanced approach to future development and make provision for urban land development on land subject to liquefaction hazard or reverse sensitivity effects, hilly land to the south of Blenheim, as well as land having very high productive value.

Further evaluate alternative options to focussing all future urban development on highly productive land, with a view to a more balanced approach, including:

- Enabling development of land subject to reverse sensitivity effects, supported by mechanisms such as 'non-complaint' covenants;
- Allowing development in eastern areas subject to appropriate soil investigations, land remediation, and standards of construction; or
- Allowing urban development on the lower parts of the foothills to the south of Blenheim with appropriate protections for rural amenity values

Make appropriate consequential amendments in giving effect to our submissions.



**SUBMISSION TO MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL ON  
PLAN CHANGES 64-71**

**1. GENERAL SUBMISSIONS**

- 1.1. Federated Farmers appreciates the opportunity to submit on Plan Changes 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71 to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan (The Plan Changes).
- 1.2. Federated Farmers supports the proactive approach being taken by Marlborough District Council to address anticipated problems with affordable housing by ensuring supply of land for urban development. We support in particular the proposition that there is limited time to address imminent problems with land supply and housing affordability in Blenheim.
- 1.3. Federated Farmers is also aware that Marlborough District Council faces many challenges in allocating land to enable further urban growth, including liquefaction and other natural hazards, reverse sensitivity effects, impact on utility and transport networks, and loss of highly productive land.
- 1.4. Despite our support, Federated Farmers is concerned that loss of highly productive land appears to have taken a lesser priority or weight to factors such as adverse effects of liquefaction hazard or reverse sensitivity effects, with the apparent result that the area proposed to be rezoned for urban development is entirely on highly productive land, some of which is recognised as the most fertile and productive land on the Wairau Plains.

**Decisions sought**

- 1.5. Note the support of Federated Farmers for the efforts of Marlborough District Council to achieve sustainable urban growth in and around Blenheim.
- 1.6. Note the overall concern of Federated Farmers over the loss of highly productive land to production arising from Proposed Plan Changes 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71.
- 1.7. Note that in case of any doubt, decisions sought in this submission apply to each of Plan Changes 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71 to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan.
- 1.8. Make appropriate consequential amendments in giving effect to our submission.

**2. LIQUIFACTION AND OTHER EARTHQUAKE DAMAGE**

- 2.1. The planners report notes at page 5 that *(as a consequence of an initial report) growth areas on the east of Blenheim were removed from the growth strategy due to the significant risk and likelihood of liquefaction in the event of an earthquake.* While a considered response to liquefaction hazard is appropriate, a balanced approach must be undertaken. The decision to exclude all areas east of Blenheim from future development does not appear to have been subject to the level of investigation that

underpinned the land classifications, which included five levels of risk with permanent exclusion of urban development only required in the most extreme cases. The Christchurch experience is that, while liquefaction is a risk in many places, it is unlikely that the risk of land damage will be so severe as to make development into housing unrealistic or impractical except in extreme cases.

- 2.2. Information included with the Plan Changes<sup>1</sup> indicates that while the undeveloped land to the eastern area of Blenheim is relatively lower lying, with ground characteristics that result some risk, ground conditions and likelihood of severe ground damage are highly variable across the subject area.
- 2.3. Furthermore the information included with the Plan Changes indicates that development within 'Area SE':  
*will be more costly because of high groundwater levels and the presence of liquefaction prone soils at shallow depth and the need to mitigate the effects of liquefaction and safeguard against subsidence and foundation failure*
- 2.4. For example extensive areas of Christchurch are classified as TC3, and very likely to be subject to liquefaction in a significant ground shaking event. Other areas are identified as high risk, but are able to be built on following extensive remediation, as has occurred in Pegasus Town for example.
- 2.5. Overall, the evidence presented does not support the proposition that the areas to the east of Blenheim are entirely unsuitable for urban development and that there is no choice but to expand onto areas of highly productive land to the west of town.

### **Decision Sought**

- 2.6. Allow some urban development on areas prone to liquefaction to the east or southeast of Blenheim, subject to suitable standards of geotechnical testing, and if necessary, land remediation, and higher standards of construction.
- 2.7. Provide for on-going review of the acceptance framework for land development based on the Royal Commission report and other information that continues to come to be made available following the Christchurch earthquakes.

### **3. REVERSE SENSITIVITY EFFECTS**

- 3.1. Federated Farmers acknowledges that reverse sensitivity effects are an important factor in the allocation of land for urban use. For example when the ability of farmers to carry out primary production activities is limited by the sensitivities of neighbours to spray, or to generate noise or odour. Reverse sensitivity effects can result in reduced productive capacity or versatility and further encroachment of subdivision on production land.
- 3.2. While the location of proposed areas for urban development appears to be designed in part to minimise problems with reverse sensitivity effects, placement of new urban areas will not prevent all reverse sensitivity effects and other options should also be

---

<sup>1</sup> Appendix 2 – Blenheim Urban Growth Study: Geological Evaluation at page 14

considered, including 'non nuisance complaint' covenants for new residential subdivision near areas used for primary production activities, including future activities.

- 3.3. An excessive focus on preventing reverse sensitivity effects can also distort decision making and direct land development to areas that are less appropriate for urban development. This appears to have happened with potential reverse sensitivity effects on Omaka Aerodrome where urban development has been excluded from an area for the benefit of the users of this facility (who are few), regardless of the advantages of using this location, or overall appropriateness in terms of the purpose of sustainable management.

#### **Decision Sought**

- 3.4. Recognise that placement and design of subdivision is not the only mechanism to address reverse sensitivity effects and that other options are also available.
- 3.5. To prevent more the values of remaining highly productive land being compromised, include specific mechanisms to manage reverse sensitivity effects, including covenants on sections allocated near land that is intended to remain in primary production.

#### **4. LOSS OF HIGHLY PRODUCTIVE LAND**

- 4.1. The reports and appendices that accompany the plan changes show that the majority of land proposed to be rezoned for urban residential use is highly productive land that has supported cropping or horticulture in the past, and will be able to support high intensity food production in the future.

- 4.2. This information accords with anecdotal evidence from local farmers that the subject land is some of the most fertile and productive land on the Wairau Plains.

- 4.3. Recent studies<sup>2</sup> indicate that:

*29% of the 25,000 hectares of new urban areas developed between 1990 and 2008 occurred on high class land. In Hawke's Bay and Marlborough a high proportion of urbanisation has occurred on high-class land (49% and 50% respectively). High quality land is defined as land capable of being used intensively to produce a wide variety of crops, including arable crops.*

Federated Farmers accords with the view that high quality land deserves protection because it is limited in supply and underpins the welfare of future generations. Protecting high value land for the benefit of future generations also extends to people not living in New Zealand. Structural shifts in the prices of grains and dairy products, and civil disorder in some countries indicate that food shortages and consequent lack of affordable food is already an issue. Severe shortages of food are predicted to occur internationally, with widespread hardship and social disruption virtually inevitable in many countries.

---

2





4.4 In light of the worldwide shortage of food and consequent importance of highly productive land to the future of people both in Marlborough and elsewhere, Federated Farmers is of the view that the Plan Changes and the approach taken, with all future urban development is directed on to highly productive Class 1 and 2 land, does not achieve the purpose of sustainable management embodied in section 5 of the RMA.

### **Decision Sought**

4.5 In making decisions on Plan Changes 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71, have regard to the current and future values of highly productive land to current and future generations, both within and outside Marlborough.

4.6 Take a balanced approach to future development and make provision for urban land development on land subject to liquefaction hazard or reverse sensitivity effects, hilly land to the south of Blenheim, as well as land having very high productive value.

4.7 Further evaluate alternative options to focussing all future urban development on highly productive land, with a view to a more balanced approach. Options include:

- Enabling development of land subject to reverse sensitivity effects, supported by mechanisms such as 'non-complaint' covenants;
- Allowing development in eastern areas subject to appropriate soil investigations, land remediation, and standards of construction; or
- Allowing urban development on the lower parts of the foothills to the south of Blenheim with appropriate protections for rural amenity values.

## **5 ABOUT FEDERATED FARMERS**

5.4 The Marlborough Province of Federated Farmers welcomes the opportunity to submit on Plan Changes 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, and 71 to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan.

5.5 Federated Farmers of New Zealand is a primary sector organisation that represents farming and other rural businesses. Federated Farmers has a long and proud history of representing the needs and interests of New Zealand farmers.

5.6 The Federation aims to add value to its members' farming business. Our key strategic outcomes include the need for New Zealand to provide an economic and social environment within which:

5.6.1 Our members may operate their business in a fair and flexible commercial environment;

5.6.2 Our members' families and their staff have access to services essential to the needs of the rural community; and

5.6.3 Our members adopt responsible management and environmental practices.

5.7 This submission was developed in consultation with the members of Federated Farmers. It is important that this submission is not viewed as a single submission, but as a collective one, that represents the opinions and views of our members.

5.8 Federated Farmers acknowledges submissions from individual members of Federated Farmers.

Gary Barnett  
Provincial President  
Marlborough Province  
Federated Farmers of New Zealand

Submission on Plan Change 64 - 71  
Blenheim Growth Area One - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan



Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

1. Submitter Details

Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address   
  
 Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home   
Fax  Mobile

Address for Service   
(if different from above)   
 Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)  Date

2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No


4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:





5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

*See attached*

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

*See attached*

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

*See attached.*

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

Plan Changes 64 to 71

**5. The Specific parts of the proposed plan changes the submission relates to are as follows:**

The proposal to rezone the areas identified as Urban Residential 2 in PC 64 to PC 70 and the new provisions relating to subsoil investigations proposed in Plan Change 71.

**6. My submission is:**

We oppose plan changes 64, 65, 67 and 68 on the grounds that it is premature to be expanding the town onto these areas due to the following:

- It is land of exceptionally high versatility for the production of food.
- The area is more costly to bring into residential subdivision than potential other areas to the west, north west, south west and south of Blenheim
- The area has, in many parts, a high water table and can be affected by flooding.
- In the **Blenheim Urban Growth Study Report: Geotechnical Evaluation** the Opus Interpretive Report states on page 1.

*From a sustainability perspective, it would not be prudent to encourage development on land which will require considerable cost and consume substantially more resources compared to development in land which is more stable in earthquakes and other hazards. **This is on the basis that it would be more sustainable to develop areas to a lower level of hazard, such as the alluvial gravel plains west of Blenheim.** (My emphasis)*

- We submit that Council should not go to these plan change areas under these circumstances as first choices.

We oppose plan change 71 as we consider that any area to be re zoned should have been assessed prior to, not post rezoning in respect to suitability for foundations. The testing proposed will carry with it substantial costs. Appendix L covers the entire plan change area proposed.

If foundation variability is ascertained then this will also have an effect on the provision of services, in particular in areas with a high water table.

We support in part plan changes 66, 69 and 70.

We are aware that Council is fast running out of time but not land options.

If the areas above are suitable from a geotechnical view point then the above plan change areas should be considered due to their proximity to the existing town and services.

It is regrettable that changing this land use to residential use will swallow up land of high versatility. This should, however, be mitigated by Council considering land for rezoning to the west, southwest and south of Blenheim which is, significantly, of lower versatility rather than the highly versatile land to the north. This would also give the buying public choices between the lower lying areas of the northwest and the higher lands to the west, southwest and south of Blenheim.

The parts of plan Changes 66, 69 and 70 that we are opposed to are areas within these plan change zones where reverse sensitivities will clearly occur from existing businesses.

These areas need carefully planning and zone modification in buffering areas. We do not see this being addressed nor quantified in the proposed plan changes.

In the event that both the northwest and north plan change zones are approved then consideration will be needed for additional schooling capacity and possibly a new school.

**7.The decision I seek from Council is:**

That plan changes 64, 65, 67 and 68 be rejected in total.

That plan change 71 be rejected in total or alternatively modifications be made to the plan change that will ensure that infrastructure to service the zones is not installed until a full and satisfactory engineering report is undertaken that conclusively proves the zone is suited to development. Such report to cover off the general foundation requirements of the plan change zone.

That plan changes 66, 69 and 70 be accepted in part and that consideration of effects of reverse sensitivity be given to those areas within the above plan change areas from existing or planned businesses.

*J. H. Mann*  
*30<sup>th</sup> August 2013.*



## Mark Caldwell-8225

---

**From:** ralph.mason@farmside.co.nz  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 August 2013 1:46 p.m.  
**To:** Plan Change Urban Growth  
**Subject:** Submission to Plan Changes of Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan

**Importance:** High

Submission to Plan Changes of Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan re Blenheim Urban Growth

I oppose the proposal to expand Blenheim to the north and west of its present boundaries using highly fertile productive soils as shown on areas 64 to 69 .

The proposal is not in line with good town planning principles.

The Wairau Plains are limited in fertile soils thereby making alluvial loam in the areas 64 to 69 to be especially valuable. Marlborough's productive land needs to be safeguarded for present and future production.

There are other far better options that will not use the most fertile soils. That is to the south and west of Blenheim.

Signed

Ralph Mason  
840 Avondale Road,  
Waihopai Valley RD6,  
Blenheim 7276  
ralph.mason@farmside.co.nz

Submission on Plan Changes 64 to 71  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan



Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

1. Submitter Details

Full Name	Kevin & Lynda Morgan		
Organisation (if applicable)	N/A		
Contact Person (if applicable)	Murray Hunt		
Postal Address	C/- Hardy-Jones Clark		
	PO Box 646		
	Blenheim	Post Code	
Email	murray@hjc.co.nz		
Telephone	Business 5785339	Home	
	Fax	Mobile	
Address for Service	as above		
(if different from above)			
		Post Code	
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)			Date 30.8.2013

*Submitter and duly authorised agent.*

2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496  
Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

**Kevin & Lynda Morgan**  
**Submission on Plan Changes 64 -71 continued**

**5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:**

This submission relates to each of Plan Changes 64 to 71 inclusive but notes that a separate submission has been made for Plan Change 70 which has some unique aspects.

The submission relates to the whole of the Plan Changes.

**6. My submission is:**

Infrastructure and Risk

The planned infrastructure in particular roading has not been the subject of adequate consultation and the changes and development are dependent on the infrastructure. This should be resolved. For example indicative roading as shown on land that is not part of the change and to the extent it involves an area we own adjacent to Waipuna Street. We do not agree with roading in that location.

Reverse Sensitivity

The loss of highly productive land is a significant resource management issue to this Region and also a key "assessment principle" clearly downplayed.

With regard to the impacts of reverse sensitivity, the AEE submitted simply repeats the following for each of the separate urban growth / Plan Change areas:

We are landowners on Old Renwick Road. Our block is utilised for farming and viticulture. The lack of specific measures to deal with reverse sensitivity is a major shortcoming of the Plan Changes.

A combination of setbacks, buffers, reduced density of dwellings or other methods including in the new zones is necessary to preserve existing rights of rural users to continue to farm on adjoining and nearby land. The hazard identification process and the requirement to establish infrastructure as provided for in the indicative plan is not an appropriate or efficient method for ensuring that development proceeds in an ordered, efficient or sustainable way.



In the event that residential development does incrementally expand into Areas 1-7, there will be new residential dwellings constructed in areas or adjoining areas that are currently used for productive purposes or could be used productively in future. As a result, rural properties/activities currently setback well away from the Residential Zone will find themselves a lot closer. Given the presence of Class 1 and 2 soils to the west and north of existing urban boundaries, the actual impacts from reverse sensitivity are likely to be more significant than that assessed in the Plan Change. There is a real risk of incremental creep.

**7. The decision I seek from Council is:**


- (i) Reject the Plan Changes; or
- (ii) Defer the rezoning until the infrastructure and hazards issues are resolved so that there can be confidence the land will be able to be used for efficiently and effectively for residential development; or
- (iii) Utilise the status of deferred rezoning as a technique to ensure the orderly and efficient development of the areas in the Plan Changes; or
- (iv) Identify and provide for the methods to be adopted to minimise or eliminate the risk of reverse sensitivity with adjoining rural land and rural activities.
- (v) Identify and provide the methods for avoiding incremental creep of residential activity onto adjoining land by way of better defined boundaries areas of lower density at the urban/rural interface or similar.
- (vi) Such other relief as may be required to give effect to this submission, including consequential amendments to objectives, policies and rules of the District Plan.

**Submission on Plan Change 71 -  
Blenheim Growth Area Plan Provisions  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**



**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name	Vicki Nalder			
Organisation (if applicable)	New Zealand Institute of Surveyors			
Contact Person (if applicable)	Vicki Nalder			
Postal Address	PO Box 186			
	Blenheim			
		Post Code	7 2 4 0	
Email	vicki.nalder@aurecongroup.com			
Telephone	Business	5206068	Home	
	Fax	5789983	Mobile	
Address for Service				
(if different from above)				
		Post Code		
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)			Date	30/08/13

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

**5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:**

See attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**6. My submission is:** *(state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)*

See attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**7. The decision I seek from Council is:** *(where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)*

See Attached

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*



## **Submission on Plan Change 64-71 by the NZIS Nelson Marlborough Branch**

The NZIS support the Council in the rezoning of land to allow for future Urban Residential Development. Land availability for urban development has diminished markedly over the last 6 years. Private Plan Changes have not been encouraged by Council in the past, and generally they are an expensive and time consuming exercise with no certainty in outcome.

Therefore the implementation of Council initiated Plan Changes for opening up areas for future urban development is a positive initiative and well overdue.

### **Plan Change 64-70**

The concerns that NZIS have are in relation to:

- Staging
- Servicing
- Costs

Under Section 3.2 there are broad statements on sequencing for the areas based on the cost effectiveness for the servicing. As stated by Council there are no Stormwater, water or sewage services in these areas at all.

Appendix 6 shows the extent of the upgrades required before any one stage can be developed. What will triggers the upgrades required for all services? and who pays initially if one of the five owners say in Area One wants to develop and the others don't?

It would be beneficial to see the "Accepted Services Plan" now because that will have implications on individual land owners. On whose property will the proposed retention ponds be? Which properties will need to feed into them? How are the land owners compensated if they have the pond on their land for the benefit of others?

Will Council coordinate all the servicing and be "banker" as suggested. How far does this roll go? The proposal to address all the servicing issues as a whole is to be commended and realistically is the only way forward. However looking at the very basic information and plans in Appendix 6 it stands out that "lots of developers money" will need to be found before we ever see a section sold.

### **Recommendation:**

The workability and Practicality of the "Accepted Services layout Plan" needs to be considered from a Commercial aspect, and be viable to the Public for comment as part of this process. There need to be some costs available (Future development and Zone levy costs) to ensure that the Plan Change has not priced itself out of the Blenheim market before it begins.

It is not good enough to say the "market" will decide if the break even point is \$250,000 for a new section.

### **Plan Change 68**

We are concerned about creating an island of Rural 3 land surrounded by residential land. This small pocket of land will be severely restricted as to the activities that can be carried out on it with a huge potential for reverse sensitivity issues.

**Recommendation:**

Either,

- large lot residential rather than rural zone for that island of rural land, or
- deferred residential status for that island of rural land, or
- exclude plan change 68 area from the consideration.

**Plan Change 71**29.1.4.2 Subsoil Investigations

The Geotech report that has been carried out to date by Opus provides an indication only of the soils in the area. It is by no means definitive, and there may well be variances over the extent of the proposed Plan Change areas. What is found on site may also govern locations of future services, roads and housing platforms.

The Resource Management Plan is not the place to include specific Geotech requirements. The reason is that as seen in Christchurch the testing regimes required alter monthly. The RM Plan can only be changed by a formal Plan Change and this can take years. Currently Christchurch refers to MBIE for Geotech requirements, and these can be updated relatively easily.

It is unclear whether Council deems there needs to be no assessment of future liquefaction or lateral spreading over all the Plan Change areas. Does this mean that Council accepts the Opus report (2011-2013) and are satisfied that there is no the risk. All that has to be dealt with is bearing capacity?

**Recommendation:**

Remove 29.1.4.2 reference to Testing and bearing capacity from the Resource Management Plan.

Roading Layouts

Whilst we agree that there need to be an overall strategy for the roading layout, we would hope that Council will exercise some discretion in the final locations.

The reason being that because of the number of small landowners within the Proposed Plan Change areas, more practical or suitable alternatives may be required.

**Recommendation**

Ensure that Council officers are willing to apply some discretion for the location of the roading layout based on practicality and serviceability.

We wished to be heard in relation to this submission

**Contact:**

Chairman of Nelson Marlborough Branch of NZIS

Vicki Nalder

[Vicki.nalder@arecongroup.com](mailto:Vicki.nalder@arecongroup.com)

03 520 6068

Pursuant to Clause 6 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act 1991

**Submissions on Proposed District Plan Changes 64-71 to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**

**To:** Environmental Policy Division  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
**BLenheim 7240**

**From:** NZ Transport Agency  
PO Box 5084  
Lambton Quay  
**WELLINGTON 6145**

---

1. **The NZ Transport Agency (the Transport Agency) supports in part proposed plan changes 64 - 71 to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan.**

2. **The specific provisions of the plan change requests that the Transport Agency's submission relates to are as follows:**

The proposed plan changes in their entirety.

3. **The Transport Agency could not gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission.**

4. **The reasons for making this submission are:**

**The Transport Agency's statutory responsibility**

The Transport Agency is a Crown entity providing an integrated approach to transport planning, investment and delivery. The NZTA's statutory objective is to carry out its functions in a way which contribute to "an effective, efficient, and safe land transport system in the public interest."

When undertaking its functions the Transport Agency must give effect to the Government Policy Statement on Land Transport Funding (GPS) which directs the Transport Agency to seek the integration of land use planning, transport planning and infrastructure investment.

In particular the Transport Agency must promote the safe, effective and efficient function of the land transport system and seek to ensure that the land transport system is not adversely affected by land use development. The Transport Agency is also an investor in the Marlborough local road network and has an interest in ensuring that its investment in the local transport network (including State highway projects) is not compromised by existing and future land use development.

5. **Integrated Planning**

Integrated planning is essential to the Transport Agency in fulfilling its purpose under the Land Transport Management Act 2003 (LTMA) as it enables it, in partnership with others, to provide greater certainty for infrastructure planning and investment. The Transport Agency does this because integrated planning leads to

better management of environmental and social impacts and to improved transport efficiencies.

## **6. General Comments**

In 2010 the Transport Agency provided feedback to Council on the proposed Urban Growth Strategy noting that Old Renwick Road should be the northern limit for urban growth and that it did not support urban growth north of this road.

Since the Canterbury earthquakes in 2010 and 2011 the Transport Agency understands that the Council has undertaken further ground testing and has found that the land to the north of Blenheim Township is the most suitable for urban growth with regard to ground conditions.

## **7. State Highway 6**

The Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) prepared by GHD recommends that a number of intersection improvements are required along the State Highway 6 (SH6) corridor to accommodate the proposed urban growth in northern Blenheim. This does cause some concern for the Transport Agency for two primary reasons; firstly they could compromise the through function of SH6 and secondly there is no justification as to why these improvements are needed.

SH 6 is classified as a Regional Strategic State Highway which are highways that contribute to the social and economic well being of a region and connect regionally significant ports or airports. They are also major connectors between regions.

The ITA recommends a number of significant intersection improvements along SH6 which may compromise the through function of the State highway. The Transport Agency would prefer to see network optimisation take place rather than adding additional capacity to the network. The Transport Agency considers that the network could accommodate the proposed urban growth without any significant improvements to the roading network.

The Transport Agency requests that further information be provided by Council to justify the need for these recommended roading improvements. The Transport Agency would like to review this information once it has been provided.

Once this information has been reviewed then there may be a need to develop monitoring and/or sequencing triggers. One way of doing this is through the provision of staging rules within the subdivision chapter of the District Plan which links the rate of development with any roading improvements.

Please be aware that if Council determines that any improvements are required to accommodate the proposed urban growth, then a funding plan will need to be developed which details how the costs of any improvements will be met. The Council should note that there is no guarantee of funding from the Transport Agency and that the Transport Agency expects that those who generate the need for roading improvements should contribute towards their costs.



## **8. Financial/Development Contributions**

Given the number of proposed roading improvements and new local roads to service growth in this area then Council should ensure that developers are required to pay their fair share towards the infrastructure.

## **9. Limited Access Road**

Plan Change 69 which is the land adjacent to the Westwood development shows an indicative road layout (essential connection) to SH6 and an indicative road which runs adjacent to the highway. SH6 is a Limited Access Road (LAR) as declared under Section 88 of the Government Roothing Powers Act 1989. The purpose of LAR is to stop numerous accesses being created alongside roads which are subject to considerable development pressure. Unless there are considerable overall benefits to the land transport network then the Transport Agency would not support any additional at grade connections to SH6.

The Transport Agency request that the indicative local road running parallel to State highway 6 be deleted due to the potential adverse effects from light glare.

## **10 Decision Sought**

If Council are of a mind to approve these proposed plan changes then the Transport Agency seeks the following relief:

- Network optimisation take place ahead of any proposed roading improvements where applicable;
- The Council provide further information to justify the need for the recommended roading improvements along the SH6
- The Council delete the indicative road which runs adjacent to SH6;
- The Council remove the indicative roading connection to SH6; and
- Any other means to address matters raised by the Transport Agency in their submission.

**12. The NZTA does wish to be heard in support of this submission.**

Dated at Wellington this 30<sup>th</sup> day of August 2013.



**Kristin Aitken**

Principal Planning Advisor, Planning and Investment, Central

Address for service: Teresa Minogue  
Planning Advisor  
NZ Transport Agency  
PO Box 5084  
Lambton Quay  
**WELLINGTON**

Telephone Number: (04) 894 5240  
E-mail: [teresa.minogue@nzta.govt.nz](mailto:teresa.minogue@nzta.govt.nz)

**From:** Tony Orman <boto@slingshot.co.nz>  
**Sent:** Friday, 30 August 2013 12:43 p.m.  
**To:** Plan Change Urban Growth  
**Subject:** Submission

## **Submission on Plan Changes to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan – Blenheim Urban Growth Plan**

**I wish to oppose the use of highly fertile soils and productive land for Blenheim's future urban development being areas 64 to 69 (inclusive) to the north and west of Blenheim's current boundaries.**

**The proposals are against the fundamental principles of sound town planning.**

**In addition the use of the flat land requires pumping stations thus adding to the cost of creating housing.**

**The Wairau Plains are not large in area and Marlborough needs to make full production use of the fertile soils for food production for commercial production and export crops and in the future to give Marlborough some degree of self sufficiency given that civil and international disorder could result in food shortages.**

**Blenheim has other options for expansion.**

**The far more preferable alternative is to expand Blenheim to the south west and south where the soils are less fertile and contours give gradients for sewage and storm water infra-structure.**

**I find it incredible that the Marlborough District Council have paid ratepayers' money to Auckland-based consultants for such flawed advice.**

**Tony Orman, MNZIS**

*Tony Orman  
P O Box 939  
Blenheim, 7240  
New Zealand*

Ph 03-5777875

---

---

**SUBMISSION: PLAN CHANGE 68 - URBAN GROWTH AREA**

---

---

**TO:** MARLBOROUGH DISTRICT COUNCIL  
**FROM:** KATHERINE JULIE SAVILLE-SMITH  
**SUBJECT:** PLAN CHANGE 68 - URBAN GROWTH AREA  
**DATE:** 30/08/2013

This part of my submission relates to:

The proposed plan change is to amend the Wairau/Awatare Resource Management Plan by rezoning the area from Rural 3 to Urban Residential 2 to facilitate the residential development of the site. An indicative road layout is provided for the zoned land. This area is located north of Old Renwick Road to the west of Waipuna Street – 20.5 hectares.

I oppose this part of the plan change in full.

My reasons for opposing this part of the plan change are:

- The negative environmental impacts associated with urban sprawl including:
  - irreparable compromise of ground and surface water
  - reduction of habitat
  - degradation of air and soil
  - degradation of visual amenity and landscape
  - increased risk and costs to manage the impacts of stormwater, river management, water supply and sewerage systems.
- Accumulated affects associated with furthering Blenheim's existing urban sprawl and land use inefficiency particularly because this proposal is simultaneous with similar plan change proposals (Plan changes 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71) which together constitute well over 170 hectares of urban land.
- Land degradation associated with rezoned land which is not utilised immediately for use under the new zone.


The data on population growth patterns in Marlborough and Blenheim and the particular nature of its economy do not justify the extraordinary expansion of the urban land proposed in Plan Changes 64-70. It will not reduce residential land prices and will increase travel distances and costs as well as the costs of ratepayer funded infrastructure through the attenuation of sewerage, water supply and local roads. There is no evidence or mechanisms proposed that will promote either environmentally sustainable housing or affordable housing.

The decision I seek from the Council is rejection of proposals Plan Changes 64-70 and, as a consequence, Plan Change 71.

I wish to speak to my submission at any hearing. My contact details are:

- PO Box 26 Spring Creek 035702044 or 0274303575
- [kay@cresa.co.nz](mailto:kay@cresa.co.nz)





**Submission on Plan Change 68 -  
Blenheim Growth Area Five - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan**

**Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013**

**1. Submitter Details**

Full Name

Organisation (if applicable)

Contact Person (if applicable)

Postal Address   
  
 Post Code

Email

Telephone Business  Home   
 Fax  Mobile

Address for Service   
 (if different from above)   
 Post Code

Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)  Date

**2. Trade Competition**

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

**3. Council Hearing**

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

**4. Return Submission to:**

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496

Email: [urangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz](mailto:urangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz)

For Office Use  
Submission No:

5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:

The impact of the proposed plan change has on our property, 28 Old Renwick Road, which is immediately north of the change 68 area.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

6. My submission is: (state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)

1 I oppose, in part, The loss of very fertile and productive land  
2 If the plan proceeds, it needs better attention to impacts on adjacent rural properties, such as ours.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

7. The decision I seek from Council is: (where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)

Assuming the plan change goes ahead I seek some transition planning on the northern side, from suburban to rural. This was included in an earlier draft plan, but does not appear in the new plan.

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Submission on Plan Change 64 - 70  
Blenheim Growth Area One - Rezoning  
to the Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan



Submissions close 5.00 pm 30 August 2013

1. Submitter Details

Full Name	David Wilson		
Organisation (if applicable)			
Contact Person (if applicable)			
Postal Address	PO Box 380		
	Blenheim	Post Code	7 2 4 0
Email	wilsondp1@gmail.com		
Telephone Business	022 169 3569	Home	
Fax		Mobile	021 823 314
Address for Service			
(if different from above)			
		Post Code	
Signature (of submitter or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)		Date	29/08/2013

2. Trade Competition

Could you gain an advantage in trade competition in making this submission?  Yes  No

If you answered yes, please note that there are restrictions on your ability to make a submission. Refer to Clause 6(4) of the First schedule of the RMA for further information.

3. Council Hearing

Do you wish to be heard in support of your submission?  Yes  No

If you answered 'Yes to being heard, would you be prepared to consider presenting a joint case with others who have made a similar submission?  Yes  No

4. Return Submission to:

Attention Planning Technician  
Marlborough District Council  
PO Box 443  
Blenheim 7240

Fax: 520 7496 Email:  
urbangrowth@marlborough.govt.nz

For Office Use  
Submission No:

**5. The specific parts of the proposed plan change the submission relates to are as follows:**

See attached submission letter

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**6. My submission is:** *(state the nature of your submission whether you support or oppose (in full or in part) specific provisions)*

See attached submission letter

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*

**7. The decision I seek from Council is:** *(where amendments are sought, provide details of what changes you would like to see)*

That plan change process in placed on hold until "Accepted Services Plan" is finalised.

*Continue on a separate sheet if necessary*



## Submission on Plan Change 64-71 by David Wilson

I support the Council in re-zoning of land for future Urban Residential Development. It will provide certainty for co-ordinated future development of Blenheim without ad-hoc development through private plan change.

### Plan Change 64-70

The concerns I have relate to lack of detail within the plan change documents regarding the mitigation of the effects of urban development on stormwater quality and quantity.

It is well documented that urban development can have detrimental impacts downstream due to increasing the quantity of stormwater runoff in addition to conveying contaminants downstream to sensitive receiving systems.

The plan change document states that:

*“Required upgrading of infrastructure (including preparation of a detailed Accepted Services plan by Council), funding mechanisms, and the sequence of development is set out in more detail in the Council Report “Blenheim Urban Growth Provision of Infrastructure Proposed Plan Changes 64-71” attached as Appendix 6 and in Sections 3.4-3.10 of this plan change document.”*

Regarding stormwater quantity a common phrase used in Sections 3.4-3.10 of the Plan Change Document is *“The “Accepted Services” plan will provide Retention Pond positions and detail.”* Appendix 6 states that *“Work to date has established initial infrastructure concept plans which can now be subject to more detailed survey and engineering design to finalise an “Accepted Services Plan”.”* From this statement Council acknowledges that it has not finalised the “Accepted Services Plan” yet is relying on it in the plan change document.

The lack of background studies and lack of regard for the possible complexities involved is highlighted by the statement in Appendix 6 that *“Hydraulic modelling has been extensively used to ensure future sewer and water upgrades are identified and levels of service and funding requirements can be met.”*

Without understanding the sensitivity of the receiving systems to changes in stormwater quality and quantity the performance requirements of mitigation measures cannot be established. Therefore the design and thus costing and viability of these measures cannot be estimated.

Appendix 6 refers to the use of retention ponds, but has not stated why these treatment systems have been chosen or whether or not there has been any assessment of whether or not these would work. From my experience I would expect that the following information would need to be assessed prior to estimating pond sizes include;

1. Performance criteria (quality or quantity or both)
2. Downstream water levels
3. Ground water levels

Basically I consider that insufficient work has been undertaken to assess stormwater mitigations measures including sensitivity of receiving systems, performance requirements of mitigation measures, costs (including land area required).

**Recommendation**

The stormwater aspects of the "Accepted Services Plan" needs to developed in more detail , "finalised", to ensure that stormwater servicing level of proposed Plan Change is assessed with sufficient detail to have confidence that appropriate performance levels can be obtained. The "Accepted Services Plan" should at least meet the level of details expected of Council from a Private Plan Change.

Plan Changes should be placed on hold until "Accepted Services Plan" has been finalised

A handwritten signature in blue ink, consisting of a stylized 'D' followed by a long horizontal line that ends in a small upward tick.

David Wilson

CPEng MIPENZ (Civil and Environmental)