

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S01 – Marion J Anderson						
S1/1	All	Oppose	House is 1.1m from rear boundary and does not have a living court as there is a flood plain on other side of boundary, under the impression when the house was built that the site would remain empty.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 3	Reject
S1/2	All	Oppose	Fence and buildings close to the boundary causing shading onto back of property causing a loss of sunlight affecting health and wellbeing.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 3	Reject
S1/3	All	Oppose	Impacts of flooding and cumulative effects of climate change and intensification.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S1/4	All	Oppose	Increased traffic congestion on Rangitikei Line, Milson Line and Gillespies Line associated with the proposal. Flyers Line in poor condition due to flooding which may not be suitable for increased flows.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 4	Reject
S1/5	All	Oppose	Concerns regarding noise, dust and vibrations during construction.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 9a	Reject
S1/6	All	Oppose	Loss of privacy, views and bird watching.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 8	Reject
S02 – Edward Anderson						
S2/1	Thomas Planning report, pg. 26	Oppose	The proposed plan change is in the district plan flood prone overlay and should not be built on.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S2/2	All	Oppose	Concerns new owners won't be able to get insurance for their house due to flooding.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S2/3	All	Oppose	Increased traffic congestion towards the city along Rangitikei and Milson overbridges on a daily basis. Flyers line would not be sufficient for increased traffic flows due to flood damage and it down to one lane in some areas.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 4	Reject

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S2/4	All	Oppose	Concerns with loss of wildlife if site is built on.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 8	Reject
S2/5	All	Oppose	Concerns that north westerly prevailing winds will blow dust towards houses on Meadowbrook Drive during construction/earthworks. This would make normal day to day life intolerable such as not being able to hang washing outside to dry.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 9a	Reject
S2/6	All	Oppose	House is 1.1m from rear boundary and does not have a living court as there is a flood plain on other side of boundary, under the impression when the house was built that the site would remain empty. Building on the proposed plan change site will result in reduced sunlight leading to a less warm and dry home.	One or more of the following conditions be made if the plan change is approved: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A road be created to the rear of houses along Meadowbrook Drive. • A 15 to 20 metre green belt or buffer to the rear of houses along Meadowbrook Drive. • That the section directly behind 23 Meadowbrook Drive be made a reserve or playground. 	Issue 3	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No high fencing that will block sunlight. Height restrictions of any building that may block sunlight onto 23 Meadowbrook Drive. 		
S2/8	All	Oppose	Concerned regarding the safety of existing residents as this is not a suitable site to build on.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 1	Accept in part
SO3 – Paula Eyres						
S3/1	All	Oppose	Concerned of the loss of light and sun will have on her property	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 3	Reject
S3/2	All	Oppose	Concerned that flooding could occur if culvert running along boundary of 15a Meadowbrook Drive is covered when land is zoned to residential. The culvert is wet and running during rainfall. Has observed large pooling of surface water in the proposed plan change area.	Opposes plan change in total. If accepted that the culvert should be left open with planting around it to contain water flows and reduce flood risk.	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S3/3	All	Oppose		That the following be made if the plan change is approved: a) Removing the proposed sections along the property boundary of dwellings at	Issue 3	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
				<p>Meadowbrook Drive with the houses starting after the proposed road.</p> <p>b) Enhance the natural swamp by planting</p> <p>c) Adding a walkway.</p> <p>d) Only one story houses in the area closest to Meadowbrook Drive to reduce loss of sunlight onto existing sections on Meadowbrook Drive.</p>		
S3/4	All	Oppose	Concerned regarding loss of view. Was assured by the Palmerston North City Council when purchased the property that the land would not be built on due to it being a flood plain. Property was brought under the assumption the view would be retained.	Opposes plan change in total.	Issue 3	Reject
SO4 – Flyers Investment Group Ltd						
S4/1	Policy 2.8	Support	Amend Policy 2.8 to better reflect urban design principals.	The submitter has requested Changes to the proposed policy 2.8 be amended to	Issue 3	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
				include the following design principles: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stormwater and Flooding • Open space and reserves • Gas pipeline • Streets and linkages • Subdivision design and integration • Typology and density 		
S05 – Peter D Jones						
S5/1	Appendix 2: Hydraulic Modelling , Option 6, pg. 8 – 9.	Oppose	Prevent any flooding from occurring on existing properties along Benmore Avenue, especially the western end between number 25 – 45 Benmore Avenue. Rejects current design unless inundation of Benmore Avenue properties can be prevented. The existing drain located on the north side of Flyers Line should be upgraded/ strengthened to cater for spillway flooding.	Manage future effects of flooding to mitigate effects on residents.	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S5/2	All	Oppose	Proposed roundabout for Benmore Avenue and Meadowbrook Drive must be heavy duty. Consideration of heavy laden traffic/industrial road users along Benmore Avenue should be given as a by pass. Additional measures or modifications must be in place at Bennet Street and Benmore Avenue intersection to accommodate increased traffic flows.	Traffic and road upgrades to cater for increased traffic.	Issue 4	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
SO6 Joshua Thompson						
S6/1	All	Support	Supports the proposal to increase housing supply in Palmerston North for the benefit of the whole community.	Approve plan change	Entire report	Accept in part
SO7 – Michele D Mitchell						
S7/1	All	Oppose	Concerns that properties adjacent to the proposed plan change area will decrease in value.	Reject Plan Change Proposal	Issue 1a and 3	Reject
S7/2	All	Oppose	Many have brought properties along Meadowbrook Drive for the view of native wildlife and mountains.	Reject Plan Change Proposal	Issue 3	Reject
S7/3	All	Oppose	Safety of those living at number 1- 5 Meadowbrook Drive as they are closer to the proposed roundabout/intersection. Has concerns navigating coming off roundabout and children walking to and from school by themselves, especially with increased traffic flows.	Reject Plan Change Proposal	Issue 4	Reject
S7/4	All	Oppose	Loss of sunlight and views	Reject Plan Change Proposal	Issue 3	Reject
S7/5	All	Oppose	Concerns about increased flooding	Reject Plan Change Proposal	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S7/6	All	Oppose	Concerns regarding crime occurring at the proposed location for a corner store (commercial area). Corner stores can be targets for theft and hold ups.	Reject Plan Change Proposal	Issue 5	Reject
S7/7	All	Oppose	Loss of productive farming land if housing is placed on the proposed plan change area.	Reject Plan Change Proposal	Issue 9b	Reject
SO8 Palmerston North City Council (PNCC)						

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S8/1	All	Support in principle	<p>The specific issues of interest include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Noise • Road connectivity/ layout • Liquefaction/Geotech • Roading • Flooding • Cultural Impact Assessment • Urban Design • District Plan Provisions • Council Growth Strategies • Council Infrastructure Strategy • Council Financial Strategy • PNCC Asset Management Plans and 2021/Long Term Plan. 	That the private plan change request makes amendments to ensure the outcomes of the proposed plan change are realised by any subsequent development of land.	Issues: 1a, 1b, 2, 3 and 4	Accept
SO9 – Barney and Rose Hyde						
S9/1	Appendix 2 – flooding, pg8.	Neutral	Lives along Flyers line and has concerns regarding a heightened flood path on their property. Concerned regarding the preferred option 6 and how it works.	That concerns be addressed, and relevant amendments be made.	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S9/2	Appendix 12 – Stormwater (detention and wetland area)	Neutral	Concerned about stagnant water close to property which could attract insects and rats. Would like this to be moved to different location.	That concerns be addressed, and relevant amendments be made	Issue 9d	Reject
SO10 – Brian S McPherson						

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S10/1	All	Oppose	The proposed plan change area is not appropriate to be built on as it is prone to flooding from the Mangaone Stream on a 10-40-year cycle. Concerned that no stopbanks have been included in the proposal. Concerned regarding cumulative effects downstream due to the recontouring of the Whiskey Creek water course by reducing its width and what effects this will have on households.	Reject plan change request.	Issue 1a	Accept in part
SO11 – Michael McCavana						
S11/1	All	Oppose	Currently has views of Mount Ruapehu, rural outlook which provides a view of sun sets. Was told when purchasing the home in 2017 that the proposed plan change land would not be built on, due to flood hazards on the site. Loss of amenity values, sense of community and property value. Loss of sunlight on property and inside house, especially during winter months. Concerned regarding shadowing onto property from high fencing and buildings.	Reject plan change request but if accepted that amendments are made to incorporate a greenbelt to retain amenities, sun, privacy and views.	Issue 3	Reject
11/2	All	Oppose	Impacts of flooding upstream and downstream and flood risks from future development on the proposed plan change area.	Reject plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part
11/3	All	Oppose	Increased traffic causing safety concerns, especially for children and wider community.	Reject plan change request	Issue 4	Reject
11/4	All	Oppose	The effects of dust and noise will have on them during construction and concerns about any future stages of development in the same proposed area.	Reject plan change request	Issue 9a	Reject
11/5	All	Oppose	No community input in design and plan change process to protect existing residents from inappropriate development.	Reject plan change request	Requestors documents	

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
11/6	All	Oppose	The proposal is not in line with regional policy statements, plans and the district plan that relate to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Protection of high-quality rural land b) Avoidance of flood hazards associated with sensitive communities c) Protection of water quality and associated freshwater values d) Maintenance of city form e) Protection of community values within existing residential zones f) Protection of amenity values. 	Reject plan change request	Statutory assessment	Reject
11/7	All	Oppose	Loss of amenity values, sense of community and property value.	Reject plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
11/8	All	Oppose	Loss of sunlight on property and inside house, especially during winter months. Concerned regarding shadowing onto property from high fencing and buildings.	Reject plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
SO12 – Maureen Haddock						
S12/1	All	Oppose	Would cause disruption to peace, quiet, rural views and views of Mt Ruapehu.	Reject plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
S12/2	All	Oppose	Concerned about increased flooding on her property and unsure what effects are as the technical documents do not give clear indication. Has observed significant flooding over a span of 46 years and worried about cumulative effects of climate change and proposed plan change. Concerned that the proposed development could increase insurance premiums. Would like clarification on how flood waters will be cleared via the stormwater network.	Reject plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S12/3	All	Oppose	Land is zoned rural, and it is not appropriate for residential development as stated in the One Plan and the District Plan.	Reject plan change request	Issue 9b, Statutory assessment	Accept in part
S12/4	All	Oppose	Wants to know how construction effects will be managed i.e operation times, dust control measures, noise limits.	Reject plan change request	Issue 9a	
S12/5	All	Oppose	Concerned with increased traffic congestion of Bennett Street, Rangitikei Line and Benmore Avenue.	Reject plan change request	Issue 4	Reject
SO13 – Michael G Hermansen						
S13/1	All	Oppose	Lives adjacent to proposed road and roundabout and has concerns accessing his property due to the close proximity of the roundabout to the driveway. Concerned about increased traffic congestion and direct effects on his property being next to roundabout, new road and the proposed commercial area. Concerned about night time road activity and car lights shining into master bedroom at night.	Reject plan change request	Issue 4	Reject
S13/2	All	Oppose	Proposed commercial area is located behind his property. Has concerns regarding shadowing on his property and loss of sun and view. Has concerns regarding delivery truck activity in early hours of the morning and creating noise. Concerned about the presence of rodents in commercial area.	If the plan change is approved, suggests the proposed commercial area be moved further into the proposed plan change	Issues 2 and 5	Reject
S13/3	All	Oppose	Concerned with the cumulative effects of earthworks, runoff from the Mangone Stream and the proposed Kiwi rail Freight Hub will have on flooding and these effects on his property. The proposed plan change area is inappropriate for development due to flooding.	Reject plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S13/4	All	Oppose	Concerned regarding loss of property values due to commercial area behind the property and a roundabout out the front.	Reject plan change request	Issue 4 and Issue 5	Reject
SO14 – Ngāti Turanga						
S14/1	All	Partial support / partial oppose	Cumulative adverse effects on water quality.	Avoid adverse effects	Issue 9c	Accept in part
S14/2	All	Partial support / partial oppose	Inability to exercise Mahinga kai and Manakitanga obligations.	Avoid adverse effects	Issue 7	Accept in part
S14/3	All	Partial support / partial oppose	Loss of rural amenity values.	Avoid adverse effects	Issue 3 and Issue 9b	Reject
S14/4	All	Partial support / partial oppose	Intensification of land use in a way that does not appear to be consistent with the city's strategic growth priorities.	Avoid adverse effects	Overview – strategic context	Reject
S14/5	All	Partial support / partial oppose	Cumulative impacts associated with intensive land use within an active, known flood zone.	Avoid adverse effects	Issue 1a	Accept in part
SO15 – Anthony and Carlyne Cade						
S15/1	All	Oppose	There should be no development or building within the flood plain.	Reject the plan change	Issue 1a	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S15/2	All	Oppose	Property values will be negatively impacted by the loss of open space and views at the rear of existing residential properties.	Reject the plan change	Issue 3	Reject
S15/3	All	Oppose	Loss of sunlight will lead to shading, cooling of homes and soggy back yards.	Reject the plan change	Issue 3	Reject
S15/4	All	Oppose	Changes in ground level will surely impact on neighbouring properties by way of runoff.	Reject the plan change	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S15/5	All	Oppose	Liquefaction and other ground conditions needs to be taken into account.	Reject the plan change	Issue 1b	Accept in part
S15/6	All	Oppose	The Traffic Engineering and Transportation Planning report submitted with the plan change application is conservative and inaccurate with respect to the amount of traffic likely to be generated.	Reject the plan change	Issue 4	Reject
S15/7	All	Oppose	The proposed roundabout will create a hazard due to vehicles queueing back over the bridge over the Mangaone Stream. Access/egress to properties will be restricted by the roundabout.	Reject the plan change	Issue 4	Reject
S15/8	All	Oppose	Increased traffic flow, the new road and the roundabout will create an unsafe situation for children walking to kindergartens and schools.	Reject the plan change	Issue 4	Reject
S15/9	All	Oppose	The new road connection through 127 Benmore Avenue will create adverse effects on adjoining neighbours due to vehicular noise and headlight glare.	Reject the plan change	Issue 2 and Issue 4	Reject
SO16 – David J Setter						
S16/1	Thomas planning report on Page 52,	Oppose	To ensure that the development does not block sheet flow flooding that is currently designed to cross SH3 from doing so. Otherwise, properties north of SH3 may be flooded.	Amend plan change	Issue 1a	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
	Objective 9-1.					
SO17 – Waka Kotahi						
S17/1	All	Supports in part.	Supports a left in, left out vehicle access to Rangitikei Line (SH 3), provided a physical layout that prevents right hand turns is constructed. The location of the access will also need to be located as far as possible from the Mangaone Stream bridge to maximise separation distance for sight lines. The layout and infrastructure will need to be approved by Waka Kotahi.	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 4	Accept in part
S17/2	All	Supports	That no additional stormwater discharge to the SH 3 stormwater network occurs as part of the development.	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S17/3	All	Supports	That no increase in flooding risk to the state highway network occurs as a result of the development.	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S17/4	All	Supports	Agrees with the Traffic Engineering and Transportation Planning report submitted with the plan change application that 4 or 5 car parking spaces are removed along Bennett Street, between the bus stop and Rangitikei Line.	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 4	Accept in part
S17/5	All	Supports	Supports the four-arm roundabout created at the intersection with Meadowbrook Drive.	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 4	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S17/6	All	Supports	Supports the Acousafe noise report submitted with the application where it proposes to manage state highway noise with building setbacks.	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 2	Accept
S17/7	All	Supports	How does the proposed walking network maximise access for future residents to the existing bus stop on Benmore Avenue?	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 4	Accept in part
S17/8	All	Supports	Supports the proposed shared path and connections through to the existing shared path network along the Mangaone Stream. Would like to see the shared path extended to connect to the shared path on SH 3 at the cost of the applicant.	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 4	Accept in part
S17/9	All	Supports	Would like to see better information provided in relation to key public transport, walking and cycling links to the development.	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 4	Accept in part
S17/11	All	Supports	Supports the higher density housing along the northern edge of the development. Would like to see consideration of more higher density housing within the site.	The provision of further information, analysis and requested conditions.	Issue 3	Accept in part
SO18 – Horizons Regional Council						
S18/1	All	Conditional support	Supports the development subject to obtaining resource consent approval for earthworks designed to avoid flood hazard and address potential liquefaction.	Conditional support subject to relief set out in submission	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S18/2	All	Conditional support	That stormwater is managed to avoid adverse effects.	Conditional support subject to relief set out in submission	Issue 1a	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S18/3	All	Conditional support	That realignment of the Whiskey Creek stream and construction of the wetland require resource consent. Impacts on freshwater will need to address and consents approved by Horizons.	Conditional support subject to relief set out in submission	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S18/4	All	Supports	Horizons supports a separation distance performance standard from the First Gas natural gas pipeline.	Conditional support subject to relief set out in submission	Issue 3	Accept
S18/5	All	Supports	Horizons supports a multi modal approach to traffic in relation to support for public transport, safe access to Rangitikei Line and Benmore Avenue and an approach that enables increases in active transport.	Conditional support subject to relief set out in submission	Issue 4	Accept in part
S18/6	All	Supports	Horizons supports that allotments should be shaped and designed to enable dwellings with good solar access and sufficient outdoor amenity.	Conditional support subject to relief set out in submission	Issue 3	Accept in part
S18/7	All	Supports	Horizons notes that the One Plan directs Territorial Authorities to consider the benefits of retaining Class 1 and 2 versatile soils.	Conditional support subject to relief set out in submission	Issue 9b	Reject
SO19 – Mid Central DHB						
S19/1	All	Supports with condition.	That a cycle lane be installed on Benmore Avenue to provide for safe access to Cloverlea School with the costs to be shared by Council and the developer.	Approve with conditions	Issue 4	Accept in part
S19/2	All	Support with condition.	The installation of a roundabout on Benmore Avenue is supported along with designs to slow speeds of traffic and make the roundabout cyclist friendly.	Approve with conditions	Issue 4	Accept in part
S19/3	All	Support	Support improved access to the Mangaone Stream shared path.	Approve with conditions	Issue 3 and Issue 4	Accept
S19/4	All	Support	Support further engagement with local iwi.	Approve with conditions	Issues 7	Accept in part
SO20 – John and Raewyn Anderson						

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S20/1	All	Oppose	The flood risk to houses built within the development.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S20/2	All	Oppose	Increased flood risk on adjoining residential areas on Meadowbrook Drive, Benmore Avenue and Gillespies Line.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S20/3	All	Oppose	Climate change effects have not been considered.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S20/4	All	Oppose	Loss of residential amenity values and views from the existing residential area will down grade the value of properties.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
S20/5	All	Oppose	5 metre high buildings on Whiskey Creek area will result in loss of sun and shading in winter months around 2pm to most of the homes along Meadowbrook Drive and Benmore Avenue. The backyards will never dry out resulting in a bog.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
S20/6	All	Oppose	The loss of sun will increase energy use for heating, adding to climate change. It will also create health issues due to mould developing from dampness.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
S20/7	All	Oppose	1.8 metre high fencing is going to be installed resulting in extra shading of existing backyards.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
S20/8	All	Oppose	Wind gusts from 5 metre to 11 metre high buildings will increase from 60 kph to 120 kph.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
S20/9	All	Oppose	There will be increased traffic noise and light pollution due to an increase in vehicles and the removal of the small mound by the roundabout.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 2 and Issue 4	Reject
S20/10	All	Oppose	The bus route may be taken away due to the roundabout.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 4	Reject
S20/11	All	Oppose	The roundabout will create problems and a hazard area for children walking or cycling to school.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 4	Reject

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S20/12	All	Oppose	There will be a loss of habitat for Pukeko, hawks and spur-wing plover.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 8	Reject
S20/13	All	Oppose	Dust from construction works will be blown onto existing residential properties.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 9a	Reject
S20/14	All	Oppose	Security lights from new dwellings/buildings will spread light onto existing residential properties which will affect sleep and quality of life.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
S20/15	All	Oppose	Tree plantings will restrict water flow and cause water to backup when flows are restricted. Rubbish will collect in water channels.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1a	Reject
S20/16	All	Oppose	The area to be rezoned has liquefaction, is good farmland and a flood way. We need to keep residential development off these areas.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1b	Reject
S20/17	All	Oppose	Flygers Line is a single lane, second tier road and will not take extra traffic flows.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 4	Reject
S20/18	All	Oppose	Traffic flows in the applicant's traffic assessment are wrong because most houses these days have at least two cars which will double the traffic flow. The roading structure won't cope with increased flows in Benmore Ave and beyond.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 4	Reject
S20/19	All	Oppose	There seems to be allowance for extra sewage requirements and the PNCC system is already overloaded.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 6a	Reject
S20/20	All	Oppose	Extra stormwater is going to affect the whole area and properties downstream.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1a	Reject
SO21 – Anne Judith Milne						
S21/1	All	Oppose	The proposed National Policy Statement on Versatile Soils is ignored. Insufficient weight is given to objectives in the One Plan on versatile soils and flooding. The proposal goes against the PNCC District Plan Section 7 Objective 3 to	Reject the plan change request	Statutory assessment and Issue 9b	Reject

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
			retain Class 1 and 2 versatile soils for use as production land.			
21/2	All	Oppose	The proposal goes against the PNCC 10 year plan Goal 4 – planning to accommodate growth through intensification rather than urban sprawl.	Reject the plan change request	Overview – strategic context	Reject
21/3	All	Oppose	The proposal goes against the PNCC District Plan Section 7 Objective 3 to retain Class 1 and 2 versatile soils for use as production land.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 9b	Reject
SO22 – Sally and Murray Rasmussen						
S22/1	All	Oppose	The risk of liquefaction is not to be taken lightly as evidenced from the 2011 Christchurch earthquake.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1b	Reject
S22/2	All	Oppose	The risk of flooding along the Mangaone Spillway flow path is substantial. The increasing number of extreme events accentuates the risk. The raising of the Flyers Line stopbank will not be enough to protect the current residential properties without the inclusion of any proposed residential properties. There have been at least two events when I have not been able to exit Meadowbrook Drive because the road has been flooded on the corner.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S22/3	All	Oppose	The proposal will increase traffic flow on the corner of Benmore Avenue and Meadowbrook Drive to such an extent that major and continuous disruptions to the smooth flow of traffic will occur.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 4	Reject
S22/4	All	Oppose	The left-out traffic exit onto Rangitikei Line will result in more cars using Flyers Line. Flyers Line is in a state of disrepair due to flood damage and may be closed. This is a major concern due to increased traffic flow.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 4	Reject

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S22/5	All	Oppose	Noise from construction works would bring severe interference to the existing residential area.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 2	Reject
S22/6	All	Oppose	Adverse visual effects including loss of sunlight is an enormous factor to those whose house, garden and fencing have been aligned to maximise views and sunlight. A 1.5 metre high solid boundary fence will result in the loss of 50% of the sunlight they currently receive. It will also seriously diminish the productivity of gardens growing vegetables and flowers.	Reject the plan change request or If not, then a 10 metre green corridor be created between the back boundary and the boundary of new residential sections	Issue 3	Reject
S22/7	All	Oppose	The natural wildlife habitat over the back fence for birds, hares, hedgehogs and skinks will be lost.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 8	Reject
S22/8	All	Oppose	There will be higher costs for insurance due to increased flooding potential risks and higher costs of building designs engineered to mitigate the risk of flooding and/or liquefaction.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S22/9	All	Oppose	There will be a lack of facilities for new housing residents.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 6b	Accept in part
SO23 – Heritage Estates 2000 Ltd						
S23/1	All	Conditional support.	The plan change is inconsistent with Council’s residential growth and long-term infrastructure projects.	Supports with conditions	Overview - Strategic context	Accept in part
S23/3	All	Conditional support	Opposes the plan change where the effects of the plan change are greater than those demonstrated by the notified documents or where information is found to be incorrect.	Supports with conditions	Entire report	Accept in part
SO24 – First Gas Ltd						

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S24/1	All	Support	Support the inclusion of the Whiskey Creek structure plan, subject to minor amendments for clarification purposes.	Support with conditions.	Entire report	Accept in part
S24/2	All	Support	Support the structure plan incorporating the Gas Transmission Pipeline within the proposed road corridor, and in particular under the grass berm and not beneath the paved road formation.	Supports with conditions	Issue 3	Accept in part
S24/3	All	Support	Support the incorporation of a minimum 20 metre setback of habitable buildings from the gas pipeline.	Supports with conditions	Issue 3	Accept
SO25 – Brian Kouvelis						
S25/1	Sections 7.2 and 7.11 and appendices 2 and 12 of the application.	Neutral	<p>The flooding reporting is too provisional in regard to the impact and mitigation of flood risk. Both internally for the proposed subdivision and externally in terms of impact on the state highway and downstream impacts on farmland along Flyers Line and Gillespies Line.</p> <p>The mitigation options discussed are far too general and more detail is required.</p> <p>The potential impacts are more frequent flooding of SH 3 through backwater effects without improvement of the floodwater hydraulics and culverts at and about the state highway. An increase of 40mm is indicated at and around Flyers Line may impact on the flood risk/passability of Flyers Line.</p> <p>The application needs to cover any potential upgrade of flood stopbanks along Benmore Avenue to maintain the existing level of service.</p> <p>The application is not clear on the operation of the flood detention pond under the Mangaone spillway operation and the flood gating of the development causing internal flooding in the proposed development area.</p>	That the Council seek a peer review of the hydraulic and stormwater modelling, potential impacts of flooding and seek more detail on any proposed mitigation both upstream and downstream of the development as well as within the development area.	Issue 1a	Accept in part

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/ oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
SO26 – Irene Hamilton						
S26/1	All	Oppose	Flooding – during heavy or continuous rain, properties on Meadowbrook Drive and Benmore Avenue that adjoin the plan change area experience flooding. The plan change will create more risk of flooding.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part
S26/2	All	Oppose	Traffic – the proposed roundabout is of extreme concern to residents who will exit into the roundabout because it will be dangerous. Those properties at 1, 2 and 3 Meadowbrook Drive plus all others that will use the roundabout.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 4	Reject
S26/3	All	Oppose	The volume of traffic will increase considerably, particularly at peak times. Commercial and industrial business owners on Bennett Street will be greatly affected. The increase in traffic could affect city bus timetables. It will also affect school children attending Cloverlea School who will be more vulnerable to accidents.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 4	Reject
S26/4	All	Oppose	Housing – the development site is suitable for cropping or grazing of cattle and valuable for farming and other land should be found.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 9b	Reject
S26/5	All	Oppose	It is unacceptable for new houses to be built 3 metres from the boundary of the Meadowbrook Drive and Benmore Avenue properties. There will be a lack of privacy and a lot less sunshine. The reduction of sunshine will mean the ground will take longer to dry out which will lead to homes gradually becoming damp and unhealthy. This will affect the physical and mental health of occupiers.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
S26/6	All	Oppose	Lifestyle – there will be a loss of views to birdlife and other creatures and to Mt Ruapehu.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 8	Reject

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planners Recommended Decision
S26/7	All	Oppose	When they purchased the property they were assured that the plan change area would never be developed because of the flood plain.	Reject the plan change request	Issue 3	Reject
S26/8	All	Oppose	The loss of view will lead to property valuations reducing by \$20,000 to \$30,000.	Reject the plan change request	Entire s42a Report	Reject

Further submissions

Submission point	Plan Provision	Support/oppose	Reasons	Decision Requested	Relevant s42A Section	Planning Recommended Decision
FS1 – S Rasmussen						
FS1/1	All	Oppose	Support own original submission S22	Reject plan change request	Various	Reject / accept in part
FS2 – E and M Anderson						
FS2/1	All	Oppose	The destructive power of flood water	Reject plan change request	Issue 1a	Accept in part