

Rangitikei District Council

Postal Address: Private Bag 1102, Marton Street Address: 46 High Street, Marton

Phone: 06 327 0099 Freephone: 0800 422 522 Fax: 06 327 6970

Email: [info@rangitikei.govt.nz](mailto:info@rangitikei.govt.nz) Website: [www.rangitikei.govt.nz](http://www.rangitikei.govt.nz)

## FORM 5 – SUBMISSION ON PROPOSAL TO CHANGE THE RANGITIKEI DISTRICT PLAN

Proposed zoning of 217 hectares of rural land near Marton to industrial

Clause 6 of the First Schedule, Resource Management Act 1991

### SUBMITTER/S DETAILS

Full Name DAVID M. DEAN, JOY BOWRA-DEAN

Postal Address

Business Phone

Fax Number

Private Phone

Email

Mobile Phone

Contact

Person

Address

Phone Number

(if different from above)

RECEIVED

20 SEP 2019

To: MH

File: 1-PL-2-9

Doc: 004

### SUBMISSION

☐ I support the application

☒ I oppose the application

My submission is (specific parts of the plan change proposal; whether you wish to have the proposal amended; the reasons for your views) See attached sheets

I seek the following decision from the Rangitikei District Council (*give precise details*) \_\_\_\_\_

Please make sure the submission is received by the Council before the due date – i.e. 23 September 2019, 5.00 pm.

Regarding the proposed rezoning of 1165, 1151, 1091 State Highway 1, Marton.

We are opposed to the rezoning for several reasons:

1. The area for rezoning is inappropriate relative to the population of Marton. The existing population is 4950 of which 22% are over the age of 65; hence they would not see any economic benefits from the proposed rezoning. If the population of Marton almost doubled (1800 to 2400 FTE jobs plus their families, as on section 6.8 of the TPG report) there would be a significant change from the Marton as it is now to a more crowded, busier town. In the last few years many retired people have chosen Marton for its relaxed, rural, friendly lifestyle. Marton has little or no rental property at the moment. House sales are buoyant with houses selling within a week and prices on the rise. A large increase in the population would require a large number of high density affordable homes and/or rental properties, since the majority of jobs created would not be in the high income bracket. There would also be a consequent increase in demand for almost all services such as Schools, Medical facilities, Supermarkets, Petrol stations etc. etc. An increase in population, of this scale, would also affect hospitals in Whanganui and Palmerston North which are already stretched, at times.
2. Amenity effects  
The TPG report section 6 discusses Amenity effects; 6.5.1 "noise does not exceed reasonable levels". Who decides what a reasonable level is? 6.5.2 "Light spill that does not comply with these standards is a Restricted Discretionary activity". Who has discretion to decide? And again 6.5.3 "The discharge must not result in an offensive or objectionable odour beyond the boundary of the property". Who exercises their discretion on odour and how do you stop it at the boundary of the site? Section 6.8 refers to warehousing and bio-forestry as a use for the land. Palmerston North has, in the last few years, developed large warehousing and industrial areas on Railway Rd. and Napier Rd. so why are more warehouses needed in Marton? Today's warehouses are computer controlled and use robots to restock and deliver goods to despatch so do not employ large numbers of people. Bio-forestry would also rely on job saving technology.
3. Traffic and roading  
Since Light spill is discussed in section 6 we assume that the major development on the site would be 24/7. This would mean a turnover of workers 3 times a day and if we assume 2 people per car that would indicate 600 cars involved for a staff of 1800 or 800 for a staff of 2400. That's a large number of worker vehicle's traveling through Marton at unsociable hours. Makirikiri Rd. is not, in our opinion, suitable for a large increase in heavy goods vehicles. The junctions at Pukepapa Rd., Wellington Rd. and SH 1 with Makirikiri Rd. would need traffic management work. We would also suggest a 50 kph speed limit passing by Makirikiri School.

4. Safety considerations

Large numbers of logs and a Bio-forestry plant, producing chemicals, would be a significant fire risk. On a recent visit to Waingawa Industrial Park we noticed that they have a fire station, on site. Also on a visit to the warehousing/ manufacturing site at Railway Rd. Palmerston North, there are rain collection tanks for firefighting purposes. Would, firefighting infrastructure, on site, be planned for, if the development of 1165 SH 1 goes ahead?

5. Construction Phase

During construction more people are employed than after a site is developed and commissioned. Yet there is no mention in the TPG report of the need for accommodation for these workers and their families. Apart from earthworks, which is discussed in the TPG report, what environmental safeguards will be in place during construction? For example noise, dust, traffic moving on and off the site and permitted working hours.

In conclusion, we think that for all the reasons explained above the rezoning of 1165 SH1 should not go ahead in its present form.

Consider that the population of Masterton is 25,700, an industrial site such as Waingawa is appropriate to the size of the town. Similarly the population of Palmerston North is 88,700 so the industrial sites on Railway Rd., Napier Rd. and Tremaine Ave. are appropriate.

On a more positive note we do see the need for more employment options for the people of the Rangitikei region. But since the population of the whole of the Rangitikei is 14,022 and the number of unemployed is 411 an industrial zone of 217 hectares seems like a sledgehammer to break a walnut!

We believe that an industrial development on this scale, so close to Marton would significantly affect the character of the town and the lifestyle of many of the present population. So why is this the only option being considered? There are many kilometres of SH 1 and the main trunk railway running parallel as they pass through the Rangitikei region. Have any other land owners been approached with a view to changing their land from rural zone to industrial zone?

If this proposal does go ahead we suggest that by changing the boundary at its western side (see attached plan) to follow an existing line of trees and a waterway the effect would be to increase the distance between industrial development and existing residential and rural properties on Goldings Line, the western end of Wings Line, Princess St., Racecourse Ave., French St., King and Alexandra St. The land lost to development could, we suggest, be planted in manuka to encourage bees and thus manuka honey production as discussed in "Accelerate 25" and the TPG report, section 3.1.1.



Print Date: 5/07/2019  
Print Time: 2:34 PM

# RANGITIKEI DISTRICT COUNCIL

*ringitiki, the place where*



Scale: 1:18319  
Original Sheet Size A4

Projection: NZGD2000 / New Zealand Transverse Mercator 2000  
Bounds: 1803989.07055582,5557306.26589489  
1806157.36142518,5559992.58906091

Digital map data sourced from Land Information New Zealand. CROWN COPYRIGHT RESERVED.  
The information displayed in the GIS has been taken from Rangitikei District Council's databases and maps.  
It is made available in good faith but its accuracy or completeness is not guaranteed.  
All excavations near council assets to be undertaken with due care. Contractors will be liable for damages.  
If the information is relied on in support of Resource Consent it should be verified by independent survey.

Decisions that we would like to have answered by Rangitikei District Council.

We ask the following questions;

1. Referring to section 6.5.1 of the TPG report. Who decides what a reasonable level of noise is?
2. Section 6.5.2. Who has discretion to decide how much light spill is acceptable?
3. Section 6.5.3. Who exercises their discretion on odour and how do you stop it at the boundary of the site?
4. In the last few years, large warehouses have been built in Palmerston North. Why are more needed, and why, in Marton in particular?
5. Would on-site firefighting infrastructure be planned? And who pays for this and other infrastructure work such as potable, storm and waste water, gas and electricity? It seems unfair to us that the ratepayers of the Rangitikei should bear the costs.
6. What environmental safeguards will be in place during construction?
7. Why are 1165, 1151 and 1091 SH1 the only options being considered? Have any other land owners in the middle region of the Rangitikei been approached?



**David & Joy Bowra-Dean**

