M24

The proposed
Christchurch Replacement District Plan

Submission form
(For the Memorial Business Park Plan change)

Your submission can be:

Emailed to: dpreview@ccc.govt.nz

Posted to: District Plan Submissions
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73001 Christchurch 8154

Delivered to: Christchurch City Council
53 Hereford Street, Christchurch

RECEIVED
04 FEB 2015
BY:

Submissions on this plan change close Friday 30 January 2015

Submitter Details *(All details marked with * must be provided)*

Full Name(s)* SHERYN CAROL VALMAI LINTON

Postal address* P.O.BOX 79107 /AVONHEAD /CHRISTCHURCH 8446

Email Address* sheryn.linton@gmail.com

Phone number* *(include area code)* Mobile number* +61 (0)459807069
or/+64 (0)212691787

Contact person *(If different from submitter)* —

Trade Competition

Note: If you are a person who could gain an advantage in trade competition through making a submission, your right to make a submission may be limited by Clause 6(2) Schedule 1 of the Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order 2014. Please complete the following.

I could gain an advantage in trade competition through this submission. Y (N)

If you answered Yes to the above statement please complete the following.

I am directly affected by an effect of the proposal that -
(a) adversely affects the environment ; and
(b) does not relate to trade competition or the effects of trade competition Y N

The specific provision that your submission relates to is:

Please identify the specific provision of the plan change request that your submission relates to by providing the clause number or planning map number; eg provision 14.3.3.3 Site Coverage

Provision number and name MEMORIAL BUSINESS PARK PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE REQUEST (PROPOSAL)

Map Number 24.55 HECTARES OF LAND – BORDERING RUSSLEY RD/MEMORIAL AVE/ + AVONHEAD RD.

My submission is:

☐ I support ☑ I oppose ☐ I seek to have the above provision amended

If you have more than one submission point, please attach an additional sheet.

Reasons for my submission:

* ATTACHED 4 ADDITIONAL PAGES

(TOTAL PAGES INCLUSIVE -6)

The decision I seek is that the provision:

☐ Be retained ☑ Be deleted ☐ Be amended as follows (*please provide the details of the particular amendments you are seeking to the plan change*):

M24

Hearing
I wish to be heard in support of my submission ☐ Y ☑ N
If you answered Yes to the above statement please complete the following:
If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at a hearing. ☐ Y ☑ N

Signature of submitter [signature] Date 23/1/15

SHERYN LINTON

If you require further information about this plan change request please contact the Independent Hearings Panel, email **info@chchplan.ihp.govt.nz** or phone **0800 2424 040**

Privacy Act 1993
Submissions are public information. Information on this form including your name and contact details will be accessible to the public on the Council's website and at Council service centres and libraries. The Council is required to make this information available under the provisions of the Canterbury Earthquake (Christchurch Replacement District Plan) Order 2014. Your contact details will only be used by the Council and the Independent Secretariat for the purpose of the District Plan Review process (for example to contact you about hearings and decisions on your submission). The information will be held by the Christchurch City Council. You have the right to access the information and request any correction.

FREEPOST Authority No.178

Christchurch City Council

Free

District Plan Submissions
Christchurch City Council
PO Box 73001
Christchurch 8154

SUBMISSION ON PRIVATE PLAN CHANGE "MEMORIAL BUSINESS PARK"

1. I the undersigned, oppose the proposed private plan change known as Memorial Business Park (MBP) on multiple accounts, in the form outlined in the private plan change request, August 2014.

2. The rezoning of this prime land from current rural 5/ rural 5 airport influence to business/industrial is unnecessary and unsuitable for this unique block of land positioned at the City entrance. There is adequate land available elsewhere on the western side of Russley Road for development of this nature and it is critical that the city retains significant areas such as the one in question for uses that will better serve the long term requirements and interests of the people of the city. This land is clearly of value as smaller lifestyle/residential blocks mixed with exceptional public parks, sporting facilities, public meeting facilities and other amenities that would far better serve the ratepayers of Christchurch.

3. <u>Rezoning must not be done in isolation.</u>
   If rezoning of this land is deemed necessary (as distinct from fulfilling the desires of a commercially based proposed plan change) then it is the duty of the hearing committee to consider the rezoning of the remaining rural 5 zone land immediately adjacent and continuing down Russley Road towards the previously proposed Russley business park. If this is not done then it serves only to further marginalise this land. As an owner of land directly and immediately adjacent to this proposed MBP, I am acutely aware that a zoning change to the MBP would be unfair and have likely significant and detrimental financial and environmental impacts on myself, neighbours, and surrounding residents.

   Consideration must be given to what possibilities are available for that land marked rural 5 airport influences directly adjacent (Southeast aspect Avonhead road) to the MBP site as any change to the proposed rezoning in the plan change will without doubt marginalise the

remaining land opposite and in my case further limit my ability to conduct rural activities or any activity that the current definition of zoning allows for.
In summary: The rezoning of the MBP site must be made in conjunction with all the rural 5 land in this area of the North West review.

4. I further oppose the proposed private plan change on the terms of the Resource Management Rational (2.2 c) "The potential to consolidate the airport as a commercial node of regional significance and deliver associated social and economic benefits to Christchurch and the wider region"
The airport and associated activities are more than adequately catered for by current developments at Dakota Park and more recent development on airport land on the northern aspect of Memorial Avenue. The airport has sufficient land and ability to develop its own "Commercial Node" as well as there being adequate development opportunities on land positioned to the north of the airport and on the western side of Russley road if required.
There are also large areas of new business/industrial developments relatively close to the airport such as the Waterloo Business Park, Hornby.
The potential for retail and office development on the proposed MBP site will clearly undermine the ability of regeneration of the Christchurch CBD and definition to our city by fractionating further the central heart of the city.
In summary the development of business/industrial operations on this site is unnecessary and out of character for the surrounding residential communities of Avonhead, Russley and Burnside. Urban development? – YES. Business/Industrial development? –NO.

5. I oppose the inclusion in the MBP proposal under section 3. "The provisions requested" the following activities:

Activity Industrial -P1 Industrial Activity and P2 Warehousing and distribution activities.
Activity commercial –P9 Service station.

6. I oppose the designation of parking lots within the proposed CIAL REPA Zone. I find this contrary to the original requirements of restricted activity as initially proposed by CIAL in previous attempts to designate a "REPA" over land that was and still is in private ownership. I am surprised how rulings of past that were seemingly so important to CIAL are now able to be watered down to suit a particular proposal for the MBP site.

7. I oppose the Built form standards 16.4.5.2 as outlined in the proposed MBP plan change. In particular relation to:
16.4.5.2.1 (Maximum height of buildings and fencing)
16.4.5.2.3 (Minimum building setbacks from road boundary)
16.4.5.2.4 (Minimum setbacks from eastern boundary & residential activity)
16.4.5.2.7 (Landscaped areas)
I oppose the non-complying activities description 16.4.5.1.5, NC7 in that it does not include Avonhead Road.
I oppose Hours of deliveries 16.4.5.2.10 with respect to the hours proposed.

8. Consultation. As a significant party when combined with 4 other immediate small land block owners I am surprised that we have not, in the process, been considered "Key stakeholders" (particularly as the consultation process saw fit to consider the Russley Golf club as a key stakeholder). In 2009, as owner of rural 5 land adjacent to the MBP site, I did not receive as outlined in the documents, any correspondence or invite to discuss the proposed plan change nor have I had direct contact by the MAIL, MBP, or associates, enabling me to directly voice my concerns or issues over any proposed plan changes. I see this as a major shortcoming in consultation and blatant lack of consideration, given that

I am likely to be one of, if not the closest, residential premises to the proposed MBP site.

9. Avonhead Road is of no less consideration than Memorial Avenue.

I wish to voice a clear concern that whilst the plan pays voice to include Avonhead Road in descriptions along with Memorial Avenue and Russley Road, It is clear from the body of this proposed plan change based on emphasis within the document that Avonhead Road is being considered the "backdoor" to this proposed development and yet this is the only corridor that faces directly on to multiple permanent residences. The proposed plan does not make adequate consideration of the visual impacts, proposed setbacks, extraordinary landscaping requirements, and increased traffic issues associated with Avonhead Road and the Avonhead/ Roydvale intersection.

It is noted that all traffic entering into the MBP must exit to Avonhead Road if heading in any direction other than west on Memorial Avenue. This is a significant impact on current traffic flows experienced on this section of Avonhead Road and will have effects over and above what would normally be expected for a suburban residential road. This will impact on "quality of living" for those residents who have bought and live in this area knowing that it is designated as rural and place a significant effect on residential amenity values and safety.

23/1/15

– SHERYN LINTON –