



SUMMARY OF DECISIONS REQUESTED IN SUBMISSIONS TO

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 14

TIMARU DISTRICT PLAN

**Summary of Decisions Requested in Submissions to Proposed Plan Change 14: Timaru District Plan
Washdyke Industrial Expansion**

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
1. Meadows Road Trustees	109542 / 109543	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roading & stormwater management • Cycle linkages • Usage of wetland area • Service contributions & compensation 	<p>Generally Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative roading network should not be binding. Primary & secondary roads could be repositioned for more efficient use of land. • Cycle linkages excessive – question the need for linkages along primary & secondary roads to Aorangi Road. Construction costs for cycleways should fall on the wider community, as of little benefit to industry. • Wetland area outside the Coastal Erosion Zone should still be capable of being used by the land owner. • Inclusive consultation process should be undertaken to determine how stormwater or other service contributions are calculated, along with compensation to affected landowners. 	As described
2. Thompson Investment Trust	109541	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Roading & stormwater management • Cycle linkages • Service contributions & compensation 	<p>Generally Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Indicative roading network should not be binding. Primary & secondary roads could be repositioned for more efficient use of land. • Cycle linkages excessive – question the need for linkages along primary & secondary roads to Aorangi Road. Construction costs for cycleways should fall on the wider community, as of little benefit to industry. • Inclusive consultation process undertaken to determine how stormwater or other service contributions are calculated, along with compensation to affected landowners. 	As described
3. Transpower NZ Limited	109502	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sections 74(2) and 75(3)(a) of the RMA obliges Council to ensure that provisions of a proposed plan 	<p>Oppose in Part: If approved the plan should be modified to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recognise the benefits of the National Grid • Ensure and protect the ability for ongoing operation and maintenance of the network • Protect the existing network from issues of reverse 	<p>A. That TDC refrains from approving the proposed plan change (PPC) unless the provisions of the plan change are amended to ensure:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The NPSET is given effect to; • The sustainable management of the National Grid as a physical resource; • The protection of the existing network from issues of reverse sensitivity and the effects of others' activities.

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
		<p>change give effect to a national policy statement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Section 74 of RMA states PPC must have regard to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement 	<p>sensitivity</p>	<p>B. Include provisions that appropriately recognise and provide for an adequate level of protection for the National Grid from adverse effects of subdivisions, buildings, structures and tree planting associated with third party activities/development. This could be achieved by including the following provisions within the PPC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduce a new Performance Standard and advice notes in the Industrial L Zone of Part D of the District Plan numbered 5.15 and entitled 'Electricity Transmission Line Buffer Corridor - Seadown Road' and for this provision to specify that the following standards apply to developments in the Industrial L Zone: <p>Activities within the Electricity Transmission Line Corridor – Seadown Road as shown on Council's planning maps:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ No building or structures shall be located within 20 metres either side of the centre point of an electricity transmission line designed to operate at or above 110kV. <p><u>Advice Note:</u> That vegetation to be planted within the electricity transmission line buffer corridor as shown on Council's Planning Maps for Seadown Road should be selected to ensure that it will not result in that vegetation breaching the Electricity (Hazards from Trees) Regulations 2003.</p> <p><u>Advice Note:</u> Transpower shall be considered an affected party for any activity requiring consent under Rule 3.7 or 4.1, or as a consequence of non-compliance with Performance Standard 5.15, 'Electricity Transmission Line Corridor – Seadown Road'.</p> <p>C. Introduce a new provision, numbered 3.7 in the Industrial L Zone provisions which identifies activities in the 'Electricity Transmission Line Corridor – Seadown Road' as identified on the District Plan maps as follows:</p> <p>3.7 Buildings and structures located between 8m and 20m either side of the centre point of an electricity transmission line designed to operate at or above 110kV which does not meet performance standard 5.15, the Council shall restrict its discretion to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proximity of buildings and structures to electrical hazards; The risk of electrical hazards affecting public safety and risk of property damage;

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The risk of electrical faults causing disruption to electricity supply; • The extent of earthworks required and use of mobile machinery near the transmission line which may put the line at risk; • The risk of radio interference or earth potential rise; • Any other matters set out in plans for buildings; and • Extent of compliance with NZECP34:2001. <p>D. Introduce a new non-complying provision for buildings and structures located within 8m of either side of the centre point of an electricity transmission line designed to operate at or above 110kV as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">4.1 Buildings and structures located within 8m either side of the centre point of an electricity line designed to operate at or above 110kV.</p> <p>E. Introduce new subdivision provisions relating to the Electrical Transmission Line Corridor – Seadown Road as follows:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Amend provision 6.3.7.13 to read as follows (amendment underlined):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">Any subdivision in the Residential 6 Zone <u>or Industrial L Zone</u> that creates new allotments within an area measured 20 metres either side of the centre point of an electrical transmission line designed to operate at or above 110kV, shall be a Restricted Discretionary activity and shall comply with the Performance Standards and General Rules.</p> <p>F. Plot the alignment of the Electrical Transmission Line Corridor – Seadown Road on all relevant planning maps along with notation that identifies the corridor and relevant plan provisions.</p> <p>G. The following are examples of provisions that Transpower considers are suitable provisions relating to the implementation of Policies 10 and 11 of the NPSET and that could be included in the District-wide plan change to give effect to those NPSET policies.</p> <p><i>Issues</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Encroachment of development and land use activities on existing infrastructure/network utilities.</i> ➤ <i>Managing the adverse effects of subdivision, development and activities on</i>

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
				<p><i>the National Grid (infrastructure/network facilities).</i></p> <p><i>Objectives</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>The provision for the sustainable, secure and efficient use and development of the electricity transmission network within the Timaru District while seeking that adverse effects on the environment are avoided, remedied or mitigated to the extent practicable, recognising the technical and operational requirements and constraints of the network.</i> ➤ <i>To recognise the importance of the National Grid to the district's, regions and nations social and economic wellbeing.</i> <p><i>Policies</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>To manage the reverse sensitivity effects generated by subdivision and land development within electricity transmission corridors to avoid, remedy or mitigate the adverse effects on both the safe, secure and efficient use and development of the transmission network and on the safety and amenity values of the community.</i> ➤ <i>Recognise and provide for existing and future transmission corridors when identifying and managing areas of new urban development to ensure the safe and efficient use and development of the transmission network.</i> ➤ <i>To generally avoid locating buildings, structures, earthworks and tall vegetation under or within immediate proximity to a transmission line.</i> <p><i>Explanation & Reasons</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Subdivision and future development of land over which high voltage transmission lines pass must be controlled so existing corridors are not compromised and adverse effects on the high voltage infrastructure are appropriately managed.</i> <p><i>Environmental Results Anticipated</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ <i>Adverse effects on the National Grid from subdivision, development and other land use activities are avoided or mitigated.</i> <p>H. Such other relief to those parts of the PPC to which sections 75(1)(a) and (b) and 75(2) of the RMA are applicable and that are consequential to the changes referred to above, and/or are necessary to give effect to the NPSET.</p>
4. Raewynn Gail	109495	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands	Oppose:	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
Campbell		to Light Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise, dust, pollution, poor air quality • Health issues • Safety issues due to increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	
5. Simon Manson	109494	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Increased traffic, increased risk • Noise and pollution • Loss of Morrison Park 	Do not rezone
6. Kathrin Manson	109493	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Noise • Increased traffic, increased risk • Air quality compromised due to dust and pollution • Loss of Morrison Park 	Do not rezone
7. Maria Magdalena Johanna Swarepoel	109492	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Dust & pollution • Noise • Increased traffic, increased danger • Loss of recreation land, especially Morrison Park 	Do not rezone
8. Gillian Miskelly	109491	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise, dust and pollution • Health issues • Safety issues with increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
9. Stephanie Joy Horne	109490	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise • Increased traffic, increased danger 	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air quality compromised due to dust and pollution affecting health & plants • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	
10. Rachael Laura Vincent	109489	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise, dust, pollution creating poor air quality • Health issues for humans, animals & plants • Safety issues due to increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
11. Monique Reynecke	109488	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise, dust, pollution creating poor air quality • Health issues for humans, animals & plants • Safety issues due to increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
12. James Basil Arps	109487	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise, dust, pollution creating poor air quality • Health issues for humans, animals & plants • Safety issues due to increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
13. Corey Joseph Arps	109486	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise, dust, pollution creating poor air quality • Health issues for humans, animals & plants • Safety issues due to increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
14. Philip Frances Pain	109485	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No buffer zone provide on re-zoned lands • Loss of Morrison Park as recreational • Devaluation of private properties including rural • Dust / noise pollution to private properties including rural 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 100m buffer zone created on land proposed for rezoning • 100m buffer zone created on land proposed to all rural & residential private properties and recreational • Keep Morrison Park as recreational

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
15. Janet Rebecca Pain	109483	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Safety issues with increased traffic • Increased noise • No buffer zone between rural and light industrial • Health issues due to dust and pollution • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
16. Rodney James Kerrison	109482	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural lifestyle • Noise • Pollution • Increased traffic, safety issues • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
17. Gemma Margaret Elizabeth Silke	109481	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural lifestyle • Noise • Increased traffic, increased danger • Air quality due to dust and pollution affecting health & plants • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
18. Helen Louise Williams	109480	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise, dust, pollution – poor air quality • Increased traffic, increased risk • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
19. Michella Ho Brosnahan	109478	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise • Increased traffic, increased risk to road users • Dust and pollution affecting air quality – health issues • Loss of recreation area including Morrison Park 	Do not rezone
20. Leona	109479	Rezoning Rural 1 &	Oppose:	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
Macartney		Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Noise • Safety issues with increased traffic • Dust and pollution - health issues • Loss of recreational land 	
21. Kayo Middlemass	109477	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Noise, dust pollution • Health issues • Safety issues • Loss of recreational land 	Do not rezone
22. Glen Lloyd Middlemass	109476	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic and associated risk to cyclists • Land better suited to housing or farming 	Do not rezone
23. Olivia Mary Simpson	109475	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise, dust pollution affecting air quality • Health issues for humans, animals & plants • Safety issues due to increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
24. Clifford Anderson	109474	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise, dust pollution creating poor air quality • Health issues for humans, animals & plants • Safety issues due to increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
25. Matthew Simpson	109473	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Poor air quality due to dust & pollution • Noise • Safety issues due to increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
26. Mark Theodore	109472	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands	<p>Oppose:</p>	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
Pavelka		to Light Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Health issues, noise, dust pollution • Children's & general safety issues due to increased traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	
27. Lisa Joy Bowman	109471	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise pollution • Poor air quality due to dust & pollution • Close proximity to housing & farms • Health issues • Traffic safety regarding children • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
28. Vivienne Wilson	109470	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural outlook • Noise pollution • Poor air quality due to dust & pollution • Health issues • Safety issues due to heavy traffic • Loss of Morrison Park for recreation 	Do not rezone
29. Marc Hageman	109469	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Noise & pollution • Loss of recreation land, especially Morrison Park 	Do not rezone
30. Geoffrey & Anne Uys	109461	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of recreational land 	Do not rezone
31. New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)	109466	The plan change in its entirety	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPC will absorb & utilise more than remaining capacity in the State Highway (SH) network • Provisions not sufficient to avoid, remedy or mitigate the actual or potential effects of the rezoning, particularly in relation to addressing upgrading to the key intersections of SH1/Seadown Road and 	<p>NZTA request that the following provisions be added to the District Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Amend the following on the Outline Development Plan (ODP). <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Notation on the ODP that no new direct access is to be provided to SH1 from any of the rezoned land; b. Removal of the notation which mentions signalisation at the intersection of Meadows Road and Hilton Highway;

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
			<p>SH1/Meadows Road, and upgrading SH1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PPC does not give effect to section 31 of RMA by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Not establishing appropriate measures to achieve integrated management of land and associated natural & physical resources - Not controlling effects of the use, development or protection of land - Doesn't have regard to efficiency & effectiveness • Methods of PPC do not implement policies of the District Plan required by section 75(1) of RMA. • Provisions of PPC do not achieve objectives & policies of the District Plan required by section 76(1)(b) of RMA. • PPC inhibits NZTA of meeting its statutory responsibilities by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Impinging ability of NZTA to provide for sustainable land transport - Impacting on the SH network • PPC does not achieve objectives & policies of the District Plan, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Transport – Part 8 Objectives 1 & 3; and Policies 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 9 & 11 • PPC does not give effect to the Canterbury Regional Policy Statement, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Chapter 12, Objective 2 & Policy 3 - Chapter 15, Objective 1 & Policy 1 • Mitigation measures to be included in the PPC provisions. 	<p>c. Identify by way of notation Phase 1 (covering the area of land already zoned industrial) & Phase 2 development land (the new 74 hectares of land); and</p> <p>d. That a through road must be shown from the end of Elginshire Street which links up with Seadown Road on the ODP.</p> <p>Any such rules must be included where appropriate in the following chapters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation • Industrial L & H Zones • Subdivision <p>2. Include where appropriate rules to the following effect:</p> <p><i>No subdivision shall take place within that area of land identified on the Washdyke Industrial Expansion ODP as Phase 2 unless:</i></p> <p>i. <i>Upgrading of the SH1/Seadown Road intersection and roading surroundings has taken place which includes:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>The left southbound lane be extended back for a distance of not less than 200m;</i> 2. <i>Additional left turn land 200m in length be constructed;</i> 3. <i>The right-turn bay on the Seadown Road approach to SH1 be extended to 250m.</i> <p>ii. <i>Upgrading of the intersection of SH1/Meadows Road and surroundings has taken place which includes:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>adding an extra lane on SH1 south bound lane -this would require bridge widening;</i> 2. <i>adding additional land on the SH1 south exit;</i> 3. <i>hi-entry angle left turn land out of the intersection.</i> <p><i>Subdivision on any Phase 2 land prior to the above works being undertaken is a non-complying activity.</i></p> <p>3. Include the following in the rules for Industrial Zones, in the area covered by Phase 2 Washdyke Industrial Expansion Area ODP:</p> <p><i>Non-Complying Activities:</i> <i>The erection of any building and structure, or establishment of any activity</i></p>

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
				<p><i>within the Industrial L Zone and/or the Industrial H Zone within the Phase 2 area identified on the Washdyke Industrial Expansion Area ODP, shall be non-complying unless:</i></p> <p><i>i. Upgrading of the SH1/Seadown Road intersection and roading surroundings has taken place which includes:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. The left southbound through land be extended back for a distance of no less than 200m;</i> <i>2. Additional left turn land 200m in length be constructed;</i> <i>3. The right-turn bay on the Seadown Road approach to SH1 be extended to 250m.</i> <p><i>ii. Upgrading the intersection of SH1/Meadows Road and surroundings has taken place which includes:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. Adding an extra land on the SH1 southbound land. This would require bridge widening.</i> <i>2. Adding extra land on the SH1 south exit.</i> <i>3. Hi-entry angle left turn land out of the intersection.</i> <p>4. Include the following rules into Transportation Rules 6.7.2:</p> <p><i>Access Washdyke Industrial Expansion Area – Phase 2</i></p> <p><i>i. No new direct vehicle access to SH1 shall be provided from any site, or any property within any zone within the Phase 2 area as shown on the Washdyke Industrial Expansion Area ODP.</i></p> <p>And any consequential amendments to issues, objectives, policies, methods, rules, explanation and principal reasons and any other provisions necessary to give effect to the above.</p> <p>Alternatively, if the above measures are not accepted:</p> <p>Any alternative relief that resolves the matters contained in the submission.</p>
32. Jack Harrison Law	109464	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan change in its entirety • The rezoning of 	<p>Oppose: That PPC 14:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is inappropriate • Will not promote the sustainable management or 	<p>That the PPC be rejected.</p> <p>In the event that the PPC is adopted:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. That his property at Seadown Road not be rezoned and instead be retained as

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
		submitters property from R1 to a mixture of Rural 1, Industrial L & Industrial H	<p>efficient use of natural and physical resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Is inconsistent with sound resource management practice Is inconsistent with the purposes and principles of Part 2 of the RMA <p>Reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPC indicates the new boundary between the Industrial Zones and the current Rural 1 Zone running through the centre of Mr. Law's property, dividing his 6038sq.m property into 3 different zones, Rural 1, Industrial L & H. This is considered unreasonable, making the on-going use and development of the property difficult. Existing dwelling sits in the proposed Industrial H Zone, resulting in any redevelopment of the house being a non-complying activity. Adverse amenity effects, including noise, odour and visual effects. 	<p>Rural 1 zoning.</p> <p>b. That landscaping be required along the edge of the new zoning boundary to mitigate the adverse visual effects of development of his property.</p>
33. Southern Packers Limited	109463	Stormwater Management – Wetland 2 Area	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Location of the proposed Wetland 2 stormwater <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Building consent obtained and intention to construct a new storage building on the site of the proposed Wetlands 2 area. Building work is scheduled to commence in July 	Southern Packers Ltd wishes to continue with their development plans with the minimum costs & disruption, to allow them to construct the storage building on-site.
34. Philip & Raewyn Bensemman	108322	None – submission relates to rezoning land outside PPC area, being the area zoned Residential 1 and Residential 4 located between SH1 & SH8	Support	To rezone the lands currently zoned Residential 1 & 4 located between State Highways 1 & 8 to Industrial L and Commercial.
35. Anthony Aloysius &	109460	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closing of Seadown Road 	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closing of Seadown Road Rail Crossing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seadown Road railway crossing remain open No rezoning of rural land and Morrison Park – or industrial development within this

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
Suzanne Denise Blackstock		Rail Crossing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning of Rural 1 and Recreation 2 lands bound by SH1 and Seadown Road Encroachment of Rural 1 & 2 Zone lands 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning of Rural 1 Zone lands bound by SH1 and Seadown Road Reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential area almost surrounded by industrial zoned land Traffic & safety, especially school bus routes Encroachment of Rural 1 & 2 Zone land 	block <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No heavy or light industrial development on Rural 2 Zone land.
36. Sandra Ann Falvey	109446	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise, light, vibrations, air quality, dust, sunlight/daylight, odour, health issues, hazardous substances, fire risk Property value Visual amenity – disruption of views and rural outlook, privacy Groundwater quality Access conflicts, increased traffic Loss of recreation area 	Do no rezone
37. Colin Ross Iggo	109447	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial Rezoning of land east of Seadown Road to Industrial H Closing intersection of Meadows / Seadown Road & opening new road south of existing 	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise, odour, dust, air & vibration pollution: from increased traffic, construction & industry – health effects Obtrusive light; glare Reduction in property values Residential & visual amenity – loss of rural outlook; privacy; security; degrading of townscape Road safety & traffic – including school busses and cyclists; access from Flemington Street onto Seadown Road Ground water quality Loss of sunlight/daylight Fire risk / hazardous substances from industry Loss of recreational area Potential for inappropriate signage Due process not followed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not rezone If PPC does proceed, measures which mitigate against the effects of the rezoning the land between the Residential 1 area and the proposed Industrial L area are outlined in a petition. TDC to advise on mitigation measures for living downwind of a heavy industrial area – or compensation in lieu. Do not open new road – divert traffic away from Flemington Street / Seadown Road intersection

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
38. Washdyke Action Group Incorporated	109448	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial • Rezoning of land east of Seadown Road to Industrial H 	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, odour, dust, air & vibration pollution: from increased traffic, construction & industry – health effects • Obtrusive light; glare • Reduction in property values • Residential & visual amenity – loss of rural outlook; privacy; security; degrading of townscape • Road safety & traffic – including school busses and cyclists; access from Flemington Street onto Seadown Road • Ground water quality • Loss of sunlight/daylight • Fire risk / hazardous substances from industry • Loss of recreational area • Potential for inappropriate signage • Due process not followed 	<p>Measures to mitigate against effects of rezoning Rural 1 lands between Seadown Road, Randwick Place and SH1:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noise: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. At least 100m separating industrial development from residential area b. A planted mound 10m high with mature vegetation of 2-3m high c. Noise monitoring to be strictly enforced by Council 2. Obtrusive Light <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Points a. & b. above apply b. No lighting above 10m in new industrial area 3. Air quality; health issues; groundwater quality; odour; hazardous substances <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Council to monitor and respond rapidly to complaints 4. Dust <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Points 1. (a. & b.) above apply b. No dust producing materials to be stored unless in a building 5. Aesthetics <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Points 1. (a. & b.) above apply b. The open area between Randwick Place & the industrial area to be turned into parklands 6. Suitability of Roads <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. TCD to look at safety measures to mitigate new risks. This may include traffic lights at Seadown Road / Flemington Street intersection, with pedestrian crossing and a cycle/walkway parallel to Seadown Road. 7. Sunlight / Daylight <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Point 1. (a.) above applies b. No buildings or structures should be visible over embankment as viewed from Randwick Place 8. Indigenous Fauna Habitat <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Suitable landscaping to be provided for skinks in the parkland. Construction must be periodic to allow skinks to move to new habitat 9. Fire Risk

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
				<p>a. Park lands to be watered and groomed to provide a suitable firebreak</p> <p>10. Loss of Morrison Park as a community recreation area</p> <p>a. Point 5. (b.) above applies</p> <p>b. New park land to be created in consultation with community. A cycle/walkway to be hard against the base of the embankment.</p> <p>11. Property values, loss of outlook and changed townscape, loss of privacy & security</p> <p>a. Compensation to be arranged for those affected</p> <p>12. Lack of consultation with land owners & immediate adjacent community</p> <p>a. Expect involvement in formulation & design of all above points</p>
39. Robert Walter Mackay	109449	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise - engine breaks from heavy vehicles; construction noise • Obtrusive light facing residential area • Air quality, health issues – dust, fumes, particulates • Devaluation of property • Visual amenity, aesthetics – disruption of views and rural outlook • Suitability of roads & site access • Sunlight • Privacy & security • Flora & fauna – especially protection of skinks • Access to Seadown Road, especially from Flemington Street & safety for school children • Loss of recreation area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not rezone Rural 1 land between SH1 and Seadown Road • Resubmit an acceptable alternative proposal
40. Barry Jonathan Angel	109413	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise – traffic, construction, factory • Obtrusive light • Vibration, compacting – traffic, construction • Air quality – fumes, particles, odour • Dust – traffic, construction • Property values • Visual, amenity, aesthetics, loss of rural outlook, privacy, security 	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suitability of roads for increased traffic • Ground water quality • Sunlight/daylight • Health issues • Flora & fauna 	
41. Kirstie Elenor Mackay	109370	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of rural outlook and amenity – including memories 	Do not rezone
42. Simon Cullimore	109387	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of properties • Noise, odours, dust, impaired views • Lack of consultation • Change to natural habitats, especially the skink population 	Do not rezone
43. Helen Joy Cooke (may also include submission on behalf of S. Wills; J. Cooke; and D. Hoare)	109412	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise – traffic, construction, factory • Obtrusive light • Vibration, compacting – traffic, construction • Air quality – fumes, particles, odour • Dust – traffic, construction • Property values • Visual, amenity, aesthetics, loss of rural outlook, privacy, security • Suitability of roads for increased traffic; site access to/from Seadown Road • Ground water quality • Sunlight/daylight • Health issues • Flora & fauna • Reinstatement of buffer zone in front of Randwick Place residents (min 50m) • Hazardous substances • Fire risk • Loss of recreation area • Cost to ratepayers • Lack of consultation 	Do not rezone
44. David	109374	Rezoning Rural 1 &	Oppose:	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
Swaney		Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Excessive noise & dust from traffic and industry • Loss of rural outlook • Need to address compensation for devaluation of property • Lack of consultation 	
45. Andrew William Vosper	109371	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of rural outlook • Increased dust 	Do not rezone
46. Irene Swaney	109373	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose in Part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of rural outlook • Devaluation of property • Loss of recreational facility (Morrison Park) • Noise, dust, visual outlook, sunlight, health issues, hazardous substances, fire risk, odours, privacy, security, increased traffic & resultant safety issues, cost of road network & infrastructure • Lack of consultation 	Do not rezone
47. Carolyn Mary Mackay	109451	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of rural outlook • Lack of consultation 	Do not rezone
48. Trevor Laws	109422	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose in Part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of existing townscape 	Do not rezone
49. Andrew Derek Workman	109465	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial • Rezoning of Rural 2 to Industrial H 	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise effects • Devaluation of property 	TDC to seek alternative location which would not disrupt residential amenity, e.g. Washdyke Flat Road
50. Joanne Marie Peat	109423	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Negative health impacts • Devaluation of property, privacy & residential amenity • Reduced air quality – increased dust 	Reject PPC 14
51. Jeffery Peat	109424	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ground water quality 	Reject PPC 14

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
		to Light Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health issues • Noise 	
52. Antoinette Maree Iggo	109425	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning of lands to Industrial L <p>Reason:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic • Dust, noise and odour • Loss of view • Devaluation of property 	Reject PPC 14
53. Leona Ferguson	109426	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic • Pollution • Noise • Resale value 	Do not rezone
54. Morris Frank Billington	109427	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust and noise • Devaluation of property 	Do not rezone
55. George Henry Edgeler	109428	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of rural lifestyle • Creation of dust • Loss of agricultural land 	Do not rezone
56. Andrea Ferguson	109429	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust and noise • Devaluation of property 	Do not rezone
57. Dennis Matayae	109430	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of Morrison Park • Dust and noise • Devaluation of properties 	Do not rezone
58. Selina Joy Hetherington	109431	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hours of operation • Devaluation of properties 	Do not rezone
59. Dave Berry	109432	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of properties • Loss of recreational land • Increased noise 	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of rural outlook 	
60. Terry Penamone	109433	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise pollution • Devaluation of properties 	Do not rezone
61. James David Drake	109434	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced air quality • Increased traffic 	Do not rezone
62. Walter Kenneth Penman	109435	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of properties 	Do not rezone
63. Rodger John Smyth	109436	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased noise & dust • Devaluation of property 	Do not rezone
64. Julian Graham	109437	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Pollution of water table 	Do not rezone
65. Elizabeth Fay Shand	109438	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, dust, air pollution • Change of environment • Devaluation of property & lifestyle 	Do not rezone
66. Gary Allan Shand	109439	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise & dust • Need protection of existing residential area 	Do not rezone
67. Rodd Ashley Darrech	109440	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise & dust • Traffic • Loss of recreational area 	Do not rezone
68. Thomas Hartley	109441	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property values • Noise & dust 	Do not rezone
69. Christine Hartley	109442	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Property values • Noise & dust 	Do not rezone
70. Jennifer June Eddington	109443	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise & dust pollution • Disruption to lifestyle 	Do not rezone
71. Ray Alec	109445	Rezoning Rural 1 &	Oppose:	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
Waters		Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of air quality and increased dust, fumes and particles will affect health 	
72. Audrey Lilian Waters	109444	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resultant health issues 	Do not rezone
73. Deirdre Margaret Whitley	109450	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial • Rezoning of Rural 2 to Industrial H 	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emissions, noise and all associated adverse effects on residential amenity 	Rezone Washdyke Flat Road instead as it will not affect as many residents.
74. Mary Bernadette Barker	109401	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of consultation • Industrial adjacent to residential activities • Increased traffic on Seadown Road • Noise • Lack of buffer between residential and industrial sites 	Do not rezone If PPC is approved, provide a buffer zone between the residential and industrial areas.
75. Valerie Fay Angel	109417	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose	Do not rezone
76. Zela Margaret Barlow	109416	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust & odours • Health issues 	TDC to take into account the wildlife and the people in the area
77. Dorothy Meryll Henke	109415	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic, dust, noise and health issues • Lack of consultation 	Do not rezone
78. Rachael Fearn	109414	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust, odour, noise and health issues • Safety and health of children • Increased heavy traffic 	Do not rezone
79. Andrew Fearn	109414 / 109457	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Increased traffic, odour, dust and reduction in air quality • Safety concerns for children 	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
80. Diane Maisie Welsh	109411	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health issues arising from fumes, particles & dust • Devaluation of property • Increased traffic • Noise 	Do not rezone
81. Donald Sommerville Welch	109410	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Increased noise, dust & traffic • Health issues • Air quality • Ground water quality 	Do not rezone
82. Ida May Johnson	109409	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose in Part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, property value, increased traffic, ground water quality, odour, privacy, security, flora & fauna, hazardous substances, pollution, loss of recreation area, access to Seadown Road, financial cost to rate-payers 	Do not rezone Rural 1 & Recreation lands to Industrial L
83. Richard Broomhall	109407	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise • Health issues • Increased traffic • Devaluation of property 	Do not rezone
84. Louise Broomhall	109406	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic • Noise • Health issues • Devaluation of property 	Do not rezone
85. Peter Fairbairn	109405	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Increased rates • Increased traffic on Seadown Road • Safety risk for school children catching bus 	Do not rezone
86. Pam Fairbairn	109404	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Increased rates • Increased traffic causing increased dust, noise & health hazards 	Do not rezone

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety risk for school children 	
87. Joanne Everett	109403	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impact on families & health 	Do not rezone
88. Eric Percival Parker	109402	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust • Increased traffic • Property values • Loss of recreation area • Reinstatement of buffer area between residential and industrial – minimum 50 metres 	Do not rezone
89. Jocelyn Martha Phiskie	109400	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose in Part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust contamination • Noise • Devaluation of property • Health problems to humans & animals 	Do not rezone Rural 1 & Recreation lands to Industrial L
90. William Donald Phiskie	109399	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose in Part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust contamination • Noise • Devaluation of property • Health problems to humans & animals 	Do not rezone Rural 1 & Recreation lands to Industrial L
91. Margaret Josephine Gallagher	109398	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust, pollution • Cost to ratepayers • Property values 	Do not rezone
92. Reon James Keenan	109397	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Traffic causing increased noise & dust • Safety for school children 	Do not rezone
93. Megan Elizabeth Hughes	109396	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose in Part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase noise, traffic, construction dust, odour • Air quality • Property value • Ground water quality • Health issues • Privacy, security • Loss of recreation area 	Do not rezone Rural 1 & Recreation lands to Industrial L

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to Seadown Road • Flora & fauna 	
94. Rachel Anne Hughes	109395	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase noise, traffic, construction dust, odour • Air quality • Property value • Ground water quality • Health issues • Privacy, security • Loss of recreation area • Access to Seadown Road • Flora & fauna 	Do not rezone Rural 1 & Recreation lands to Industrial L
95. Anne Marie Hughes	109394	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase noise, traffic, construction, dust, odour, obtrusive lighting • Air quality • Disruption of views & rural outlook • Suitability of road for increased traffic • Property value • Ground water quality • Health issues • Privacy, security • Loss of recreation area • Access to Seadown Road • Reinstatement of buffer zone in front of Randwick Place 	Do not rezone Rural 1 & Recreation lands to Industrial L
96. David John Hughes	109393	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase noise, traffic, construction, dust, odour, obtrusive lighting • Air quality • Disruption of views & rural outlook • Suitability of road for increased traffic • Property value • Ground water quality • Health issues • Privacy, security • Loss of recreation area 	Do not rezone Rural 1 & Recreation lands to Industrial L

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to Seadown Road • Reinstatement of buffer zone in front of Randwick Place 	
97. Graham Dean Welford	109392	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of rural outlook • Dust, noise, air quality, odours • Devaluation of property 	Do not rezone
98. Phil Christie	109391	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disruption to outlook • Noise, dust odour caused by factories 	Do not rezone
99. Arthur Raymond Welford	109390 / 109456	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not want to live beside industrial land 	
100. Rose Welford	109389	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Safety for children crossing road • Pollution, health • Traffic noise • Loss of views • Disruption to sleep • Devaluation of property • Dirt & dust • Change in character from residential to industrial 	Do not rezone
101. Deborah Jackson	109388	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Effect on air quality, dust • Loss of views & rural outlook 	Do not rezone
102. Gary Neville Jackson	109385	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Noise, dust and health issues • Privacy 	Do not rezone
103. Carl Francis Rapsey	109384	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, dust, odour, pollution • Resale of property • Ground water quality • Financial costs to rate-payers • Inconvenience to access Seadown Road 	Withdrawal of PPC
104. Carl Francis Rapsey	109381	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, dust, pollution, odour, 	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inconvenience to residential dwellers 	Withdrawal of PPC

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
		fire risk, air quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cost to rate-payers • Reduced property values • Inconvenience to access Seadown Road 		
105. Leolie Ennis	109383	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, less light, air quality, vibrations, dust, vermin, pollution, fire risk • Loss of rural outlook • Health issues • Loss of privacy & security • Access to Seadown Road • Devaluation of property • Increased rates 	Do not rezone If approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide minimum 50m buffer having regard to site specific flora & fauna • Adequate buffer planting to reduce pollution effects
106. Gerald Ennis	109382	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, loss of light, increase in dust, odour & air quality • Increased traffic • Reduced visibility from home 	Do not rezone If approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide minimum 50m buffer having regard to site specific flora & fauna
107. Raymond Noel Colvill	109380	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of views and outlook 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suspend proposed to allow further consultation. • Restrict hours of operation from 7.30am – 5.30pm Monday to Friday to limit effects of noise, dust and traffic
108. Philip & Julie Reese Jones	109454	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of property • Loss of visual amenity • Noise & dust 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All new industrial development contained east of Seadown Road, with west to remain unchanged • 75m buffer extending north of residential area • Suitable screening along buffer to retain residential amenity, including adequate landscaping, prior to development of industrial land • No stockpiling of earth or shingle etc • Prohibit buildings over 10m in height • Enforcement of District Plan rules
109. Robert Newton	109455	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No industrial development west of Seadown Road 	Keep all development east of Seadown Road

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
110. Debbie Ennis	109378	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose in Part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic, fumes, construction noise, vibrations • Loss of outlook & winter sun • Dust and fumes from machinery – effect on air quality 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not rezone recreational land to Industrial L • Planting to protect local ecology • Minimum 100m buffer between residential area and new industrial
111. Philip John Luscombe	109377	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose in Part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, dust, traffic, construction • Devaluation of properties 	Do not rezone from Rural 1 to Industrial L
112. Lory Luscombe	109376	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose in Part: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise, dust, traffic, construction • Devaluation of properties 	Do not rezone from Rural 1 to Industrial L
113. Dave Fraser	109375	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential surrounded by industrial use 	
114. Scott Anderson Mackay	109452	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic related noise • Loss of local ecology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not rezone from Rural 1 to Industrial L • Restrict rezoning to eastern side of Seadown Road
115. Trevor John Brosnahan	109372	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation of properties • Noise & visual impact on residential lifestyle • Safety issues due to increased traffic • Dust pollution and its associated effects on farming 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TDC to consider compensation to landowners • 100m buffer zone north of residential area
116. Jack Simmons	109369	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Devaluation, noise, dust, security, traffic, access to property, industrial odours, rates & rubbish 	Do not rezone
117. Scott Justin Berry	109368	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic, noise, pollution & dust • Devaluation of properties 	Do not rezone
118. Alan Gibbs	109367	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of rural lifestyle • Increased noise & dust pollution • Loss of recreation area 	Do not rezone
119. Morris Family	109366	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Due to effect on Washdyke community 	Do not rezone – leave for farming
120. Fraser B	109364	Rezoning Rural 1,	Oppose:	Do not rezone the Rural 1, Rural 2 and Recreation zones

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
Ross		Rural 2 & Recreation 2 lands to Industrial L & H Zones	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of food producing soils • Industrial development non-sustainable use for the land • Loss of flora, including 'specimen oak trees' • Loss of residential amenity • Impacts on stormwater runoff and downstream ecosystems • Inadequate consultation • Alternative sites not examined 	<p>If approved, impose the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Productive soils to be removed for other use • Specimen and native trees to be retained • Provide amenity roadside planting • Stormwater design to ensure no contamination of waterways or wetlands • Rural 1 lands between SH1 and Seadown Road to remain Rural 1 or zoned Residential • Maintain and enhance residential amenity of existing residents • Independent Commissioner to oversee hearing to avoid any potential conflicts of interest
121.Richard Douglas Thomas Scott	109353	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial • Routing of heavy traffic along Seadown Road 	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of Seadown Road by heavy vehicles, which will be in conflict with the residential users • Lands east of Meadows Road already zoned for industrial use should be utilized first • Loss of potential for expansion of residential area • Increased dust, noise and air pollution, created from industrial uses which will potentially lead to the Canterbury Clean Air Programme and associated guidelines being exceeded. • Devaluation of properties • Insufficient detail on the type of industrial uses that could establish north of residential area - need to limit the type of uses to prevent potentially harmful industries on human health • Loss of quality of life for existing residents • Rural 1 land north of Randwick Place should remain rural to limit potential for industrial expansion • Increased noise & dust and a loss of peace and quiet • Children's safety along Seadown Road • Loss of Morrison Park for residents and workers in the Washdyke area 	<p>Do not rezone the Rural land north of Randwick Place</p> <p>If permitted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Industrial activity should be controlled to retain residential habitat • Place caveat on the land prohibiting certain types of industry <p>Suitable mitigation measures to retain a level of residential amenity, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Installing double glazing and other noise reducing measures • Clean air burners or heat pumps <p>Independent Commissioner to oversee hearing to avoid any potential conflicts of interest</p>
122.Ken	109337	Rezoning Rural 1 &	Oppose:	

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
Robinson		Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic along Seadown Road • Loss of recreational area • Health issues – dust, noise • Loss of natural habitats • Devaluation of properties 	
123.Dorothy Merle Robinson	109336	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased traffic along Seadown Road • Poor access to Seadown Road • Loss of recreational area • Health issues – dust, noise • Loss of natural habitats • Devaluation of properties 	
124.Aoraki Development Trust & the South Canterbury Chamber of Commerce	109317	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Endorse the concept for increasing both Industrial L & H zones • Support the roading plan • Support the development of the greenways 	<p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Further residential development would hamper further industrial development in this area • Need sufficient industrial zoned land to accommodate industrial growth – provides a catalyst for growth in the district • Areas required to lure new business ventures to Timaru 	Fully support the proposed
125.Ian Lachlan Howie	109237	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	Oppose	An explanation for the justification of any zone change
126.Michael Coffey	109173	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial • Closing intersection of Meadows & Seadown Roads and creating a new opening 	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dust, visual outlook, noise, air quality, stress • Devaluation of properties • Closure of intersection of Meadows & Seadown Roads and creating a new opening will create dust, noise, vibration and affect safety & sleep 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep land north of residential area rural, recreational or residential • Need buffer between residential and industrial uses of at least 200m & raised to protect visual impact • Retain existing intersection of Meadows and Seadown Road and provide a new road directly west to SH1 for all industrial traffic – this will avoid traffic passing residential area
127.Thornhill Holdings	109147	Rezoning of lands to Industrial Light	<p>Generally Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative locations for Industrial L land to be 	Delete the proposed Industrial L Zone amendments to Part C Planning Maps 22, 25 & 26

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
Limited			given more consideration, especially between Washdyke Flat Road & SH8, and the land between SH1 & SH8	
128.Land Services Group Limited	109148	Supports the intent of the proposed plan	Generally Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All rules should be contained in the appropriate rules section of the District Plan and not in a separate appendix Delete proposed Part D 4.1.3.5 new bullet Delete proposed Part D 4.2.1.15 Delete proposed Part D 4.2.2.13 Delete proposed Part D 8 Appendix 4 – the indicative roading pattern & stormwater management criteria could readily be shown in Part C (Planning Maps) of the District Plan Delete the proposed Industrial L Zone amendments to Part C Planning Maps 22, 25 & 26
129.Rooney Holdings Limited	107850	Supports the underlying principles of the proposed plan	<p>Supports:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> PPC will provide for future industrial growth, generating economic & social well-being for the people and community of the district <p>Opposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Closure of part of Seadown Road as it will impede sustainable transport in the area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> TDC allow the PPC to provide for rezoning Amend the PPC to exclude the closure of part of Seadown Road
130.Pauline Greta Berry	109408	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of rural lifestyle Increased traffic Dust, noise & pollution would affect health Devaluation of properties 	Do not rezone
131.Christopher David Swaney	109386	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreational lands to Light Industrial on western side of Seadown Road	<p>Oppose in Part:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Noise & dust effects from industry Interruption to sleep Affect on rural aspect Loss of privacy 	
132.Ian Russell & Janice Louise Geary	109352	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consultation Evaluation Performance standards Evaluation of alternative 	<p>Oppose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning of Rural 1, Rural 2 and Recreation to Industrial L & Industrial H Costs to rate payers Compensation for loss in property value Lack of meaningful consultation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review the proposal Provide scientific facts supporting the plan change

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
		methods <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary & conclusions 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of amenity & view, noise, odour, dust emissions & traffic 	
133.M.S & E.A Gregerson	108969	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreation 2 lands to Industrial L on western side of Seadown Road	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreation 2 land best drained sports facilities in Timaru and should be retained Residents need protection from noise, dust, diminished sunlight, invasion of privacy, mental stress, odours, increased traffic, visual impact, hazardous chemicals Devaluation of property Closing of railway crossing at Seadown Road would result in a dangerous intersection from Meadows Road to cross track to Seadown Road 	Do not rezone Rural 1 lands west of Seadown Road or Recreation 2 lands (Morrison Park)
134.Philip James Drake	108848	Rezoning Rural 1 lands to Industrial L	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Devaluation of property Noisy / dusty operations close to residential 	Do not rezone Rural 1 lands
135.Jan Ellen Colvill	109379	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreation 2 lands to Industrial L	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Residential safety Loss of rural views Noise, dust, traffic impacts on residential 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce speed limit on Seadown Road to 50km Protect rural views
136.G. P. Brown	109310		Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recreational land should be retained Creation of noise, dust, traffic 	
137.Patrick Joesph David Daly	109164	Changing character of area	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Loss of rural life Danger to groundwater Loss of views Increased noise, fumes, particles Devaluation of property 	TDC to purchase property if selling
138.Dawn Reihana	109418	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreation 2 lands to Industrial L	Oppose: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rezoning not required Health, hazards 	Do not rezone
139.Hermann G Frank	109251	Rezoning Rural 1 & Recreation 2 lands to Industrial L	Neutral: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed rezoning of the Rural 1 lands north of the residential area will result in the loss of habitat for the common skink – this is in conflict 	Retain a buffer of approximately 20 – 30m between the residential area and the proposed Industrial L lands to retain a habitat for the skinks. This could be planted with native flora. This strip should be in public ownership and provided in a staged manner.

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
140.PrimePort Timaru Limited	109235	Full Provisions	<p>with the requirements of the RMA</p> <p>Support:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In full support of the need and objectives to be delivered by the rezoning • Planning for other industrial land needs to be resolved now – Washdyke provides the logical choice • Freight advantages pertain to Washdyke and Timaru – within 200km of 75% of south island population; proximity to SH1, main trunk rail, airport, PrimePort; land & services with capacity to expand • Ideally located to support service industry for the rural sector • Support the roading plan introduced, specifically the need to upgrade Meadows Road intersection • Promote the inclusion of cycleways within the roading or stormwater greenways • Considers that the industrial area proposed is insufficient for future growth: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scope of the plan needs a vision that is 50 years plus - If not identified for industry now, residential or lifestyle development would develop as a ribbon around the existing or proposed zone - Use of adjacent land irrespective of planning rules becomes an issue of reverse sensitivity - Acquiring land that is residential or developed as lifestyle will not be economic in comparison to the current rural use - The planning of road and council services needs to be future proofed for expanded development, allowing that development to be staged. If expanded concepts are not included now, the cost of retrofitting new roading or services will be prohibitive or impossible to locate within the development - 48Ha of new industrial land may be adequate 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Approve PPC • Extend plan area to be designated Industrial L & H • Plans should be redrawn incorporating significantly greater zones of Industrial L & H (as far as Kennel’s Road) • The plan should designate proposed zones of land use in addition to the locked in designations as shown. This would provide a buffer and protect against future development which would otherwise preclude future industrial use. This option would ensure a staged development. • Reverse sensitivity is a real issue that needs to be addressed to ensure industrial development is not hindered.

Submitter Number and Name	Subn ID / Mail No.	Specific provisions of the proposed plan change that my submission relates to	Submission i.e. whether the submitter supports or opposes specific provisions and the reasons for these views	The following decision is sought
			<p>for next 10 years, but is not sufficient to meet the longer term</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investments by other regions demonstrates that the Timaru district needs to maintain competitive options • Aggregating transport connections, waste disposal and other services in one area is practical 	
141. Proteus Holdings Ltd (c/o Mark Edward Woodward)	109087	None – submission relates to rezoning land outside PPC area, being the area zoned Residential 1 and Residential 4 located between SH1 & SH8	Support	To rezone the lands currently zoned Residential 1 & 4 located between State Highways 1 & 8 to Industrial L.