

FARMERS CORNER DEVELOPMENT LIMITED, PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 3 - SUMMARY OF SUBMISSIONS

20th March 2020

The period for making submissions on to Plan Change 3 to the District Plan closed on 27th February 2020. This is the second stage of the public submission process where people have the opportunity to make further submissions.

Further submissions give the opportunity for the public to either support or oppose the submissions received and summarised or aspects of these submissions. Please note it is not another opportunity to make fresh submissions on the Plan Change itself, as a further submission can only relate to a submission which has already been lodged.

#	Submitter	Address	Wishes to be heard?	Support/ Oppose	Summary of Submission	Decision Sought
1	B G & M L Francis	54 Milton Road RD2 Ashburton Maryfrancis282@gmail.com	No	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none">Concerned that there is already adequate number of hotels/motels in Ashburton.Believes Ashburton is not big enough for another guest house/hotel would rather see existing hotels being used instead of being empty.	Does not state
2	E J Wood	86 Wills Street Ashburton pearlted@actrix.co.nz	Yes	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none">No Rural Tourism Zone in District Plan.Believes the importance of maintaining the integrity of the Rural B zone as Ashburton has an agricultural economy.Is of the opinion that approving the application will result in environmental damage to the Rural B zone.Believes the applicant has a reputation of pushing zoning rules to the limit.	Decline the application

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If approved, believes that the economic and social benefits to the community would be minor. 	
3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ)	c/o Beca Ltd PO Box 3942 Wellington 6140 Attention: Alicia Todd Alicia.todd@beca.com	Yes	Neutral	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes that the application does not make reference to onsite water supply for firefighting purposes. Additionally identifies that no standards are proposed relating to the firefighting water supply for buildings or visitor accommodation in the proposed Rural Tourism Chapter. Seeks greater certainty around the water availability within the plan change area and in the form of compliance with the New Zealand Firefighting Code of Practice SNZ/PAS 4509:2008 (Code of Practice). Seeks certainty that firefighting appliances and firefighters would have access to all habitable structures Suggests consideration is given to alternative access routes to use in the event of an emergency. Believes Ashburton tends to exhibit hot, dry conditions in the summer and autumn seasons. Seeks that the Appendix 3A-2 be amended to remove all highly flammable plant species from the list. Have provided a list of recommended plant species that are low flammability to reduce the risk to people, property and surrounding environment. Notes that the proposal involves some onsite car parking beneath vegetation and the 	Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) seeks the following amendments: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That a policy be added in relation to indigenous biodiversity to avoid planting indigenous plant species that are identified as being highly flammable Additional zone standards requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> That all habitable building to be serviced with water supply and access that complies with <i>New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008</i>. All habitable buildings and visitor accommodation to be setback at least 3m from any plantings, unless agreed with Fire

					location of a BBQ area is directly adjacent to vegetation. Recommends that any activity that has the potential to cause a fire should be appropriately separated from flammable plant species.	and Emergency New Zealand 3. That Appendix 3A -2 (<i>Plant Species List</i>) be amended to remove species identified as being highly flammable and posing a fire risk.
4	New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)	PO Box 1479 Christchurch 8011 Attention: Deborah Hewett Deborah.hewett@nzta.govt.nz	Yes	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Considers it appropriate to require the upgrade of State Highway 1/Long beach Road intersection through the establishment of a right turn bay. NZTA are supportive of the incorporation of the right turn bay • Notes that consideration has been given to the left turn from the State Highway into Longbeach Road. Concerned that as development increases, the number of vehicle movements will increase and may require further improvement for left turning traffic. • Supportive of intent of rules that require traffic related issues to be assessed at times of further development however suggest amendment to draft rules 3A.8.5. Also recommends that the reason for the rule, and subsequent rule is reinforced through the incorporation of an additional policy siting under Objective 3A.1 being 3A -1F. • Seeks that Rule 3A.8.5 (b) is amended to specify that 81 to 100 visitor accommodation units is a discretionary activity. 	NZ Transport Agency wishes the consent authority to make the amendments to the Plan Change 3 in accordance with the submission set out by The Agency. It is noted that The Transport Agency is open to discussing the proposal further with the application and Council with a view to reaching a suitable agreement whereby the Plan Change could be approved subject to the matters raised in the submission.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommends that the Council or applicant consider updating the traffic assessment, to ensure that any consideration of traffic related effects is based on up to date records including traffic counts. • Is generally satisfied with the proposed provision to address reverse sensitivity matters • Raised concerns around people entering the highway corridor from the site. For safety purposes it is preferred that high fencing similar to deer fencing should be established the full extent of the site, where it adjoins the highway. It is recommend that such a requirement could be incorporate as a site standard or in Outline Development Plan. • Believes that there should be specific controls for signage in the proposed Tourism Zone of be demonstrated that adequate provision exist to ensure signage is suitably controlled • Supports Objective 3A.2 Indigenous Biodiversity • Request Policy 3A.1B, 3A.1C, 3A.1E is amended • Seeks amended 3A.5 Anticipated Environmental Effects • Amend and add additional assessment matters 	
5	L Francis	216 Simpsons Road	Does not state	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Feels as though it does not benefit the Ashburton community and only benefits the established business. Does not believe it will 	Decline the application

		Maronan RD8 Ashburton 7778			<p>bring anything to town as visitors would only stop in this location and continue travelling so would not stop in Ashburton itself.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has concerns around the increase in volume of traffic at the intersection turning into Longbeach Road • Believes that it is already a dangerous intersection when approaching from the south and existing to travel north as through experience. • Believes that there is sufficient accommodation in Ashburton town which is not always full. • Considers further buildings on this site would be an eyesore in the landscape • Does not see any benefit allowing the change of Rural zone to Rural Tourism 	
6	S Reilly	5 -11 Allens Road Ashburton office@allentonpharmacy.co.nz	No	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposes the application to allow development at Farmers Corner as they live nearby. • Believes that it is aesthetically and morally wrong to allow the development outside of town where it's appropriately zoned. • Believes the proposal is a traffic hazard 	Does not state
7	David, Jill & Debbie Geddes	273 Longbeach Road Ashburton	Yes	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the District Plan has been widely consulted with and that the ratepayers have financially supported the plan. • Considers that the town of Ashburton is an example of a small rural town in New Zealand and expect travellers to visit shops 	Decline the zone change

					<p>and attractions including a range of working farms within easy range of tour buses.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has had overseas experience recently and noted tour buses are accommodated in far larger cities within large bus number and believes Ashburton could accommodate buses when required. • Is of the opinion that Ashburton needs visitors to it centre for it to remain a vibrant town in future and to provide employment opportunities. • States that New Zealand relies heavily on agricultural exports and believes New Zealand farmers are heavily regulated. Questions how the applicants attempt to circumvent these regulation for their personal gain. • The submitter does not wish to see Ashburton's collective strengths compromised for the advantage of the individuals. • Believes that our competitive advantage when it comes to tourism is our wide open spaces and low population density compared to tourist home countries. 	
8	Nancy & Bill Ridder	233 Hinds Highway RD5 Ashburton 7775 njwjrider@kinect.co.nz	Yes	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes the proposal is against the District Plan. • Concerned about road safety on State Highway 1 and at own gateway. • Believes the acoustic report to be inaccurate and concerned about the noise level. 	Not to change the District Plan

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that the proposed trees are not suitable as fruit encourage pest and seed spreading. • Has concerns about wastewater and questions where discharge would be in wet weather. • Concerns around safety from burglars • Believes that quietness is a rural experience. 	
9	Stephen M & Karen J Clements	54 Longbeach Road RD3 Ashburton 7773 Sm.kjc@xtra.co .nz	Yes	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Purchased property on basis of living in quiet rural area with unobstructed mountain views. Concerned that the proposed complex would be in line with outlook and affect lifestyle and future property value. • Has concerns around wastewater in particular the quantity of wastewater to be discharged per day and odor. • Questions the type of wastewater system and location. • Is concerned about their own well water and has noted that it is located approximately 80m from the boundary of the application site. • Concerned about the sensitivity to contamination from the upstream wastewater discharge. • Makes note that in appendix 8 of the application 4.2 waste water treatment options it states that the underlying groundwater is relatively shallow (Seasonal high 2.4m). 	Decline the application

10	GA & AJ Reith	Spring Farm Winslow RD5 Ashburton 7775 reith@reith.nz	Yes	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about increase in scale of the operation on the site. • Concerns around the zoning description as per page 6 of the application. • Believes that neighbours and affected parties could not have any protection, input or say if anything tourism related could proceed. • Requests clarification around the number of units and what classifies a unit. • Has concerns around how binding the application is as they believe from past experience there have been significant variances. • Raised concerns around sale of property to new owners and introduction of potential activities such as helicopters, jet boats on a pond, concerts, regular music events, fireworks, light shows for visitors staying on the site. • Request clarification around what is future expansion. • Believes the tourism trade is volatile and has changing trends. Does not believe the application has accounted for the 'free traveller'. • Questions whether adjoining properties in the same ownership could apply for zone change later on if the application is approved. Believe that changing surrounding properties to the Rural Tourism zone later down the track could be easier. 	Decline the application
----	------------------	---	-----	--------	---	-------------------------

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Believes that previous plan changes such as Lake Hood and North Park Industrial area were created due to the demand from the public and the land is for sale to the public and states that the Farmers Corner is purely private. • Questions if buildings can be achieved as a right in Rural B zone then why is there a need for the tourism zone. • Seeks clarification around the internal zoning and what is being proposed. Believes that the rezoning of the entire property could enable areas to be changed and adapted to other uses. • Questions the landscape planting along the boundary and suggest that it provide little screening or protection from noise for a number of years. • They do not consider that the volume of earthworks for the initial development are similar to the current Rural B earthworks volume rules. • Does not believe it is possible to enforce or manage the hours of operation. • Believes that if the proposal is granted then it could have detrimental effect on all Rural B zoned areas in the District and could set a precedent for any other application. 	
11	J Box		No	Oppose	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not believe that there would be a benefit to the community if zone changed for this area. 	Would like the status quo to remain and the zoning for the land to remain.

					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Notes that community benefits from using local contractors but believes it is not encouraged to visit or use the existing restaurant currently. • Does not believe it would benefit employment in local region • Concerned that the road layout does not go far enough to help with the intersection. • Raised concerns around the intersection and questions whether the crash statistics have been looked at. Believes that this has not been looked into enough. • From experience they have had a bus every month pull into their drive looking for Farmers Corner. • Believes that drivers are not familiar with the area and are unsure of where they are going. Questions if they are the same people that are going to be travelling around rural roads getting lost. • Raised concerns about accommodation. • Believes tourism should be available to all visitors and that this proposal is directed at one group. States that it should be provided to all visitors in the region and not just our Asian visitors. • Of the opinion that the proposal only benefits the landowner and the money would be removed from the district and not shared within. 	
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

