

	FURTHER SUBMISSION IN SUPPORT OF OR OPPOSITION TO A SUBMISSION ON A PLAN CHANGE TO THE CHRISTCHURCH DISTRICT PLAN	Office use only F-Submission No.
	Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991	

Submissions can be:			
Posted to:	City Planning Team Christchurch City Council PO Box 73012 Christchurch 8154	Delivered to:	Ground floor reception 53 Hereford Street Christchurch Attn: City Planning Team
Emailed to:	PlanChange@ccc.govt.nz		

For Office Use Only Received in Council Office		
_____	_____	_____
Date	Time	Person

* Denotes required information

This is a further submission on: Plan Change Number: 19 (PPC19)

Your name and contact details:	
Full name of person or organisation making further submission: Jolene Eagar for the Templeton Residents' Association	
Address for service: 5 Van Dieman Close, Templeton, Christchurch	
Email: Jolene.eagar@lincoln.rh.co.nz	Phone: 0272419835

Person of interest declaration* I am (state whether you are): ☒ (a) a person representing a relevant aspect of the public interest, or ☐ (b) a person who has an interest in the proposal that is greater than the interest the general public has, or ☐ (c) the local authority for the relevant area. Explain the grounds for saying you come within category (a) or (b) above: The Templeton Residents' Association represents a relevant aspect of the public interest (category a), advocating on behalf of residents directly affected by the proposed plan change and its wider environmental, amenity, and community impacts.

Note to person making further submission <i>A further submission can only support or oppose an original submission listed in the summary. It is <u>not</u> an opportunity to make a fresh submission on matters not raised in the submissions. A copy of your further submission must be served on the original submitter within 5 working days of making the further submission to the Council.</i>
--

I support / oppose (choose one) the submission of:*
--

*(Please insert the name and address of the original submitter, and submission number of the original submission. If you are making a further submission on multiple submitters, please use the **table form** on the last page and make sure it is attached.)*

The Templeton Residents Association:

- **SUPPORTS** submissions opposing PPC19
- **SUPPORTS IN PART** submissions seeking stronger mitigation
- **OPPOSES** submissions supporting the plan change without significant amendment

The particular parts of the submission that I support / oppose (choose one) are:*

*(You should clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose (state **S** and **D** number as shown in the summary of submission), together with the relevant provision of the proposed Plan Change.)*

The reasons for my support (or opposition) are:* *(Please give precise details)*

This further submission is made in support of submissions opposing PPC19 and in opposition to submissions supporting it.

The Templeton Residents Association supports the opposing submissions as they collectively demonstrate **significant and unresolved adverse effects** arising from PPC19.

In particular:

1. Gateway and Visual Amenity Effects

Multiple submitters identify that this location forms a key **gateway to Christchurch**, yet the proposal enables large-scale industrial development with insufficient setbacks and screening.

This will result in a visually dominant industrial environment along SH1, which is inconsistent with the city's identity and expectations for a primary entrance corridor.

2. Incompatibility with Residential Environment

Submitters consistently raise that Industrial Heavy zoning directly adjacent to existing residential properties will result in:

- Noise, lighting, and vibration effects
- Loss of outlook and privacy
- Reduced residential amenity

These effects are inherent to the zoning and are not adequately mitigated by the proposal.

3. Inadequate Setbacks and Landscaping

Evidence from submitters shows that:

- The proposed setbacks are insufficient
- Landscaping provisions are weak and not permanent

As noted in technical submissions, mitigation such as planting must be **maintained in perpetuity** and should include space for **effective bunding**, which is currently not guaranteed.

4. Traffic and Safety Effects

Submitters highlight existing congestion and safety issues at:

- Marshs Road / SH1 intersection
- Surrounding roading network

Further industrial development will exacerbate these issues, and infrastructure upgrades remain uncertain and unresolved.

5. Environmental and Cumulative Effects

Submissions identify cumulative impacts including:

- Wildlife loss
- Increased heavy vehicle movements
- Degradation of rural character

These effects demonstrate that the area is already under pressure and not suitable for further industrial intensification.

6. Lack of Strategic Justification

Technical submitters raise concerns that the proposal does not adequately meet higher-order planning tests, including those relating to highly productive land and out-of-sequence development.

I seek that the whole or part of the submission be allowed / disallowed:* *(Please specify the relevant parts)*

The Templeton Residents Association seeks that:

1. **All submissions opposing PPC19 be allowed**
2. **All submissions supporting PPC19 be disallowed**
3. Christchurch City Council **declines PPC19**

Alternatively, if PPC19 is approved, it must be significantly amended to:

- Require **permanent setbacks** (with no sunset clause) from:
 - SH1
 - Residential properties
- Require **substantial landscaped bunding and screening**, including:
 - Minimum height requirements
 - Full-length screening along SH1 and residential boundaries
 - Ongoing maintenance in perpetuity
- Introduce **specific urban design controls** to address:
 - Building bulk and scale
 - Visual dominance
 - Interface with public roads
- Ensure **transport infrastructure upgrades are in place prior to development**, including:
 - SH1 / Marshs Road intersection safety improvements
 - Capacity upgrades to support heavy traffic
- Recognise the site as a **gateway to Christchurch** and apply appropriate planning controls to reflect this function.

Please indicate by ticking the relevant box whether you wish to be heard in support of your further submission.*

☒ I wish to / ☐ ~~I do not wish to~~ speak at the hearing in support of my further submission.

Joint submissions *(Please tick this box if you agree)*

☒ If others make a similar submission, I will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

If you have used extra sheets for this submission, please attached them to this form and indicate this below*

☒ Yes, I have attached extra sheets.

☐ No, I have not attached extra sheets.

Signature of submitter *(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)*

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means.

Signature:



Date:

23/04/2026

Submissions are public information

The information requested in this submission, including your contact details is required by the Resource Management Act 1991. A copy of your submission will be made available for inspection at all Council service centres and libraries in accordance with the requirements of the Act. A document summarising all submissions and including names and addresses of submitters will be posted on the Council's website.

If you consider there are compelling reasons why your contact details should be kept confidential, you should contact the Statutory Administration Adviser at 941 8999.

Submitter Name and Address for service*	Submission No.	Support or Oppose*	Reasons for support / opposition* (Please give precise details)	Decision sought (I seek the whole or part of the submission to be allowed / disallowed)* (Please specify the relevant parts)
Example: John Doe, 21 Jump Street, Papanui, Christchurch 8051	S10	Support	I support this submission because...	I seek the whole submission to be allowed.
Mark Anisy – S1.1	S1	Support	The TRA supports concerns regarding increased truck traffic, congestion, noise, pollution, and property value impacts. These effects are consistent with community feedback and demonstrate that Industrial Heavy zoning is inherently incompatible with the existing and anticipated residential environment.	Allow the submission. Decline PPC19 or significantly reduce the rezoning area.
John Edward Stewart – S4.1 & S4.2	S4	Support	The TRA strongly supports concerns regarding visual amenity and the lack of consideration of the outlook along Main South Road. The gateway function of this location is critical and currently undervalued in the proposal.	Allow the submission. Retain current zoning or require substantial setbacks and visual mitigation.
Julianne Farrell – S6.1	S6	Support	The TRA agrees that the proposed 20m setback is insufficient and that industrial expansion is not justified. The scale and intensity of Heavy Industrial zoning is incompatible with nearby residential activity.	Allow the submission. Decline PPC19.

Warren & Pauline Newell – S7.1	S7	Support	The TRA supports the submitters' reference to the Cottonsoft building as an example of poor visual outcome , reinforcing concerns about bulk, scale, and long-term visual dominance. This highlights the real-world effects of similar development.	Allow the submission. Decline PPC19.
--------------------------------	----	---------	--	--------------------------------------

Submitter Name and Address for service*	Submission No.	Support or Oppose*	Reasons for support / opposition* (Please give precise details)	Decision sought (I seek the whole or part of the submission to be allowed / disallowed)* (Please specify the relevant parts)
Dave Tucker – S11.1	S11	Support	The TRA supports concerns regarding wildlife loss, traffic volumes, and environmental degradation . These cumulative effects demonstrate that the area is already under pressure and not suitable for further industrial intensification.	Allow the submission. Decline PPC19.
Maree Summers – S12.1	S12	Support	The TRA supports long-term residents' concerns regarding loss of rural character and quality of life. The plan change represents a fundamental shift in land use that is not adequately justified or mitigated.	Allow the submission. Decline PPC19.
Gavin & Deborah Newell– S13.1	S13	Support	The TRA strongly supports the recognition of this location as a gateway to Christchurch (the Garden City) . Industrial development at this location undermines that identity and conflicts with the city's image.	Allow the submission. Decline PPC19.

Fong Chih John Chang – S20.1	S20	Support	The TRA supports the tourism and visual amenity argument. SH1 is a key route for visitors, and the visual experience of entering Christchurch should not be dominated by industrial development.	Allow the submission. Decline PPC19.
Rachael Carruthers - Selwyn District Council – S5.1, S5.2, S5.3	S5	Support in part	The TRA supports: • The application of NPS-HPL tests (questioning appropriateness of rezoning) • The need for permanent landscaping maintenance • Concerns about noise standards and sensitive receivers These are critical technical issues that reinforce community concerns.	Allow the submission, particularly where it: • Seeks refusal of PPC19, or • Requires stronger and permanent mitigation measures
Kate Bonifacio - NZTA Waka Kotahi – S26.1–26.3	S26	Support in part	The TRA supports concerns regarding: • Safety of SH1 / Marshs Road intersection • Need for infrastructure upgrades • Increased risk from industrial traffic This aligns with community safety concerns.	Allow the submission, particularly requirements for: • Intersection upgrades • Safety controls • Appropriate infrastructure planning

Any submission supporting PPC19 (general)		Oppose	The TRA opposes any submission that supports PPC19 without significant amendment, as these submissions fail to adequately recognise: • Gateway effects • Residential amenity impacts • Long-term environmental and visual consequences • Infrastructure and safety constraints	Disallow those submissions.
Canterbury Regional Council	S25	Support in Part	Supports concerns regarding groundwater, contaminated land, and out-of-sequence development.	Allow the submission, particularly requirements for the implementation of appropriate mitigation measures.