

## Submission Summary – Urban Residential Four

Sub. No.	Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Contact Person (if applicable)	Specific provisions of proposal	Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Submission	Relief Sought	Wish to be Heard
1	Roslyn Fountain			Amenity - two storied housing	Oppose	It should not go ahead. I have seen in many cases the distrss it can cause neighbours of single storied houses. Loss of sun, loss of privacy or loss of view. It reduces the enjoyment of lifeand value of property. When people buy it is for a reason and I don't consider it right for this to change indiscriminately. It can be devastating, psychologically, emotionally and mentally. I found the consultation to be too secretive for the general public. Ity required looking up what these variations meant. A good proportion of the public would not do this. It could have been clearly stated on the mailer at no extra cost. Look forward to improvement on this regard	That this does not go ahead. That the decsion be based on human value and consideration rather than cramming everyone into compromised situations for profit. That the situation is seen as a possible beginning of negative things rather than positive.	Yes
2	Paul Williams	Provincial Coldstores Ltd	Paul Williams	Reverse sensitivity	Oppose	Figure 2 (map showing potential sites available for infill subdivision) on page 45 of the Section 32 report for Variation 7, shows undeveloped greenfields sites for potential <i>Urban Residential 2</i> development. This includes land immediately to the east and south of the PCL site. It is also stated on page 45 of the s32 report that: ' <i>There is the potential that future sites may seek to rezone to Urban Residential 4 through a plan change/variation process will be located on HPL and will be assessed on its merits. However, the proposed desity will assist in reducing the spacial extent to the minimum necessary</i> '. The implication with this map and the above statement is that at least some of the areas that are currently zoned <i>Urban Residential 2 - Greenfields</i> may be suitable to eventually be zoned <i>Urban Residential 4</i> by means of a Plan Change. The <i>Urban Residential 4</i> zone will provide for considerably more dense urban development that does <i>Urban Residential 2</i> . PCL is concerned that rezoning land in proximity to PCL to <i>Residential 4</i> (or any other residential zone for that matter) would further intensify the potential for reverse sensitivity issues with the well-established rural industries on the PCL site.	Further intensification in the form proposed by Urban Residential 4 in the vicinity of the PCL site is not allowed (inferred)	Yes
3	Simon Collett	Kerepi Ltd	Mark Lile		Support	Kerepi Limited fully support the changes proposed to Volumes 1, 2 and 3 of the MEP, and in particular, the proposed new Urban Residential 4 Zone. This new zone has been developed alongside Kerepi Limited, with input from its multi-disciplinary team. This also included constructive input from the Council and its professional advisors, including specialised urban design advice. Careful consideration has been given to the new planning framework making up Variation 7. As a result of that process, it is considered that the new Zone will efficiently and effectively achieve Objective 12.1, and the outcomes sought within proposed policies 12.1.7 and 12.2.4A. Alongside Variation 6, it is considered that Variation 7 will help the Council deliver on its obligations under the NPS-UD, and in doing so, will also see the creation of a well-functioning urban environment that will serve a range of housing needs. Kerepi Limited also supports Variation 7 as it is submitted that this variation: 1. the form of development enabled by Variation 7 (and Variation 6) is appropriate for this site and location; 2. the change has given appropriate consideration to natural hazards and freshwater values (Caseys Creek); 3. will maintain the character and amenity of the adjacent residential environment; 4. will lead to development that can be appropriately serviced and accommodated within the local transportation network.	Support the variation (inferred)	Yes
4	Craig Piner	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Craig Piner	6A.2.8 Water supply and access for firefighting	Amend	This submission addresses matters relating to activities required to be undertaken to enable an effective emergency response and to provide for the health and safety of people and communities. Issues of particular interest and relevance to Fire and Emergency broadly include: - ensuring emergency service appliances and Fire and Emergency personnel can adequately access the built environment in future UR4 development scenarios in the event of an emergency, and - ensuring new UR4 development is adequately serviced by firefighting water supply. <u>Emergency service access</u> Fire and Emergency requires adequate physical access to ensure that it can respond to emergencies. This includes access in the event of fire, natural hazard, hazardous substances spill, medical incident, or a rescue or assist. For fire appliances to access an emergency, adequate carriageway width, height clearance, road gradient and tracking curves (among other requirements) are necessary to support the operational requirements of fire appliances. To support efficient and effective emergency response, the general requirements relating to emergency vehicle access are as follows: - Carriageway widths should not be less than 4m to accommodate a fire appliance. This width is required for firefighters to efficiently work around the fire appliance and safely access and operate the hoses, pumps and other equipment. - A clear vehicle crossing of no less than 3.5m wide should be provided as site entrances, internal entrances and between buildings. - A height clearance at vehicle crossings and along carriageways should not be less than 4m. This includes gateways/doorways and overhanging structures (e.g. ducts, pipes, sprinklers, walkways, signs, structural beams, trees, hanging cables, etc.). - The maximum negotiable gradient is 1:5 but, in general, the roading gradient should not exceed 16%. - Operate pumping appliances from a hard standing capable of withstanding the fully laden weight of a fire appliance from which fire operations for a structure are conducted. Often, this can be done from the public road, and this is how Fire and Emergency prefers to operate, where possible. The full requirements for emergency vehicle access are set out in detail within the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 and within the Firefighting Operations Emergency Vehicle Access Guide (F5-02 GD). <u>Firefighting water supply</u> The primary objective of Fire and Emergency is to reduce the incidence of unwanted fire and the associated risk to life and property. To achieve this objective Fire and Emergency requires adequate water supply be available for firefighting activities. It is critical for Fire and Emergency that water supply infrastructure is in place prior to any development commencing, and that this water supply has adequate capacity and pressures available to service the future developments in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008 <u>Variation 7: firefighting water supply and access</u> Existing Policy 12.2.5 relating to all urban residential zones includes the requirement that subdivision and/or residential development can be adequately serviced (stormwater, sewer and water), accessed and/or otherwise adequately managed. This policy is amended by Variation 7 and this amendment is supported by Fire and Emergency for reasons set out [Sic] above. Further, Variation 7 introduces a new permitted activity standard 6A.2.8. Water supply and access for firefighting that requires: - 6A.2.8.1 New buildings (excluding accessory buildings that are not habitable) shall have direct access to a Council reticulated water supply with fire fighting capability including hydrants. - 6A.2.8.2 Where a building (excluding accessory buildings that are not habitable) is located more than 75m from the nearest road that has reticulated water supply (Including hydrants) access must have a minimum formed width of 4m, a height clearance of 4m and be free of obstacles that could hinder access for	That Council accept new performance standard 6A.2.8; andIntroduce a new assessment criteria for non-compliance with performance standard 6A.2.8 as follows:a. The extent to which compliance is achieved with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008This will provide Council and applicants a prompt to consider the extent of effect and associated risk of non-compliance in relation to the permitted activity standard 6A.2.8 for fire fighting water supply and emergency service access.	Yes

Sub. No.	Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Contact Person (if applicable)	Specific provisions of proposal	Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Submission	Relief Sought	Wish to be Heard
						<p>firefighting and emergency service vehicles. Fire and Emergency supports this new performance standard to the extent that it requires new buildings to have access to Council's reticulated network with firefighting capability and where a building cannot be accessed within 75m of the road that has reticulated water supply, that a minimum formed vehicle access of 4m to accommodate emergency service vehicles be provided. This is paramount in medium density developments where, for example, side and rear setbacks can be as low as 1m from boundaries (as provided for through Variation 7), which can increase the risk of fire spreading and can inhibit Fire and Emergency personnel from getting to a fire source. It is also expected that all UR4 developments will be reticulated and that any new water supply infrastructure provided to service UR4 in greenfield locations will be designed and constructed in accordance with SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Where an activity that cannot comply with 6A.2.8.1, an application under 6A4.1 must be made as a discretionary activity. This will allow Council full discretion to consider the extent of non-compliance with 6A.2.8. Fire and Emergency notes that no reference is made to SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as a means of compliance.</p>		
5	Allison Tindale	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Allison Tindale	Reverse sensitivity	Amend	<p>Variation 7 introduces a new planning framework that considers Medium Density Housing [sic] in a greenfields situation (Urban Residential 4) into the PMP. Whilst supporting documents indicate that there is no current intention to apply this zone to land within 100m of the rail corridor, it is possible that future applications could be lodged, which propose to rezone land to this new medium-density zone, which are close to the rail corridor. As the variation is introducing a new planning framework into the Environment Plan and that framework is to be carried across into various sites that are not currently known, KiwiRail seeks to reduce the potential for future conflicts between new residential development and the rail line, by the inclusion of provisions in District Plans which manage the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. These provisions do not reduce the development potential of land but seek to ensure that new dwellings built close to the rail corridor, provide an appropriate internal noise environment for occupants, that mitigates the noise which could be generated by day and night-time passenger and freight train movements. These provisions also provide a clear signal to landowners/developers that additional requirements apply to buildings used for noise sensitive activities close to the rail corridor. KiwiRail considers that it is appropriate for potential transportation and reverse sensitivity effects to be included in the planning framework as well as being considered in more detail at future plan change stages when site specifics are known. The regional significance of the rail corridor, in addition to the likelihood of occupants of buildings used for noise sensitive activities, are likely to suffer adverse noise effects, where they are located within 100m of the rail corridor, unless they are carefully designed, requires a more strategic approach. Noise effects from rail operations have the potential to be felt more than 100m from the corridor, however KiwiRail takes a pragmatic approach to the issue and does not seek for provisions to apply beyond 100m, but does seek to ensure new or altered noise sensitive activities have adequate protection from established rail operations. The rail network is a 24 hour a day, seven day a week operation, and the frequency, length and weight of trains is not static and changes regularly based on customer requirements. Noise can have an impact on the internal amenity of a building. Appropriate mitigation, installed to ensure that the health and wellbeing of those living and working near to the rail network are not adversely affected, is pivotal to ensure that undue restrictions are not placed on the operation of the rail network. KiwiRail seeks the inclusion of a new permitted standard that sets out the level of mitigation required to be achieved to ensure an appropriate level of internal amenity in buildings for sensitive activities. This is most effectively achieved at the time of construction. The further removed from the rail corridor a building is, the less additional mitigation may be required. The noise level proposed is in accordance with the World Health Organisation standards, with an adjustment reflecting that trains are intermittent and that often there is a degree of community acceptance of train noise. Where the permitted standard is not complied with, it is recommended that consent is required as either a Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary activity. KiwiRail has also suggested appropriate matters of discretion, should a consent be required. KiwiRail is also seeking the imposition of a "no-build" setback within 5m of the railway corridor for new buildings or structures on sites adjoining the railway corridor. This is to ensure that people can use and maintain their land and buildings safely without needing to extend out into the railway corridor, minimising the risks of physical interference on railway operations and health and safety hazards on these residents. It is critical that the Plan provides for adequate management of the interface between urban development and lawfully established, critical infrastructure, such as the railway network. New buildings should provide healthy living environments, which allow the rail network to operate and develop in the future without constraint. An integrated and proactive approach to planning is critical to support the overall vision of our urban environments, and to ensure that our transport network can support the increasing growth and housing intensification.</p>	<p>Add new definition for clarity with associated mapping: <a href="#">Highway and Railway Noise Overlay means the area potentially affected by a noise between a railway corridor boundary or State Highway boundary and a distance of 100m. Highway and Railway Noise Overlay shown on the planning maps identifies areas that have the potential to experience high noise levels from rail and road traffic. New buildings and alterations to habitable rooms in buildings used for sensitive land uses within land zoned Urban Residential 4 are required to demonstrate that adverse noise effects have been appropriately managed by demonstrating compliance with the new noise standard.</a> Add new definition with associated mapping: <a href="#">Rail Vibration Alert Area Overlay means the area potentially affected by vibration between a railway corridor boundary and a distance of 60m.</a> Amend comments regarding reverse sensitivity under Issue 12A in Chapter 12: Urban Environments of the PEMP (Appeals Version) third paragraph. 'Reverse sensitivity' can also be an issue – when residential development comes closer to existing rural or industrial development <a href="#">or established transport networks</a>, and the amenity expectations of the new residential uses can limit the <a href="#">existing or future</a> operation of <del>the</del> established rural, <a href="#">or</a> industrial <a href="#">or transport</a> activities.' Supports proposed policy 12.1.7 regarding the enablement of medium density housing. An amendment is sought to clause (d) to address potential reverse sensitive effects between noise sensitive activities, particularly new dwellings and established transport networks. The following is suggested: (d) On-Site Amenity: Provide acceptable on site amenity in respect to privacy, solar access, daylight, <del>and</del> outlook <a href="#">and internal noise</a> by stipulating: ... (v) <a href="#">the use of acoustic noise mitigation within noise sensitive activities located in the Highway and Rail Noise Overlay which achieves the noise standard specified in 6A.3.10.</a> An amendment to clause (f)(f) ensuring peoples health and wellbeing through: (i) good building design including energy efficiency and the provision of natural light; (ii) <a href="#">Within Urban Residential 4, requiring the use of acoustic insulation for noise sensitive activities within the Highway and Railway Noise Overlay that ensures that residents are protected from unreasonable noise levels during the day and night.</a> Amend existing Policy 12.2.2 regarding the protection and enhancement of the character and amenity value of residential environments. <a href="#">(e) Ensuring that new buildings used for noise sensitive activities in the Urban Residential 4 zone provide an appropriate internal noise environment within the Highway and Road Transport Overlay that mitigate noise effects on occupants and allow for uninterrupted sleep at night.</a> Add new explanatory text under existing policy 12.2.7 The adverse effects of noise are an issue in urban environments where noise may impact on people's health and their enjoyment of the area in which they live. While background noise is unavoidable, lower density residential environments generally enjoy lower ambient noise levels and lack intrusive noise. Higher density residential environments can expect similar protection, but it is recognised that as they are in closer to main roads and business activities, residents can anticipate a higher level of noise to occur. To ensure that the character and amenity of the urban environment is maintained, limits on <a href="#">some</a> noise <a href="#">generating activities will be imposed</a> through permitted activity standards. <del>will be imposed:</del> <a href="#">Noise generated by the use of vehicles along the Highway and trains operating within the railway corridor can not be satisfactorily addressed through permitted activity standards. As a consequence, new noise sensitive activities within the Highway and Railway Noise Overlay are required to use noise acoustic mitigation to achieve an acceptable level of internal amenity. This requirement currently only applies to properties within the Urban Residential 4 zone.</a> Add an additional permitted standard under 6A.2.1 Construction and siting of building...relating to the need for a setback from the rail corridor. 6A.2.1.17 <a href="#">Buildings and structures within the Urban Residential 4 zone must not be located within a 5m setback from a boundary with a rail corridor. Non-compliance with this standard, will require a resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Matters for consideration, where this standard is not complied with are: 1. The safe and efficient operation of the rail network. 2. Compatibility with the surrounding environment. 3. The reason for the reduced setback.</a> Add an additional permitted standard under 6A.2.1 Construction and siting of a building...relating to the need for acoustic insulation on properties within the Highway and Railway Noise Overlay. <a href="#">6A.2.1.18 Within the Urban Residential 4 zone, noise sensitive activities in the Highway and Railway Noise overlay must comply with noise standard 6A.3.10.</a></p>	Yes

Sub. No.	Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Contact Person (if applicable)	Specific provisions of proposal	Support/ Oppose/ Amend	Submission	Relief Sought	Wish to be Heard
6	Paul Enright		Rachel Enright	Amenity	Oppose	Building of medium density housing in the greenfield next to 170 Muller Road. - Building of medium density housing is too high for existing areas character - Parking congestion and increased noise and traffic - Increase in crime and safety concerns for children and elderly - The height of the buildings may cast shade and block sun on my property which currently derives a lot of warmth from the sun - Impact on value of my property	Variation 7 not be granted in its current form. Variation 7 should only apply to private residential housing, not social housing. Developers who build Medium Density Housing should fully fund the following neighbours: - high quality new fencing for sound proofing & security - Double glaze windows	No - but would join others
7	Liza Herkt		Liza Herkt	Amenity	Oppose	Too far away from town Section size too small Not the right location for this type of development	Revise subdivision layout Standard subdivision rules to remain	No - but would join others
8.1	David Price			Reverse sensitivity	Amend	Variation 7 UR4 zone document both implies in general and specifically states on page 10, 3.2 Applicability of Urban Residential 4 zone to other sites that 'Council considers the UR4 zone provisions are a sound basis for providing MDH housing on other greenfield areas in the district...' Given this I would like to see it stipulated for the rezoning of any site to UR4 zone to require documented acceptance of existing neighbouring activity for rezoning to be permitted. This is to prevent unfair reverse sensitivity complaints against neighbouring properties and their owners/ occupiers who wish to continue with their existing activities. With MDH being of a higher density than the norm for UR1 zone, reverse sensitivity issues are more likely.	For the rezoning of any site to UR4 zone to require documented acceptance of existing neighbouring activity for rezoning to proceed.	No - but would join others
8.2	David Price				Amend	I would like to see as part of the new UR4 zoning provisions (for sites other than Kerepi should they become the basis for providing MDH on other greenfields site as page 10, 3.2 suggests) protection granted to any property owner who would like to continue with their existing activity should their property be rezoned against their wishes. A likely scenario for this is a smaller property being taken in as part of a larger area being rezoned in the future. This is in response to page 20, 6.2.2(v) which states potential adverse effects in the UR4 zone can be effectively avoided or mitigated through compliance with the zone rules. This reads as if to say there won't be adverse effects once rezoning occurs because after the fact compliance can be asserted, which I don't believe would be the case, rather that the new zone should only proceed if it assures and accounts for existing property owners activities.	Protection granted to any property owner who would like to continue with their existing activity should their property be rezoned against their wishes	No - but would join others
9	Caroline McCarthy				Amend	We would like Council to consider extending the Proposal and variations to include our area being Oakwood Lane, Witherlea to allow for subdivision of sections in the area (within reason). There is plenty of room to subdivide both our property at 209 Oakwood Lane and our adjoining neighbours property at 211 Oakwood Lane for potentially 2 housing sites on both Lots. Although realistically, in terms of our own property, one additional house would, in our view, have minimal impact on the neighbouring properties. It may be that the owners of the other adjoining properties at 207 and 205 may be interested in this proposal but we have not discussed this with them. The Wai-iti subdivision on Alabama Road and the Poswillo subdivision at Dry Hills/Wither Road are all in the vicinity of our properties. We further understand that David Hawtin (who has developed a storage facility on Alabama Road (which is visible from our properties) may be looking to further develop that area. While it is not a given that we would subdivide, we would like Council to consider extending the proposal to allow for it to occur.	For Council to consider either as part of this Proposal and/or an extension to this proposal, including the Oakwood Lane area for further potential development for housing.	Yes
10	David and Lisa Poole				Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	Yes
11	Ken Wilson				oppose	The inner city and older suburbs have many sections available for the reduced size as suggested and suitable for infilling. I believe this is a better option and better overall for Blenheim's future. This subdivision would create small houses and sections on the edge of town ie higher density of people, where the inner city and older suburbs have more services, better access to services and shopping.	MDC allow the smaller section size section in the central and older suburb areas before the outer suburbs are considered.	No - but would join others
12	Andrew Smith	Cedar Industries	Andrew Smith		Not specified	Not specified	Not specified	No
13	Andrew & Elspeth Smith				oppose	We have concerns re the medium density residential plan going ahead. We live adjacent to land that could possibly be divided for sections in the near future (between Westwood & Adams Lane).	Not specified	No