

PC 54 Rezoning: Whanganui District Council Officer Recommendations

Table 1 Plan Text Recommendations

All submissions in support are accepted.

Submissions referring to inclusion of Mill Road map ad Appendix M are accepted.

Submissions referring to punctuation, spelling and minor typographical amendments are accepted.

Submitter	Submission Point	DP Provision	Recommendation	Reason	Amended Text as Shown in Appendix 4
Ara Poutama – Dept of Corrections	6.1	GIZ-R1	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The intent of this plan change is to ensure that activities in land zoned for industrial purposes is for industrial purposes or contributes positively to the zone purpose. As indicated in the submission, community correction facilities are “essential social infrastructure”. While the activity may not be inconsistent with the zone it is not primarily industrial. It is not appropriate to include community corrections facilities in GIZ-R1	<i>No change</i>
	6.2	GIZ-S4 1.	Accept	This submission point should be accepted. The change recognises that a while a community corrections facility may include activities that are consistent with industrial uses, this change is agreed to remove doubt and limit the potential for interpretation issues when assessing and application for such a facility.	<i>Add:</i> a. <u>Standards GIZ-S4 a) and b) do not apply to community corrections facilities.</u>
Powerco	7.2	GIZ-R1, GIZ-R2, GIZ-R3	Accept	This submission point should be accepted, it improves efficiency of the plan and removes duplication. The same change applies to GIZ-R3	<u>The following activities, provided they achieve compliance with the standards in GIZ-S1 - GIZ-S10-S9:</u>

					5. Network utilities as provided by NU Network Utilities
A.T. Wanganui					
	8.1	GIZ-I1	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The potential for adverse impacts from industry is well understood and is made explicit in clause 15 (1) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	<i>No change</i>
	8.2	GIZ-I2	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The potential for adverse impacts from industry is well understood and is made explicit in clause 15 (1) of the Resource Management Act 1991.	<i>No change</i>
	8.3	GIZ-I3	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. This clause in the plan identifies an issue for industrial development.	<i>No change</i>
	8.4	GIZ-P3	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The Resource Management Act 1991 describes the functions of territorial authorities to include in clause 31 (1) (aa) “the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in respect of housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the district” which include an integrated approach to the provision of infrastructure.	<i>No change</i>
	8.6	GIZ-S3	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The southern and western boundaries adjoin residential properties. The required screening is intended to ensure all adverse effects are internalised.	<i>No change</i>

	8.7	GIZ-S4	Reject	The submission point should be rejected. The purpose of the industrial zone is to provide an adequate supply of land for industrial purposes. Building should be primarily for industrial purposes.	<i>No change</i>
	8.8	GIZ-S10	Accept in part	This submission point should be accepted in part. Amendments have been identified in relation to this issue. See response to submission 13.3	<i>Amend</i> Replace the term standards with the term provisions where it occurs in the specified parts of the plan in relation to Hazardous Substances.
	8.9	HAZ-R1	Accept in part	This submission should be accepted in part. The proposed amendment may be acceptable if suitable standards can be identified and agreed upon to enable Council to define the extent of its discretion.	<i>To be confirmed</i>
	8.11	SUB-P38	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. Managing access to infrastructure is a means of ensuring industrial development occurs preferentially at Mill Road.	<i>No change</i>
	8.12	SUB-R2 (11)	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The Resource Management Act 1991 describes the functions of territorial authorities to include in clause 31 (1) (aa) “the establishment, implementation, and review of objectives, policies, and methods to ensure that there is sufficient development capacity in respect of housing and business land to meet the expected demands of the district” which include an integrated approach to the provision of infrastructure and the use of	<i>No change</i>

				planning discretion to manage development of business land.	
FENZ	10.4	GIZ-R3	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The intent of this plan change is to ensure that activities in land zoned for industrial purposes is for industrial purposes or contributes positively to the zone purpose. As indicated in the submission, “There may be a functional need for emergency service facilities (including fire stations) be located within this zone to improve emergency response times and availability of staff resourcing.” This does not indicate a primary relationship with the purpose of the zone, only that it is physically convenient for emergency service purposes. While the activity may not be inconsistent with the zone it is not primarily industrial. It is not appropriate to include emergency service facilities in GIZ-R1	<i>No change</i>
	10.5	GIS-S1	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. As indicated in response to submission point 10.4, it is my position that emergency services facilities remain as discretionary activities. No benefit is gained by making the proposed change or by differentiating structures associated emergency services facilities from other activities in an industrial zone which may also have structures that are tall or otherwise encroach on boundaries.	<i>No change</i>
	10.6 & 10.7	GIZ-S3	Accept	This submission point should be accepted. The change supports the safety of persons in the GIZ and is in accord with the purpose of the RMA (s5 (2)) “enables peoples and	<i>Add:</i> f. Planting and screening shall not obscure emergency or safety

				communities to provide for their ...safety". It does not compromise amenity values or the purpose of the zone.	<u>signage or obstruct access to emergency panels, hydrants, shut-off valves or other emergency response facilities.</u>
	10.8	GIZ-S8	Accept	This submission point should be accepted. The change supports the safety of persons in the GIZ and is in accord with the purpose of the RMA (s5 (2)) "enables peoples and communities to provide for their ...safety". It does not compromise the efficient development or purpose of the zone.	<i>Add:</i> <u>GIZ-S10 Firefighting Water Supply</u> <u>All new buildings and structures shall provide an adequate supply of water and access to water supplies for firefighting purposes in accordance with NZ Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u>
Ministry of Education	11.3	GIZ-R3	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The intent of this plan change is to ensure that activities in land zoned for industrial purposes is for industrial purposes or contributes positively to the zone purpose. As indicated in the submission, "Certain education facilities such as work skills training centres may have a functional need to be located within industrial areas, in close proximity to the industry they relate to." While the activity may benefit from location in the industrial zone, the issue relates to the safety of the users of the educational facility, in particular young people.	<i>No change</i>

				The solution sought to include educational facilities in GIZ-R1 is not appropriate and not supported.	
First Gas					
	12.15	GIZ-R1	Accept	This submission point should be accepted, it improves efficiency of the plan and removes duplication.	<i>Amend:</i> <u>The following activities, provided they achieve compliance with the standards in GIZ-S1 - GIZ-S10 S9:</u> 5. <u>Network utilities as provided by NU Network Utilities</u>
	12.17	GIZ-R3	Accept	This submission point should be accepted, it improves efficiency of the plan and removes duplication.	<i>To be confirmed</i>
	12.18	GIZ-R4	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The rationale for these activities to be non-complying is related to issues of amenity and the potential for those activities to compromise the purpose of the general industrial zone.	<i>No change</i>
	12.20	GIZ-S1	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. See 12.27 and 12.29	<i>No change</i>
	12.22	GIZ-S3	Accept in part	This submission point should be accepted in part. As indicated in the submission, clear rules supported by guidelines already exist for permitted activities within a registered gas pipeline easement: "Registered pipeline easements include provisions such that no planting is permitted without Firstgas approval, and that Firstgas has the right to	<i>Add the following text:</i> Note: <u>A permit is required to work within the gas easement. This includes digging/earthworks, driveway construction, laying services, planting and fencing.</u>

				remove vegetation, without reinstatement, at any time.” Duplicating that requirement in the district plan does not add value and leads to the possibility of the two regulatory instruments falling out of step. The proposed note to GIZ-S3 is a pointer to the easement requirements and should be accepted.	
	12.27	GIZ-S8	Accept in part	The submission should be accepted in part. The proposed change is supported in principle, however additional information is required on the basis for the separation distance (20 metres) proposed.	<i>Change to be confirmed.</i>
	12.29	GIZ-S10	Accept in part	The submission should be accepted in part. The proposed change is supported in principle, however additional information is required on the basis for the separation distance (20 metres) proposed.	<i>Change to be confirmed.</i>
	12.34	HAZ-P1	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The wording of the policy implies that not all adverse impacts can be internalised, in sub-clause (b) “minimising residual risk...”	<i>No change</i>
	12.35	HAZ-P2	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The policy must be read as a whole, requiring the decision maker to <i>have regard</i> to each of the sub-clauses. Sub-clause (b) addresses adverse effects and sub-clause (c) indicates one way in which that is achieved, i.e. internalisation. Adding the term “unacceptable” requires additional interpretation and is not supported.	<i>No change</i>
	12.42	SUB-R2 (11)	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. Section EW-P2 of the district plan already requires: “Avoid earthworks and land	<i>No change</i>

				modification that result in damage to property, network utilities or significant nuisance effects.” No additional trigger or protection is supported.	
The Oil Companies					
	13.3	Use of the term “standards” in NFL-CESM-S4, GRZ-S9, CRZ-S3, GRUZ-S3, RLZ-S6, RPROZS3, SETZ-S3, COMZ-CC-S3, COMZ-NC-S7, and AZ-S3	Accept in part	This submission point should be accepted in part. The term standards has a particular meaning in the plan, the use in this context is confusing.	<i>Amend:</i> Replace the term <i>standards</i> with the term <i>provisions</i> where it occurs in the specified parts of the plan.
	13.4	Definitions: significant hazardous facilities	Accept in part	This submission point should be accepted in part. The submitter’s arguments for the addition of a definition for major hazardous facilities are accepted. The deletion of the definition for significant hazardous facilities is not accepted.	<i>Add:</i> <u>major hazardous facility:</u> <u>has the same meaning as “major hazard facility” in section 4(1) of the Health and Safety at Work (Major Hazard Facilities) Regulations 2016 or any successor regulations as made from time to time (eg. Means a facility that WorkSafe has designated as a lower tier hazard facility or an upper tier</u>

					major hazard facility under regulation 19 or 20 of the Health and Safety at Work (Major Hazard Facilities) Regulations 2016.
	13.5	HAZ – Hazards and Risks, Hazardous Substances – Overview	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. Item 10, Chapter 7 District-wide Matters Standard of the National Policy Standard specifies that the title is Hazardous Substances.	<i>No change</i>
	13.6	HAZ-Issues HAZ-I1 and HAZ-I2	Reject	This submission should be rejected. The definition of significant hazardous facilities has been altered.	<i>No change</i>
	13.7	HAZ Objectives HAZ-O1 and HAZ-O2	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. A risk management approach is always pragmatic and the inherent aim of risk management is to reduce risk. The term minimised is already conditioned by “as low as reasonably practical”.	<i>No change</i>
	13.8	HAZ-P1, HAZ-P2, HAZ-P3	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The definition of significant hazardous facilities has been altered.	<i>No change</i>
	13.9	HAZ-R1, HAZ-R2	Reject	This submission point should be rejected. The definition of significant hazardous facilities has been altered.	<i>No change</i>

PC 54 Rezoning: Whanganui District Council Officer Recommendations

Table 1 Mapped zoning changes Recommendations

Submitter	Submission Point	Recommendation	Reason	Amended Map
Axiam Plastics	1.1	Accept	<i>The submission to extend the zoning of land at the Axiam Plastics site located at 131 Somme Parade Aramoho should be accepted. This is consistent with recent approved subdivisions and resource consents for the property, and appropriately zones the whole site as General Industrial.</i>	<i>Appendix 4: See amended Map for 131 Somme Parade</i>
Paul Thomas for the Roman Catholic Bishop Diocese of Palmerston North	2.1	Reject	<i>The submission to change the zoning of land identified as 32D Peat Street, Whanganui from General Industrial to General Residential should be rejected because:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) the land adjoins existing industrial uses,</i> <i>b) the interface with the existing railway land</i> <i>c) the shape and location of the site would not meet the amenity values of the General Residential Zone,</i> <i>d) the current use of the site for car parking is not inconsistent with the General Industrial Zone but is inconsistent with the General Residential Zone.</i> 	<i>No change</i>
MacBlack	3.1	Reject	<i>The submission to retain General Industrial Zone in part or full of land identified as 384 Kaikokopu Road, Brunswick should be rejected. It is understood that this refers to that part of the property at the lower end and adjacent to 60 Kaikokopu Road. The submission should be rejected because:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) as identified in the technical studies, the site has difficulties in servicing with infrastructure,</i> <i>b) it is an overland flow path,</i> <i>c) due to earlier decisions to approve inconsistent development of 60 Kaikokopu Road industrial development on the area in question would now create potential sensitivity effects.</i> 	<i>No change</i>

MacBlack	3.2	Reject	<p><i>The submission to retain General Industrial Zone for land identified as 6 – 8 George Street, Aramoho should be rejected because:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) the site is small so future usability is limited given its setting,</i> <i>b) it is bounded on two sides by land zoned Residential</i> <i>c) is unlikely to be able to meet the requirements of GIZ-P6 to manage adverse effects on sites within those zones by providing adequate separation or by internalising adverse effects within the zone.</i> 	No change
Greytown Trust	4.1	Reject	<p><i>The submission to retain the General Industrial Zone for land identified as 34 Bedford Avenue, Gonville and 37 Bedford Avenue should be rejected. These two sites adjoin the General Residential Zone and have limited transport access through a residential area due to being located between the railway and the river. The location would better serve as General Residential and contribute to the supply of inner urban development sites.</i></p>	No change
McDonald Concrete Group and including further submissions by M Eden, P McKee, D McDonnell and J McMananway	5.1	Reject	<p><i>The submission to retain General Industrial Zone in land identified as the properties fronting Kaikokopu Road, Lot 1 DP352705, Lot 1 DP54394, Lot 1 DP20406 and part section 21 RB Whanganui River should be rejected Because:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>a) as identified in the technical studies, these sites have difficulties in servicing with infrastructure,</i> <i>b) it is an overland flow path,</i> <i>c) due to earlier decisions to approve inconsistent development of 60 Kaikokopu Road, industrial development on the area in question would now create potential sensitivity effects.</i> 	No change