

**WAIMAKARIRI DISTRICT  
COUNCIL**

**SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS  
(Includes Further Submissions)**

**COUNCIL PLAN CHANGE 33  
(PC33)**

**MANDEVILLE NORTH BUSINESS 4  
AND  
RESIDENTIAL 4A ZONES**

**MARCH 2015**

Submission Number:	Name:
83	Anthony JB Banks 207 Butchers Road RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
84	Gavin Bennett & Yvonne Thompson 460 Mandeville Road RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
85	WS & CE Cockram 179 McHughs Road RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
86	Maureen Currie 50 Modena Place RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
87	Canterbury Regional Council PO Box 345 CHRISTCHURCH 8140
88	Robin Driver Sherwood Stud 256 Jeff Drian Road RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
89	Peter Harris C/- Eliot Sinclair & Partners Ltd PO Box 9339 Tower Junction CHRISTCHURCH 8149
90	Ingrid Hill 83 Winter Road RD 5 RANGIORA 7475
91	John Howard 84 Millbrook Lane RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
92	Robert & Lynne King 7 Redfern Lane RD 6 RANGIORA 7476
93	Helen & Tony McGregor 26 Leyland Crescent RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
94	JM Murray 1 Pinewood Close RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692

Submission Number:	Name:
95	Claire and Greg McKeever 69 Velino Place RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
96	NZ Fire Service Commission (NZFS Commission) C/- Beca Ltd PO Box 3942 WELLINGTON 6140  Attention: Alex Strawbridge
97	Suzanne Nilsson PO Box 27 031 CHRISTCHURCH 8640
98	Ratua Holdings Ltd C/- Adderley Head PO Box 16 CHRISTCHURCH 8140  Attention: Paul Rogers
99	Rebecca Searle 164 Vicenza Drive RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
100	Jeremy Simpson 800 Tram Road Ohoka Downs RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
101	John Stapley 107 Vicenza Drive RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
102	Trevor Walmsley 37 Winter Road RD 5 RANGIORA 7475
103	WJ Winter & Sons 223 Butchers Road RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
104	Robyn Young 177 McHugh's Road RD 2 KAIAPOI 7692
105	Steven Hammond 450 Mandeville Road RD 2 KAIAPOI 7472

# ***SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS (DECISIONS REQUESTED AND REASONS)***

## ***Agenda 33: Mandeville Business***

### ***Ref Relief Sought***

#### ***A Banks***

- 83.1 Cease all subdivisions in the Oxford/Eyre area until provision is made to capture stormwater discharges, with the water used for future irrigation.

**Reason** Subdivision in the Oxford/Eyre area of the Waimakariri District Council is having an adverse effect on farming. The expansion of the stock water race to an irrigation scheme has had an adverse effect on underground water flows. Current summer water flows of drains, creeks and ditches in the area have exceeded all past known flows. Adverse effects on farming activities. Drainage schemes are not sufficient to alleviate the problem.

F84.1	Bennett, G & Y Thompson	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose
F98.1	Ratua Holdings Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose

#### ***Bennett, G & Y Thompson***

- 84.01 Relocate the location of the proposed business zone stormwater management area into either of the Council reserves.

**Reason** There is insufficient design information as the extent of buildings is not known. There are better alternatives to the proposed location. Stormwater investigations should be designed and amalgamated with other flood mitigations in Mandeville.

F98.4	Ratua Holdings Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/> Support
-------	--------------------	----------------------------------

- 84.02 Develop the Outline Development Plan for the business zone to show site layouts including positions of buildings, roads, accesses. Introduce controls on building positions, configurations, massing, heights and dominance.

**Reason** The Outline Development Plan does not show a building position, or adequate access/ egress roads and layout. Greater accuracy is required. There is also a requirement to provide a declaration lane along Tram Road. The proposed building height of 8 metres may be an issue if located close to the boundary.

F98.5	Ratua Holdings Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose
-------	--------------------	---------------------------------

- 84.03 Ensure the proposed access/ egress and related signage for the Business 4 Zone does not conflict with or compromise existing accesses.

**Reason** Access/egress from Tram Road will require new warning information signage. No consideration of the effects of this signage has been undertaken. The existing entranceways are proposed to be used for future subdivision.

- 84.04 Ensure that adequate measures and controls are in place to provide landscaping to the Mandeville Road access road.

**Reason** Not all recommendations of the landscape report are included within the plan change proposals. Landscaping along the new access from Mandeville Road will be highly visible as the road crosses an open paddock that has no existing shelterbelt.



- 84.05 Include the whole of 933 Tram Road into the proposed Residential 4A Zoning and accurately plot the Outline Development Plan.

**Reason** The area to be rezoned is inaccurate and does not reflect the proposed boundary of a title to be issued for subdivision. The entire parcel should be included as there is no logical reason to exclude that part of the site.

F98.6

Ratua Holdings Ltd

☐ Oppose

- 84.06 Amend proposed Rule 32.1.1.12 to read 'The average area for any Residential 4A Zone, except for Wards Road, Mandeville North shown on District Plan Map 162, and the Residential 4A Zone, Bradleys Road, Ohoka shown on District Plan Map 169, and the Mandeville North Residential 4A Zone shown on District Plan Map 182, shall be met by each subdivision application.'

**Reason** Lot yield is currently governed by Rules 32.1.1.11 and 32.1.1.12, which set an average to be met across each subdivision. It is more appropriate for lot yield to be determined through a yield assessment rather than an average lot size rule.

- 84.07 Insert new Rule 32.1.1.14 to read 'Within the Mandeville Residential 4A Zone shown on District Plan Map 182, the maximum number of residential allotments for each sub-area shall be as shown in Figure XXX (see attached submission plan). The average allotment area requirement shall be applied over the whole area contained within the Outline Development Plan shown on District Plan Map 182.'

**Reason** A lot yield assessment takes into account accessways and roads, and environmental effects can be assessed in a more specific and accurate way. The reserve land should be included when calculating averages as the reserve land will continue to contribute to maintaining the overall visual amenity and anticipated characteristics of the zone. Taking into account the reserve land, the average will be met for the proposed plan. This approach has been previously used.

- 84.08 No restriction on the use of the existing vehicle access to 460 Mandeville Road and 933 Tram Road should be imposed.

**Reason** Proposed Rule 30.6.1.10 intends to impose restrictions on the use of the existing vehicle crossing. The existing crossing has been in existence since 1997 and is exempt from Rule 30.6.1.15 in terms of numbers, location, and space. Its existence pre-dates Policy 6.3.9 of the Regional Policy Statement. A previous consent notice limiting users was removed prior to notification. Council has been aware of the potential for future subdivision. Support the use of speed limit restrictions. The existing access is tar sealed with excellent sightlines. The Ableys Transportation Report comments that the existing access is suitable. Access to Tram Road would require relocation of an existing driveway and barn, as well as power, phone and water reticulation make other connections superfluous.

- 84.09 Amend proposed Table 31.1 to require a setback to Tram Road and Mandeville Road to be 6 metres and the setback to an internal access road or site boundary to be 5 metres for structures within the proposed Residential 4A Zone.

**Reason** The current setback is 6 metres and is inconsistent with the proposed setback to the Business 4 Zone. The Rule as drafted does not give clarity in relation to internal access road setback requirements.

**Ref Relief Sought**

---

- 84.10 Delete the requirement for a 400mm freeboard and replace with a required 300mm freeboard in proposed Rule 27.1.1.30 as it applies to the proposed Residential 4A Zone.

**Reason** The attached flood hazard map does not show 460 Mandeville or 933 Tram Road. The land is classified as Low/No hazard flooding. The proposed imposition of a 400mm freeboard above the modelled 200 year flood event.

- 84.11 Examine and investigate the engagement process since September 2010.

**Reason** Our land immediately abuts the Business 4 land and represents 45% of the overall sub-dividable land area. There have been frustrations with the plan change process. Council changed their minds from rural residential zoning to consideration of a business zone. Council encouraged us to purchase 933 Tram Road for future development options. The requirement to work together with a neighbouring site required the need for professional input. Council has not reimbursed costs. Council was aware that the proposed concept plans required road access. Council set up competition between two landowners. Consent to subdivide the land was not supported after Council determined that the commercial location would be looked at on an adjacent site. A subdivision consent to amalgamate a part of 460 Mandeville Road and 933 Tram Road has been granted.

**Canterbury Regional Council**

- 87.1 Amend proposed Rule 31.2.3 (i) to read "the maximum gross retail area shall be 1300m2."

**Reason** Proposed Rule 31.2.1(i) refers to a limit on the 'gross retail floor area', whereas the District Plan definition for Retail area implies a net figure, in that it refers to the area 'on or in which goods and/or services are displayed, sold or offered for sale'. The amendment will ensure that the rule is in line with the definition for retail area and ensures the maximum amount of floor area for all retail activities within Mandeville is limited to 1300m2.

F98.8      Ratua Holdings Ltd      ☐ Support

- 87.2 Support the proposed Plan Change subject to the amendment to Rule 31.2.3(i) sought by submission point 87.1.

**Reason** Mandeville is well established and the plan change is unlikely to cause any significant effects in relation to new rural residential housing, or encourage the diversion of retail and business activity away from surrounding towns. Small scale commercial activity is warranted in order to sustainably service the Mandeville community consistent with the rural residential setting. The plan change will assist the Waimakariri District Council to carry out its functions under Section 31(1) of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA). The plan change contains policies that implement the objectives and rules that implement the policies in accordance with Section 75 of the RMA. The plan change achieves the purpose of the RMA and is in accordance with sections 5, 6, 7 and 8 of the RMA.



**Cockram, WS & CE**

- 85.1    Decline the proposed plan change in its entirety.

**Reason** A business zone is not sought by residents. The site is unsuitable for businesses. There are major traffic issues and soughtcomings. Residential 4B is the appropriate zoning in relation to adjoining properties. Inadequate consideration of the status quo option.

F84.2	Bennett, G & Y Thompson	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose
F98.7	Ratua Holdings Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose

**Currie, M**

- 86.1    Support the plan change if the junction of Tram Road, Bradleys Road and McHughs Road is improved.

**Reason** The junction at Tram, Bradleys and McHughs Road in its present form would not be good enough for the increased traffic demands. There are additional houses to be constructed in the area and the Mandeville Sports Centre is becoming busier. Traffic on Tram Road goes at a very high speed and is used by pedestrians and cyclists going to the Mandeville Sports Centre.

F98.31	Ratua Holdings Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose
--------	--------------------	---------------------------------

**Driver, R**

- 88.1    Cease all subdivisions in the Oxford/Eyre area until provision is made to capture stormwater discharges, with the water used for future irrigation.

**Reason** Subdivision in the Oxford/Eyre area of the Waimakariri District Council is having an adverse effect on farming. The expansion of the stock water race to an irrigation scheme has had an adverse effect on underground water flows. Current summer water flows of drains, creeks and ditches in the area have exceeded all past known flows. Adverse effects on farming activities. Drainage schemes are not sufficient to alleviate the problem.

F84.3	Bennett, G & Y Thompson	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose
F98.2	Ratua Holdings Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose

**Harris, P**

- 89.1    Consider any potential adverse traffic conflicts between a future vehicle crossing serving the proposed Business 4 Zone and a future right of way serving up to six allotments along the frontage of 116 McHughs Road.

**Reason** 116 and 148 McHughs Road are currently zoned Rural but signalled in the Rural Residential Development Plan as suitable for future rural-residential development. On-site physical constraints require development of accesses onto Mandeville Road. Any future crossing to the Business 4 Zone needs to ensure efficient and safe access to the any future development on 116 and 148 McHughs Road.

- 89.2    Support the identification of land fronting Mandeville Road to be zoned Residential 4A rather than Business 4.

**Reason** For reasons of visual amenity and community expectations as provided through the Mandeville growth strategy.

## **Ref**      **Relief Sought**

- 89.3      Insert into new Objective 16.1.2 new sub-clause (c)(ii) to add the words 'access crossing design' after 'loading areas'.

**Reason** 116 and 148 McHughs Road are currently zoned Rural but signalled in the Rural Residential Development Plan as suitable for future rural-residential development. On-site physical constraints require development of accesses onto Mandeville Road. Any future crossing to the Business 4 Zone needs to ensure efficient and safe access to the any future development on 116 and 148 McHughs Road.

- 89.4      Insert into new Policy 16.1.2.1 a new sub-clause to read 'limits access onto Mandeville Road to locations that do no conflict with the establishment of a new shared vehicle crossing on adjacent land that has legal frontage onto Mandeville Road.'

**Reason** 116 and 148 McHughs Road are currently zoned Rural but signalled in the Rural Residential Development Plan as suitable for future rural-residential development. On-site physical constraints require development of accesses onto Mandeville Road. Any future crossing to the Business 4 Zone needs to ensure efficient and safe access to the any future development on 116 and 148 McHughs Road.

F98.9      Ratua Holdings Ltd      ☐ Support

- 89.5      Confirm any consequential changes to give effect to the proposed amendments to Planning Map 93 and Outline Development Plan Map 182 as necessary to allow the location of any future vehicle crossing serving the Business 4 Zone to be provided as a controlled activity (Rule 31.2.3) rather than a non-complying activity (Rule 31.5.6).

**Reason** 116 and 148 McHughs Road are currently zoned Rural but signalled in the Rural Residential Development Plan as suitable for future rural-residential development. On-site physical constraints require development of accesses onto Mandeville Road. Any future crossing to the Business 4 Zone needs to ensure efficient and safe access to the any future development on 116 and 148 McHughs Road.

F98.10      Ratua Holdings Ltd      ☐ Support

## **Hill, I**

- 90.1      Decline the proposed plan change in its entirety.

**Reason** The Tram Road McHughs Road intersection is already bad. Potential for vehicles doing U-turns on Tram Road. Increased Traffic. Rangiora shops are only 8 minutes away. The area is a Rural area. There will be extra noise effects on the rural community.

F84.4      Bennett, G & Y Thompson      ☐ Oppose

F98.28      Ratua Holdings Ltd      ☐ Oppose

## **Howard, J**

- 91.1      Support the commercial development proposed by the plan change

**Reason** If Council fail to attract developers the community will continue to stagnate. Interest in progression will fade and a development may never be seen as attractable in the future. The community needs a commercial development that is seen as a destination.

F98.17      Ratua Holdings Ltd      ☐ Support

- 91.2      Enlarge the proposed commercial development footprint to 1600m2.

**Reason** The Mandeville catchment should include the Ohoka Downs area which is approximately 1 Km away.

F98.18      Ratua Holdings Ltd      ☐ Support



**Ref**    **Relief Sought**

---

91.3    Allow a left turn entrance into the Business 4 Zone.

**Reason** The traffic report deems a left turn entrance into Tram Road as safe. The left turn entrance would assist and promote easy access for traders and support tenancy occupation.

F98.19    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Support

**King, R & L**

92.1    Vehicle access to Mandeville Road via the location shown on the Outline Development Plan Map182 should be "exit" and "entry".

**Reason** If the Mandeville Road access is limited to exit only vehicles will be forced to make a U-turn on Tram Road to enter the business area.

F98.20    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Support

**McGregor, H & T**

93.1    Support the plan change in its entirety, in particular commercial development.

**Reason** There are sufficient residents in the area to justify the proposed development and this trend will continue. Other commercial centres are some distance away. Proximity of services is important. The development will enhance a feeling of community, with social and security aspects in mind.

F98.21    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Support

93.2    Enlarge the proposed development footprint to greater than 1300m2.

**Reason** The current population trend is set to continue. There is good and various road access to accommodate future expansion.

F98.22    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Support

93.3    Support ingress and egress from Mandeville Road and left turns in and out of Tram Road.

**Reason** No reason given.

F98.23    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Support

**McKeever, C & G**

95.1    Support the proposed Plan Change subject to amendments sought by submission points 95.2 to 95.6.

**Reason** There is no discussion or reasons for subdivision within the Business 4 Zone to be a non-complying activity. The controls on the buildings and tenancy sizes will control any effects related to subdivision. It is not clear what the purpose of the 'Local purpose reserve' shown on the Outline Development Plan is. The Outline Development Plan does not allow for any site design enhancement to the edges of the Business 4 Zone. It may be necessary to address site shape, access to Mandeville Road and service configuration in the future without being limited to the access shown on the Outline Development Plan. Clarify that "general accordance" does not mean "exactly" in accordance with the Outline Development Plan. Describe 'Mandeville North' as 'Mandeville'.

95.2     Change the District Plan text from Mandeville North to Mandeville.

*Reason* There is no discussion or reasons for subdivision within the Business 4 Zone to be a non-complying activity. The controls on the buildings and tenancy sizes will control any effects related to subdivision. It is not clear what the purpose of the 'Local purpose reserve' shown on the Outline Development Plan is. The Outline Development Plan does not allow for any site design enhancement to the edges of the Business 4 Zone. It may be necessary to address site shape, access to Mandeville Road and service configuration in the future without being limited to the access shown on the Outline Development Plan. Clarify that "general accordance" does not mean "exactly" in accordance with the Outline Development Plan. Describe 'Mandeville North' as 'Mandeville'.

95.3     Amend the proposed rule structure to make subdivision in the Business 4 Zone a controlled activity.

*Reason* There is no discussion or reasons for subdivision within the Business 4 Zone to be a non-complying activity. The controls on the buildings and tenancy sizes will control any effects related to subdivision. It is not clear what the purpose of the 'Local purpose reserve' shown on the Outline Development Plan is. The Outline Development Plan does not allow for any site design enhancement to the edges of the Business 4 Zone. It may be necessary to address site shape, access to Mandeville Road and service configuration in the future without being limited to the access shown on the Outline Development Plan. Clarify that "general accordance" does not mean "exactly" in accordance with the Outline Development Plan. Describe 'Mandeville North' as 'Mandeville'.

F98.12

Ratua Holdings Ltd

☐ Support

95.4     Give further clarity to the proposed local purpose reserves shown on the Outline Development Plan.

*Reason* There is no discussion or reasons for subdivision within the Business 4 Zone to be a non-complying activity. The controls on the buildings and tenancy sizes will control any effects related to subdivision. It is not clear what the purpose of the 'Local purpose reserve' shown on the Outline Development Plan is. The Outline Development Plan does not allow for any site design enhancement to the edges of the Business 4 Zone. It may be necessary to address site shape, access to Mandeville Road and service configuration in the future without being limited to the access shown on the Outline Development Plan. Clarify that "general accordance" does not mean "exactly" in accordance with the Outline Development Plan. Describe 'Mandeville North' as 'Mandeville'.

95.5     Provide for site design enhancement on the edge of the proposed Outline Development Plan.

*Reason* There is no discussion or reasons for subdivision within the Business 4 Zone to be a non-complying activity. The controls on the buildings and tenancy sizes will control any effects related to subdivision. It is not clear what the purpose of the 'Local purpose reserve' shown on the Outline Development Plan is. The Outline Development Plan does not allow for any site design enhancement to the edges of the Business 4 Zone. It may be necessary to address site shape, access to Mandeville Road and service configuration in the future without being limited to the access shown on the Outline Development Plan. Clarify that "general accordance" does not mean "exactly" in accordance with the Outline Development Plan. Describe 'Mandeville North' as 'Mandeville'.



**Ref**    **Relief Sought**

---

- 95.6    Clarify that “general accordance with the Outline Development Plan” does not mean “exact accordance with the Outline Development Plan.”

**Reason** There is no discussion or reasons for subdivision within the Business 4 Zone to be a non-complying activity. The controls on the buildings and tenancy sizes will control any effects related to subdivision. It is not clear what the purpose of the ‘Local purpose reserve’ shown on the Outline Development Plan is. The Outline Development Plan does not allow for any site design enhancement to the edges of the Business 4 Zone. It may be necessary to address site shape, access to Mandeville Road and service configuration in the future without being limited to the access shown on the Outline Development Plan. Clarify that “general accordance” does not mean “exactly” in accordance with the Outline Development Plan. Describe ‘Mandeville North’ as ‘Mandeville’.

**Murray, JM**

- 94.1    Avoid vehicles accessing and egressing the business zone from Tram Road in favour of Mandeville Road.

**Reason** Access onto Tram Road may cause traffic issues. The construction of an overpass between McHughes Road and Mandeville Road, as well as a slip road, would alleviate traffic concerns.

F98.30    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Oppose

**Nilsson, S**

- 97.1    Support the proposal in its entirety, in particular business zoning.

**Reason** The location falls within the Mandeville residential area. The proposed development provides essential services to the community. The proposal does not encroach on a “rural feel”. Residents would not need to travel to further away facilities. The proposal will complement the Mandeville domain. The proposal will bring business opportunities and employment to the area. The proposal does not compete with other services in the area.

F98.24    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Support

**NZ Fire Service Commission (NZFS Commission)**

- 96.1    Add new criteria (k) to proposed Policy 16.1.2.1 to read “ensures that the Business 4 Zone is provided with a water supply that enables protection from damage in the event of a fire.”

**Reason** The ability for the New Zealand Fire Service (NZFS) to operate effectively and efficiently is achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Standard for the provision of firefighting water supply. The existing Mandeville reticulation does not provide adequate firefighting capacity, however, adequate capacity can be provided for by compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. The proposed amendments will ensure that the NZFS will be capable of effectively addressing a fire emergency in the area.

F98.12    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Oppose



**Ref**      **Relief Sought**

- 96.2      Add new criteria (k) to proposed Business 4 Zone Rule 31.2.3 to read “the site shall be provided with a firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.”

**Reason** The ability for the New Zealand Fire Service (NZFS) to operate effectively and efficiently is achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Standard for the provision of firefighting water supply. The existing Mandeville reticulation does not provide adequate firefighting capacity, however, adequate capacity can be provided for by compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. The proposed amendments will ensure that the NZFS will be capable of effectively addressing a fire emergency in the area.

F98.14      Ratua Holdings Ltd      ☐ Oppose

- 96.3      Add new criteria (xiv) to the matters for control for Business 4 Zone Rule 31.2.3 to read “the ability of the development to comply with SNZ PAS 4509:2008, or whether any alternative forms of providing for the operational requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service are available, in consultation with the New Zealand Fire Service.”

**Reason** The ability for the New Zealand Fire Service (NZFS) to operate effectively and efficiently is achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Standard for the provision of firefighting water supply. The existing Mandeville reticulation does not provide adequate firefighting capacity, however, adequate capacity can be provided for by compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. The proposed amendments will ensure that the NZFS will be capable of effectively addressing a fire emergency in the area.

F98.15      Ratua Holdings Ltd      ☐ Oppose

- 96.4      Add new Rule 32.1.1.51 read “Any new allotment in the Mandeville Road – Tram Road, Mandeville North Residential 4A Zone shall be provided with a firefighting water supply in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.”

**Reason** The ability for the New Zealand Fire Service (NZFS) to operate effectively and efficiently is achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Standard for the provision of firefighting water supply. The existing Mandeville reticulation does not provide adequate firefighting capacity, however, adequate capacity can be provided for by compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008. The proposed amendments will ensure that the NZFS will be capable of effectively addressing a fire emergency in the area.

F84.5      Bennett, G & Y Thompson      ☐ Oppose

F98.16      Ratua Holdings Ltd      ☐ Oppose

**Ratua Holdings Ltd**

- 98.01      Approve Plan Change subject to amendments as sought by submission points 98.2 – 98.17.

**Reason** Subdivision and development will have benefits for the surrounding areas, a reduction in travel and increased choice and employment.

- 98.02 Amend proposed Business 4 Rule 31.2.3(i) to read 'the maximum gross retail floor area shall be 1700m<sup>2</sup>'.

**Reason** The Property Economics report underestimates the population within a more generalised local trade catchment. The perceived sustainability of the Mandeville development is not a valid reason to place limits on the gross floor area (GFA) in the development. If there is insufficient demand the centre may not develop to its maximum retail floor area. Any additional environmental impacts from building bulk, traffic, and visual amenity would be negligible. The report fails to give any consideration to the prospect of commercial centres developing in areas such as Swannanoa and Ohoka, with this possibility remote and not a valid reason to limit the GFA. The report concludes that a centre of circa 1700m<sup>2</sup> will not have the scale or store types to divert significant sales away from Rangiora or Kaiapoi. The Land Use Recovery Plan recognises that neighbourhood centres are important to the local communities they serve. The report concludes that the development is not considered to impact on the districts key activity centres. There are potential adverse effects if the proposed 1300m<sup>2</sup> floor limit remains.

F84.6     Bennett, G & Y Thompson     ☐ Oppose

- 98.03 Delete proposed Rule 31.2.3(a) that limits individual tenancy size.

**Reason** Any potential adverse environmental effects from allowing no GFA limit will be mitigated through the comprehensive development rules such as landscaping, building height and carparking. The size of an individual tenancy is best managed by allowing the market to determine what is feasible.

- 98.04 Amend proposed Business 4 Zone Policy 16.1.2.1(e) to read 'limits access onto Tram Road to 3 locations, including a left hand turn exit onto Tram Road from the Business Zone that avoids additional turns out onto, right hand turns from, and further access onto Tram Road.'

**Reason** The proposed left hand turn access is at the same location as the proposed entrance, and will not have any noticeable impact beyond that which will already occur from the proposed ingress. Any effects on the amenity and characteristics of Mandeville are addressed by other controls on the development. The report provided by the landscape architect does not raise any issues with a left turn exit. The Abley's Transportation report confirms that the left turn exit will not have negative effects on the safety or efficient functioning of the road network with an acceleration lane not required. A left out turn is critical to support successful trade, with greater convenience options.

- 98.05 Amend proposed Rule 30.6.1.15 to read 'within the Business Zone no more than one exit onto Tram Road shall be provided.'

**Reason** The proposed left hand turn access is at the same location as the proposed entrance, and will not have any noticeable impact beyond that which will already occur from the proposed ingress. Any effects on the amenity and characteristics of Mandeville are addressed by other controls on the development. The report provided by the landscape architect does not raise any issues with a left turn exit. The Abley's Transportation report confirms that the left turn exit will not have negative effects on the safety or efficient functioning of the road network with an acceleration lane not required. A left out turn is critical to support successful trade, with greater convenience options.



- 98.06 Amend proposed Rule 30.6.2.9 to read 'the site access and exit between Tram Road and the Mandeville North Business 4 Zone shown on District Plan Map 182 is exempt from complying with Rule 30.6.1.23 (construction of acceleration and deceleration tapers for retail activities).', or any other similar wording.

*Reason* The proposed left hand turn access is at the same location as the proposed entrance, and will not have any noticeable impact beyond that which will already occur from the proposed ingress. Any effects on the amenity and characteristics of Mandeville are addressed by other controls on the development. The report provided by the landscape architect does not raise any issues with a left turn exit. The Abley's Transportation report confirms that the left turn exit will not have negative effects on the safety or efficient functioning of the road network with an acceleration lane not required. A left out turn is critical to support successful trade, with greater convenience options.

- 98.07 Amend proposed District Plan Map 182 to show a left turn exit from the Business 4 Zone to Tram Road.

*Reason* The proposed left hand turn access is at the same location as the proposed entrance, and will not have any noticeable impact beyond that which will already occur from the proposed ingress. Any effects on the amenity and characteristics of Mandeville are addressed by other controls on the development. The report provided by the landscape architect does not raise any issues with a left turn exit. The Abley's Transportation report confirms that the left turn exit will not have negative effects on the safety or efficient functioning of the road network with an acceleration lane not required. A left out turn is critical to support successful trade, with greater convenience options.

- 98.08 Delete proposed Rule 31.2.3(f) that proposes a light reflectance value for buildings in the Business 4 Zone.

*Reason* An anchor tenant will not be able to achieve this standard due to corporate branding requirement, meaning that the rule may dissuade any anchor tenant from establishing. The Property Economics Report notes that it is important for a large anchor tenant to establish, while also indicating that an anchor tenant is required for the commercial viability of the development. Other proposed development rules will provide for the character of the surrounding environment.

- 98.09 Amend proposed Business 4 Zone Rule 31.2.3 to read 'landscaping shall occur: for an average depth of 4 m along the length of the Tram road boundary except for the vehicle entrance locations.', or similar wording.

*Reason* The landscape assessment of Andrew Craig recommends an average landscaping depth, whereas the plan change proposes a minimum depth.

- 98.10 Amend proposed Rule 30.6.1.35 to read 'Within the Mandeville North Business 4 Zone shown on District Plan Map 182 no parking space or manoeuvring space shall be located within 3 metres of the Tram Road boundary.', or similar wording.

*Reason* The landscape assessment of Andrew Craig recommends a landscaping depth of 3 metres whereas the proposed plan change requires 4 metres.



**Ref**    **Relief Sought**

- 98.11 Amend proposed Business 4 Zone Objective 16.1.2(iii) to read 'avoids more than minor effects on the function and viability of Key Activity Centres'.

*Reason* Minor and less than minor effects on the Key Activity Centres should not be considered in assessing a development consequential to the plan change.

- 98.12 Amend proposed Rule 31.5.6 to read 'Any land use that does not comply with Rule 31.2.3 (development of the Business Zone) is a restricted discretionary activity, with discretion limited to the subject matter of the rule', or similar wording.

*Reason* The proposed non-complying activity status for the Business 4 Zone is inappropriately restrictive for the level of development that will be undertaken.

- 98.13 Delete proposed Policy 16.1.2.1(c) that proposes subdivision in the Business 4 Zone to be a non-complying activity.

*Reason* The proposed non-complying activity status is inappropriate as no additional effects will result from subdivision of the Business 4 Zone, as environmental effects are controlled through development rules. Including this restriction will have financial implications for the landowner.

- 98.14 Amend proposed Rule 32.4.10 to read 'any subdivision of land within the Mandeville Business 4 Zone is a controlled activity. In considering any application for resource consent under Rule 32.4.10 the Council shall, in granting consent and in deciding whether to impose conditions, exercise control over the matters specified in Rule 32.1.3.'

*Reason* The proposed non-complying activity status inappropriate as no additional effects will result from subdivision of the Business 4 Zone, as environmental effects are controlled through development rules. Including this restriction will have financial implications for the landowner.

- 98.15 Delete proposed Rule 32.1.1.10 that proposes a lot yield for the proposed Residential 4A Zone.

*Reason* A lot yield assessment ensures the environmental effects can be assessed in a specific and accurate way. The reserve should be included within the calculation of average areas as it will contribute to the visual amenity and anticipated character of the zone.

F84.7        Bennett, G & Y Thompson        ☐ Support  
F105.1       F/S Hammond, S                    ☐ Support

- 98.16 Insert new Rule 32.1.1.13 to read 'Within the Mandeville Residential 4A Zone shown on District Plan Map 182, subdivision shall proceed in accordance with the masterplan'. (master plan attached to submission)

*Reason* A lot yield assessment ensures the environmental effects can be assessed in a specific and accurate way. The reserve should be included within the calculation of average areas as it will contribute to the visual amenity and anticipated character of the zone.

F84.8        Bennett, G & Y Thompson        ☐ Support  
F105.2       F/S Hammond, S                    ☐ Support

**Ref**    **Relief Sought**

---

98.17    Make any consequential amendments in order to achieve submission points 98.2 – 98.16.

**Reason** Any consequential amendments will achieve the intention of the submissions.

**Searle, R**

99.1    Support the proposal in its entirety, in particular the business zone.

**Reason** The area is growing and conveniences are needed. Benefits in purchasing convenience goods locally.

F98.25    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Support

**Simpson, J**

100.1    Support the proposal in its entirety, in particular the business zone.

**Reason** The proposal would add a sense of heart to the community. The proposal would bring the ability to walk/ cycle from Mandeville. The proposal would avoid the need to travel to Rangiora/Kaiapoi for conveniences. The proposed district plan amendments should not compromise the development. The market should determine the size.

F98.26    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Support

**Stapley, 101**

101.1    Approve the proposal in its entirety, in particular the business zone.

**Reason** The population of Mandeville is likely to exceed that of Oxford. Shops are needed, with scope to expand in the future.

F98.27    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Support

**Walmsley, T**

102.1    No additional traffic entrances or exits be allowed for the Residential 4A sections to Tram Road.

**Reason** Increased traffic entrances or exits are an additional hazard and can be provided from Tram Road.

F84.9    Bennett, G & Y Thompson    ☐ Oppose

102.2    Create a noise buffer around the Business 4 Zone to reduce noise to adjacent housing.

**Reason** Noise mitigation should be considered at an early stage to avoid complaints.

102.3    Extend the proposed business zone parking area to allow for long term staff carparking away from short term customer parking.

**Reason** Lack of public transport dictates that staff will drive to the business area. Number of workers will be high if two story shops will be built.

102.4    Parking should be prohibited to the north of Tram Road from Bradleys Road to the end of the proposed subdivision.

**Reason** Prohibited parking should stop east bound traffic stopping on Tram Road and interfering with cyclists cycling eastwards

F98.11    Ratua Holdings Ltd    ☐ Oppose

**WJ Winter & Sons**

- 103.1 Cease all subdivisions in the Oxford/Eyre area until provision is made to capture stormwater discharges, with the water used for future irrigation.

**Reason** Subdivision in the Oxford/Eyre area of the Waimakariri District Council is having an adverse effect on farming. The expansion of the stock water race to an irrigation scheme has had an adverse effect on underground water flows. Current summer water flows of drains, creeks and ditches in the area have exceeded all past known flows. Adverse effects on farming activities. Drainage schemes are not sufficient to alleviate the problem

F84.10	Bennett, G & Y Thompson	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose
F98.3	Ratua Holdings Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose

**Young, R**

- 104.1 Decline the application in its entirety.

**Reason** Traffic hazards/management issues. Loss of rural residential lifestyle.

F84.11	Bennett, G & Y Thompson	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose
F98.29	Ratua Holdings Ltd	<input type="checkbox"/> Oppose

---

<b>Grand total</b>	<b>68</b>
--------------------	-----------