

Howard and Samantha Walsh

c/o Edmonds Judd Lawyers, PO Box 35, Te Awamutu

PART A

Further submissions **in support** of the following submissions on publicly Notified Proposed Rangitikei District Plan Change – Rural to Industrial:

Number	Submitter and Address	Parts of Submission we support:	Reasons
2.	<u>A. & C. Calman</u> 70 Wings Line RD 1 Marton	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Traffic • Noise • Drainage	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Highlighting significant safety issues with Wings line, making it unsuitable for predicted traffic volumes. <i>We do not support</i> the proposed solution as it is inadequate to resolve wider issues such as the heavy traffic diversion and ongoing lack of suitability of the road in general. • On-going safety of residents • Agree with observations of extension of noise into the night. Need rules specific to restrict sound. • Impact on drainage will adversely affect pugging on productive land A drainage plan needs to be in place before development and specific rules to safeguard productive land.
3.	<u>P. Hancock</u> 76 Wings Line RD 1 Marton	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Traffic • Noise• Drainage	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• As above, the very real traffic safety issues raised have not been addressed - in particular flooding. The submission of a truck leaving road is supported as an on-going issue and is due to narrowness of road which is in appropriate for heavy traffic in its current form. • As above• As above

4.	<u>Dean /Bowra-Dean</u> 19 Goldings Line RD 1 Marton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zoning inappropriate • Traffic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lack of infrastructure. Other sites should be considered. • Impacts of shift work and late-night traffic have not been considered.
5.	<u>W. & C. Sinclair</u> 89 Wings Line RD 1 Marton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic • Noise 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard of Wings Line Road • Hours of operation
7.	<u>L. Pearson</u> 71 Marumaru St Marton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic safety 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Standard of Wings line in far too narrow for heavy traffic in the volumes contemplated. • Flooding potential
10.	<u>Fraser Auret</u> 73 Wings Line RD 1 Marton 4787	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part 4. –_Lack of Information • Lack of Demand • Traffic effects • Light and Noise • Incomplete Infrastructure Assessment • Stormwater/wastewater • Versatile soils 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is so deficient it cannot be remedied and should be withdrawn • There is no justification for the scale of development. The assessment is inadequate to offset speculative benefits against known detriment • Impact of increased volume over 24 per day – inappropriate for area, particularly as to the warping of the traffic flow onto Wings Line by Rail Bridge Height Restrictions • Lack of forward planning demonstrates an inappropriate “zone first, fix later” mentality. Mitigation of impacts and also the full assessment of the financial impacts are inappropriately deferred by the current approach. Further inappropriate for reasons raised by the submitter esp. in s. 4.16 and 4.17 • Risk of pugging in neighbouring properties if not addressed well (4.19). • We adopt the reasons set out in 4.21. • As set out in 4.22-4.24 and in the submissions of H and S. Walsh. • Refer paragraphs 4.16, 4.17 and submissions of H and S Walsh

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improper Tests applied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As set out in submissions of H and S Walsh • Paragraphs 4.22 to 4.24 adopted
12.	<u>Interested Residents</u> 15 Bond Street Marton 4710	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incompatibility with RDC Long Term Plan • Versatile soils • No proposed changes to the Objectives Policies and Rules • Insufficient analysis • Flawed Process • Size inappropriate • Structure Plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water issues highlighted by this submitter support the contention that insufficient consideration has been given to the effects • The proposal is not in line with the existing Plan and shows insufficient recognition of issues already identified by Council as growth areas • Should be preserved and are inappropriate for this development • Refer Walsh submission • Costs/benefits have been insufficiently quantified • The public has not been given sufficient opportunity to assess potential costs and potential effects (page 3) affecting the s 32 assessment (page 5). The proposal does not demonstrate that it gives effect to the RPS (page 5) • The size of the proposal aggravates the lack of technical assessment and lack of intersect with RPS • We support the need for a mitigation plan addressing visual mitigation and traffic control measures in general, of which planting and slip-lanes mentioned by this submitter are examples
13.	<u>R Snijders</u> 5 Grey St Marton 4710	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The re-zoning of Marton agricultural land is inappropriate given other available sites • A detailed development plan should accompany 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The assessment of suitable alternative land is questioned given the evidence provided by this submitter. No adequate justification is given for the size of the proposal given lack of investor commitment. Small derelict sites inhibit the vibrant growth of Marton but no effort is made in the rules to avoid the proposed site being cut up into similar small parcels. • Existing Rules do not adequately address a site of this scale nor address the issues raised in para 3.1. A detailed development plan is best practice and has not been followed.

		<p>re-zoning including site specific rules</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Traffic excessive for road • Development Contributions Policy required 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paragraph 3.4 addresses the warping effect of the height restriction on traffic patterns • The deficiencies in the proposal throw exaggerated potential costs, not adequately ascertained onto a small rate-payer base. The party reaping the increased value of re-zoned land should contribute significantly to the costs it throws onto a small community.
17.	<p><u>NZTA (L Jarrett)</u> Po Box 1947 Palmerston North 4440</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NZTA submissions in their entirety as they relate to lack of information, mitigation, funding and scale 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not considered that this proposed plan change has adequately identified or (sought) to manage the potential/anticipated adverse effects of the intensification of the proposed industrial land uses and the impacts on the surrounding land uses and infrastructure (4.2) • Need for conditions to manage subdivision and development, particularly cumulative effects

We seek that those aspects of the submissions identified be allowed, unless specifically stated above.

In regards to aspects of the submissions not identified above we take a neutral position.

Howard and Samantha Walsh

PART B

Further submissions **in opposition to** the following submissions on publicly Notified Proposed Rangitikei District Plan Change – Rural to Industrial:

Number	Submitter and Address	Parts of Submission we support:	Reasons
1.	<u>H Dalrymple</u> 158 Dalrymple Road Bulls 4894	<ul style="list-style-type: none">All	<ul style="list-style-type: none">The submission lacks a balanced consideration of the potential negative effects or any attempt to weigh or mitigate them in terms of the guiding legislation or the specific benefit to Marton.
11	<u>The Downs Group</u> Po Box 275, Marton 4741	<ul style="list-style-type: none">All	<ul style="list-style-type: none">As above, the submission lacks a balanced consideration of the potential negative effects or any attempt to weigh or mitigate them, indeed denies they exist.The statement that Marton is short of Industrial land is incorrect.
18	<u>NZ Bio Forestry Ltd</u> Po Box 10799 Wellington 6143	<ul style="list-style-type: none">All	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Submission is out of timePrivate information release – accompanied by a refusal to provide detail (nor any information) in a submission - is inappropriate and in breach of the ActThe purported submission lacks sufficient specificity to identify fairly the issue submitted.Attempting to include information at the hearing stage without allowing consideration by other submitters is in breach of the legislation specifically and all principles of natural justice generally.

We seek that these submissions be disallowed. We seek further that the submission by NZ Bio Forestry Ltd be struck out and that no additional information be accepted at hearing.

N Brodnax BA, LL.M (Hons)

For H and S Walsh