

---

# ***Submission Summary - Proposed Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan-V50-Neighbourhood Business Zone-Extension of the Springlands Neighbourhood Business Centre - By Name***

---

## **S Stanley - Participant #: 1**

### **Submission Point: 1.3.4.2 - Landscaping**

**Submission:** The submitter would like to see strong landscaping caveats in place since the area is an important entrance to Blenheim.

**Relief sought:** Have strong landscaping caveats in place.

### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50. This seems logical given that there are a number of business operations and factories already in place next to a busy main arterial road and probably already mean residential values are compromised for the remaining houses.

**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 50 as notified, subject to changes specified elsewhere in the submission.

---

## **A G C & E M Wilson Family Trust ( Alan George Clifford Wilson) (Alan George Clifford Wilson) - Participant #: 2**

### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes Variation 50. This is because the submitter considers that in the town the size of Blenheim a central shopping centre is more beneficial than fragmentation.

**Relief sought:** There should be one Central Business Zone and one Industrial Zone i.e. Riverlands and Cloudy Bay Business Park.

---

## **Robyn Caughey - Participant #: 3**

### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes Variation 50 unless overhead roading is provided. This is because Middle Renwick Road already gets snarled up with old fashion road junctions and schools everywhere.

**Relief sought:** Provide overhead roading if the development is to proceed.

---

## **Russell Hopkins - Participant #: 4**

### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50.

**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 50 as notified.

---

## C Rayner - Participant #: 5

### Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation

**Submission:** The submitter does not oppose any of Springlands business growth. Blenheim's business growth must move in that direction away from town and the central business people might improve things.

**Relief sought:** No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's non-opposition to business growth at Springlands, to be seeking a retention of Variation 50 as notified.

---

## A M Miller - Participant #: 6

### Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation

**Submission:** The submitter resides in a villa at the Ashwood Park retirement village, immediately adjacent to Middle Renwick Road and has concerns about the movement of traffic along the road frontage and the safety of pedestrians.

The submitter considers that at present there is little provision for safe entry and exit to and from the shopping precinct for pedestrians. A pedestrian crossing in the car park is barely visible. The focus has been on vehicle movement and numbers. There is no safe walkway to the premises at the entry or within the carpark.

The subject of pedestrian safety on Middle Renwick Road has been raised and investigated before, without apparent satisfactory resolution.

Springlands shopping centre provides for the needs and wants of residents, businesses, the retirement village, school children and others in the form of the medical centre, banking, post shop, pharmacy, food supplies, hairdresser, garden centre and cafe.

- Relief sought:**
1. Ensure a safe and controlled pedestrian entry to and within the development and exit to the highway.
  2. Action the recommendations in the traffic reports that have been prepared before.
  3. Provide a safe pedestrian access across Middle Renwick Road
- 

## Graham & Jennifer Bryant - Participant #: 7

### Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation

**Submission:** The submitters support Variation 50.

**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 50 as notified.

---

## Lis Johnston (Lis Johnston) - Participant #: 8

### Submission Point: 1.8.2.1 - Operating Hours - Commercial Activity

**Submission:** This new rule is unfair if other commercial areas aren't restricted as well. If the hours are going to be restricted they need to be realistic i.e they should cover the current hours of use/operation.

**Relief sought:** 1. If new rule 1.8.2.2 is imposed, other commercial areas should be restricted as well.

---

2. If the hours are going to be restricted they should cover the current hours of use/operation.

**Submission Point: 1.8.2.2 - Operating Hours - Deliveries**

*Submission:* This new rule is unfair if other commercial areas aren't restricted as well. If the hours are going to be restricted they need to be realistic i.e they should cover the current hours of use/operation.

If the deliveries happen mainly around 8am, the Springlands Health Centre employees and patients can often have difficulty getting to the centre. It is dangerous having big trucks moving about and backing at that time of the day. It is also dangerous for the supermarket and mall clients.

- Relief sought:*
1. If new rule 1.8.2.2 is imposed, other commercial areas should be restricted as well.
  2. Service deliveries need to be either very early or very late i.e from 6.30am or up to 9.30pm.

---

**Paul Way - Participant #: 9**

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

*Submission:* The submitter supports Variation 50 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 50 as notified.

---

**Nigel & Leticia Henderson - Participant #: 10**

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

*Submission:* The submitters support Variation 50.

*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 50 as notified.

---

**Bruno Dalliessi - Participant #: 11**

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

*Submission:* The submitter supports Variation 50. This is because the Variation is a natural progression in expanding an existing retail zone to meet the growing demand of the Springlands area.

*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 50 as notified.

---

**Gwyneth Lowe - Participant #: 12**

**Submission Point: 1.3.4.2 - Landscaping**

*Submission:* The existing landscaping should be extended to enhance any development and retain the garden feel of the Springlands area.

*Relief sought:* Extend the existing landscaping.

**Submission Point: 1.8.2.1 - Operating Hours - Commercial Activity**

**Submission:** The restriction on the hours of operation needs careful consideration. The status quo has not impacted severely on the neighbourhood (presumably).

**Relief sought:** Maintain the status quo.

**Submission Point: 1.8.2.2 - Operating Hours - Deliveries**

**Submission:** The restriction on the hours of service deliveries needs careful consideration. The status quo has not impacted severely on the neighbourhood (presumably). Deliveries need to be well completed before trading hours to lessen the impact on traffic flow and thus public safety.

**Relief sought:** 1. Maintain the status quo.  
2. Deliveries need to be well completed before trading hours start.

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50 as this would be an appropriate move given this area is already the focus of this suburb.

**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 50 as notified, subject to changes specified elsewhere in the submission.

---

**T Wise - Participant #: 13**

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50.

**Relief sought:** 1. Permit the extensions requested and encourage the developers initiatives and increase car parking.  
2. Forget about restriction, its discriminatory.

---

**Alan Perano - Participant #: 14**

**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.

---

**Susan Bugler - Participant #: 15**

**Submission Point: 1.8.2.1 - Operating Hours - Commercial Activity**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes the new rule to limit the hours of operation as this could result in other retailers of the same being able to trade outside these hours thus having an advantage.

**Relief sought:** No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's opposition to this rule, to be seeking no limits on operating hours.

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50 as the existing retailers at Springlands need some expansion.

**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 50 as notified, subject to changes

specified elsewhere in the submission.

---

## **Derry Properties Limited ( Nigel McFadden) (Nigel McFadden) - Participant #: 16**

### **Submission Point: 1.1 - Chapter 11 - Permitted activities**

**Submission:** The provision could be interpreted to mean that alcohol may not be sold through the supermarket in the Springlands neighbourhood business centre site and could lead to difficulties with the existing supermarket which holds an Off Licence for the sale of liquor.

**Relief sought:** 1. The first bullet point should read:  
"Commercial activities, and excluding activities requiring a licence under the Sale of Liquor Act 1989 except an Off Licence in respect of the Springlands supermarket."  
  
2. The second bullet point should read:  
"Commercial activities in the Springlands neighbourhood business centre including the sale of liquor requiring licence under the Sale of Liquor Act 1989 for the Springlands Supermarket, but otherwise excluding activities requiring a licence under the Sale of Liquor Act 1989, which commercial activities in the zone shall be subject to a maximum total gross floor area of 5700m<sup>2</sup> (includes 660m<sup>2</sup> garden centre, covered/uncovered space)."

### **Submission Point: 1.8.2.2 - Operating Hours - Deliveries**

**Submission:** The supermarket is supplied by B-trains which deliver between 5.00am and 6.00am on Saturdays inclusive, and after 7.00am on Sunday. The proposed rule would not allow for this to occur.

**Relief sought:** Amend the rule to read:  
"All deliveries shall be between 0500-2200 hours Monday to Saturday (inclusive) and 0700-2000 hours on Sundays."

### **Submission Point: 11.3.2 - Policy 1.9**

**Submission:** The word "complimentary" has been used instead of "complementary".

**Relief sought:** Amend the word "complimentary" to "complementary."

### **Submission Point: 11.3.2.3 - Methods of implementation**

**Submission:** The amendment proposed could be interpreted as:  
a) precluding the sale of liquor in the supermarket; and  
b) precluding the future expansion of the Springlands neighbourhood business centre.

**Relief sought:** Amend the last sentence of the Rules method to read:  
"These include restaurants, bars and other licensed premises (including the sale of liquor in supermarkets) and the future expansion of the Springlands neighbourhood business centre beyond what is permitted activity."

### **Submission Point: 4.1 - Standards and Criteria for Discretionary Activities**

**Submission:** The third bullet point needs to be clarified.

**Relief sought:** Amend the provision to read:  
"Commercial activities in the Springlands Neighbourhood Business Centre once commercial activities in the Springlands Neighbourhood Business Centre have exceeded 5700m<sup>2</sup>."

### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** Generally Variation 50 is supported by the submitter.

Derry Properties Limited owns the Springlands mall complex, which is the oldest and most established supermarket facility in the Blenheim area. Whilst there has been significant residential development in the Springlands area, there has been no major development at the Springlands Mall complex for over 10 years because the existing development is at capacity within the current Zone boundaries. In order to allow the Springlands Mall to cater for the demand for growth, both from customers and tenants, the Zone needs to be extended to

allow for growth.

**Relief sought:** Extend the Neighbourhood Business Zone.

---

### **M F Salvador - Participant #: 17**

#### **Submission Point: 1.3.2 - Noise**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes the proposal to limit noise by the erection of a 1.8 metre high wooden fence. Noise from vehicles, extractor and cooling fans also comes from Ariki Industries.

**Relief sought:** 1. Change the fencing requirement to a 1.8 high x 100 mm thick continuous concrete fence; and  
2. The fencing requirement be extended to include the boundary abutting Ariki Industries.

#### **Submission Point: 1.3.4.2 - Landscaping**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes the proposal to limit noise by the inclusion of a 4.5 m wide planted area abutting Urban Residential Zone. Noise from vehicles, extractor and cooling fans also comes from Ariki Industries.

**Relief sought:** 1. Increase the vegetation buffer to a 6 metre wide planted area; and  
2. The landscaping requirement be extended to include the boundary abutting Ariki Industries.

#### **Submission Point: 1.8.2.1 - Operating Hours - Commercial Activity**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes the proposed hours of operation. The currently approved trading hours of 0700-2100 Monday to Sunday provide neighbouring residents some respite from noise/lighting etc on Friday, Saturday and Sunday evenings.

**Relief sought:** The currently approved trading hours (0700-2100 Monday to Sunday) remain extant.

#### **Submission Point: 1.8.2.2 - Operating Hours - Deliveries**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes the proposed delivery hours. The currently approved hours of 0600-2100 provide neighbouring residents with minimal disruption and respite from noise/lighting in the very early morning and late evening.

**Relief sought:** The currently approved delivery hours (0600-2100) remain extant.

---

### **Celeste & Foster Rudd - Participant #: 18**

#### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitters' support this zone change proposal as it appears it will enhance the expanding local residential area, without having a major effect on Blenheim's Primary Shopping Area and CBZ generally. Importantly it does not impact detrimentally on Rural zoned land.

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 50 as presented in the notification.

---

### **The McKeage No1 Family Trust ( Ian McKeage) (Ian McKeage) - Participant #: 19**

#### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

---

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50.

**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 50 as notified.

---

### **G F & A M Giles - Participant #: 20**

#### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitters' consider the Variation is a great idea as it allows sensible expansion from existing retail sites and strengthens two important retailing zones within the greater Blenheim area.

**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 50 as notified.

---

### **Sue Hutchinson - Participant #: 21**

#### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes Variation 50 for the following reasons:

1. It will remove the retail focus from the Blenheim CBZ and as Springlands is less than 10 minutes away it is preferable to keep all new retail areas within the same zone as existing in Blenheim.

2. The proliferation of light industry or commercial ugliness is opposed.

**Relief sought:** 1. No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's opposition, to be seeking no expansion of the Neighbourhood Business Zone at Springlands as proposed in Variation 50; and

2. That light industry and commercial activity should be concentrated in one area.

3. Trees and planting should be used to camouflage the existing commercial area.

---

### **Axis Productions Limited ( Sue & Nigel Hutchinson) (Sue & Nigel Hutchinson) - Participant #: 22**

#### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes Variation 50 for the following reasons:

1. It will diminish the retail focus from the Blenheim CBZ.

2. The proliferation of light industrial or commercial ugliness is opposed.

3. Good planning can concentrate commercial uses on the existing sites.

4. There seems to be a lack of good design when it comes to commercial districts (and residential districts too).

**Relief sought:** 1. No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's opposition, to be seeking no expansion of the Neighbourhood Business Zone at Springlands as proposed in Variation 50; and

2. Concentrating light industry and commercial use in one area and don't allow their sprawl over beautiful land.

---

---

## 121 Middle Renwick Road Limited ( Neil Hodgson) (Neil Hodgson) - Participant #: 23

### Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation

**Submission:** The submitter (land owner of 121 Middle Renwick Road) opposes Variation 50 because it will significantly erode the existing amenity and quality of life values and land value of their property.

Rezoning of 121 Middle Renwick Road through the variation will result in any future alternative building use or alteration, particularly residential building extensions, automatically triggering a resource consent. This will result in additional compliance costs, and reverse sensitivity issues in relation to residential versus neighbourhood business effects. A resource consent could also be required for this property for commercial activities if Derry Properties Ltd expansion proposals exceed the 5700m<sup>2</sup> gross floor area trigger. This is unfair and unreasonable, but potentially ultra vires.

A Neighbourhood Business Zone could potentially allow high traffic generating commercial activities, including large scale deliveries and customers to utilise the right of way as of right and therefore have a significantly adverse affect on the amenity values of the residential property. The proposed improvement to parking to the total site will not be significant as the right of way will mean any new parking will be fragmented in nature. Adjoining property titles not currently entitled to access the right of way will not be able to provide access across the right of way.

The section 32 analysis fails to take into account the effects on 121 Middle Renwick Road. The submitter states that the objectives and policies cited in the section 32 report remain incompatible with the existing dwelling and residential use of 121 Middle Renwick Road and fail to take into account any consideration for the health and wellbeing of the submitter's property. The submission also considers that the Variation does not meet the purpose and principles of the RMA.

- Relief sought:**
1. That Variation 50 be rejected in its entirety.
  2. That any further retail development be positioned in one of the new, purpose designed Business Parks such as the Outer Limits Limited proposal.
  3. If that does not occur, then the submitter seeks that the property at 121 Middle Renwick Road is protected by an amenity buffer zone on Derry Properties Ltd land around the residential dwelling. This buffer zone should achieve the same amenity protection as required for Neighbourhood Business Zones adjacent to residential boundaries including: an amenity buffer zone, height recession plane requirements, bulk and location requirements, height restrictions, noise restrictions measured at the boundary, restrictions on delivery hours and glare standards for residential purposes.
  4. That the driveway servicing 121 Middle Renwick Road not be utilised for commercial purposes and that it remains fenced, with the same residential buffering surrounding the entire length of it. Signage should be put in place to ensure that commercial users do not restrict access to the driveway.
  5. That 121 Middle Renwick Road be provided with the following permitted activities:
    - Residential purposes
    - Commercial Activities - in so far as a square meterage is provided for so that if Derry properties Ltd build around 121 Middle Renwick Road, there is still the ability to continue to have an option of permitted uses on the site.

---

## John Rocks - Participant #: 24

### Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation

**Submission:** The submitter objects to this supermarket extension due to the increased noise and the increased foot and car traffic accessing the supermarket from Lakings Road via Spinglands

scout den (no 48 Lakings Road). This has increased the rubbish problem which inevitably ends up in the submitters garden.

**Relief sought:** No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's opposition, to be seeking no expansion of the Neighbourhood Business Zone at Springlands as proposed in Variation 50.

---

## **Bruce & Tina Hampton - Participant #: 25**

### **Submission Point: 1.3.2 - Noise**

**Submission:** The submitters' oppose the erection of a 1.8 metre wooden fence.

**Relief sought:** The requirement should be for a 1.8 metre X 100mm thick concrete fence including the southern and eastern boundaries.

### **Submission Point: 1.3.4.2 - Landscaping**

**Submission:** The submitters' oppose the limit of noise by a 4.5 metre wide planted area abutting residential properties.

**Relief sought:** The requirement should be for a minimum of a 6 metre wide planted area including the eastern boundary.

### **Submission Point: 1.8.2.1 - Operating Hours - Commercial Activity**

**Submission:** The submitters' oppose any extension to the trading hours. Keeping the trading hours as they currently are will give them, as neighbours, some respite from noise over the weekend period.

**Relief sought:** The trading hours should remain the same - 0700-2100 Monday to Sunday.

### **Submission Point: 1.8.2.2 - Operating Hours - Deliveries**

**Submission:** The submitters' oppose the delivery hours. Keeping them as they are will give them and neighbouring properties respite from noise and lighting in the early morning and late evenings.

**Relief sought:** Delivery hours should remain the same as present.

---

## **NZ AA Marlborough District ( Kelston Swete) (Kelston Swete) - Participant #: 26**

### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50 on the basis that it is an existing feature and rational development is best served by consolidating existing services rather than permitting unplanned, sporadic development.

The submitter notes measures to protect safety and function of SH6 arising from expansion pressures along with increased side road demand at Boyce, Colemans and Battys/Murphys have been envisaged for some time. These involve roundabouts at the three intersections and a raised median between the three roundabouts.

**Relief sought:** 1. All access and internal movement to meet short and long term shall be designed by a qualified person to MDC's approval.

2. The current formation of queues back to the highway must be eliminated.

3. Signage needs to be reconsidered. Large primary identification with minimal distractive clutter is recommended. It should be the subject of Council approval.

4. Points of access and egress shall be clearly marked.

## Redwood Development Limited ( Paul Ham) (Paul Ham) - Participant #: 27

### Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50.

- Relief sought:**
1. No specific relief was sought by the submitter in terms of their support. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 50 as notified as well as the following additional relief.
  2. Consideration should be given to expanding the Redwood Town Neighbourhood Business Zone to cater for residential growth in the area.

---

## Tony Hay - Participant #: 28

### Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50 with one exception and this concerns existing Policy 1.8. (\*\*Note that Policy 1.8 is not proposed to be amended by Variation 50.)

The submitter's concerns relate to an accessway over Department of Conservation land at the back of the supermarket through to Lakings Road. Concerns exist because of the state of the accessway in terms of: accessibility, safety, litter, parking on Lakings Road and a lack of lighting. It is anticipated that these concerns will be made worse with expansion of the mall. For these reasons the submitter believes Policy 1.8 is not being adhered to. Suggested options of the submitter for dealing with the situation are by improving the state of the accessway or by closing it altogether. The submitter's preference is for it to be closed.

- Relief sought:**
1. No specific relief was sought by the submitter in terms of their support. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's support, to be seeking a retention of Variation 50 as notified subject to the following additional relief.
  2. That Derry Properties be required to close off the access to Springlands Mall from Lakings Road via the Department of Conservation property at No. 38 Lakings Road.

---

## Progressive Enterprises Limited ( James Gardner-Hopkins/Kristen Gunnell) (James Gardner-Hopkins/Kristen Gunnell) - Participant #: 29

### Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation

**Submission:** The submitter supports Variation 50 to the extent it is consistent with a centres-based strategy, achieves sustainable management and is supported by an appropriate section 32 assessment.

The submitter's reasons (to the extent it is consistent with the above), are that the Variation is appropriate and consistent with the purpose, principles and provisions of the RMA and the Proposed Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan, in terms of section of section 32 requirements regarding effectiveness and efficiency. The submitter also states that the Variation will enable the efficient use and development of resources within Blenheim and Marlborough, and will enable social economic and cultural well being and will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations.

- Relief sought:**
1. That the variation be adopted subject to any amendments necessary to best achieve:
    - a) a centres based strategy that enables a level of development commensurate with the needs of the community and the demand for growth in the district;
    - b) sustainable management; and
    - c) an appropriate section 32 assessment.
  2. Such further or consequential amendments necessary to give effect to this submission.

---

**Foodstuffs (South Island) Limited ( Rebecca Parish) (Rebecca Parish) - Participant #: 30**

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes Variation 50. This is because development at Springlands as proposed through the Variation will:

- be in direct competition with the central business area, potentially undermining the social and economic wellbeing (viability and vitality) of the district;
- not enable access to lower priced goods;
- not offer the large format retail which is needed in Marlborough; and
- place adverse pressure on on-street car parking in the adjoining residential environment.

The submission also states the Variation fails to adequately address the retail demands of the community and will contribute to commercial creep into the existing residential environment.

The submitter states that generally the Variation is inappropriate and inconsistent with the RMA, the Proposed Wairau/Awatere Resource Management Plan and the Transitional Marlborough District Plan.

**Relief sought:** Decline Variation 50.

---

**Wayne Palatchie - Participant #: 31**

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes any extension of the supermarket at the back of their property located at 9 Nicoll Street, Springlands. This is because of the problems he has experienced over 10 years from noise with trucks, forklifts etc operating at the rear of the supermarket. There have also been problems with rubbish in this area. The submitter asks why the supermarket operator cannot be made to beautify the back of the supermarket as well as the front so as not to devalue neighbouring properties?

The submitter believes that the situation will only get worse if the supermarket expands.

**Relief sought:** No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's opposition, to be seeking no expansion of the Neighbourhood Business Zone at Springlands as proposed in Variation 50.

---

**Outer Limits Limited ( Hugh Briggs) (Hugh Briggs) - Participant #: 32**

**Submission Point: 11.3.2.2 - New policies**

**Submission:** It is essential to maintain all Neighbourhood Business Zones as local shopping areas providing those "day to day" convenience goods and services that are appropriate in such locations. The Springlands Neighbourhood Business Zone requires additional limitations due to the potential on the SH6 frontage to attract other larger, more intensive forms of retail activity, which would be at an inappropriate scale and could create more traffic congestion.

**Relief sought:** 1. Amend new policy 1.9 to read "Ensure that any new retail activity within the Springlands Neighbourhood Business Zone reflects its role as a neighbourhood centre designed to serve the convenience needs of the local community, being subsidiary and complementary to the CBD and LFR zones."

2. Amend new policy 1.10 to read "Any such expansion of retail activity at the Springlands Business Zone shall be subject to an assessment of potential adverse effects on the neighbourhood servicing function of the Zone."

3. Add a new policy 1.11 "Retail activity of a more intensive nature, such as large format retail outlets, shall not be permitted in the Neighbourhood Business Zones."

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The opportunities provided by Variation 42 for large format retail in Neighbourhood Business Zones are highly inappropriate adjoining sensitive residential areas with traffic generation effects. The section 32 report did not evaluate the appropriateness of large format retail in the Neighbourhood Business Zone and should have done so.

Expansion of Neighbourhood Business Zone onto adjoining residential land is inappropriate

Retail activity needs to be compatible with the scale and function of a neighbourhood centre and therefore activity such as large format retail needs to be limited.

- Relief sought:**
1. There needs to be better amenity buffer controls.
  2. Add a new activity under non-complying activities as follows:  
"\*Large format retail activity"
  3. Off-site traffic management measures are required on SH 6 to accommodate additional traffic movements.

---

**Bryan K & Elaine W Lawless - Participant #: 33**

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitters' support the proposed variation as the existing Springlands Neighbourhood Business Zone provides an invaluable amenity in a pleasant and friendly environment, for the benefit of the whole Springlands area and its surrounds. It is hindered by a lack of space to expand. The submitters' don't believe the proposed expansion of the Zone could be seen as a threat to the viability of the CBZ or other Neighbourhood Business Zones.

**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 50 as notified.

---

**R E McDowell - Participant #: 34**

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes the variation as it will undermine the Central Business Zone, especially with the lack of street parking and high parking fees. Market and Queen Streets are the principal shopping areas where Marlborough people should be encouraged to shop in.

**Relief sought:** No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's opposition, to be seeking no expansion of the Neighbourhood Business Zone at Springlands as proposed in Variation 50.

---

**Nigel Hutchinson - Participant #: 35**

**Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

**Submission:** The submitter opposes the variation. The beautiful rural town residential area will be destroyed with ugly American style gross retail companies and in doing so undermine the heart of the town retail and social area.

**Relief sought:** No specific relief was sought by the submitter. However, the Council has inferred the submitter's opposition, to be seeking no expansion of the Neighbourhood Business Zone at Springlands as proposed in Variation 50.

## **Maxwell Kenneth Joseph & Patricia Marianne Currie - Participant #: 36**

### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

*Submission:* The submitters' support Variation 50.

*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 50 as notified.

---

## **M R Hamilton - Participant #: 37**

### **Submission Point: General - Whole Plan Variation**

*Submission:* The submitter believes that given the development that already exists at Springlands, it is appropriate to allow the area to be expanded, rather than allowing the Westwood proposal to be permitted. The submitter states it is not appropriate to have large barn type buildings in the Rose Street area

*Relief sought:*

1. Springlands Neighbourhood Business Centre should be allowed to expand with no greater restrictions for noise, hours etc than there is for Seymour Street area.
2. Total Gross Floor Area should not be limited.
3. Height should be somewhere near a 2 storey house height maximum.
4. Service vehicles should access the site off Lakings Road.
5. Businesses should have to provide adequate car parking for their clients and staff.

---