



SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED FOR PLAN CHANGE 36

Further submissions due 17/12/2010

Name Gordon, Peter and Dee

| Position | Plan Provision | Decision Requested | SubNo. |
|-----------------|--|---|---------------|
| Partly Support | 11.3.7, 11.5.5.1(13) and (22) | That plan change 36 be adopted with the following amendment: That establishment of the bund and landscaping thereof as a condition of an ODP should provide sufficient mitigation to enable subdivision to be completed and buildings commenced without having to wait for the landscaping to mature. | 36/1/1 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee Support points 1-4 | <i>Support</i> | 36/1/1 |
| Partly Support | Rule 11.6.2 (ii) Figure 1 | That plan change 36 be adopted with the following amendment: That Figure 1 of Rule 11.6.2(ii) be amended so the combined height of bunding and landscaping be 7 metres (rather than 8 -9 metres) and; That there is greater flexibility as to the height of vegetation and mounding to achieve the required combined height | 36/1/2 |
| Partly Support | 11.5.5.1(14) | That plan change 36 be adopted with the following amendment: That it be clarified that the Structure Plan referred to in Rule 11.5.5.1(14) is the one on Page 22. That it be clarified how the ODP would control development on land already subdivided. | 36/1/3 |
| Partly Support | Rule 11.6.2 (c) | That plan change 36 be adopted with the following amendment: That the assessment matters of Rule 11.6.2(c) should not require the ODP to reassess the suitability of the stormwater systems or other services already in place in the developed part(s) of the Structure Plan. | 36/1/4 |

Name Ledgerwood, Jim and neighbours

| Position | Plan Provision | Decision Requested | SubNo. |
|-----------------|---|---|---------------|
| Oppose | | The land needs to be excavated to the level of Balantyne Rd, Gordon Rd, and Frederick Street so that the buildings will not be too visible. | 36/2/1 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | <i>Oppose</i> | 36/2/1 |
| | Oppose submission 36/2/1 as significant excavation is intended in order to lower levels to those shown on the contour plan attached to the submission. This is the lowest practicable ground level and will reduce the visibility of buildings from outside the site. Together with retaining the knoll, the proposed bunding and landscape planting, and the maximum building controls, the proposed excavation is considered to provide suitable screening and will avoid or mitigate adverse visual effects. Lowering the site to the level of Gordon and other surrounding roads would be financially unviable; would produce more fill to be disposed of than is practicable; and the environmental effects would be too great | | |

Name Orchard Road Holdings Limited

| Position | Plan Provision | Decision Requested | SubNo. |
|-----------------|---|--|---------------|
| Oppose | The Structure Plan and zone map (the geographic extent of the plan change) | That the plan change 36 boundary be extended to include the 'industrial extension' and 'buffer reserve' land and associated road network over the ORHL land as shown on the plan entitled 'Orchard Rd Holdings Industrial Zone Extension Concept Plan' attached to the submission. Any consequential changes to the provisions in order to give effect to the relief sought. | 36/3/1 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | Other | 36/3/1 |
| | Regarding point 36/3/1, the submitter would not be concerned if ORHL's land were included in the plan change area but note that consequential changes to the plan change would be required. | | |
| Oppose | The entire plan change | That plan change 36 be rejected in its entirety | 36/3/2 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | Oppose | 36/3/2 |
| | Regarding point 36/3/2 the plan change should be approved even if the relief sought in this submission is not granted | | |

Name Strong, Donah L

| Position | Plan Provision | Decision Requested | SubNo. |
|-----------------|--|---|---------------|
| Oppose | | If there is a need for more industrial land then keep the buildings low so that they are not visually polluting | 36/4/1 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | Oppose | 36/4/1 |
| | Regarding point 36/4/1 the landscape mitigation and site and zone standards proposed provide sufficient mitigation to avoid adverse visual effects, noting that industrial buildings generally require a 7 m building height in order to satisfy operational requirements. | | |

Name Wallace, Shona and Bob

| Position | Plan Provision | Decision Requested | SubNo. |
|-----------------|--|--|---------------|
| Oppose | The entire plan change | That the whole plan change be disallowed | 36/5/1 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | Oppose | 36/5/1 |
| | Oppose point 36/5/1 on the basis that the landscape mitigation and site and zone standards proposed provide sufficient mitigation to avoid adverse environmental effects. The noise controls provide for similar levels of noise at night as are allowed in the residential areas in the daytime. The location of the planted bund will help attenuate some of this noise. The noise levels should not create adverse effect on nearby residential activities. | | |

| Position | Plan Provision | Decision Requested | SubNo. |
|-----------------|--|---|---------------|
| Partly Support | | To approve the plan change but take account of the following point: Extend the Industrial B Zone to include the land owned by the submitter and the designated site on the corner of Riverbank and Ballantyne roads. | 36/6/1 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | <i>Oppose</i> | 36/6/1 |
| | Oppose including the submitters sites in this plan change (submission point 36/6/1) as it has not been considered or consulted on, will have different environmental issues, and would be better considered through a separate plan change process. | | |
| | Orchard Road Holdings Limited | <i>Oppose</i> | 36/6/1 |
| | Oppose the submission (points 1-7) on the basis that the submitter's land is isolated from the land subject to plan change 36; is located on the riverbank and, as such, potentially raises a unique set of environmental effects not addressed through plan change 36; and the land would more appropriately be dealt with through a separate plan change. | | |
| Partly Support | | To approve the plan change but take account of the following point: Formulate the zone such that heavier industries are located together, away from lighter industry | 36/6/2 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | <i>Support</i> | 36/6/2 |
| | Support submission point 36/6/2 as it is the intention of the Industrial B Zone to encourage industrial activities into the zone, leaving other business zones for lighter industrial and commercial activities. | | |
| Partly Support | | To approve the plan change but take account of the following point: Clarify what the relevant Structure Plan is and what it means | 36/6/3 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | <i>Support</i> | 36/6/3 |
| | Support submission point 36/6/3 as this clarification is also sought by submission 36/1/3. | | |
| Partly Support | | To approve the plan change but take account of the following point: If residential and offices are intended to be prevented then they should be prohibited | 36/6/4 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | <i>Oppose</i> | 36/6/4 |
| | Oppose submission point 36/6/4 as the rules (which make residential uses prohibited, ancillary offices permitted, and other offices non complying) are appropriate in that they prohibit residential and discourage offices except those that are an ancillary use from locating in this zone. | | |
| Partly Support | | To approve the plan change but take account of the following point: Airports and associated activities should be prohibited | 36/6/5 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | <i>Oppose</i> | 36/6/5 |
| | Oppose submission point 36/6/5 as airports are unlikely to ever become an issue given the proposed development of the zone, its size, and the proximity to residential areas. | | |
| Partly Support | | To approve the plan change but take account of the following point: No reason why offensive trades (Health Act 1956) should be non complying | 36/6/6 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | <i>Oppose</i> | 36/6/6 |
| | Oppose submission point 36/6/6 as non complying status provides greater ability to decide if such activities (offensive trades) are appropriate and, if so, then the effects can be adequately mitigated through conditions. | | |
| Partly Support | | To approve the plan change but take account of the following point: The proposed separation distance from residential activities may not be sufficient. | 36/6/7 |
| | Further Submissions - Firth Industries | <i>Support</i> | 36/6/7 |
| | Support submission 36/6/7 in relation to the fact that the separation distance of residential activities may not be sufficient as issues of reverse sensitivity and cross boundary impacts from industrial activities may impact upon nearby residential dwellings. | | |
| | Gordon, Peter and Dee | <i>Oppose</i> | 36/6/7 |
| | Oppose submission point 36/6/7 as there are no residential activities on adjacent sites and there is the ability for further separation distances to be included on future plan changes on adjacent land if necessary in order to avoid reverse sensitivity issues. Given the distances from existing residential activities from the site, the 15m wide planted bund is considered a sufficient separation distance between the proposed industrial and these residential activities. | | |

| Position | Plan Provision | Decision Requested | SubNo. |
|----------|---|--|---------------|
| Oppose | 11.3.8 activity table | The table needs to specifically detail that the processing of animal or fish products is prohibited | 36/7/1 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | Oppose | 36/7/1 |
| | Oppose submission point 36/7/1 as it is considered that non complying status provides sufficient ability to decide if such activities are appropriate and, if so, then the effects can be adequately mitigated through the consent process | | |
| Oppose | 11.5.5 - performance standard 3 (outdoor waste storage areas) | Outdoor waste storage areas should be screened from neighbouring properties to help prevent them being visible from residential areas, particularly at the Frederick St end of the zone | 36/7/2 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | Oppose | 36/7/2 |
| | Oppose submission 36/7/2 on the basis that agree with the principle of screening waste areas from views of out of zone neighbours and roads but that buildings, the proposed bunding, and screen vegetation will ensure sufficient screening. | | |
| Oppose | 11.5.5 (4) - Fencing | That fencing be required on all zone boundaries; not just where there is no road or open space separating the zones. | 36/7/3 |
| | Further Submissions - Gordon, Peter and Dee | Oppose | 36/7/3 |
| | Oppose submission point 36/7/3 and approve the plan change as drafted | | |
| Oppose | 11.5.5 (5) - Hours of operation | Reduce the allowable hours of operation from 8 pm to 6 pm and either apply the hours of daytime operation to all sites within the zone OR locate the zone much further away from rural residential areas. | 36/7/4 |
| | Further Submissions - Firth Industries | Oppose | 36/7/4 |
| | Oppose amendment to Rule 11.5.5(5) seeking a reduction of the hours of operation for all sites within the Industrial B Zone (point 36/7/4) as this will likely restrict the anticipated industrial activities from establishing within the Industrial B zone. Consequently industrial activities requiring a high level of amenity may establish in the zone, which may be inconsistent with those activities already established. Potential effects of reverse sensitivity and cross boundary issues may arise. | | |
| | <i>Gordon, Peter and Dee</i> | Oppose | 36/7/4 |
| | Oppose 36/7/4 as greater restrictions on the hours of operation would mean industrial activities would locate in other zones without the restrictions, which would not achieve the outcomes sought for this zone. | | |
| | <i>Wanaka Landfill Limited and Maungatua Contracting</i> | Oppose | 36/7/4 |
| | Oppose the requested reductions in operating hours and noise limits (36/7/4 and 36/7/6) as a) industrial activities require longer operating hours to cater for business needs and customer requirements; and b) higher noise levels than those proposed by the submitter are required to enable industrial activities to operate without hindrance and this is the very purpose of an industrial zone. | | |
| Oppose | 11.5.5 (10) - Building Heights | Amend the maximum building height above ground from 7 metres to 6 metres. | 36/7/5 |
| | Further Submissions - Firth Industries | Oppose | 36/7/5 |
| | Oppose amendment to rule 11.5.5(10) seeking to amend building height from 7m - 6 m (point 36/7/5) as this will likely restrict the anticipated industrial activities from establishing within the Industrial B zone. Consequently industrial activities requiring a high level of amenity may establish in the zone, which may be inconsistent with those activities already established. Potential effects of reverse sensitivity and cross boundary issues may arise. | | |
| | <i>Gordon, Peter and Dee</i> | Oppose | 36/7/5 |
| | Oppose submission point 36/7/5 as the landscape mitigation and site and zone standards proposed provide sufficient mitigation to avoid adverse visual effects, including those of building height. It is noted that industrial buildings generally require a 7 m height in order to provide sufficient internal space to satisfy operational requirements. Any less height potentially affects the ability of the site to be used for industrial purposes and would not achieve the outcomes sought for the zone. | | |
| Oppose | 11.5.5 (11) - Noise | The noise limits should be lowered to: Daytime 50 decibels maximum with any short term allowable exceptions not being of a regular or ongoing nature and, at night-time, a 40 decibels maximum (no short term exceptions permitted) OR the zone should be located much further from rural residential areas. | 36/7/6 |
| | Further Submissions - Firth Industries | Oppose | 36/7/6 |
| | Oppose amendment to rule 11.5.5(11) seeking a greater restriction in noise standards (point 36/7/6) as this will likely restrict the anticipated industrial activities from establishing within the Industrial B zone. Consequently industrial activities requiring a high level of amenity may establish in the zone, which may be inconsistent with those activities already established. Potential effects of reverse sensitivity and cross boundary issues may arise. | | |
| | <i>Gordon, Peter and Dee</i> | Oppose | 36/7/6 |
| | Oppose 36/7/6 and maintain the noise controls as per the plan change on the basis that they provide for similar levels of noise at night to those allowed in the residential zones in the daytime and that the location of the planted bund will also help attenuate noise. | | |