

Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan

Plan Change 69 – Urban Growth Area Six

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

November 2013

Submission Summary - Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan - Plan Change 69 - Urban Growth Area 6 - By Name

Gary John Barnett - Submitter #: 1

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Objects to the Plan Change.

Does not think the Plan Change addresses the issue of affordable housing.

Concerned about the loss of fertile land for food production.

Considers the Plan Change needless for such a large area.

Concerned the Plan Change will create reverse sensitivity issue for existing and future rural users.

Relief sought: Wants Marlborough District Council to actively encourage development of multi-storey apartment type housing (3-4 levels only).

Marlborough District Council should withdraw the Plan Change and concentrate new subdivision to Renwick where stoney land is available with ample space for recreation.

Roger William Beardsworth - Submitter #: 2

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: No development should be allowed on high quality soils.

Relief sought: Reject the Plan Change.

Jill Bunting - Submitter #: 3

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Supports the Plan Change.

The Plan Change will zone the land to what it is already being used for - residential development.

Relief sought: That the Plan Change be accepted.

Alistair Murdoch Campbell - Submitter #: 4

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Opposed in full as the Marlborough District cannot afford to have highly productive areas urbanised.

Old Renwick Road provides excellent boundary between urban and rural activities.

Relief sought: That Blenheim be developed on the poorer soils to the south of its present boundaries.

Maurice Douglas Cresswell - Submitter #: 5

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Does not support the Plan Change due to the use of productive horticultural land for housing.

Does not wish to be "rated off" their property.

Relief sought: None specified but assumed that they seek the proposed Plan Change to be rejected.

Delux Properties Limited (Greg Smith) - Submitter #: 6

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Fully supports the re-zoning of land for future residential growth.

It is important to have land available and zoned for residential development ten years in advance of demand. This will ensure that a lid is kept on the cost of this land for the potential consumer.

There is a shortage of quality sections in areas other than Taylor Pass Road. The building sector will suffer while waiting for new development to proceed.

Developing on fertile land means people are able to grow gardens and vegetable, contributing to tranquillity and self-sufficiency.

It is important that smaller intimate areas with cul-de-sacs are also developed, as well as main grid roading systems.

Consultation with property owners is required to make sure existing privately owned stormwater ditches are best utilised for the likes of road reserves/berms and are carefully planned, and also so that existing right of ways do not become obsolete.

Relief sought: A speedy process so that the building sector does not suffer from a lack of available sections to build on.

Would like the opportunity to discuss infrastructure issues before any final roading plans are prepared.

Alasdair Drew - Submitter #: 7

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Disagree with proposal to grow Blenheim to the north and west (Areas 64 to 69) as it will be over fertile productive land.

Growth should be to the south west on poorer soils.

Relief sought: Blenheim's expansion should be to the south west on poorer soils.

Foodstuffs (South Island) Properties Limited (Jen Crawford/Alex Roberts) - Submitter #: 8

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: The submitter owns the Pak'n'Save food warehouse at 1 Westwood Avenue, Springlands, Blenheim, located within the Westwood retail area, and is directly adjacent to the Plan

Change 69 area (along its western boundary).

The store operates 7am-10pm, seven days a week, and the loading and servicing area is located close to the property boundary closest to the proposed residential area.

The submission relates to the Plan Change in its entirety.

The Plan Change ignores existing activities on land adjacent to the proposed residential development (including in particular the operation of a Pak'n'Save food warehouse within the Westwood retail area).

Does not recognise or provide for potential reverse sensitivity effects that could arise from enabling residential activity to establish in close proximity to the existing food warehouse operation. The Plan Change fails to control the potential effects of the use of the subject land for residential purposes on adjoining land.

Fails 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 the Resource Management Act 1991.

Fails to meet the requirements of section 32 of the Resource Management Act, in that the proposed policies and rules are not the most appropriate method for achieving the Resource Management Act's purpose nor are they the most efficient and effective means for achieving the District Plan's objectives.

Will not assist the Council to carry out its statutory functions in order to achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act.

Does not promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources, and it therefore not in accordance with Part 2 of the Resource Management Act.

Concerned about reverse sensitivity effects related to noise, traffic, light and operating hours.

There may also be issues with the stormwater discharge from the redevelopment of the adjoining proposed residential area.

Though Plan Change 69 acknowledges the potential for reverse sensitivity issues to arise, no specific mitigation measures are proposed, and the existing residential provisions do not recognise land use conflict with commercial activities. With no boundary set back, a residential property could be built right up to the boundary shared with Pak'n'Save. There are no limit controls set on stormwater management. The permitted activities in the new residential area are likely to adversely affect Foodstuffs' established operations on its site.

Plan Change 69 needs to explicitly recognise the 'anchor' roles retail activities such as supermarkets play in urban areas, and recognise the likely adverse effects that residences will experience if they locate next to these activities. This would be consistent with established District Plan provisions such as Objective 7.1.2 (Quality of Life), and Policy 7.1.7 (Amenity Values).

Resource consents for those activities directly adjacent to the Westwood retail area should be classified restricted discretionary activities. Assessment criteria should include the likely effects of the proposal on existing activities on adjacent sites. Or an appropriate setback should be included which mitigates the likely effects on residents from the Pak'n'Save operations.

Relief sought: The Westwood retail area (including in particular the Pak'n'Save food warehouse) be rezoned to reflect the existing activities on the site.

The policies and rules in Plan Change 69 be amended to reflect the issues raised in this submission.

Such other relief as may be required to give effect to this submission.

Should the above relief sought not be approved, the submitters seek that Plan Change 69 be placed on hold pending the wider District Plan Review that addresses the inter-zoned circumstances; and/or

That the policies and rules be amended to reflect the issues raised in this submissions; and/or

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.

If all of the above relief is not granted, then Foodstuffs seek that Plan Change 69 if rejected.

John Terence Ford - Submitter #: 9

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Opposes the Plan Changes

The proposed areas are too valuable for food production to be lost to residential development

The proposed areas are susceptible to liquefaction. Building domestic houses on the most stable ground makes sense.

Knowledge gained from the Christchurch earthquakes in respect of liquefaction must be considered. Liquefaction could be reduced if building codes require ground compaction, deep piling and wooden construction.

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

Relief sought: The Plan Change is rejected in full.

Paul Ham - Submitter #: 10

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Oppose the Plan Change in its entirety.

The Plan Change provides for urban sprawl onto highly productive land, which should be preserved for food production.

The land subject to the urban growth proposal is subject to a high water table, making it more expensive to develop for residential purposes.

The proposed growth area is very close to the Wairau fault line, making the probability and consequences of serious damage in the event of an earthquake high.

Relief sought: Leave the land in its current form and use.

Tom Harrison - Submitter #: 11

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Much public concern has been raised over the proposed residential development of highly productive land to the north and west of Blenheim.

There are other options available for urban expansion, including the lower Wither Hills and Taylor Pass.

The costs of the infrastructure upgrades for the proposed urban growth areas will be a burden on ratepayers.

Productive land must be retained for rural purposes and for the needs of future generations.

Relief sought: No specific relief requested but inferred that Plan Change should be rejected.

- Submitter #: 12

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Supports the proposal to create additional areas for residential development.

Wants certainty that the rating status of the land will not change until development occurs on individual properties rather than when development starts in a specific Plan Change area.

Urban design recommendations - thinks Council is hypocritical in recommending private sub-dividers avoid creating rear allotments, whilst Council's subdivision at Forest Park has allowed the on-going development of large rear allotments.

Appendix 6: Concerned land owners will be required to construct wider road carriageways without compensation for the additional road costs.

Appendix 6: Concerned no formal consultation will be undertaken with potentially affected land owners.

Relief sought: Confirmation from Council that the rating status will not change until development on individual properties occurs and not when development starts in a specific Plan Change area.

Formal consultation requested for potentially affected land owners associated with the plans contained in Appendix 6.

Requests Appendix 6 be withdrawn and a more complete and thorough assessment be made available for submissions.

Peter Graham & Maryanne Therese James - Submitter #: 13

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Supports Council rezoning land to allow for future Urban Residential Development.

Wants confirmation from Council that the rating status will not change for individual properties until development occurs on the section, rather than when development starts in a development area.

Plan Change 68, page 26:

-The description of adjoining land to this area is not strictly correct, as part of the land on the southern side of Old Renwick Road is the Racecourse, which has Rural 3 zoning.

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

Appendix 4:

-Questions the consistency of Council's 200m buffer from Casey's Creek for liquefaction and the zoning of residential areas.

-Liquefaction testing appears to be incomplete and inconsistent and the submitter disputes the findings, and intends to carry out additional testing to identify land suitable for residential development.

Appendix 5:

-Alternative options to grid roading patterns such a cul de sacs should be made available to developers.

Appendix 6:

-Concerned that consultation with land owners may be overlooked in the development of the "accepted services plan".

-Concerned that landowners will be required to construct wider roads based on the function of the road, according to the "accepted services plan"

-Concerned that the proposed piping of Casey's Creek will undo the restoration and beautification work done in the creek environment.

Relief sought: Confirmation from Council that the rating status will not change until development on individual properties occurs and not when development starts in a specific Plan Change area.

The "island" of Rural 3 land between Old Renwick Road and the newly zoned Residential 2 land be zoned "large lot residential" with a minimum allotment area of 3,000m², and defer Residential 2 zoning until more land stability tests have been undertaken.

That additional testing is undertaken in the areas shown to have potential for lateral spread so that a reasoned decision can be made as to an acceptable distance from Casey's Creek where residential development can take place.

Supply more information within Appendix 6 and conduct public consultation on the content.

H E F & C M T Jones (Angela Jones) - Submitter #: 14

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: The submitter's property is included in Council Property numbers 255317; 186909; 255918. It is described as Lots 1 and 2 DP 321132, and shown in Plan Change Area 66.

The submitter supports the proposed Plan Change subject to relief sought

Relief sought: Council to approve the Plan Change subject to no residential rating being imposed on the submitter's property until the land is developed for residential subdivision.

Kapiti Views Trust () - Submitter #: 15

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Opposed to the development of land north of Blenheim as it is an inappropriate use of land. The land is highly productive and a versatile resource.

The rezoning will have reverse sensitivity effects which will restrict existing lawful rural activities.

Rezoning is not efficient, and will not give effect to the Council's duties under the Resource Management Act.

The risks associated with the use of this land for residential activity are too high to permit the development to go ahead without properly investigating, eliminating, avoiding or mitigating those risks.

The economic costs associated with the use and costs to develop the land, in terms of opportunity cost, do not support changing the land use to residential.

The evaluation of alternatives is incomplete and inadequate. The evaluation should have focussed on land that is less productive.

The Plan Change will not be able to deliver new residential land in a timely or cost effective manner to meet demand, due to fragmented ownership, lack of infrastructure, and the cost of

upgrading the infrastructure.

The servicing constraints and geotechnical risks will create affordability issues.

It is highly likely the developed sections will be tagged with consent notices identifying the risks of liquefaction - impacting on insurance and costs.

No mitigation measures are proposed for the loss of productive land.

The loss of productive land is a resource management issue for the region.

No measures are proposed to address potential reverse sensitivity effects in the urban-rural interface.

The urban expansion will probably lead to urban creep into the residential land, leading to further loss of productive land.

Agree there is an urgent need for new land for residential growth.

Land to the west, south-west and west of Blenheim on less versatile soils is more available at a lower cost per section to develop.

The Plan Changes fail to achieve the integrated management of the effects of use, development or protection of land and the associated natural and physical resources of the District, as required by section 31 of the Resource Management Act.

The Plan Changes will not assist the Council to carry out its statutory functions.

Relief sought: The Plan Change is rejected in full or put on hold pending a wider District Plan review.

Properly investigate alternatives such as land to the south, west and south-west of Blenheim.

Recognise and support sustainable solutions to the problem of a shortage of residential land.

Consequential amendments to the objectives, policies and rules of the District Plan to address the matters raised in this submission.

Kenneth Olender Lawrence - Submitter #: 16

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Opposed to the Plan Change

Opposed to the use of fertile farmland for purposes other than farming.

Relief sought: That development occurs to the east following on from the Witherlea foothills.

Murray Ian and Carol Margaret Locke - Submitter #: 17

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Wants certainty that the rating status of the land will not change until development occurs on individual properties rather than when development starts in a specific Plan Change area.

Plan Change 68, page 26: Leaving an "island" of Rural 3 land between Old Renwick Road and the newly zoned Residential 2 land will limit the use of the rural land and threaten its current use which is viticulture.

Plan Change 71: Page 48 of the Plan Change weighs up the benefit / costs to implement Policy 1.8 which states "developer to comply with specified layouts which may not be the most economic for individual developers". Questions whether compensation will be paid

where a developer is not getting full potential use of a road through their property because of the indicative roading layout.

Appendix 4:

-Questions the consistency of Council's 200m buffer from Casey's Creek for liquefaction and the zoning of residential areas.

-Liquefaction testing appears to be incomplete and inconsistent and the submitter disputes the findings, and intends to carry out additional testing to identify land suitable for residential development.

Appendix 5:

-Alternative options to grid roading patterns such a cul de sacs should be made available to developers.

Appendix 6:

-Concerned that consultation with land owners may be overlooked in the development of the "accepted services plan".

-Concerned that landowners will be required to construct wider roads based on the function of the road, according to the "accepted services plan".

-Concerned that the proposed piping of Casey's Creek will undo the restoration and beautification work done in the creek environment.

Relief sought: Confirmation from Council that the rating status will not change until development on individual properties occurs and not when development starts in a specific Plan Change area.

The "island" of Rural 3 land between Old Renwick Road and the newly zoned Residential 2 land be zoned "large lot residential" with a minimum allotment area of 3,000m², and defer Residential 2 zoning until more land stability tests have been undertaken.

That additional testing be undertaken in the areas shown to have potential for lateral spread so that a reasoned decision can be made as to an acceptable distance from Casey's Creek where residential development can take place.

Supply more information within Appendix 6 and conduct public consultation on the content

Alison Mackenzie - Submitter #: 18

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: High quality land is of limited supply in Marlborough and should be protected.

Proposed development will cause loss of fertile productive land.

Relief sought: Blenheim's expansion should be on less fertile land.

Marlborough Province of Federated Farmers of NZ (Michael Bennett) - Submitter #: 19

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Support the efforts of Marlborough District Council to achieve sustainable urban growth in and around Blenheim.

Concerned over the loss of highly productive land to production arising from the proposed Plan Changes.

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.

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.

Placement of new urban areas will not prevent all reverse sensitivity effects and other options should also be considered, including 'non nuisance complaint' covenants for new residential subdivision near areas used for primary production activities, including future activities.

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.

Relief sought: Allow some urban development on areas prone to liquefaction to the east or south-east 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 available.

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

Include mechanisms such as covenants on sections allocated near production land to prevent highly productive land being compromised.

Have regard to the current and future values of highly productive land to current and future generations, both within and outside Marlborough.

Adopt a balanced approach to future development and make provisions for urban growth on land subject to liquefaction risks or reverse sensitivity, hilly land to the south of Blenheim, and productive land.

Evaluate alternative options to concentrating all urban growth on productive land.

John Ernest Marris - Submitter #: 20

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Supports the Plan Change in part.

Aware the Council is running out of time and does not have options for land.

If areas are identified as suitable from a geotechnical view then the Plan Change areas identified in Plan Changes 66, 69 and 70 should be considered given their proximity to the existing town and services.

If land of high versatility is to be used for residential development the Council should mitigate this change of land use by considering the rezoning of lower versatility land to the west, south-west, and south of Blenheim. The rezoning of this land would give the public choice between lower lying area to the north-west, and the higher land to the west, south-west and south of Blenheim.

Opposes the parts of Plan Changes 66, 69 and 70 that rezone areas where reverse sensitivities will occur from existing businesses. The submitter states these areas need careful planning and zone mitigation in buffering areas and this is not addressed in the Plan Changes.

If the north-west and north Plan Change zones are approved then the provision of additional education facilities will need to be considered.

Relief sought: That the Plan Change be accepted in part and that the Council reconsider the effects of reverse sensitivity on those areas within the Plan Change area from existing or planned businesses.

Ralph Mason - Submitter #: 21

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Oppose the proposal to expand Blenheim to the north and west onto highly productive soil. The proposal is not in line with good town planning principles. Marlborough's productive land needs to be safeguarded for present and future production. Better options are available to the south and west of Blenheim.

Relief sought: No specific relief requested but inferred that Plan Change should be rejected.

Kevin & Lynda Morgan - Submitter #: 22

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: The submitters are land owners on Old Renwick Road.

Inadequate consultation has been undertaken concerning the planned roading and infrastructure.

Does not agree with proposed roading near Waipuna Street as it affects land owned by the submitter.

The loss of the highly productive land is a serious resource management issue.

The lack of specific measures to deal with reverse sensitivity issues is a major shortcoming of the plan changes.

A combination of setbacks, buffers, reduced density of dwellings and other methods in the new zones should be used to preserve existing rural uses.

The likely impacts of reverse sensitivity will be greater than those assessed in the Plan Change, and there is a real risk of incremental creep.

Relief sought: The Plan Change is rejected in full, or

Defer the rezoning until the infrastructure and hazards issues are resolved so that there is confidence the land will be used effectively and efficiently for residential development, or

Utilise 'Deferred Zoning' to ensure orderly and efficient development of the areas in the Plan Changes, or

Identify and provide for methods to be adopted to minimise or eliminate the risk of reverse sensitivity with adjoining rural land and activities.

Identify and provide methods to avoid incremental creep of residential activity onto adjoining land by way of better defined boundaries of lower density at the urban/rural interface.

Any consequential amendments necessary give effect to the points raised in this submission.

New Zealand Institute of Surveyors (Vicki Nalder) - Submitter #: 23

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Support the rezoning of land to allow for future urban residential development.

Sequencing the development of areas based on the cost of effectiveness for the servicing - The submitter questions what will trigger the necessary upgrades and who will pay initially for

the upgrades.

Requests the "Accepted Services Plan" be confirmed and provided so that individual land owners can see where services are proposed to be located etc. The submitter questions how land owners be compensated

The submitter also questions how Council will coordinate the servicing.

Need to ensure that the Plan Change has not priced itself out of the Blenheim market before it begins.

The submitter agrees with the need for an overall strategy for the roading layout. However, the submitter hopes that the Council will exercise some discretion in the final locations given that there are a small number of landowners in the Plan Change area and therefore more practical or suitable alternative may be required

Relief sought: The workability and Practicality of the "Accepted Services layout Plan" needs to be considered from a commercial aspect, and be available to the Public for comment.

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

NZ Transport Agency (Teresa Minogue) - Submitter #: 24

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Supports the Plan Changes in part.

Concerned about the intersection improvements recommended by GHD Limited for State Highway 6 (SH6) to accommodate the proposed urban growth in northern Blenheim. No justification is provided for the recommendations, and the improvements could compromise the through function of SH6. Would prefer to see network optimisation take place rather than add additional capacity.

There is no guarantee the Transport Agency will fund the SH6 improvements.

SH6 is a designated limited access road, which stops numerous accesses being created alongside roads subject to development pressure. Unless there are significant benefits to the land transport network, the Transport Agency would not support any additional at grade connections to SH6.

Relief sought: That further information is provided by Council to justify the need for the recommended improvements to SH6 for Transport Agency review.

Council should expect developers to pay their fair share towards the new infrastructure and roading upgrades.

The indicative local road running parallel to SH6 is deleted due to the potential adverse effects from light glare.

The indicative roading connection to SH6 is removed.

Network optimization take place ahead of any proposed roading improvements where applicable.

Tony Orman - Submitter #: 25

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Oppose the proposed residential development of highly productive land to the north and west of Blenheim.

Proposal is against the fundamental principles of sound town planning.

Use of flat land requires pumping stations thus adding to housing cost.

The Plains are not large and Marlborough needs to make full production use (food production, commercial production) of the fertile soils to give Marlborough some degree of self-sufficiency given that civil and international disorder could result in food shortages in the future.

Submitter states they find it incredible that Marlborough District Council have paid ratepayers' money to Auckland-based consultants for flawed advice.

Relief sought: Expand Blenheim to the south and west where soils are less fertile and contours give gradients for infrastructure.

Outer Limits Limited () - Submitter #: 26

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: The submission relates to the area proposed to be rezoned as Urban Residential 2 and the related infrastructure proposed under the Plan Change 71..

The rezoning of the land as Urban Residential is not appropriate with the Resource Management Act 1991, and is not the most appropriate way to achieve the stated goal of increasing the availability of residential land, for the following reasons:

- The land is located next to a business park and reverse sensitivity issues have not been addressed.
- Infrastructure issues should have been addressed as a prerequisite to the rezoning of the land.
- There is no integrated land use planning in relation to the Westwood business site and the activities shown as Block C and D on the plan attached to the original submission.

Relief sought: Modifications are made to the plan to address reverse sensitivity issues on the Westwood business park site through the use of setback, buffer or other appropriate provisions.

The Westwood park site is incorporated into the Plan Change and appropriate infrastructure is provided for so that the indicative roading links the Westwood business park site to the Residential zoning area.

The rezoning is deferred pending a district wide review.

Any other consequential amendments to objectives, policies and rules to address the matters raised by Foodstuffs.

David Leslie Price - Submitter #: 27

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Considers the statement that the soil of the proposed growth areas has already been compromised is a generalisation. Contends that the future use of the soils has not been compromised, as much of the area in question is currently in productive use. Also contends that the fact that much of Blenheim has already been developed on high quality soil does not justify further development on high quality soils.

There is no pragmatic application of the objectives and policies to "maintain or enhance the life supporting capacities of the versatile soils in Rural 3 Zone".

Wants Council to reconsider the proposed use of the versatile soils and the lack of protection given them.

Rezoning the productive land for residential use will place a rating burden on existing farming properties and their operations will become economically unviable. If Council goes ahead with rezoning, a solution should be presented by Council to the affected property owners for the rating problem.

Opposed to the Plan Change as it has the potential to cause reverse sensitivity issues. Concerned that if a large number of residential properties were developed near the Bushes Honey operation on Old Renwick Rd, the operation would be forced to change due to tensions between parties.

Opposed to the Plan Change as it will cause a loss of rural amenity over time.

Relief sought: he Plan Change is rejected.

Council puts forward a new proposal that offers an acceptable balance of options for negatively affected parties through consultation. Wants Council to offer some form of protection to existing rural businesses and activities to safeguard their future operations. Notes Colonial Vineyards' application for rezoning was rejected due to potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing nearby businesses.

Provincial Coolstores Limited (Ian Barnes) - Submitter #: 28

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Opposed Plan Change 69 in its entirety.

The area is not considered suitable with regards to the adverse effects and constraints caused by the loss of productive land and the reverse sensitivity effects.

The loss of highly productive land is a significant resource management issue to Marlborough which is downplayed.

The Assessment of Environmental Effects submitted pays scant regard to reverse sensitivity effects. Reverse sensitivity impacts on the established commercial and industrial activities within Area 6 have also been largely dismissed. The amenity impacts from light spill, visual impacts from large scale buildings, truck movements and operating hours all have the potential to create long term tensions and adverse effects between the proposed areas and the existing activities. No mitigation measures have been proposed.

Relief sought: Decline Plan Change 69 in it's entirety, or

Redraft so that a meaningful buffer strip is created around the existing commercial and industrial activities.

Katherine Julie Saville-Smith - Submitter #: 29

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Opposed to the Plan Change.

Opposed on the basis of the negative impacts associated with urban sprawl, including the irreparable compromise of ground and surface water, the reduction in available habitat, the degradation of air, soil, visual amenity and landscape, and the increased risk and costs to manage the impacts of stormwater, river management, water supply and sewerage systems.

The accumulation of effects associated with all the Plan Changes will lead to urban sprawl and land use inefficiency.

Rezoned land that is not developed and utilised immediately will degrade.

Population growth patterns in Marlborough and Blenheim do not justify the proposed

expansion of urban land.

The proposed urban expansion will not reduce residential land prices and will increase travel distances and costs, as well as rates to fund infrastructure upgrades.

No evidence or mechanisms are proposed to promote and deliver environmentally sustainable housing or affordable housing.

Relief sought: The Plan Change is rejected in full.

Talleys Group Limited (Quentin Davies) - Submitter #: 30

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: The Section 32 report for Plan Change 69 provides alternative roading connections in respect of Talleys' coolstore facility, However, the report does not consider the need for mitigation of wider reverse sensitivity effects likely to arise from locating the activity in an urban residential zone including;

- Noise from the operation of forklifts, container loading and movements, truck movements and compressor operation. These operate 24 hours, seven days a week; and
- Visual effects of the operation on an adjoining urban residential area.

The Plan Change makes no provision for a buffer or other mitigation to ensure planned expansion of the operation, or the existing operation, will not result in reverse sensitivity effects.

The proposals are inconsistent with the following objectives and policies of the Plan, contrary to s76(1)(b) of the Resource Management Act:

- Objective 2, Chapter 11 of the District Plan is to "Ensure that growth occurs in locations suitable for residential development." The commentary to the objective notes "The Council recognises that the principle rural activities inherently involve effects that may not meet the expectations of an urban environment and that there needs to be compromise of those expectations at the urban/rural interface."

The submitter considers the objective has not been met. Plan Changes 66 and 69 draw an arbitrary line between rural and urban uses and do not provide for a "compromise" of expectations at the rural/urban interface. The existing consented industrial uses within the proposed land change areas illustrate the location is not suitable for residential development.

- Policy 1.8, Chapter 11 of the District Plan provides that the plan should avoid, remedy or mitigate the effects of industrial activity on any adjoining residential areas.

The submitter contends that the proposed rezoning of an existing industrial coolstore and immediately adjoining residential area is likely to enhance rather than mitigate adverse effects on the existing environment.

- Policy 1.4, Chapter 22 provides that the District Plan should accommodate inherently noisy activities and processes which are ancillary to normal activities within industrial and rural areas.

The submitter states that the rezoning of the coolstore property and adjacent land does not accommodate the established activities on the site, and the proposal is likely to give rise to reverse sensitivity effects which could ultimately impact on the coolstore operations.

- Policy 1.6, Chapter 23 provides that the District Plan should recognise the potential for amenity conflict between the rural environment and activities on the urban periphery.

The submitter considers the proposal does not recognise the potential conflict between the consented coolstore activity and potential residential development, and no mitigation has been proposed to address the amenity issues.

Given the above inconsistencies with the objectives and policies, the submitter argues that Plan Changes 66 and 69 are not the most appropriate way to achieve the objectives of the District Plan, as required by the Resource Management Act.

Relief sought: The Plan Change is rejected in its entirety.

Submission Point: 01 - Whole Plan Change

Submission: Supports the Council re-zoning land for future urban residential development as it will provide co-ordination and avoid ad-hoc development.

Concerned about the lack of detail and insufficiency of work completed regarding how the adverse effects of urban development on stormwater quality and quantity will be mitigated.

Appendix 6 refers to the use of retention ponds, but no reason or justification as to why these treatment systems have been chosen has been provided. Performance criteria, downstream water levels and groundwater levels need to be factored into the selection of stormwater treatment.

Relief sought: The stormwater aspects of the "Accepted Services Plan" needs to be developed in more detail to have confidence that appropriate performance levels can be obtained. The "Accepted Services Plan" should be required to meet the same level of detail expected by Council from a Private Plan Change.

The Plan Change should be put on hold until the "Accepted Service Plan" has been finalised.
