PPC19 Hearing Submission: Yager

Kia ora, Mr Chairman and Commissioners.

My name is Yager, and I live with my wife, Dasha, at 36 Marshs Road, on the Selwyn District side of the road. Our property sits directly across Marshs Road from the land proposed for rezoning under Private Plan Change 19.

We oppose this plan change and ask the Panel to decline it in its entirety.

I want to focus on three main concerns: whether this is a suitable location for a large industrial development, whether the existing road network can safely accommodate the additional traffic, and whether the proposed planning rules will adequately protect neighbouring homes in the long term.

Dasha will speak after me about our home, our daily experience and the personal impact of this proposal. I will focus on the planning and technical issues.

We understand that Christchurch needs land for businesses and industry. We are not against industrial development or economic growth. Our concern is whether this particular site is suitable and whether its effects on existing residents and roads have been properly assessed.

The proposal would rezone approximately 23 hectares from Rural Urban Fringe to Industrial Heavy. This is a significant change in the type and scale of development that could take place directly across the road from our home.

The Panel is not simply considering a change on a planning map. It is considering the future relationship between a large industrial area, an existing road network and established homes.

I ask you to keep that relationship in mind throughout your assessment.

1. Location and effects on neighbouring homes

Our home is in Selwyn District, while the proposed industrial site is within Christchurch City Council's area. But that administrative boundary does not change the physical relationship between our properties.

Depending on the activities established, potential effects could include heavy vehicle movements, machinery noise, night-time lighting, dust, vibration and changes to our outlook.

We are not asking the Panel to assume that every one of these effects will occur. We are asking that they are assessed realistically and that the planning rules provide effective protection where it is needed.

Selwyn District Council has raised concerns about effects on neighbouring residential properties, including noise and landscaping provisions. I ask the Panel to consider those concerns carefully alongside the applicant's evidence and the Council officers' recommendations.

A setback may create physical separation, but it does not automatically resolve every issue. Its effectiveness depends on the activities permitted and the controls in place.

Similarly, landscaping may soften the appearance of industrial buildings, but it does not necessarily prevent noise, dust, lighting or vibration from affecting nearby homes.

These measures need to work together as a complete system of protection, rather than being treated as separate solutions to separate problems.

2. Existing traffic conditions on Marshs Road

Traffic is one of our main concerns.

Marshs Road is already used by heavy vehicles travelling to and from nearby industrial activities. From our experience living here, traffic is an everyday issue, particularly when accessing State Highway 1.

There is no continuous footpath along the whole Marshs's road. This raises concerns about the safety and practicality of walking or cycling alongside heavy vehicles.

Turning right from Marshs Road onto Main South Road can also be difficult during busy periods. Drivers sometimes have to wait for a suitable gap in traffic, making ordinary journeys challenging.

Some residents instead turn left towards Templeton and use Kirk Road as an alternative. This adds distance and time to their journeys and shifts the turning movement to another location.

Our neighbour Dave counted 24 trucks and 83 cars passing in a 30-minute period on a weekday morning. This was a local observation, not a formal traffic survey, but it helps illustrate why residents are concerned about the existing traffic volumes.

These observations should be considered alongside formal traffic counts, modelling and expert evidence.

The question is not simply whether more vehicles can physically fit on the road. It is whether the network can operate safely and efficiently, including at busy intersections, while allowing existing residents, pedestrians and cyclists to use it safely.

I ask the Panel to consider the cumulative effects of existing industrial activity and the proposed development, rather than looking at this plan change in isolation.

3. The future Pound Road connection and interim traffic

The applicant identifies a future minor arterial road connecting the development to State Highway 1 near Pound Road.

We recognise that this connection could improve access and change traffic patterns if it is delivered and operates as intended.

However, a future road cannot manage traffic until it is built, connected and open for use.

The Panel therefore needs to understand what happens before that connection becomes available. If the industrial development can proceed first, what additional traffic will use Marshs Road and the existing State Highway 1 intersection? What pressure could be placed on Kirk Road? Can the existing network safely accommodate that traffic in the meantime?

Questions about the road's delivery, timing, funding, consents and the arrangements securing its construction are important because the traffic assessment depends on what infrastructure will actually be available at each stage.

I am not asking the Panel to assume that the road will never be built. I am asking you to establish whether the interim situation has been properly assessed and whether there is sufficient certainty around the connection.

The Council transport evidence is particularly relevant here. Mr Liqi Chen's statement of evidence, dated 25 September 2026, should be examined carefully, especially the discussion of the applicant's traffic modelling and the interim road network.

Our concern is that if the scenario where the site is developed before the arterial connection opens has not been adequately modelled, there may be a significant gap in the assessment.

It is not enough to demonstrate that traffic might be accommodated under a future network arrangement if the development could operate under a different arrangement first.

I ask the Panel to establish whether the evidence demonstrates that the existing roads and intersections can safely and efficiently accommodate the additional traffic at each stage of development.

If that question has not been adequately answered, I ask you to consider whether the uncertainty can genuinely be resolved through the proposed planning provisions, or whether it is a reason to decline the proposal.

4. State Highway 1 and the wider road network

The traffic assessment also needs to consider the relationship between Marshs Road, State Highway 1 and the alternative route through Kirk Road.

If accessing State Highway 1 is already difficult at busy times, additional industrial traffic could make turning movements and journey times more challenging, depending on the volume and timing of that traffic.

Our preparation materials refer to concerns raised in NZTA Waka Kotahi's submission about the State Highway 1 and Marshs Road intersection and the Pound Road connection.

I ask the Panel to consider the exact wording of that submission alongside the relevant transport evidence.

We do not suggest that one traffic count or a resident's observation proves how the whole network will perform. But local experience can help identify where the formal assessment needs closer scrutiny. That experience should not be dismissed simply because it is not presented in the same form as a transport model.

5. Setbacks, noise and long-term protection

My next concern is whether the proposed planning rules will adequately protect neighbouring homes over time.

The Council's published summary referred to a 20-metre setback under a related proposed provision that would apply until 1 January 2036. I ask the Panel to examine the exact provision, what it achieves, and what protection remains after that date.

A building setback does not necessarily control every activity or prevent every environmental effect. Noise can travel beyond buildings. Security lighting can affect neighbouring homes. Dust and vibration depend on the activities taking place and the controls applied.

The setback therefore needs to be considered alongside noise standards, lighting provisions, landscaping requirements, activity rules and enforcement mechanisms.

It is also important that the rules provide meaningful protection for existing homes across the district boundary, rather than focusing only on the internal layout of the industrial zone.

We want to understand what happens if residents experience unreasonable noise at night, if lighting affects their homes, or if dust and other effects become a problem. How will the rules be monitored and enforced? What happens if the actual effects differ from what was anticipated?

These are practical questions about how the proposed framework will work in real life.

We are concerned that some protections may be temporary, while the industrial development itself could remain for many years. The Panel should be satisfied that the long-term rules will provide adequate protection, not just that the effects can be managed during an initial period.

6. Balancing the benefits and effects

We recognise that the applicant may point to the need for additional industrial land and the economic benefits the development could bring.

Those benefits matter. But they must be considered alongside the effects on the existing road network, the surrounding environment and the people already living nearby.

Our concern is that the proposal may rely on infrastructure that is not yet available, while the traffic effects during the interim period require further scrutiny. We also question whether the proposed rules provide sufficient long-term protection for neighbouring homes.

These issues should not be left unresolved on the assumption that a future road or a later consent process will address them.

The Panel needs to be satisfied that the applicant has demonstrated that this particular site is appropriate and that the benefits of rezoning outweigh the potential effects and risks for the existing community.

7. Our request to the Panel

Mr Chairman and Commissioners, our position is clear.

We oppose Private Plan Change 19 because we are not satisfied that the concerns about traffic, infrastructure timing, effects on neighbouring homes and long-term protection have been adequately resolved.

We ask you to examine the interim traffic scenario carefully and establish whether the evidence demonstrates that the existing road network can safely accommodate the development before the Pound Road connection is available.

We ask you to examine the proposed setback, noise, lighting and landscaping provisions to ensure they provide meaningful and lasting protection for existing homes.

And we ask you to consider the actual location of those homes and the cumulative effects of introducing a large industrial area into an environment where traffic and access are already concerns.

We understand that planning decisions require balancing different needs. We are not asking the Panel to prevent industrial growth. We are asking that this proposal is assessed carefully, and that existing residents are not expected to accept unresolved risks based on assumptions about future infrastructure or safeguards.

For these reasons, I respectfully ask the Panel to decline Private Plan Change 19 in its **entirety**.

Thank you for your time and consideration.