
Submission Summary - Proposed Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan - V49-Industrial 2 Rezoning between Riverlands Industrial Estate and Cloudy Bay Business Park - By Name

S Stanley - Participant #: 1

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Absolutely support rezoning of land adjoining Riverlands Industrial Estate. It is ideally placed for industrial expansion, distant from most residential area and close to the main road. The area is also close to wastewater disposal facilities.

Relief sought: 1. No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified; and additionally

2. The estate should be connected directly to the adjoining main trunk rail yard by means of a rail shunting yard.

Submission Point: R 1.3.6 - Chapter 12 - Area to be landscaped

Submission: There needs to be a stronger emphasis on landscaping to enhance the entrance to Blenheim.

Relief sought: Have a stronger emphasis on landscaping.

C Rayner - Participant #: 2

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter does not oppose Riverlands Industrial from growing in any business form.

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified.

Russell Hopkins - Participant #: 3

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Support changes proposed in Variation 49.

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified.

Graham & Jennifer Bryant (Graham Bryant) - Participant #: 4

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Fully support Variation 49 as it will help further development in the industrial area of Blenheim and keep industry out of the CBD.

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitters. However, the Council has inferred the submitters' support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified.

Paul Way - Participant #: 5

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter supports Variation 49 and the ongoing principle of full progress. Change is considered necessary by the submitter to meet the future.

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified.

Nigel & Leticia Henderson - Participant #: 6

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitters' support Variation 49.

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitters. However, the Council has inferred the submitters' support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified.

Bruno Dalliessi - Participant #: 7

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter supports Variation 49. The proposed land area is close to town and services yet does not impede on other uses in the immediate area. Further land is required for industrial use in Marlborough.

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified.

Joan Penney - Participant #: 8

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter does not oppose this policy but has concerns about:
- whether unbridled enthusiasm for 'growth' is in the town's interests;
- impacts from increased traffic, waste disposal and emissions; and
- impacts on accommodation and on the nearby school.

Relief sought: Do not gloss over the impacts from traffic, waste disposal and emissions and on accommodation and the nearby school.

T Wise - Participant #: 9

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Support Variation 49.

Relief sought: 1. No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified; and additionally
2. To encourage industrial land to develop employment other than viticulture.

Alan Perano - Participant #: 10

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Do absolutely nothing until State Highway 1 is moved east. Starting north of Spring Creek and coming out south of Riverlands. Then it and its surroundings can be correctly planned.

Relief sought: Don't make any changes until State Highway 1 is moved east.

The McKeage No1 Family Trust (Ian McKeage) (Ian McKeage) - Participant #: 11

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter supports Variation 49.

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified.

Celeste & Foster Rudd - Participant #: 12

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Qualified support is given to the zone change proposal on the grounds that it is suitably located with regard to transport systems, noise and visual impacts, and is of land in the lighter fertility range of the Wairau Plain. Even this loss to primary production is regrettable but perhaps unavoidable.

The collective use of Variations 42, 49 and 50 should be to the value of all of Marlborough, of which Blenheim is the centre. It could also avoid the unnecessary destruction of prime land by establishing one or more business parks in rural zones.

Relief sought: Give effect to Variation 49 as presented in the notification.

Leon & Aloka Baumgarten - Participant #: 13

Submission Point: R 1.3.6 - Chapter 12 - Area to be landscaped

Submission: The submitters request that prior to subdivision and or development, that the landowners involved with Variation 49 be required to undertake planting in a buffer strip as set out in the relief sought.

Relief sought: 1. Prior to subdivision and or development, Marlborough Development Company and Pernod Ricard (NZ) Ltd and any other landowners that may become involved in the variation in the future be required to do the following:

- Plant a 5 to 10 metre wide buffer strip along the railway boundary of the property for screening purposes. The buffer strip should include 3 rows of plantings with the main, central species, already grown to a height of 3 metres at time of planting in order for the buffer plants to reach a height of 15 metres minimum, at maturity, with a row of low growing species to reach a minimum of 4 metres in height on either side.

- The plants should be continually maintained to achieve the required standard.

- Once subdivided, each lot should have a condition of consent requiring the buffer strip to be maintained to the required standard in perpetuity. This condition to be the subject of a consent notice on all subsequent titles created.

G F & A M Giles - Participant #: 14

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitters consider it is a great idea to allow more land area for industrial development without encroaching on residential areas.

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitters. However, the Council has inferred the submitters' support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified.

G Boon (S Wilkes) (S Wilkes) - Participant #: 15

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter supports Variation 49 because it demonstrates logical and sustainable long term planning and will go some way toward providing for the growth and future expansion of industrial areas in Marlborough. However, the submitter is the current owner of Lot 2 DP323372 and considers the Variation will lock in his rural zoned land by the railway to the south and industrial zone land to the east, north and west.

Mr Boon believes the zoning of his property should reflect the anticipated site usage and provide for the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of the people of Marlborough.

Relief sought: 1. Include Lot 2 DP 323372 as Industrial 2 Zone to be consistent with the adjacent zoning.
2. Any consequential amendments to the Plan's objectives and policies that are required in order to give effect to this submission should also be made.

Marlborough Development Company Limited (Paul Williams) (Paul Williams) - Participant #: 16

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Marlborough Development Company Limited (MDCL) owns the land legally described as Lot 1 DP323372 and Lots 2-4 DP 8762 included in Proposed Variation 49.

The Council had identified that there was a potential land liquefaction issue in the event of earthquakes on MDCL land and that this needed to be addressed. A geotechnical engineering assessment of MDCL land for potential industrial development has now been carried out.

The submitter states the report found that the site is suitable for industrial development provided appropriate and sound engineering practices are adopted, particularly in terms of foundation design. (Full details are provided in a report attached with the submission.)

Relief sought: The report prepared by Nelson Consulting Engineers Ltd, titled " Geotechnical Assessment for Lot 1 DP 323372 and Lot 2 through 4 DP8762, Riverlands, Blenheim" be submitted in support of Variation 49.

Yealands Estate Limited (Paul Williams) (Paul Williams) - Participant #: 17

Submission Point: 2.4 - New general standard 2.4.5

Submission:

Relief sought: Add Lot 1 DP 8762 to the proposed new standard under 2.4 General Standards.

Submission Point: 3.5 - Assessment Criteria (Discretionary and Non-Complying Subdivision Activities)

Submission:

Relief sought: Add Lot 1 DP 8762 to the proposed new assessment criteria under 3.5 Assessment Criteria (Discretionary and Non-Complying Subdivision Activities).

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Yealands Estate Limited (YEL) do not oppose Variation 49 per se but consider that any rezoning of land to Industrial 2 in this area should include Lot 1 DP 8762 to provide a land bank for medium term industrial development. Zoning this area, excluding the Riverlands co-op floodway, would provide 11.7 ha of additional land available for industrial development. Access to the site if zoned would be proposed by the network in MDCL land to the south-west, not off the State Highway.

YEL states a site specific technical feasibility study has shown that development of YEL land, in addition to land already identified by Variation 49, can occur without expensive upgrading of services. (Full details are provided in a report provided with the submission.)

YEL also states a specific geotechnical investigation of the site to determine if the liquefaction issue is a potential fatal flaw to development of the site for industrial purposes shows the site is suitable provided appropriate and sound engineering practices are adopted, particularly in terms of foundation design. (Full details are provided in a report attached with the submission.)

In summary the submitter states the merits of including the Yealands site in the expansion of the existing zone includes:

- Medium term future proofing for potential industrial development.
- Forward planning and creation of certainty of medium term land use for the immediate area.
- Concentration of industrial activities in an area where there is a certain degree of anticipation of such land use.
- Concentration of industrial activities in an area where there are efficiency gains in terms of infrastructure, transport and access, and market and labour force proximity.
- Expansion of industrial development in the area would be serviced by two separate pipelines for industrial and domestic waste streams. This provides for separate pre-treatment which is particularly important with waste streams such as those from industrial wineries and other food processors with high biological oxygen demand.
- A locality that minimises the potential for conflict with land use on adjacent land.
- Location of industrial activities well away from sensitive urban activities.
- Avoidance of the proliferation of small, isolated industrial operations that are not connected to surrounding land uses which may encourage conflict with existing or planned future land use.
- Use of less versatile and productive soils.

Aside from the changes sought elsewhere in the submission Yealand Estates Limited agree with all other aspects of Variation 49.

Relief sought: 1. Yealands Estate Limited requests that the Marlborough District Council recognise not only the urgent need for expansion of the Industrial 2 zone as part of a wider package to deal with commercial and business expansion requirements for Marlborough, but also medium term requirements.

2. Yealands Estates Limited requests that the Marlborough District Council include Lot 1 DP 8762 as part of Variation 49 to the Proposed Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan.

Submission Point: Volume 3 - Zoning 4 and Sheet 19

Submission:

Relief sought: Include Lot 1 DP 8762 in the amended Zoning Map 4 and sheet 19 to rezone Lot 1 DP 323372 and portions of Lot 1 DP 447, Lots 1,3 and 4 DP 8762 and Lot 2 DP 8762 from Rural 3 to Industrial 2 as shown on the map.

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Qualified support of the rezoning proposal for including in the Industrial 2 zone the areas of Lot 1 DP 323372, portions of Lot 1 DP 4447, Lots 3 and 4 of DP 8762 and a portion of Lot 2 DP 8762. It also covers a possible inclusion of Lot 1 DP 8762.

The Riverlands Co-op floodway is the major waterway carrying large amounts of upstream floodwater through the site. In resource management terminology it is a modified waterway and thus a river. To ensure the channel can carry flood flows the Council needs to upgrade and maintain the channel.

There is no legal cadastral "riverbed" associated with the Riverlands Co-op floodway. Some of the floodway is in Council ownership as a Local Purpose Reserve (river control). Much of the floodway is not. While the Council can acquire a river control reserve for mitigating flood hazard through subdivision provisions under the RMA, it is more clear cut, effective and transparent to require this as a requirement of the rezoning process.

Stormwater from the current Riverlands Industrial Zone is carried in the Riverlands Industrial Drain which runs through Pernod Ricard (Lot 1 DP 4497) of the proposed new zoning. To ensure continued maintenance the Council needs to have the channel and the flanking berm in its own ownership.

An alternative to having the river and drainage corridor land in the Council's ownership would be to zone them as Conservation or leave them as Rural Zone, similar as has been done for other floodways. This may make it easier for the Council to acquire the river/drain land at a later date if and when subdivisions occurs. This process is considered less satisfactory by the submitter than acquiring the required land at the rezoning stage.

The land south of the Riverlands Co-op floodway needs to dispose of its stormwater into the floodway. This will require pumping and the use of retention ponds. The ongoing operation and maintenance of the ponds and pumps is expected to be a Council responsibility.

If the Council is to construct the stormwater network of pipes, ponds and pumping stations, then financial contribution/development levy systems need to be in place.

- Relief sought:**
1. The land associated with the Riverlands Co-op floodway should not be zoned as industrial unless the Council can guarantee the upgrading and ongoing maintenance of the floodway channel.
 2. The Council needs to acquire this floodway corridor so as to guarantee its upgrading and maintenance. The current landowners should therefore be required to freely vest this land in Council as river control reserve as a condition of the rezoning.
 3. The free acquisition of a river corridor as a river control reserve to mitigate flood hazard should be a requirement for allowing rezoning of the land to industrial. This should also include the Wither Hills tributary of the Riverlands Co-op Floodway.
 4. The industrial drain carrying stormwater that runs through Lot 1 DP 4497 (Pernod Ricard), and a flanking berm of some 15 metres, should be freely vested in the Council as drainage reserve to ensure continued maintenance.
 5. As an alternative to the relief sought in 2, 3 and 4 above, the river and drainage corridors could be zoned as Conservation Zone or left as Rural Zone.
 6. Land for retention ponds and pumps to dispose of stormwater into the Riverlands Co-op floodway needs to be provided at an early stage. Additionally the zone rules need to include a requirement that the land for the retention ponds is to be determined at the first subdivision of the land.
 7. Financial contribution/development levy systems need to be ensured through the plan for the construction of the stormwater network of pipes, ponds and pumping stations as well as other services (water, sewer and roading).
 8. The comments regarding ponding, land and infrastructure for pumping stormwater into the

Sue Hutchinson - Participant #: 20

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter conditionally gives approval to rezone this large land mass so long as it is screened from SH 1 and other roads in the vicinity.

Relief sought: If the rezoning proceeds there should be a continuous edging that borders the entire zone of thick trees to screen all views from SH 1 and other road in the vicinity.

Axis Productions Limited (Sue & Nigel Hutchinson) (Sue & Nigel Hutchinson) - Participant #: 21

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitters approve of the Variation to rezone this land so long as it is screened from SH1 and any other road. The same should apply to the existing commercial zone - much of it is an eyesore.

Relief sought: If the rezoning proceeds provision should be made (and enforced by the Council) for a contiguous edging of trees and shrubs to screen this entire new zone from SH1 and any other road. The same should apply to the existing commercial zone.

NZ AA Marlborough District (Kelston Swete) (Kelston Swete) - Participant #: 22

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter endorses the proposal on the basis that it provides for planned development in the community without unduly compromising existing and planned infrastructure. The support is subject to certain matters.

Relief sought:

1. There should be no further access onto SH1 and that any improvements to existing access immediately obliged by this proposal should be met by the beneficiaries.
2. All existing hoardings between McCallums Rd and Redwood Pass Rd should be 'grandfathered' i.e. they shall not be maintained and when decrepit shall be removed and not replaced.
3. Significant generic signing of the Riverlands Industrial Estate, Montana and Cloudy Bay Business Park shall be agreed with Transit and Marlborough District Council as part of the Variation.

Submission Point: R 1.3.6 - Chapter 12 - Area to be landscaped

Submission:

Relief sought: Where appropriate, screen plantings shall be extended to screen distractive effects.

Redwood Development Limited (Paul Ham) (Paul Ham) - Participant #: 23

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Support

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the

Transit New Zealand (Mike Weir) (Mike Weir) - Participant #: 24

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The proposed Variation has implications for the integration of the Industrial rezoning and State Highway 1 in terms of the additional traffic generated and likely associated upgrades required of intersections with State Highway 1, particularly at the Riverlands entrance.

Financial contributions are necessary to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects on State Highway 1 and to achieve positive safety effects in terms of serving affected subdivisions and development within the rezoned area.

Relief sought: Transit seeks that appropriate provision be made in the Variation that enable financial contributions to be payable to Transit New Zealand where it is established that subdivision or development within the rezoned area generates traffic requiring the upgrade of an intersection with, crossing place with or the widening of State Highway 1. It is proposed that the amount payable be calculated on the basis of the applicant meeting the full cost of the upgrade directly and solely attributable to the traffic generated by the subdivision or development.

Bryan K & Elaine W Lawless - Participant #: 25

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Support the proposed change as a logical extension of both ends of this proposed zone, and note that it appears to have the support of the land owners concerned. There does need to be screening of the zone from State Highway 1.

An area of land should be zoned for large wholesale/retail businesses, which depend on considerable truck and trailer access by their customers close to the existing Riverlands Industrial Estate. Such development would be more appropriate to that area, with its transport access and depot and supporting light to medium industrial support, than in a purely retail zone.

Relief sought: 1. There should be adequate screening of the zone from State Highway 1 except at entry and exit points.

2. An area of sufficient magnitude to provide for the present and future (say 15 years) likely demand, in close proximity to the existing Riverlands Industrial Estate, should be zoned for development by businesses similar to Mitre 10 Mega, Placemakers or Hammer Hardware or other large wholesale/retail businesses which depend on considerable truck and trailer access by their customers.

Nigel Hutchinson - Participant #: 26

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter supports Variation 49, if the area is protected visually from the Main Road (SH1) by dense planted trees and that the area of landscaping maintained.

Relief sought: If the area is rezoned, protect the area visually from the Main Road (SH1) by densely planted trees and maintain the area of landscaping.

The Peppertree (Wernor Pluss) (Wernor Pluss) - Participant #: 27

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter opposes Variation 49 for the following reasons:

- The quality and environmental damage on the submitters accommodation business (The Peppertree) would be significant.
- Their property would lose value.
- There would be more noise from traffic as well as safety issues.

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's opposition, to be seeking none of the changes proposed in Variation 49.

R M Fitzgerald - Participant #: 28

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: The submitter opposes Variation 49 because of the potential effects on the extensive ecosystems and habitat and cultural values of the Vernon Lagoons and associated wetland areas from contaminated stormwater and accidental toxic spillages from the proposed industrial sites. At present stormwater from all sources would discharge to the tidal low flow channel of the Riverlands floodway and extensive on-site works and stringent management systems must be able to be provided for and maintained.

Accidental discharges of hazardous materials would have a serious long-term impact on lagoon ecology and warrant serious consideration with regard to mitigation measures required and financial responsibilities and future liability of Council and ratepayers if contaminated discharges are seen to originate from Council reticulation systems. These measures should be empowered by specific rules applicable to the Plan Change area and could be a requirement for site owners to impound on-site and discharge by pumping to treatment areas all roadway and hard standing area stormwater runoff.

Relief sought: 1. Introduce appropriate new standards in Chapter 3 Subdivision Volume 2 to ensure stormwater controls are adequate to mitigate the concerns expressed.

2. Remove the permitted activity status of stormwater discharges from Industrial Zones and from General Rules (Vol 2 Section 1.10.1.2) with regard to the proposed new 54 hectare Industrial 2 Zone.

Maxwell Kenneth Joseph & Patricia Marianne Currie - Participant #: 29

Submission Point: General - Whole plan variation

Submission: Support

Relief sought: No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 49 as notified.
