



Papakura District Council
35 Coles Crescent
Private Bag 7
Papakura

Ph (09) 295 1300
Fax (09) 298 1906
Attn: Nathanael Savage

Summary of Submissions:

PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 15 – **Takanini Structure Plan Area 6 (PC15)**

Submission Period: 9 December 2009 to 26 February 2010
Further Submission Period: 7 April 2010 to 23 April 2010

See Attachment A for Address for Service details, whether the submitter wishes to be heard and whether the submitter will consider presenting a joint case.
See Attachment A for Submitter details for submissions 20 to 98.
Text in brackets [---] is inferred.
Double Strikethrough text represents proposed deletions by submitters.
Double underline text represents proposed additions by submitters.

Sub #	Support / Oppose	Summary of Submission Points (Sub #. Summary Point #)	Summary of Decision Sought (Sub #. Relief Point #)*	Submitter
001	Support (with amendments)	<p>1.1 The submitter opposes the use of the NW portion of 2 Popes Road for recreational activities (plan shown in submission – corresponds with the area identified as 'Recreation Reserve' in the proposed structure plan).</p> <p>1.2 The submitter states that there is very limited need for a reserve in an industrial area.</p> <p>1.3 The submitter states that if the reserve is being created for the benefit of the residents to the north of Papakura Stream then Council will be spending Papakura ratepayers' money for the benefit of Manukau City Council.</p> <p>1.4 The submitter states that the "stormwater green belt provides a sufficient buffer area between the industrial and residential area".</p> <p>1.5 The submitter states that residential zones are proposed for land opposite Porchester Road and is a better location for a reserve to serve that residential area and the proposed industrial area.</p> <p>1.6 The submitter states that the employment zone philosophy is to create more job opportunities as a priority rather than to create recreational facilities.</p> <p>1.7 The submitter seeks an alternative zoning of the NW portion of 2 Popes Road to Industrial 1 (from Reserve) to enable the land to be used for industrial purposes.</p> <p>1.8 The submitter states that the area is fronting the Takanini School Road where the opposite side is already an industrial area.</p>	<p>1.1* Rezone the land identified as Recreation Reserve (refer to proposed Structure Plan) to Industrial 1 instead of the proposed Reserve Zone.</p>	Chan Li Chun Fa
002	Support (with amendments)	<p>2.1 The submitter states in principle support of changes for the use and development of Area 6 for predominantly employment purposes subject to amendments to address interface, land use and building, reverse sensitivity, amenity, landscaping, traffic and land transport issues raised.</p> <p>2.2 The submitter states there is a need for greater flexibility in building and land use to manage effects on adjacent existing residential and reserve areas (5B.2.3 e), Industrial 1 Zone, Rule 6.8.1, 6.9.4 and Policy 6.9.6.2.1).</p> <p>2.3 The submitter states there is a need for greater control of building height where they have an interface with reserve or residential areas, to manage visual and amenity effects (Rule 6.9.2 and 6.15.5).</p> <p>2.4 The submitter states that bulk, location, landscaping and visual amenity controls are essential in meeting the objectives and policies for Area 6.</p> <p>2.5 The submitter states that the proposed landscape concept plan (Appendix 16E) does not meet the objectives and policies for Area 6.</p> <p>2.6 The submitter states that the removal of substantial existing vegetation should require new compensatory planting.</p> <p>2.7 The submitter seeks additional assessment criteria to ensure that new planting integrates any new development into the environment.</p> <p>2.8 The submitter seeks amendments to assessment criteria to explicitly include the mitigation of impacts of development on amenity values of existing residential [activities]</p> <p>2.9 The submitter seeks amendments to assessment criteria to explicitly include the enhancement of reserve areas.</p> <p>2.10 The submitter seeks an open space / reserve connection between Porchester Rd and Takanini School Rd that includes planting to buffer / screen new development.</p> <p>2.11 The submitter seeks provision for a cycleway along the Papakura Stream corridor.</p> <p>2.12 The submitter seeks a cycle [/ pedestrian] bridge connection across Papakura Stream.</p> <p>2.13 The submitter seeks the incorporation of areas of revegetation and riparian planting in the reserve including along the south-eastern bank (together with trees for future screening) {sic}</p> <p>2.14 The submitter states that the plan change does not adequately provide for improvements to the road network to provide an appropriate standard of accessibility to the proposed industrial area.</p> <p>2.15 The submitter states that without improvements to the road network the resulting traffic congestion will divert traffic to roads within Manukau City.</p> <p>2.16 The submitter states that the plan change area is not located within accepted walking distance of existing</p>	<p>2.1* Within the northern interface area (refer to submission for defined area) introduce either: a) A new mixed use zone; or b) Amend the Industrial 1 Zone to support mixed use development, including residential, retail and studio warehousing.</p> <p>2.2* Make studio warehousing [within the Industrial 1 Zone in the northern interface area] a permitted activity where it complies with 6.9.8.2.</p> <p>2.3* Make changes to provide more control on building heights.</p> <p>2.4* Make buildings higher than 9m, within 30m of the [northern] interface boundary a restricted discretionary activity.</p> <p>2.5* Incorporate those changes identified in the amended landscape concept plan (refer to plan included with submission for detail).</p> <p>2.6* Make changes to the landscape concept plan to: a) Indicate which existing vegetated elements and tree species should be retained based on the proposed roading pattern and land use indicated in the Area 6 Structure Plan. b) Highlight opportunities to respect the landscape character and identity of the site. c) Maximise opportunities to provide visual buffers on boundaries with busy roads. d) Provide landscape buffering between industrial and residential sites. e) Maximise opportunities for increasing the ecology and amenity of the Papakura Stream environment with pedestrian paths and cycleways. f) Provide edge / transitional landscape treatments to assist with the integration of the prospective development into the mixed environs. g) Provide appropriate plant buffering and visual relief to assist in minimising potential adverse visual effects for a range of viewing audiences into the site.</p> <p>2.7* Make changes so that front yard landscaping part of the public domain by requiring screen and security fencing to be behind landscape planting (to be maintained in perpetuity).</p> <p>2.8* Make changes to ensure new planting is of a sufficient scale to provide integration.</p> <p>2.9* Amend s3 Part 6.15.1 h) Controlled Activity Assessment Criteria as follows: "Whether the landscaping is complementary with any approved landscape concept plan and existing or proposed landscaping on adjacent reserves, and whether trees will grow to a size and scale to contain or act as a backdrop to buildings."</p>	Manukau City Council

	<p>passenger transport services.</p> <p>2.17 The submitter seeks alignment of development with the provision of passenger transport routes.</p>		<p>2.10* Make changes to discretionary activity [assessment criteria to] protect the amenity of adjacent residential areas.</p> <p>2.11* Make changes to discretionary activity [assessment criteria to] protect the amenity of adjacent reserve areas.</p> <p>2.12* Amend s3 Part 6.15.3 Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria (j) (i) as follows: <u>“Whether proposed landscaping mitigates the impacts of development on the amenity values of any residential area and the surrounding neighbourhood, and enhances adjoining reserve areas including road reserves, and on the adjacent road network.”</u></p> <p>2.13* [Amend Takanini Area 6 Structure Plan to] include an open space / reserve connection between Porchester Rd and Takanini School Rd that includes planting to buffer / screen new development (refer to plan included with submission for detail).</p> <p>2.14* [Amend Takanini Area 6 Structure Plan to] include provision for a cycleway along the Papakura Stream corridor (refer to plan included with submission for detail).</p> <p>2.15* [Amend Takanini Area 6 Structure Plan to] include a bridge connection across Papakura Stream (refer to plan included with submission for detail).</p> <p>2.16* [Amend Takanini Area 6 Structure Plan to] include areas of revegetation and riparian planting in the reserve including along the south-eastern bank and trees for future screening (refer to plan included with submission for detail).</p> <p>2.17* Make changes^(either by designation or defined road widening provisions) for road widening and intersection improvements for additional vehicle and cycle capacity at: a) Manuroa Rd (between Porchester Rd and Great South Rd) . b) Manuroa Rd and Great South Rd intersection. c) Manuroa Rd and Takanini School Rd intersection (signalise). d) Porchester Rd (eastern side and south of Papakura Stream). e) Porchester Rd and Popes Rd intersection (signalise). f) Porchester Rd and Manuroa Rd intersection (signalise).</p> <p>2.18* Make changes^ to include a new rule requiring payment of financial contributions for identified road widening and intersection improvements.</p> <p>2.19* Make changes^ to ensure that identified road widening and intersection improvements will be integrated with the staging of development.</p> <p>2.20* Make changes^to ensure that identified road widening and intersection improvements are timed to avoid 'unacceptable diversion' of traffic onto the following roads: a) Porchester Rd. b) Alfriston Rd. c) Stratford Rd.</p> <p>2.21* Make changes^ to include reference to proposals described in the Integrated Transport Assessment to: a) Restrict right turns at the intersection of Spartan Rd and Great South Rd. b) Modify Great South Rd.</p> <p>2.22* Prepare a Corridor Management Plan in conjunction with Manukau City Council that: a) Provides for on-road cycle facilities. b) Takes into account the 'fact' that any road widening north of the Papakura Stream will need to be on the eastern side of Porchester Rd. c) Determines the future cross section for Porchester Rd.</p> <p>2.23* Include the Corridor Management Plan [as above] within the District Plan.</p> <p>2.24* Amend^ the following provisions to state that the objectives [s1 Part 5B2.2.2.2, s3 Part 6.6.5] can only be met by providing improved bus services as development proceeds that so as to link Great South Rd, the Takanini Railway Station, Porchester Rd with Area 6: a) S1 Part 5B.2.2.2.4. b) S1 Part 5B.2.2.9 e). c) S3 Part 6.4 10th bullet point [“To facilitate a variety...”]. d) S3 Part 6.7.</p> <p>2.25* Amend^ s3 Part 6.7 as follows:</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

			<p>"In providing for the integration of transport and business land uses within Takanini Structure Plan Area 6, it is important for all modes of transport to be utilised <u>as development of the area proceeds</u>, including public transport, cycling and walking. This in turn will ensure that the effects of activities from Takanini Structure Plan Area 6 on the transport network are minimised as far as practicable."</p> <p>2.26* Prepare a Travel Plan to identify future passenger transport routes to serve the area.</p> <p>2.27* [Make changes] to ensure subdivision or development of Area 6 does not proceed until a Travel Plan is complete.</p> <p>2.28* [Make changes] to ensure that future passenger transport routes identified in the Travel Plan will be integrated within the staging of development of Area 6.</p> <p>^Or such other forms of relief to give effect to the issue.</p>	
003	Support	<p>3.1 The submitter supports the plan change in its current form as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Promotes the sustainable management of resources and is consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991. b) Is consistent with the Takanini Structure Plan, Regional Policy Statement Change No.6, and Plan Change No.10 to the Papakura District Plan. c) Will avoid effects which adversely affect the environment. d) Contains provisions which are appropriate and justifiable in terms of section 32 of the Act and therefore warrant implementation in their present form. e) Makes appropriate provision for additional employment opportunities within the Takanini Structure Plan area. f) Ensures that there will be an appropriate supply of industrial zoned land that will provide employment opportunities for new residents in the Takanini Structure Plan area. <p>3.2 The submitter specifically supports the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) S3 Part 6.2 Overview, 9th Paragraph, "The Takanini Structure Plan..." b) S3 Part 6.3 Resource Management Issues, 8th bullet point, "The diminishing supply of..." c) S3 Part 6.4 Resource Management Strategy, 2nd bullet point, "To provide sufficient land for..." d) S3 Part 6.6.5 Objective 	<p>3.1* Approve the plan change as notified.</p> <p>3.2* Retain the following specific provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) S3 Part 6.2 Overview, 9th Paragraph, "The Takanini Structure Plan..." b) S3 Part 6.3 Resource Management Issues, 8th bullet point, "The diminishing supply of..." c) S3 Part 6.4 Resource Management Strategy, 2nd bullet point, "To provide sufficient land for..." d) S3 Part 6.6.5 Objective 	Cosgrave Residents and Landowners Association Inc
004	Support	<p>4.1 The submitter supports the plan change in its current form as it:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Promotes the sustainable management of resources and is consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991. b) Is consistent with the Takanini Structure Plan, Regional Policy Statement Change No.6, and Plan Change No.10 to the Papakura District Plan. c) Will avoid effects which adversely affect the environment. d) Contains provisions which are appropriate and justifiable in terms of section 32 of the Act and therefore warrant implementation in their present form. e) Makes appropriate provision for additional employment opportunities within the Takanini Structure Plan area. f) Ensures that there will be an appropriate supply of industrial zoned land within the Takanini Structure Plan area. <p>4.2 The submitter specifically supports the following provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) S3 Part 6.2 Overview, 9th Paragraph, "The Takanini Structure Plan..." b) S3 Part 6.3 Resource Management Issues, 8th bullet point, "The diminishing supply of..." c) S3 Part 6.4 Resource Management Strategy, 2nd bullet point, "To provide sufficient land for..." d) S3 Part 6.6.5 Objective 	<p>4.1* Approve the plan change as notified.</p> <p>4.2* Retain the following specific provisions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) S3 Part 6.2 Overview, 9th Paragraph, "The Takanini Structure Plan..." b) S3 Part 6.3 Resource Management Issues, 8th bullet point, "The diminishing supply of..." c) S3 Part 6.4 Resource Management Strategy, 2nd bullet point, "To provide sufficient land for..." d) S3 Part 6.6.5 Objective e) S3 Part 6.9.8.1 Activity Status Table 2, 2nd row, "Retail activities ancillary to..." f) S3 Part 6.11.7.1 Activity Status Table 2, 2nd 3rd 6th 7th and 8th row [refer to submission to confirm], and their respectively notified permitted or discretionary activity status. 	Retail Holdings Ltd and Southgate Centre Ltd

		<p>e) S3 Part 6.9.8.1 Activity Status Table 2, 2nd row, "Retail activities ancillary to..."</p> <p>f) S3 Part 6.11.7.1 Activity Status Table 2, 2nd 3rd 6th 7th and 8th row [refer to submission to confirm], and their respectively notified permitted or discretionary activity status.</p> <p>4.3 The submitter supports proposed provisions controlling retail activities.</p>		
005	Oppose	<p>5.1 The submitter opposes the rezoning (to Industrial 1 and 3).</p> <p>5.2 The submitter opposes the rezoning (to Residential 8 – 'high density housing like the Addison Development')</p> <p>5.3 The submitter states that new development provides built forms that create opportunities for further graffiti and vandalism, which lowers the amenity of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>5.4 The submitter states that there will be an increase in noise levels as a result of increased traffic.</p> <p>5.5 The submitter states that there will be an increase in noise levels as a result of proposed industrial activities.</p> <p>5.6 The submitter states that proposed changes will exacerbate existing traffic congestion along Porchester Rd and Manuroa Rd and make it difficult to access the submitter's property.</p> <p>5.7 The submitter states that the peat soil and traffic movements (particularly heavy vehicles) cause vibrations that are disruptive and may damage property.</p> <p>5.8 The submitter states [concerns] that Manuroa Rd and Porchester Rd is a designated route for overweight and overheight loads that operates in the early morning and late at night.</p> <p>5.9 The submitter states [concerns] that heavy vehicles trying to access the motorway will use roads with surrounding residential landuse (Manuroa Rd) as there is no direct link.</p> <p>5.10 The submitter states that the Spartan Rd access to the motorway [/ Great South Rd] is a 'blackspot for accidents' as there is no traffic control.</p> <p>5.11 The submitter states concerns that creating further industrial areas will exacerbate an existing illegal street racing problem.</p> <p>5.12 The submitter states concerns that the industrial land use will devalue residential properties.</p> <p>5.13 The submitter states concerns that the existing road and footpath network requires upgrading.</p> <p>5.14 States concern that Porchester Rd operates at an inappropriate speed, noting that the route is used by students who walk to and from Alfriston College.</p> <p>5.15 The submitter states that there are many vacant industrial buildings in Papakura [questions demand for industrial land].</p>	<p>5.1* Make changes so that the land either: a) Remains 'rurally zoned'; or b) Is developed by Council into 'park areas/ adventure playgrounds'; or c) Is zoned for 'lifestyle blocks'</p> <p>5.2* Seeks 'road and footpath upgrades'.</p> <p>5.3* Seeks 'speed restrictions' on Porchester Rd.</p>	G & A Goldring
006	Oppose	<p>6.1 The submitter opposes the rezoning (to Industrial)</p> <p>6.2 The submitter states concerns that the proposed residential area adjoining the rear of the submitters property will create the following adverse effects: a) Loss of sunlight [/overshadowing]. b) Loss of privacy. c) Loss of peacefulness [/noise]</p> <p>6.3 The submitter states concerns that roading network upgrades that may be required could create physical access problems for the submitter's property.</p> <p>6.4 The submitter states concerns that roading network upgrades that may be required could require the acquisition of the submitter's property.</p> <p>6.5 The submitter states concerns that [the change] will lead to an increase in heavy vehicles on the road network.</p> <p>6.6 The submitter states concerns that with the peat soil, heavy vehicle traffic movements will cause vibrations that may damage property.</p> <p>6.7 The submitter states that the land is more suitable for residential use given existing surrounding landuses.</p> <p>6.8 The submitter states that the land is more suitable for 'residential, sportsfields etc' given existing geotechnical issues.</p>	<p>6.1* Seeks confirmation that physical property access for the submitter will be maintained.</p> <p>6.2* Seeks road access to the rear of the submitter's property if the front entrance cannot be maintained.</p> <p>6.3* Opposes 'multi storey dwellings' at the rear of the submitter's property.</p> <p>6.4* Opposes the 'heavy industrial' zoning.</p>	L & F Morgan
007	Support (with amendments)	<p>7.1 The submitter states that the Stormwater Pond is a new landscape feature that creates an 'aesthetically pleasing buffer area' between the residential area north of Papakura Stream and the proposed industrial area.</p> <p>7.2 The submitter states that the proposed landscaping, planting and walkways will rehabilitate an area of</p>	<p>7.1* Approve the change having recognised the concerns raised.</p>	Takanini Residents Action Group

		<p>low natural value.</p> <p>7.3 The submitter states that the proposed approach to stormwater control achieves a balance that recognises historic stormwater challenges such as flooding and maintenance of peat soil groundwater.</p> <p>7.4 The submitter states that the proposed industrial/business, residential and reserve land uses provides a balanced use of the area.</p> <p>7.5 The submitter states concerns about how traffic (particularly heavy vehicles) generated by the future industrial and residential area will be accommodated on the existing roading network.</p> <p>7.6 The submitter states concerns for pedestrian and cycle safety (for school children and elderly in particular) arising from increased traffic, high speeds and heavy vehicles.</p> <p>7.7 The submitter seeks a comprehensive assessment of transport needs that prioritises pedestrian needs of children and elderly, followed by movement of freight, then other vehicle movements.</p> <p>7.8 The submitter seeks the identification of 'freight routes' to assist in the management of heavy traffic and create safe routes (e.g. to schools and shops) for children and the elderly.</p> <p>7.9 The submitter seeks the identification of Popes Rd as a 'freight route' for heavy traffic to link to Mill Rd to travel to East Tamaki or south.</p> <p>7.10 The submitter states concerns about existing traffic safety and congestion problems at:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Oakleigh Ave / Manuroa Rd intersection (following changes to Spartan Rd / Great South Rd intersection for safety reasons). Manuroa Rd. Manuroa Rd / Rail crossing intersection. Takanini School Rd / Taka St intersection (being an alternative route for heavy vehicles). 		
008		<p>8.1 The submitter states concerns about the potential effects on the state highway network.</p> <p>8.2 The submitter suggests the use of an alternative traffic model (e.g. Papakura SATURN model) to provide a more detailed assessment of the effects of the development.</p> <p>8.3 The submitter states concerns that the existing Integrated Transport Assessment (ITA) does not provide sufficient certainty as to the potential effects on the Takanini Interchange.</p> <p>8.4 The submitter states concerns that the identified roading improvements are not 'closely tied' to the timing of development.</p> <p>8.5 The submitter states concerns that responsibilities for completing roading works are not clearly stated.</p> <p>8.6 The submitter states concerns that alternative transport modes are reflected in the plan change in only a limited manner.</p>	<p>8.1* Decline the plan change unless further information/modifications to the change are made to address the submitter's issues.</p> <p>8.2* Make changes so as to ensure that potential adverse effects on the Takanini Interchange are managed to be avoided, remedied or mitigated.</p> <p>8.3* Make changes to include Figure 10 from the ITA to fully acknowledge the extent of pedestrian improvements required.</p> <p>8.4* Make changes to refer to the requirement for travel plans (and implementation of those plans).</p>	New Zealand Transport Agency
009		<p>9.1 The submitter states that Watercare proposes to extend the existing Mahia Branch Sewer to provide wastewater services to the plan change area.</p> <p>9.2 The submitter seeks confirmation that there are no conflicts at the crossing point between the proposed stormwater drainage system and the proposed Mahia Branch Sewer that would compromise the design, construction and operation of the Mahia Branch Sewer.</p>	<p>9.1* Seeks information describing the precise levels of the proposed stormwater drainage system at the crossing points with the proposed Mahia Branch Sewer.</p> <p>9.2* Seeks confirmation that there are no conflicts at the crossing point between the proposed stormwater drainage system and the proposed Mahia Branch Sewer that would compromise the design, construction and operation of the Mahia Branch Sewer.</p>	Watercare Services Ltd
010	Support (with amendments)	<p>10.1 The submitter states that Schedule 1B of Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change No.6 (RPS6) identifies Area 6 as a 'Future Urban Area' to be implemented via a plan change notified between 2005 and 2010.</p> <p>10.2 The submitter states that Policy 2.6.5.15 of RPS6 seeks that provision be made for sufficient business zoned land, in appropriate locations in the region, for the future growth of land extensive business activities.</p> <p>10.3 The submitter states that the Auckland Region Business Land Strategy identifies a need for additional land zoned for business activities (as discussed in s3 Part 6.2 of the plan change).</p> <p>10.4 The submitter states that the submitter is supportive of well designed, appropriately located zoning of land for additional (Group 1) business activities.</p> <p>10.5 The submitter states that Area 6 is currently outside the Metropolitan Urban Limits (MUL) and an extension to the MUL is being considered by the ARC (RPS14).</p> <p>10.6 The submitter supports the Industrial 1 zone uses and activity statuses for Area 6 identified in s3 Part 6.9</p>	<p>10.1* Approve the plan change subject to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> RPS14 extends the MUL to include Area 6 [Retain s3 Parts 6.6.5, 6.6.6, 6.6.6.1 and 6.6.6.2] Retain s3 Part 6.9 Retain s3 Part 6.9.2 Retain s3 Part 6.9.6.2.4-6.9.6.2.12 Retain s3 Part 6.11 Retain Controlled Activity Assessment Criteria in s3 Part 6.15.1 Retain Restricted Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria in s3 Part 6.15.2 Retain Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria in s3 Part 6.15.3 	Auckland Regional Council

		<p>which provide for small localised light industrial activities with ancillary office / retail activities and is designed to be applied in areas that are near to or adjoin non-industrial activities that are sensitive to effects on amenity.</p> <p>10.7 The submitter supports the Industrial 3 zone uses and activity statuses for Area 6 identified in s3 Part 6.11 which provide for a range of light to medium industrial and ancillary activities.</p> <p>10.8 The submitter supports the intent of those objectives and policies (specifically 6.6.5, 6.6.6, 6.6.6.1 and 6.6.6.2, 6.9.6.2.4-6.9.6.2.12) that protect the amenity of residential areas adjacent to Area 6.</p> <p>10.9 The submitter supports the requirement for resource consent to undertake any activity within the Industrial 1 zone (s3 Part 6.9.2) as this will assist in ensuring new activities consider effects on adjoining and nearby residential areas.</p> <p>10.10 The submitter opposes the proposed maximum height limits of 15m (Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary activities) and 18m (Discretionary activities) for the Industrial 1 zone because higher limits are contrary to the changes objectives of restricting adverse impacts on the amenity of the surrounding area.</p> <p>10.11 The submitter supports the controls over building heights in relation to road and reserve boundaries.</p> <p>10.12 The submitter states concerns that for the Industrial 1 zone no [greater] yard requirements are made at the interface with adjoining residential zones.</p> <p>10.13 The submitter supports Policy 16.1.9.3.2 requiring sites within the proposed Residential 8 zone fronting onto roads adjoining the proposed Industrial 1 zone to have a minimum setback of 6m.</p> <p>10.14 The submitter supports the Controlled Activity Assessment Criteria in Part 6.15.1, and specifically the proposed criteria 6.15.1 g) and 6.15.1 h).</p> <p>10.15 The submitter supports the Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria in Part 6.15.13, and specifically the proposed criteria 6.15.3 h) to 6.15.1 p).</p>	<p>j) Retain height in relation to boundary rules in s3 Part 6.15</p> <p>k) Retain s3 Part 16.1.9.3.2</p> <p>l) Amend the maximum building heights for the Industrial 1 zone by reducing them to the levels that apply [in Industrial 1 zone areas] elsewhere in the District.</p> <p>m) Increase yard standards for permitted, controlled and restricted discretionary activities in the Industrial 1 zone of Area 6 for activities adjoining residential zones.</p> <p>n) Increase yard standards for discretionary activities in the Industrial 1 zone of Area 6 for activities adjoining reserves and residential zones.</p>	
011	Support (with amendments)	<p>11.1 The submitter supports the intent of the plan change to reflect the objectives and intent of the Takanini Structure Plan and give effect to Schedule 1B of Proposed Regional Policy Statement Change No.6 (RPS6) which identifies Area 6 as a 'Future Urban Area' to be implemented via a plan change notified between 2005 and 2010.</p> <p>11.2 The submitter supports the provision of employment in this area to encourage a more sustainable pattern of trip making.</p> <p>11.3 The submitter supports objectives and policies which support a well connected, safe and convenient transport network.</p> <p>11.4 The submitter supports those parts of the plan change that facilitate multi-modal transport systems for Area 6.</p> <p>11.5 The submitter supports those parts of the plan change which promote a high level of pedestrian and cycle accessibility.</p> <p>11.6 The submitter opposes rules that enable retail activities greater than 400m² in the Industrial 3 zone as retailing is a generates more traffic than industrial activities and is contrary to the purpose of the rezoning which is to provide for light-medium industrial activities.</p> <p>11.7 The submitter seeks that retail activities greater than 200m² or commercial activities (which includes non-ancillary office activities) other than those permitted should be non-complying because of the risk of higher trip generating activities establishing in Area 6.</p> <p>11.8 The submitter seeks that retail activities greater than 200m² or commercial activities (which includes non-ancillary office activities) other than those permitted should be non-complying because these activities would displace industrial activities for which there is a regional shortage.</p> <p>11.9 If a greater proportion of retail activities are to be provided within the plan change area then the submitter seeks further modelling of the consequences on the road network.</p> <p>11.10 The submitter seeks further engagement (prior to the confirmation of the plan change) on the provision of public transport services (bus route identification) to and through Area 6.</p>	<p>11.1* [Approve] the plan change subject to the following:</p> <p>a) Continued discussion (prior to hearing) on the local connector network through this area with the objective of identifying the preferred local bus route servicing this area; and</p> <p>b) Make changes so that Table 2 in Part 6.11.7.1 so that all retailing activities over 200m² are non-complying ; or</p> <p>c) That the ITA modelling be reviewed to anticipate such activities occurring.</p>	Auckland Regional Transport Authority
012	Support	<p>12.1 The submitter supports the plan change in its current form as it:</p> <p>a) Promotes the sustainable management of resources and is consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991.</p> <p>b) Will avoid effects which adversely affect the environment.</p> <p>c) Contains provisions which are appropriate and justifiable in terms of section 32 of the Act and therefore</p>	<p>12.1* Approve the plan change as notified.</p>	Nigel Hosken

		warrant implementation in their present form.		
013	Support (with amendments)	<p>13.1 The submitter supports the plan change, subject to specific amendments, as it:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Is consistent with sound resource management principles and practice. Promotes the sustainable management of resources and will be consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). Enables the social, economic and cultural wellbeing of people and their communities to be achieved. Is appropriate in terms of s32 of the RMA. Avoids the generation of significant adverse effects on the environment. <p>13.2 In relation to the 'proposed reserve' shown on the planning maps between Takanini School Rd, the proposed stormwater pond, and Porchester Rd:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter states that 'proposed reserve' is not a zone in the District Plan. The submitter states that it is unnecessary and ambiguous to identify 'proposed reserve' on the zoning map now, as the type and extent of the reserve will not be defined until subdivision. The submitter states that as the 'proposed reserve' has not been defined by survey there may be land incorporated within the area that is not required for esplanade or drainage reserve, thereby encroaching into potential industrial land. The submitter seeks that the 'proposed reserve' be zoned Industrial 1 until land is vested as reserve at the time of subdivision. <p>13.3 In relation to the Recreational Reserve adjacent to Papakura Stream between Takanini School Rd that the proposed stormwater pond:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter states that this Recreational Reserve is unjustified and unsustainable. The submitter states that the stormwater pond and adjoining esplanade reserve provides amenity to the proposed industrial land and residential land north of Papakura Stream. The submitter states that there is no need for an active recreational area within an industrial area. The submitter states that the land would be more efficiently used for industrial land, for which there is a regional shortage. The submitter states that if there is a need for recreational reserves that they provided for in the Residential 8 zone. <p>13.4 In relation to the measurement for the extent of esplanade reserves and the consequential effect on location of the stormwater pond:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter states that the extent of the esplanade reserve should be measured pursuant to the RMA definitions and case law (from the point of average annual fullest flow). The submitter states that the extent of the Papakura Stream bed was defined by survey under an earlier subdivision when Manukau City Council realigned the stream. The submitter states that there is no reason for the extent of the stream to be redefined and that all future esplanade reserve areas should be measured from the existing Title boundaries with the stream. The submitter seeks the amendment of the location of the stormwater pond and drainage reserve to reflect a reduced, 'correct' esplanade reserve area, enabling the land to be used 'more efficiently' for industrial uses. <p>13.5 In relation to the Flood Hazard Area:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter states that the Flood Hazard Area notation for Area 6 should be removed as future subdivision and development will need to give effect to new overland flow path provisions. The submitter states that the retention of the Flood Hazard Area provisions for Area 6 creates an unnecessary consenting requirement. The submitter states that removal of the Flood Hazard Area at a later date as proposed (following development) is unnecessarily cumbersome, creates extra costs and does not represent sustainable management of the land or the efficient use of resources. <p>13.6 In relation to the Utility Yard for the Mahia Trunk Sewer Line:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The submitter states that the yard is unnecessary as design and installation of the line 'will need to precede subdivision and/or development to service the development of [Area 6]'. 	<p>13.1* Approve the plan change subject to the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the 'proposed reserve' from the zoning maps and replace with Industrial 1 zoning. Define esplanade and drainage reserve areas at the time of subdivision, then rezone them if appropriate. Either: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Delete the recreational reserve shown in the Structure Plan; or Move the recreational reserve to the proposed Residential 8 zone. Define the bed of the Papakura Stream in accordance with: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The RMA definition; and As previously surveyed for the existing Title boundaries; and 'with the concomitant modification of the zoning' Delete the Flood Hazard Area overlay from Area 6. Delete all rules and requirements relating to the proposed 10m utility yard for the Mahia Trunk Sewer Line. Reduce the overall proposed road reserve width of Porchester Rd. Reduce the road widening requirements along the western side of Porchester Rd. <p>13.2* Such other additional or consequential relief as is necessary to achieve consistency with the above and to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.</p> <p>13.3* Such other alternative relief to satisfy the concerns of the submitter.</p>	Takanini Structure Plan Area 6 Ltd

		<p>b) The submitter states that the yard restrictions are an inefficient use of land.</p> <p>c) The submitter states that the majority of the Line is to be placed in locations where they have minimal impact on developable land (e.g. road reserves, stormwater drainage reserves, esplanade reserves).</p> <p>13.7 In relation to the Porchester Rd Cross Section:</p> <p>a) The submitter states that as the Porchester Rd cross section has been reduced from a four lane to two lane road so the cross section width should be reduced from 29m to 23m as retaining the existing width is unnecessary.</p> <p>b) The submitter states that this reduction will provide more land for industrial and/or residential development.</p>		
014	Support (with amendments)	14.1 to 14.7 as per 13.1 to 13.7 above.	14.1* to 14.3* as per 13.1* to 13.3* above.	Mellviews Ltd
015	Support (with amendments)	15.1 to 15.7 as per 13.1 to 13.7 above.	15.1* to 15.3* as per 13.1* to 13.3* above.	Zabeel Investments Ltd
016	Support (with amendments)	16.1 to 16.7 as per 13.1 to 13.7 above.	16.1* to 16.3* as per 13.1* to 13.3* above.	Village Farms Ltd
017	Support (with amendments)	<p>17.1 The submitter supports the proposed rezoning of Area 6 but opposes rules and standards that place unnecessary restrictions or onerous requirements on development.</p> <p>17.2 The submitter supports the following strategic objectives for the plan change:</p> <p>a) To provide sufficient industrial land for local and regional needs.</p> <p>b) To achieve high amenity values for Area 6.</p> <p>c) To facilitate a variety of transport modes.</p> <p>d) To take into account stormwater management constraints.</p> <p>e) To take into account geotechnical constraints.</p> <p>17.1 The submitter supports the Controlled activity subdivision proposals in 6.9.8.7.2 (Industrial 1) and 6.11.7.6.2 (Industrial 3).</p> <p>17.2 The submitter seeks changes so that 'subdivision proposals around existing and/or consented development' is included as a controlled activity.</p> <p>17.3 The submitter supports the Non-notified provisions at 6.9.8.7.3 (Industrial 1) and 6.11.7.6.3 (Industrial 3) for Restricted Discretionary subdivisions.</p> <p>17.4 The submitter seeks the modification of non-notification provisions to make them consistent with the October 2009 Resource Management Act amendments.</p> <p>17.5 The submitter seeks changes to clarify the maximum extent of road widening requirements along Takanini School Rd and Popes Rd by inserting a new diagram showing dimensions.</p> <p>17.6 The submitter seeks changes to allow for flexibility in the alignment of the overland flowpaths by noting them on the proposed Structure Plan as 'indicative' and seeks changes to allow them to be amended by an application for land use consent as part of a comprehensive development proposal.</p> <p>17.7 The submitter considers that unreasonably high amenity outcomes are sought for the industrial zone and that these would result in uneconomic compliance costs and seeks the following changes:</p> <p>a) Landscape – change the landscape standards at in Part 13.8 of Section Three of the operative District Plan to require appropriate planting specifications in respect of species selection and tree spacing in order to achieve the intended street-tree and front yard amenity outcomes.</p> <p>b) Noise – change the permitted noise thresholds to:</p> <p>i) Provide consistency with the relevant 1999 and 2008 New Zealand Standards;</p> <p>ii) Increase the noise thresholds both within industrial zoned land and at/within the boundary of residentially zoned land to a moderate level; and</p> <p>iii) Specifically differentiate between habitable rooms and bedrooms within the Industrial 1 zone.</p> <p>c) Glare – change the permitted glare threshold from outdoor lighting along boundaries used for residential purposes between the hours 2200 – 0700 to also exclude Industrial zones.</p>	<p>Submitter Note: Where modifications are sought in respect of provisions relating to Residential 8 Zone, the modification or deletion/replacement of the relevant clauses of the Operative District Plan, Decision Version of Plan Change 12 or proposed Plan Change 15 are specified with regard to subdivision and development of land within Takanini Structure Plan Area 6 only.</p> <p>17.1* Change the Structure Plan at Area 6 at Appendix 16A identified overland flowpaths as follows (refer to submission Attachment 1):</p> <p>a) Change the key to demonstrate that the overland flowpaths within Area 6 are indicative only and may be modified as part of a comprehensive land use consent application involving a site specific stormwater design.</p> <p>b) Change the 'Note' as follows:</p> <p>"The exact design and alignment of reserves, roads, <u>overland flowpaths</u> etc will be determined at the time of <u>subdivision or as a Restricted Discretionary Activity land use consent in relation to a comprehensive development (refer to zone rules).</u>"</p> <p>17.2* Change the proposed Landscape Concept Plan for Area 6 at Appendix 16E as follows:</p> <p>a) Replace the Liquid Amber street trees shown on the 'proposed road' through 3 Popes Road and 55 Takanini School Road with Podocarpus Totara (refer to submission Attachment 2 for locations).</p> <p>b) Replace the Puriri street trees along Takanini School Road with Quercus Palustris (Pin Oak) (refer to submission Attachment 2 for locations).</p> <p>c) Add the following:</p> <p>"<u>No Hydrophilic trees should be used and that all proposed street tree planting must be to the satisfaction of Council's Arborist to ensure appropriateness of species for the soil and water table conditions and street tree themes.</u>"</p> <p>17.3* Insert a Road Widening Diagram (with dimensions) at Appendix 16A for Area 6 to clearly identify the maximum extent of land that may be taken road purposes within Takanini School and Popes Road (refer to submission Attachment 3 for an example).</p> <p>17.4* Change the definition of Household Unit at Section One, Part 10 of the operative District Plan to provide additional clarification as follows</p> <p>"Means a building or part building intended to be used as an independent residence and includes any apartment, townhouse, dwelling house or home unit <u>that includes kitchen, bathroom and laundry facilities.</u>"</p>	Takanini Industrial Trust

	<p>d) Bulk and Location Controls – change these provisions as they relate to Industrial 1 and 3 zones (within Area 6) to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Make side and rear yard controls only apply along boundaries adjoining land zoned for residential or reserve purposes; and ii) Enable front yard setback controls to be reduced to 3m in specified circumstances. <p>e) Landscaping and Visual Amenity Controls – change the front yard landscaping provisions for industrial zones to enable an Applicant to either:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) Comply with the specified standards; or ii) Be in accordance with a comprehensive Landscape Concept Plan for sites exceeding 3000m². <p>f) Stormwater – change these provisions to require development that occurs in advance of the installation and operation of a public stormwater drainage system to provide interim onsite stormwater detention and treatment measures capable of facilitating piped connections to the public stormwater drainage system</p> <p>17.8 The submitter considers that unreasonably high amenity outcomes for are sought for the proposed residential zones, particularly for comprehensively designed residential activities and seeks the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Changes to the Residential 8 front yard setback in relation to roads with dual frontage to the Residential 8 and Industrial 1 zones to relax the standards where adjacent land in both zones is being comprehensively developed; b) Changes to the permitted residential noise thresholds: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i) For consistency with current New Zealand standards; and ii) To reflect reasonable acoustic amenity expectations. c) Changes to specific parking provisions to provide for comprehensive Medium Density Housing Developments involving at least 75 units and public road and reserve areas. <p>17.9 The submitter opposes the Discretionary or Non-Complying activity status for Childcare Centres in the Industrial 1 Zone (Table 2 of 6.9.8).</p> <p>17.10 The submitter opposes the Discretionary or Non-Complying activity status for ground floor Retail in the Industrial 1 Zone (Table 2 of 6.9.8).</p> <p>17.11 The submitter seek changes to provide for comprehensively designed developments (involving industrial activities) that include Childcare Centres and ground floor Retail Activity (on the submitters landholdings) as a Restricted Discretionary Activity reflecting the ability to appropriately design, configure and co-locate compatible activities, services and functionality</p>	<p><u>NOTES:</u></p> <p><u>(a) Bench-top cooking surfaces do not constitute 'Kitchen facilities':</u></p> <p><u>(b) For clarity, all other parts of a household unit i.e. 'sleep-outs and above-garage units that do not meet the definition of 'household unit' are not subject to additional car-parking requirements."</u></p> <p>17.5* Change Activity Table 2 of Rule 6.9.8.1 by making Childcare Centers a Restricted Discretionary Activity as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1567 415 2288 604"> <tr> <td><u>A Childcare Centre that is developed in conjunction with or as part of an overall development (involving industrial activity) on Industrial 1 Zoned land</u></td> <td><u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u> <u>(Refer to Part 6.15.2.4 for the matters to which Council has restricted its discretion and assessment criteria)</u></td> </tr> </table> <p>17.6* Insert new assessment criteria in 6.15.2.4 to provide for Childcare Centers in the Industrial 1 zone as follows:</p> <p><u>"Restricted Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria for Childcare Centres developed in conjunction with or as part of an overall development (involving industrial activity) on Industrial 1 Zoned land.</u></p> <p><u>Council has restricted the exercise of its discretion to the following matters, and may impose any conditions of consent in relation to these:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(a) Reverse sensitivity in relation to legitimately existing lawfully established industrial activities;</u> <u>(b) Traffic, car-parking and pedestrian safety;</u> <u>(c) Appropriate acoustic protection for staff and children within the proposed Childcare Centre; and</u> <u>(d) Child safety.</u> <p><u>All aspects a proposed Childcare Centre shall be assessed in terms of the following criteria:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <u>(a) Whether the establishment and operation of the proposed childcare centre will give rise to reverse sensitivity issues that may restrict the lawful operation of existing (and future) industrial activity – particularly within the surrounding Industrial 1 zoned land;</u> <u>(b) Whether there are is a demonstrable need to locate the proposed Childcare Centre within the Industrial 1 Zone;</u> <u>(c) Whether the proposed Childcare Centre can operate safely and efficiently with an acceptable standard of car-parking, access/loading provisions and pick-up/drop-off arrangements. In particular consideration shall be had for child safety and the efficient operation of legitimate industrial activities."</u> <p>17.7* Change Activity Table 2 of Rule 6.9.8.1 by making specified ground floor retail at activity at 55 Takanini School Road a Restricted Discretionary Activity as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1567 1665 2267 1906"> <tr> <td><u>Ground floor Retail Activity with a maximum gross floor area of 5,000m² developed in conjunction with or as part of an overall development (involving industrial activity) on Industrial 1 Zoned land at 55 Takanini School Road (Lot 2 DP 363854)</u></td> <td><u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u> <u>(Refer to Part 6.15.2.5 for the matters to which Council has restricted its discretion and assessment criteria)</u></td> </tr> </table>	<u>A Childcare Centre that is developed in conjunction with or as part of an overall development (involving industrial activity) on Industrial 1 Zoned land</u>	<u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u> <u>(Refer to Part 6.15.2.4 for the matters to which Council has restricted its discretion and assessment criteria)</u>	<u>Ground floor Retail Activity with a maximum gross floor area of 5,000m² developed in conjunction with or as part of an overall development (involving industrial activity) on Industrial 1 Zoned land at 55 Takanini School Road (Lot 2 DP 363854)</u>	<u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u> <u>(Refer to Part 6.15.2.5 for the matters to which Council has restricted its discretion and assessment criteria)</u>	
<u>A Childcare Centre that is developed in conjunction with or as part of an overall development (involving industrial activity) on Industrial 1 Zoned land</u>	<u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u> <u>(Refer to Part 6.15.2.4 for the matters to which Council has restricted its discretion and assessment criteria)</u>						
<u>Ground floor Retail Activity with a maximum gross floor area of 5,000m² developed in conjunction with or as part of an overall development (involving industrial activity) on Industrial 1 Zoned land at 55 Takanini School Road (Lot 2 DP 363854)</u>	<u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u> <u>(Refer to Part 6.15.2.5 for the matters to which Council has restricted its discretion and assessment criteria)</u>						

- 17.8* Insert new assessment criteria in 6.15.2.5 to provide for ground floor retail activity at 55 Takanini School Road as follows:
- “Restricted Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria for Ground Floor Retail developed in conjunction with or as part of an overall development (involving industrial activity) on Industrial 1 Zoned land at 55 Takanini School Road (Lot 2 DP 363854).
- Council has restricted the exercise of its discretion to the following matters, and may impose any conditions of consent in relation to these:
- (a) Reverse sensitivity in relation to industrial activities;
 - (b) Traffic, car-parking and pedestrian safety;
 - (c) Appropriate acoustic protection for staff and customers within the proposed Retail Activity; and
 - (d) Tenancy size, mix (if tenants are known) and configuration shall provide for convenience needs of the local resident population and workforce.
- All aspects proposed ground floor Retail Activity shall be assessed in terms of the following criteria:
- (a) Whether the establishment and operation of the proposed retail activity will prevent the operation of existing (and future) legitimate industrial activity – particularly within the surrounding Industrial 1 and 3 zoned land;
 - (b) Whether there is a demonstrable need to fulfill convenience requirements of local resident population and workforce and if the proposed tenancy size, mix (if tenants are known) and configuration provide for this;
 - (c) Whether the proposed Retail Activity can operate safely and efficiently with an acceptable standard of car-parking, access/loading provisions. In particular consideration shall be had for customer safety and the efficient operation of legitimate industrial activities.”
- 17.9* Change Activity Table 2 of Rule 6.9.8.1 to provide for the modification of the indicative overland flowpaths depicted on the Structure Plan for Area 6 at Appendix 16A as follows:
- | | |
|--|---|
| <p><u>The modification of the indicative overland flowpaths depicted on the Takanini Structure Plan Area 6A/6B at Appendix 16A where it forms an integral part of a comprehensive development proposal involving site specific stormwater design by a suitably qualified Engineer.</u></p> | <p><u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u></p> <p><u>(Refer to Part 6.15.2.6 for the matters to which Council has restricted its discretion and assessment criteria)</u></p> |
|--|---|
- 17.10* Insert new assessment criteria for in 6.15.2.6 to provide for the modification of the indicative overland flowpaths in the Structure Plan for Area 6 as follows:
- “Restricted Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria for modification of indicative Overland Flowpaths within the Takanini Structure Plan Area 6A/6B as part of a comprehensive development proposal involving site specific stormwater design.
- Council has restricted the exercise of its discretion to the following matters, and may impose any conditions of consent in relation to these:
- (a) The capability of the proposed overland flowpaths to provide adequate flows in accordance with the general intent of the Structure Plan and/or Catchment Management Plan;
 - (b) If the proposed overland flowpaths are the best practicable option;

			<p>(c) <u>The exacerbation/avoidance of flooding and other hazard effects to adjoining/adjacent properties and sites within the lower catchment as a result of the proposed overland flowpath(s); and</u></p> <p>(d) <u>The ability of sites in the upper catchment to continue to and/or reasonably provide for future overland flows.</u></p> <p><u>All aspects proposed overland flowpath modification shall be assessed in terms of the following criteria:</u></p> <p>(a) <u>Whether the establishment and operation of the proposed overland flowpaths will prevent the operation of existing (and future) flowpaths within the catchment; and</u></p> <p>(b) <u>Whether the modified overland flowpath(s) result in improved practical outcomes including efficient development of land in relation to the overland flowpaths, reduction in actual or potential offsite flooding/hazard effects, improved maintenance access and safety outcomes.”</u></p> <p>17.11* Change the Controlled Activity subdivision rule 6.9.8.7.2 to provide for the subdivision of either existing or consented development as a Controlled Activity subject to non-notification provisions as follows:</p> <p><u>“All subdivision around either existing (legally established) or consented development (for which Land Use Consent has been granted), including freehold, cross lease or unit title subdivisions, which comply with Rule 9.8.4 and 9.8.5 of Section Three of the Plan except when the subdivision includes land within the Mahia Branch Trunk Wastewater Line Network Utility Yard (refer to Rule 6.9.8).</u></p> <p><u>Except as provided for by Section 95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c) and 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991 applications will be considered without public notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.”</u></p> <p>17.12* Change the Controlled Activity subdivision rule 9.8.4 of the operative District Plan to be consistent with changes at rule 6.9.8.7.2 the plan change as follows:</p> <p><u>“Any subdivision activity to create cross-lease titles or units in terms of the Unit Titles Act 1972 and freehold subdivision of existing (legally established) or consented development (for which Land Use Consent has been granted) shall be regarded as a Controlled Activity.</u></p> <p><u>Except as provided for by Section 95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c) and 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991 applications will be considered without public notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.”</u></p> <p>17.13* Change the Subdivision Standards (for Area 6 only) at rule 6.9.9 to apply in their entirety to the subdivision of vacant land and only with regard to road widening in relation to subdivision or existing or consented development as follows:</p> <p><u>“The following standards shall apply to the subdivision of vacant land. Where subdivision of existing (legally established) or consented development (for which Land Use Consent has been granted) is proposed only the Road Widening standard at 6.9.9.4 shall apply.”</u></p> <p>(Note: the remaining text is unmodified)</p> <p>17.14* Change the non-notification provisions of Restricted Discretionary Activity subdivision in rule 6.9.8.7.3 to be consistent with October 2009 amendments to the Resource Management Act 1991 as follows:</p> <p><u>“Except as provided for by Section 94C 95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c) and 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991 applications will be considered without public notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.”</u></p> <p>17.15* Change the Restricted Discretionary Subdivision Assessment Criteria at rule 6.15.2.3 and related provisions of the operative District Plan as follows:</p> <p>(a) Change the ‘Existing Buildings to Conform’ section of the Code of Urban Subdivision at Part 9.9 of the operative District Plan (as referenced at Criteria 6.15.2.3.1 of the plan change) to clarify compliance with an existing land use consent as follows:</p> <p><u>“Notwithstanding any other provisions in this District Plan, any scheme plan of subdivision of</u></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

land on which buildings exist shall be so designed or the buildings modified so that the buildings confirm with the standards for permitted activities or be in accordance with ~~the terms of a Discretionary~~ an existing Land Use Consent."

- (b) Change the 'Servicing' criteria at rule 6.15.2.3.3 to allow for the provision of onsite stormwater detention and treatment where development is in advance of the construction and operation of the public stormwater pond identified in the Structure Plan as follows:

"The extent to which sites can be adequately serviced for stormwater, wastewater, water supply and utilities.

This includes whether the stormwater pond identified on the Structure Plan for Area 6 (refer Section Three, Part 16A of the Plan) has been established and whether the subdivision provides for the overland flowpaths identified on the Structure Plan.

Where subdivision is in advance of construction and operation of the identified public stormwater pond; stormwater detention and treatment shall be provided for onsite in accordance with any relevant Land Use Consent; and provision of overland flowpaths shall be maintained as per the Structure Plan and/or Catchment Management Plan. "

- (c) Change the 'Design and Layout' criteria at rule 6.15.2.3.4 to allow for circumstances where comprehensive landscaping has been considered as part of an existing Land Use Consent as follows:

"The extent to which the proposed subdivision design and layout complies with and gives effect to the elements identified on the Structure Plan in Appendix 16A and relevant roading standards in Appendix 16D.

The extent to which the proposed subdivision complies with the landscape concept plan in Appendix 16E and takes into account the overland flowpath requirements, so as not to impede the flow of stormwater (refer rule 6.15.12). This shall be demonstrated by a comprehensive landscape concept plan provided at the time of subdivision detailing plant species, size, spacing and location unless addressed by an existing Land Use Consent."

- 17.16* Change Activity Table 2 of Rule 6.11.7.1 to provide for the modification of the indicative overland flowpaths depicted on the Structure Plan for Area 6 at Appendix 16A as follows:

<p><u>The modification of the indicative overland flowpaths depicted on the Takanini Structure Plan Area 6A/6B at Appendix 16A where it forms an integral part of a comprehensive development proposal involving site specific stormwater design by a suitably qualified Engineer.</u></p>	<p><u>Restricted Discretionary Activity</u> (Refer to Part 6.15.2.6 for the matters to which Council has restricted its discretion and assessment criteria)</p>
--	---

- 17.17* Change the Controlled Activity subdivision rule 6.11.7.6.2 to provide for subdivision of either existing or consented development as a Controlled Activity subject to non notification provisions as follows

"All subdivision of either existing (legally established) or consented built development (for which Land Use Consent has been granted), including freehold, cross lease or unit title subdivisions, which comply with Rule 9.8.4 and 9.8.5 of Section Three of the Plan except when the subdivision includes land within the Mahia Branch Trunk Wastewater Line Network Utility Yard (refer to Rule 6.11.7.7).

Except as provided for by Section 95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c) and 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991 applications will be considered without public notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons."

- 17.18* That the Controlled Activity subdivision rule 9.8.4 of the operative District Plan changed as specified in paragraph [3.11] of the submission.

- 17.19* Change the Subdivision Standards (for Area 6 only) at rule 6.11.7.8 as follows:

"The following standards shall apply to the subdivision of vacant land. Where subdivision of existing (legally established) or consented development (for which Land Use Consent has been granted) is proposed only the Road Widening standard at 6.11.7.8.4 shall apply."

			<p>(Note: the remaining text is unmodified)</p> <p>17.20* Change the non-notification provisions of Restricted Discretionary Activity subdivision rule 6.11.7.6.3 to be consistent with October 2009 amendments to the Resource Management Act 1991 as follows:</p> <p>“Except as provided for by Section 94C <u>95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c) and 95A(4)</u> of the Resource Management Act 1991 applications will be considered without notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.”</p> <p>17.21* Change the Restricted Discretionary Subdivision Assessment Criteria at rule 6.15.2.3 and related provisions of the operative District Plan as specified at paragraph [3.14] of the submission.</p> <p>17.22* Change the General Requirements for Industrial Zones at Clause 6.15 (or the operative District Plan, where referenced below) as follows:</p> <p>(a) Change the Landscape Design rules at clause 13.8 of the operative District Plan (cross-referenced at the first bullet point at 6.15 of the plan change) as follows:</p> <p>“The planting of trees and shrubs shall be so arranged that they do not prevent access for fire fighting appliances to all sides of the buildings.</p> <p><u>Where street tree planting is proposed within the arterial and principal road network and there are no existing street trees, the proposed planting shall be in general accordance with Council’s existing proposed street tree theme. All proposed street trees shall be to the satisfaction of Council’s Arborist to ensure appropriateness of the species and tree spacing.</u></p> <p><u>In the case of tree planting within front yards, small to medium sized trees shall have 5m spacing while large growing trees (growing to a minimum mature height and width of 15m) are to be spaced at one tree per 12m (or as otherwise required to avoid branch entanglement and excessive maintenance). In the case of road frontages, the equivalent of at least one tree for each five metres of frontage shall be included. Where existing trees on the site are retained these shall be credited towards these requirements and form the basis of a planting theme. Where a development occurs on the arterial and principal road network and there are no existing trees on site, then regard shall be had to Council’s existing or proposed street tree theme.</u></p> <p>In the case of service stations, trees shall not be required across site frontages.</p> <p>In the case of front yards of industrial zones where those yards are adjacent to or opposite a residential zone, the landscape design shall be to a high standard. In some cases the requirements may include earthmounding to reduce the transmission of noise.</p> <p>In the case of a coastal protection yard any landscaping shall be such as to enhance the visual or ecological value of that part of the coastline.</p> <p>In the case of rear and side yards any landscaping between different adjoining uses shall be designed to provide a dense visual screen and a physical barrier between those uses.</p> <p>In the case of rear and side yards any landscaping between adjoining uses may be required to incorporate provision for direct pedestrian access between the sites”.</p> <p>(b) 6.15(1) Noise:</p> <p>(i) 6.15(1)(a) Delete the proposed text and replace with the following:</p> <p><u>“All activities and buildings in an Industrial Zone shall be carried out and designed to comply with the noise levels in Tables A and B. All noise levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS6801:2008 Acoustics – Measurement of Environmental Sound and NZS6802:2008 Acoustics – Assessment of Environmental Noise.</u></p> <p><u>The noise shall be measured by a sound level meter complying with the International Standard IEC 651 (1979): Sound Level Meters, Type 1.”</u></p> <p>(ii) 6.15(1)(b) Change as follows:</p> <p>“The noise levels (L₁₀) (L_{Aeq} and L_{AEmax}) shall be measured on the nearest residential boundary at <u>measured on the nearest residential boundary and shall not exceed the limit set out in</u></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

Table A”.

Delete Tables A and B and replace with the following:

Table A	
The noise level measured at any point within any residential site shall not exceed the following levels:	
0700 - 2200	
Industrial 1	50dB LA _{eq}
Industrial 2	50dBA L10
Industrial 3	50dB LA _{eq}
Industrial 4	50dBA L10
2200 - 0700	
Industrial 1	40dB LA _{eq} and 75dBA LAF _{max}
Industrial 2	45dBA L10
Industrial 3	40dB LA _{eq} and 75dBA LAF _{max}
Industrial 4	45dBA L10

Table B	
The noise level measured at any point within an industrial site shall not exceed the following levels:	
Industrial 1	60dB LA _{eq} and 75dB LAF _{max}
Industrial 2	50dBA L10
Industrial 3	65dB LA _{eq}
Industrial 4	55dBA L10

Submitter Note: The Industrial 2 and 4 zone noise standards in replacement Tables A and B are not altered by the relief sought.

(iii) 6.15(1)(c) Delete the second paragraph and make the following changes:

“The noise standards in Tables A and B shall not apply to ~~the noise from~~ construction or maintenance activities of buildings that have been approved by the Council which are instead subject to NZS6803:1991 Acoustics – Construction Noise.”

(iv) 6.15(1)(d) No changes sought.

(v) 6.15(1)(e) change as follows:

~~“For all controlled, restricted discretionary, and discretionary and non-complying activity applications within the Industrial 1 zone and in any other case w~~ Where doubt arises as to the ability of an industry to comply with these controls, the applicant/operator shall provide ~~the~~ Council with a certificate from a registered engineer with acoustical qualifications confirming that the activity will comply with the foregoing noise controls. In the case of a new activity, this information must be provided before the activity commences.”

(vi) 6.15(1)(f) and (g) No changes sought.

(vii) 6.15(1)(h) delete and replace the existing clause with the following:

“With respect to Studio Warehousing in the Industrial 1 Zone only, the noise in habitable rooms shall not exceed:

- 35dB LA_{eq} in bedrooms; and
- 45dB LA_{eq} in all other habitable rooms

Based on a level of 60dB LA_{eq} when measured at any point within the site.

The dwelling shall be ventilated in accordance with the Building Code at the same time as the above levels are achieved.”

(viii) 6.15(1)(i) insert a new clause with the following text:

“With respect to Childcare Centres in the Industrial 1 zone only, the noise in habitable rooms for sleep purposes shall not exceed:

- 35dB L_{Aeq}:

Based on a level of 60dB L_{Aeq} when measured at any point within the site.

The sleeping rooms shall be ventilated in accordance with the Building Code at the same time as the above levels are achieved.”

- (c) 6.15(2)(b) Glare: Change the second bullet point as follows:

“an added illuminance in excess of 20lux measured horizontally or vertically at any point along any adjacent boundary of any adjacent land used for residential purposes, except for those in the Business and Industrial Zones.”

- (d) Table 6.1 at Rule 6.15(5) Bulk and Location Controls: Change the Industrial 1 and 3 Yard provisions to remove onerous yard setback standards where a site is developed comprehensively by including the following clauses as notes:

“Side and rear yard controls shall only where the side and/or rear boundary adjoins land zoned for residential and reserve purposes;

Front yard setback controls may be reduced to 3m in respect of buildings and car-parking areas where comprehensive landscaping is proposed in accordance with the Landscape Concept Plan for the Takanini Structure Plan Area 6 at Appendix 16E.”

- (e) Table 6.1A at Rule 6.15(5) Height in Relation to Road and Reserve Boundary Control within Industrial 1 and 3 zoned land located within the Takanini Structure Plan Area 6: Change the tables as follows:

TABLE 6.1A HEIGHT IN RELATION TO ROAD AND RESERVE BOUNDARY CONTROL WITHIN INDUSTRIAL 1 AND 3 ZONED LAND LOCATED WITHIN TAKANINI STRUCTURE PLAN AREA 6

	South (facing Residential 8 zone only)	East Porchester (facing Road only)	All Other Road and Reserve Frontages
Industrial 1	2m+35 degrees <u>7.5m+55 degrees</u>	2m+45 degrees	2m <u>7.5m+55 degrees</u>
Industrial 3	N/A	N/A	2m <u>7.5m+55 degrees</u>

- (f) Table 6.2 at Rule 6.15(5) Standards for Discretionary Activities: Change the Industrial 1 and 3 Yard provisions to reflect the changes at Table 6.1.

- (g) 6.15(6)(a) Front Yard Landscaping for all Industrial Zones: Change as follows:

“Front yards shall be landscaped in accordance with either a comprehensive Landscape Concept Plan prepared by a qualified Landscape Architect or Designer for sites exceeding a gross area of 3,000m² or in the following manner...”

- (h) 6.15(6)(b) Side and Rear Yard Landscaping for all Industrial Zones: Change as follows:

“Side and Rear Yards ~~landscaping for all Industrial Zones~~ shall be landscaped in accordance with either a comprehensive Landscape Concept Plan prepared by a qualified Landscape Architect or Designer for sites exceeding a gross area of 3,000m² or in the following manner...”

- (i) 6.15(11)(b) Stormwater: Change this provision to correctly describe temporary soakage pit design requirements as follows:

			<p>“6.5(11)(b): A soakage pit providing temporary storage for the runoff is required. Soakage pits are to be designed in accordance with the Code of Urban Subdivision and storage volume is to be provided between 1.5m below ground level and 0.5m below ground level. The design soakage pit requirements are based on a design storm of 15mm of rainfall over a 1 hour period <u>the first 155mm of any rainfall event.</u>”</p> <p>(j) 6.15(11)(c) Stormwater: Change this provision to provide clarification in circumstances where development precedes the provision of public stormwater drainage by including the following notation after the existing text:</p> <p>“6.5(11)(c): Overflow from the soakage system is to be provided for with a piped connection to the public stormwater drainage system.</p> <p><u>Note: Where development is proposed in advance of the provision of the public stormwater drainage system, interim measures such as temporary stormwater detention and treatment pond(s) shall be provided for onsite. The temporary onsite measures shall be capable of facilitating piped connections to the public stormwater drainage system that are designed to meet the Code of Urban Subdivision.</u>”</p> <p>17.23* Change the Discretionary Studio Warehousing Assessment Criteria at rule 6.15.3.2.6 as follows:</p> <p>(a) Criteria 6.15.3.2.6(a)(i): Change to enable the residential component of a studio warehousing unit to be the same or less than the warehouse/office component as follows:</p> <p>“The area of the unit to be used for residential purposes should be proportionally less than <u>or equal to</u> the warehouse office component.”</p> <p>(b) Criteria 6.15.3.2.6(a)(v): Change to enable a reasonable amount of residential storage to be provided for the residential component of a studio warehousing unit as follows:</p> <p>“Residential storage space <u>shall be provided in each studio warehousing of at least 6m² per unit</u> should be provided.”</p> <p>17.24* Insert a new Restricted [Discretionary] Activity rule at 16.1.4.2.5 (and associated assessment criteria) to provide for the modification of the indicative overland flowpaths depicted on the Structure Plan for Area 6 at Appendix 16A as follows:</p> <p><u>“16.1.4.2.5: The modification of indicative Overland Flowpaths within the Takanini Structure Plan Area 6A/6B as part of a comprehensive development proposal involving site specific stormwater design:</u></p> <p><u>The modification of the indicative overland flowpaths depicted on the Takanini Structure Plan Area 6A/6B at Appendix 16A where it forms an integral part of a comprehensive development proposal involving site specific stormwater design by a suitably qualified Engineer.</u></p> <p><u>Council has restricted the exercise of its discretion to the following matters, and may impose any conditions of consent in relation to these:</u></p> <p>(i) <u>The capability of the proposed overland flowpaths to provide adequate flows in accordance with the general intent of the Structure Plan and/or Catchment Management Plan.</u></p> <p>(ii) <u>If the proposed overland flowpaths are the best practicable option;</u></p> <p>(iii) <u>The exacerbation/avoidance of flooding and other hazard effects to adjoining/adjacent properties and sites within the lower catchment as a result of the proposed overland flowpath(s); and</u></p> <p>(iv) <u>The ability of sites in the upper catchment to continue to and/or reasonably provide for future overland flows.”</u></p> <p>17.25* Insert new assessment criteria in clause 16.1.5.1.3 to provide for the modification of the indicative overland flowpaths on the Structure Plan Area 6 as follows:</p> <p><u>“Restricted Discretionary Activity Assessment Criteria for modification of indicative Overland Flowpaths within the Takanini Structure Plan Area 6A/6B as part of a comprehensive development proposal involving site specific stormwater design</u></p>	
--	--	--	---	--

All aspects proposed overland flowpath modification shall be assessed in terms of the following criteria:

- (a) The extent to which the establishment and operation of the proposed overland flowpaths will prevent the operation of existing (and future) flowpaths within the catchment; and
- (b) The extent to which the modified overland flowpath(s) result in improved practical outcomes including efficient development of land in relation to the overland flowpaths, reduction in actual or potential offsite flooding/hazard effects, improved maintenance access and safety outcomes.”

17.26* Change the Restricted Discretionary standards (and cross-referenced Permitted Activity standards) for specified activities to provide for an achievable but high standard of residential amenity without imposing unnecessarily restrictive compliance and/or monitoring requirements, as follows:

Operative District Plan

- (a) The stormwater standards at Rule 16.1.6.6(i) (as referenced at rule 16.1.7.[.4] of the operative District Plan) should be modified as follows:

“Upon development, all sites are to provide for groundwater recharge by providing for soakage disposal of stormwater run off from buildings and other impervious surfaces, and monitoring of factors critical to maintaining ground stability for a period deemed appropriate for the location and nature of the development.”

- (b) The car-parking standards at Rule 16.1.6.7 (as referenced at rule 16.1.7.5 of the operative District Plan) should be modified as follows and inserted into table format:

Household Units	2 per unit		
Retirement Villages	1.5 per Unit		
Homes for the Aged	1 for every 2 employees plus 1 for every 5 people the facility is licensed to accommodate		
<u>Medium Density Housing Developments involving the comprehensive design of 75+ units and road/reserve areas to be vested in Council.</u>		Within 800m radius of train station	Greater than 800m radius from train station
	1 -2 bedrooms	1 per unit; plus 1 per 4 units for visitors	1 minimum per unit, 2 maximum per unit; plus 1 per 4 units for visitors
	2+ bedrooms	1 minimum per unit, 2 maximum per unit; plus 1 per 3 units for visitors	1 minimum per unit, 2 maximum per unit; plus 1 per 3 units for visitors

“Note: in the case of Medium Density Housing Developments involving 75+ units and road/reserve areas to be vested in Council this may be either by way of integrated subdivision/land use consent or subsequent subdivision consent.”

- (c) The noise standards at Rule 16.1.6.8 (as referenced at rule 16.1.7.6 of the operative District Plan) should be modified by deleting all clauses and replacing with the text as follows:

(i) 16.1.6.8(i) Delete and replace with the following text:

“Noise from any site within a residential zone shall not exceed the following noise limits at any point within another residential site:

0700 – 2200 = 50dB L_{Aeq}

2200 – 0700 = 40dB L_{Aeq} and 75dB L_{AFmax}”

(ii) 16.1.6.8(ii) Delete and replace with the following text:

			<p><u>“Construction work is not subject to the noise standards of 16.1.6.8(i). All construction and maintenance shall comply with NZS6803:1991 Acoustics – Construction Noise.”</u></p> <p>(iii) 16.1.9.8(iii) Delete and replace with the following text:</p> <p><u>“All noise levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS6801:2008 Acoustics – Measurement of Environmental Sound and NZS6802:2008 Acoustics – Assessment of Environmental Noise.”</u></p> <p>(iv) 16.1.9.8(iv) Delete and replace with the following text:</p> <p><u>“The noise shall be measured by a sound level meter complying with the International Standard IEC 651 (1979): Sound Level Meters, Type 1.”</u></p> <p><i>Proposed Plan Change 15</i></p> <p>(d) Change the Permitted Activity Yard Setbacks standard for the Residential 8 zone (within Area 6 only) at rule 16.1.9.3(2)(a) [renumbered from 16.1.6.3 by PC12] to provide for an achievable but high standard of residential amenity without imposing unnecessarily restrictive compliance in circumstances where development is comprehensively designed, as follows:</p> <p>“In the following control the term “setback” is defined as the shortest distance between the legal road boundary and the closest part of the building or part thereof:</p> <p>(i) The minimum setback for front sites shall be 6m <u>or 3m where the proposal involves comprehensive development of either side of the road within the adjacent Residential 8 and Industrial 1 zones.</u></p> <p>(ii) Rule 16.1.9.3(b) above applies”</p> <p><i>Decisions Version of Plan Change 12</i></p> <p>(e) For development in Area 6 the stormwater standards at Rule 16.1.9.6(i) (as referenced at rule 16.1.10.4 of Plan Change 12) of Plan Change 12, make changes as follows:</p> <p><u>“Upon development, all sites are to provide for groundwater recharge by providing for soakage disposal of stormwater run off from buildings and other impervious surfaces and long term monitoring of factors critical to maintaining ground stability and monitoring of factors critical to maintaining ground stability for a period deemed appropriate for the location and nature of the development.”</u></p> <p>(f) For development in Area 6 the car-parking standards at Rule 16.1.9.7 (as referenced at rule 16.1.10.5 of Plan Change 12) of Plan Change 12, make changes and insert into table format as follows:</p>
--	--	--	---

Household Units	2 per household unit		
Residential Development on lot sizes of 0 = 250m ²	1.5 per household Unit		
<u>Medium Density Housing Developments involving the comprehensive design of 75+ units and road/reserve areas to be vested in Council.</u>		Within 800m radius of train station	Greater than 800m radius from train station
	1 -2 bedrooms	1 per unit; plus 1 per 4 units for visitors	1 minimum per unit, 2 maximum per unit; plus 1 per 4 units for visitors
	2+ bedrooms	1 minimum per unit, 2 maximum per unit; plus 1 per 3 units for visitors	1 minimum per unit, 2 maximum per unit; plus 1 per 3 units for visitors

“Note: in the case of Medium Density Housing Developments involving 75+ units and road/reserve areas to be vested in Council this may be either by way of integrated subdivision/land use consent or subsequent subdivision consent.”

(g) For development in Area 6 the noise standards at Rule 16.1.9.8 (as referenced at rule 16.1.10.6 of Plan Change 12) of Plan Change 12 make changes by deleting paragraph (i) and replacing with the text as follows and either deleting the internal noise standards at paragraph (ii) for dwellings or amending the standard to relate to sites located within specified high background noise environments:

(i) Delete 16.1.9.8(i) and replace with the following:

“Noise from any site within a residential zone shall not exceed the following noise limits at any point within another residential site:

0700 – 2200 = 50dB L_{Aeq}

2200 – 0700 = 40dB L_{Aeq} and 75dB L_{AFmax}”

(ii) 16.1.9.8(ii) is either deleted or changed to relate to defined high background noise areas such as immediate proximity to Arterial roads (such a modification would not be appropriate to include landholdings at 55 Takanini School Road).

(iii) Delete 16.1.9.8 and replace with the following:

“Construction work is not subject to the noise standards of 16.1.9.8(i) and 16.1.9.8(ii). All construction and maintenance shall comply with NZS6803:1991 Acoustics – Construction Noise.”

(iv) Delete 16.1.9.8(iv) and replace with the following:

“All noise levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS6801:2008 Acoustics – Measurement of Environmental Sound and NZS6802:2008 Acoustics – Assessment of Environmental Noise.”

(v) Delete 16.1.9.8(v) and replace with the following:

“The noise shall be measured by a sound level meter complying with the International Standard IEC 651 (1979): Sound Level Meters, Type 1.”

17.27* Change the Controlled Activity subdivision rule 9.8.4 of the operative District Plan to include freehold subdivision around existing and consented development and non-notification provisions as follows:

			<p><u>“Any subdivision activity to create cross-lease titles or units in terms of the Unit Titles Act 1972 and freehold subdivision of existing (legally established) or consented development (for which Land Use Consent has been granted) shall be regarded as a Controlled Activity.</u></p> <p><u>Except as provided for by Section 95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c) and 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991 applications will be considered without public notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.”</u></p> <p>17.28* Correct a typographical error at paragraph 1 of the Controlled Activity subdivision standards and terms at rule 9.8.5 as follows:</p> <p>“161.3.5” is corrected to read as “16.1.3.5”.</p> <p>17.29* Change the non-notification provisions for Restricted Discretionary subdivision at rule 16.1.3.3 of the operative District Plan to be consistent with the October 2009 amendments to the Resource Management Act 1991 as follows:</p> <p>“Except as provided for by sections 94C 95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c) and 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991, and except where Council does not consider the proposed design satisfactorily meets the criterion 16.1.3.6.4, applications for restricted discretionary activity subdivision will be considered without <u>public</u> notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.”</p> <p>17.30* Change the non-notification provisions for Restricted Discretionary subdivision at rule 16.1.3.3 of Plan Change 12 to be consistent with October 2009 amendments to the Resource Management Act 1991 as follows:</p> <p>“Except as provided for by sections 94C 95A(2)(b), 95A(2)(c) and 95A(4) of the Resource Management Act 1991, and except where Council does not consider the proposed design satisfactorily meets the criterion 16.1.3.6.4, and except where required under Regulation 10 section 2(i) (Resource Management (Forms, Fees and Procedure) Regulations 2003), applications for restricted discretionary activity subdivision will be considered without <u>public</u> notification or the need to obtain approval from affected persons.”</p> <p>17.31* Such further or alternative relief as may be necessary to address the issues or concerns outlined in the submission.</p>	
018	Oppose	<p>18.1 The submitter considers that the proposal is a significant deviation from the Takanini Structure Plan and the decision to adopt the plan change was inconsistent with existing District Plan policies. The submitter states that they were not aware that Area 6 had been identified for employment use via ancillary documents aligned to the Takanini Structure Plan.</p> <p>18.2 The submitter considers that insufficient consultation has been undertaken on the changes and seeks that the plan change be withdrawn to allow for a complete review of the plan change and Takanini Structure Plan by the new Auckland Council with the commissioning of additional technical reports by ‘independent experts’ to be consulted upon with the community.</p> <p>18.3 The submitter states that they are not opposed to creating ‘employment opportunities’ in the area however the submitter opposes industrial development. The submitter states that the type of industry enabled by the proposal will not create sufficient employment opportunities sufficient enough to justify the environmental cost of industrial development. Furthermore, the submitter questions the demand for industrial land given the current economy and the existing local supply</p> <p>18.4 The submitter opposes the incremental implementation of the existing Takanini Structure Plan as they consider it to be ad-hoc planning that ignores cumulative effects while creating a precedent effect for the further [industrial] urbanisation of the rest of Takanini.</p> <p>18.5 The submitter considers that the plan change provisions do not adequately address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Urban design b) Landscaping c) Accessibility d) Interface with the Papakura Stream e) Environmental effects on the Papakura Stream f) Scale, bulk and domination effects on the residential areas of Porchester Park, Randwick Park, Alfriston and Takanini g) Noise h) Vibration i) Impact of Emissions 	<p>18.1* Decline the plan change.</p> <p>18.2* Prepare further information (covering issues raised in the submission, and traffic in particular), review the Takanini Structure Plan and undertake further consultation prior to notifying a new plan change following the local government amalgamations.</p>	Alfriston Residents Group – Lifestyle Blocks

		<p>j) Odour k) Environmental Impacts l) Stormwater and flood hazards m) Geotechnical suitability for development</p> <p>18.6 The submitter considers that monitoring procedures that are reliant on local resident monitoring and reporting is unsatisfactory.</p> <p>18.7 The submitter has significant concerns about the management of traffic generated by the proposal and its impact on the surrounding area.</p> <p>18.8 The submitter seeks the incorporation of the recommendations of the independent traffic assessment within the plan change and the preparation of a Traffic Plan and comprehensive traffic assessment for the greater Takanini/Alfriston area.</p> <p>18.9 The submitter considers that these assessments need to specifically address, and the plan change provide for, the following: a) The Mill Road Corridor. b) Dedicated east/west routes to the Takanini motorway interchange. c) Traffic growth and capacity issues at the Takanini and Manurewa motorway interchanges. d) Management of heavy traffic routes to discourage use of residential streets. e) Pedestrian and cycle needs (e.g. school student travel, safe cycle lanes) f) Connection to the passenger transport network to reduce private car trips.</p> <p>18.10 The submitter raises concerns that in adopting the plan change the costs of processing the change are born by ratepayers. Furthermore, the submitter states that full costs for the Manuroa Rd grade separation (as a result of proceeding with a NZTA funding subsidy) should not fall to residents.</p> <p>18.11 The submitter states concerns about amendments to 'allow further discretion to Council to make decisions on industrial development. ...residents do not have confidence in allowing any additional discretion provisions to be inserted into the District Plan as we do not feel that Council would make ethical decisions to protect the real or potential impact on current and future residents or the current environment'.</p>		
019	Opposes (seeks changes)	<p>19.1 Opposes the plan change as it is inconsistent with the operative District Plan and fails to adequately offset environmental impacts through the provision of land transport and environmental infrastructure.</p> <p>19.2 The submitter states that the plan change does not provide for adequate improvements to the transport network to address traffic growth resulting from the industrial rezoning and the growing population.</p> <p>19.3 The submitter states that funding has not been provided for in PDC's Long Term Council Community Plan (LTCCP) for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Road widening at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Takanini School Rd • Manuroa Rd • Porchester Rd • Signalised intersections at: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Porchester Rd and Popes Rd • Porchester Rd and Manuroa Rd • Mill Road corridor improvements. <p>19.4 The submitter states that the plan change does not address congestion issues at the intersection of Great South Rd and Manuroa Rd.</p> <p>19.5 The submitter states that the plan change does not address capacity issues at Takanini Interchange / State Highway network and Mill Road.</p> <p>19.6 The submitter states that the plan change is not supportive of Passenger Transport use given the walking distance to bus and rail services.</p> <p>19.7 The submitter states that the Industrial 1 controls do not address concerns about protection of the amenity of adjacent residents. Specific controls identified as being inadequate are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Yards • Landscaping, tree planting and the Landscape Concept Plan 	<p>19.1* [Decline] the plan change; or</p> <p>19.2* If approved, make amendments to address the issues raised in the submission</p>	D Newman

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Height limits • Effects of earthworks and construction activity. <p>19.8 The submitter considers that amendments to provide for mixed use developments could 'go some way to addressing reverse sensitivity issues'.</p> <p>19.9 The submitter states that the plan change is a departure from Takanini Structure Plan (2000) which proposed a mixed use development based on residential, business and retail, and was informed by extensive stakeholder consultation and technical assessment. Submitter states concern that most of Area 6 'is now earmarked for industrial development – almost double what was initially anticipated'.</p>		
020	Oppose (seeks changes)	<p>NOTE: Submissions 20 – 98 are pro forma submissions, the summary below applies to all. If a submitter has included comments in their submission that have not already been identified from the pro forma submission then these additional points have been listed separately (refer submission 97 and 98).</p> <p>20.1 The submitter states that the proposed industrial activities will generate effects which are incompatible with existing residential activities. Specific matters of concern are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Air quality (odour, particle and dust emissions) Noise Vibration (on site and vehicular) Visual amenity (due to poor site design and layout) Light and Glare (security lights, street lights, vehicles at night) Scale, intensity and hours of industrial operations Ecological degradation of Papakura Stream Stormwater (quality and quantity) Traffic – especially heavy vehicles on residential roads (specifically Porchester Rd north of Papakura Stream) and associated effects on safety, air quality, vibration, and noise. <p>20.2 The submitter states that no Integrated Transport Assessment or Traffic Impact Analysis has been undertaken and raises concerns about the management of traffic and effects of heavy vehicles arising from the proposal (and wider growth), with particular regard to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Porchester Rd Alfriston Rd Stratford Rd Ranfurly Rd Popes Rd (west of Area 6) Manuroa Rd Congestion on the motorway network <p>20.3 The submitter states that there is a lack of detail on how reverse sensitivity issues will be specifically addressed.</p> <p>20.4 The submitter is concerned about the capacity of the wastewater network to handle the increased demand.</p> <p>20.5 The submitter is supportive of the stormwater pond proposed but is concerned about its capacity, and that of the wider stormwater network to handle the increased pressure given the flood and soil conditions.</p> <p>20.6 The submitter is concerned about the maintenance and monitoring of the stormwater pond to manage 'public health issues such as insect infestations (mosquito, fly) and ongoing industrial contamination.</p> <p>20.7 The submitter is concerned about the potential loss of property values arising from a loss of amenity.</p> <p>20.8 The submitter considers that insufficient consultation has been undertaken.</p> <p>20.9 The submitter states that sufficient industrial land is already available and that alternative sites that are not close to residential activities should be used.</p> <p>20.10 The submitter states that the existing rural use provides an 'ecological, acoustic and visual barrier' to existing industrial development and that the proposed esplanade and stormwater pond reserve will not create an effective buffer to mitigate the adverse effects generated by the proposal. The submitter</p>	<p>20.1* Opposes industrial land uses in Area 6 for the reasons identified in the submission.</p> <p>20.2* Seeks changes to the proposal to enable 'high quality medium density residential' and mixed land use of medium density retail, office, light commercial and community service / education facilities to be developed in Area 6.</p> <p>20.3* Seeks changes that create a 10 ha (minimum) area for a recreational reserve, neighbourhood park and native tree conservation area.</p> <p>20.4* Seeks the planting of a significant tree belts or other screening on eastern boundary parallel to stream and the Sheriff Place residential area.</p> <p>20.5* Seeks the retention of the existing boundary shelterbelts as a buffer against the existing industrial areas.</p> <p>20.6* Seeks a review of the Takanini Structure Plan.</p> <p>20.7* Retain the provisions requiring site specific geotechnical reports at the time of subdivision to ensure the land is suitable for development.</p>	See Attachment A

		<p>considers that significant green space and trees planting would be needed to mitigate the adverse effects of the industrial activities and to retain the rural ambience.</p> <p>20.11 The submitter states that the Papakura Open Space Strategy identifies Area 6 as a significant Greenfield space to be protected and developed for community recreation and conservation and the industrial activities proposed will adversely affect this objective.</p> <p>20.12 The submitter supports the mandatory requirement for geotechnical reports at the time of subdivision.</p>	
021 to 096	Oppose (seeks changes)	As per 20.1 to 20.12.	As per 20.1* to 20.7*.
097	Oppose (seeks changes)	<p>97.1 to 97.12 as per 20.1 to 20.12.</p> <p>97.13 The submitter states concerns that industrial sites may attract illegal car racing.</p>	As per 20.1* to 20.7*.
098	Oppose (seeks changes)	<p>98.1 to 98.12 as per 20.1 to 20.12.</p> <p>98.13 Submitter states concerns about a potential increase of crime due to the influx of workers from areas outside of the current residential area.</p>	As per 20.1* to 20.7*.

NOTE: Submission 011 by ARTA was received late and a s37 RMA1991 decision on whether to waive the lateness will be made by the plan change hearing panel (unless determined prior to the hearing by Papakura District Council).

ATTACHMENT A

Sub#	Submitter	Org Contact Name	Address for Service 1	Address for Service 2	Address for Service 3	Address for Service 4	Wishes to be Heard?	Will consider a joint case at Hearing?
1	Chan Li Chun Fa		8 Ridings Rd	Remuera	Auckland 1050		Yes	Yes
2	Manukau City Council	Attn: Bruce Nicholson	Private Bag 76917	Manukau 2241			Yes	-
3	Cosgrave Residents and Landowners Association Inc	Attn: Julie Goodyer	c/- Ellis Gould Lawyers	PO Box 1509	Auckland		Yes	Yes
4	Retail Holdings Ltd and Southgate Centre Ltd	Attn: Julie Goodyer	c/- Ellis Gould Lawyers	PO Box 1509	Auckland		Yes	Yes
5	G & A Goldring		160 Manuroa Rd	Takanini 2112			-	-
6	L & F Morgan		158 Manuroa Rd	Takanini 2112			Yes	Yes
7	Takanini Residents Action Group	Attn: Michael Toohey	Flat 1, 21 Berwyn Ave	Takanini			Yes	Yes
8	New Zealand Transport Agency	Attn: Matthew Richards	NZTA Auckland Office	PO Box 106602	Auckland 1143		Yes	No
9	Watercare Services Ltd	Attn: Andrew Kantor	Private Bag 92521	Auckland 1141			-	-
10	Auckland Regional Council	Attn: Hugh Jarvis	Auckland Regional Council	Private Bag 92012	Auckland		Yes	-
11	Auckland Regional Transport Authority	Attn: Matthew Rednall	ARTA	Private Bag 92236	Auckland		Yes	-
12	Nigel Hosken	Attn: Claire Kirman	c/- Ellis Gould Lawyers	PO Box 1509	Auckland		Yes	Yes
13	Takanini Structure Plan Area 6 Ltd	Attn: Emma Bayly	c/- Harrison Grierson Consultants Ltd	PO Box 276121	Manukau City		Yes	Yes
14	Mellviews Ltd	Attn: Emma Bayly	c/- Harrison Grierson Consultants Ltd	PO Box 276121	Manukau City		Yes	Yes
15	Zabeel Investments Ltd	Attn: Emma Bayly	c/- Harrison Grierson Consultants Ltd	PO Box 276121	Manukau City		Yes	Yes
16	Village Farms Ltd	Attn: Emma Bayly	c/- Harrison Grierson Consultants Ltd	PO Box 276121	Manukau City		Yes	Yes
17	Takanini Industrial Trust	Attn: Helen Webb	c/- MPC Planning	PO Box 8960	Symonds St	Auckland 1150	-	-
18	Alfriston Residents Group – Lifestyle Blocks	Attn: G Rudolph	25 Everlea Pl	Alfriston 2105	Manukau		Yes	Yes
19	D Newman		4 Gleneagles Grove	Wattle Downs	Manurewa 2103		Yes	Yes
20	K & P Linklater		4c Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
21	R Hanrahan		4b Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
22	H Sweeney		4a Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
23	P Kumar		4 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
24	N Wyatt & A White		2c Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
25	M Boot & D Lewis		2b Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
26	G Tahata & M Hiku		2a Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
27	S Bennett		2 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
28	P Wong		5 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
29	C Garratt		6 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
30	S Victoriaie & Y Edouard		6a Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
31	J & W Bornman		6b Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
32	P & L Taiapa		7 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
33	J Willcocks		8 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
34	V McDonald		8b Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
35	K Kahlon		10 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
36	G Kelket		10a Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
37	D Han		10b Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
38	E Brett		12 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
39	M Stevens & B Morris		15 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
40	G Davis		17 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
41	L & A Lloyd		19 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
42	J Ash		20 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
43	S & A Airs		21 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			No	-
44	N Flood		23 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			No	-
45	L Rakei		24 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-
46	V & N Narayen		25 Sheriff Pl	Randwick Park 2105			Yes	-

47	M & R Krishna	28 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
48	P, E & E Staub	27 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
49	H Kareko & A Vitolino	30 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
50	M Singh	32 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
51	T & S Elin	31 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
52	R & S Miles	33 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		No	-
53	M Williams	35 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
54	A Morley	37 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
55	S Stoneham	38 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
56	G Hewitt	39 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
57	J McGaughey	42 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
58	K Hona & D Alene	43 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
59	W Wells	45 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
60	S K Ney la	48 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
61	S Singh & K Khan	51 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
62	S Lal	52 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
63	Mr & Mrs Mason	54 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
64	D Simcox	53 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
65	A & S Lal	60 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
66	D, M & M Theron	62 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
67	K & D Li	64 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
68	K McLennan	65 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
69	P & T Umaki	66 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
70	E Yapp	69 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
71	W & L Patu	70 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
72	G Walkinson	71 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
73	R & J Graham	72 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
74	P & M Reynolds	74 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
75	D Bajaj & R Kalra	75 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
76	P & D Stephens	76 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
77	K Pratt & G Davis	78 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
78	D & J Annabell	73 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
79	B Miller	68 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
80	K & B Meehan	67 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
81	J & J Woodroffe	61 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
82	G Newton	57 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
83	M Fairweather	55 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
84	M Van Ng & Le T L I	50 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
85	C & L Davis	8a Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
86	K & C Jack	47 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
87	Mr & MRs Buchan	46 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
88	I & V Olesen	44 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
89	R O'Connor	41 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
90	J Blakeman	40 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
91	D & K Mahay	36 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
92	S Steward & J Leatai	26 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
93	M Pritchard	22 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
94	K & B Field	14 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
95	M & P Van Tiel	1 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		No	-
96	A Whisker	9 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
97	R Merkley	49 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-
98	D Trent	11 Sheriff PI	Randwick Park 2105		Yes	-