

My name is Raelene Shanks. My Husband, Peter and I reside at 234 Riverbank Road which is 4.3705 ha. zoned rural general. We built a new home on a designated platform at the rear of our property in 2002. It is nice to look at!! but to fulfil our resource consent conditions we had to screen buildings from both Ballantyne and Riverbank roads. This took 10 years to achieve! The nice rural mountain views we currently enjoy is over the subject land. We moved to Wanaka permanently in August 2012.

PLAN CHANGE 46 will affect us as we have stated in our submission, and along with some of the land designated in Plan change 36 causes us great concern and has a huge impact on our property.

The proposed development Plan Change 46 and that of plan change 36 INDUSTRIAL B granted already to ORHL, will be highly visible from Riverbank Road and **especially our property**. The proposed development area is on a flat area that is slightly elevated above Riverbank Road meaning that future views from Riverbank Road properties will be dominated by a built form rather than existing pastoral landscape. Existing views across the site will be blocked with buildings on the existing Industrial B and the proposed industrial development becoming a dominant feature in the landscape as seen from our property, which is more than 4 metres lower than the proposed land. Allowing a 7 metre building at ground level results in an 11 metre block of view. The proposed development will break the line and form of the existing landform and skyline when viewing the site from Riverbank Road. An area of reserve has been submitted, but a development of this size should have more significant areas of open space with plantings of a mature height that will lessen the impact of built form in the landscape and buffer the Industrial activities from residents in the Rural General Zone

We were aware of Mr Gordon's Application PC 36. "OConnell Precent" and saw that as a provision of more Industrial land for future need in a contained area. We were content in the knowledge that the development would be of minimal effect or impact on us. We did therefore not put in a submission. What we were not aware of, was that via a submission to that application, ORHL gained a large amount of rural general land to be rezoned Industrial B for Industrial and provision of reserve. As adjoining land owners we were never notified by council or contacted by the developer before the application via Mr Gordons application for PLAN CHANGE 36 or even during the plan change process. When Plan change 36 result was publicised, we were astounded to find we as one of the most affected partys were denied an opportunity to participate in the plan change process. We contacted Council to voice our concerns only to be told through discussion it was a done deal and was legal.

I wish to comment we had observed pegs out on the land in front of us. So we researched who owned the land and contacted Allan Dippie . He was very obliging and willing to meet with us on the land. We wanted to know what the pegs were for and his plans for the land in the future. We all walked over to the paddocks having casual friendly conversation. Mr Dippie said he was in discussions with the council and planning for years down the line looking at housing, cycle tracks roading. He stated that we would be looking out at houses at the left of front side of our land and he commented "and may be you will see more industrial closer in years to come". He also did say the council wanted a road as far South on the property, and this would all be some 10-20 years away as he had to develop 3 parks first. So we thanked him and we were at time happy with our discussions thinking ok houses in future not as bad as 7 mtre industrial buildings to look at!!

At no time did Mr Dippie divulge to us that he was well into a process via a submission to Mr Gordons PC36 application.

In April 2013 A neighbour mentioned they had been visited re Plan Change 46 by Alison Noble representing ORHL to deliver info re a proposed PLAN CHANGE 46. We had not been visited so I phoned Mr Dippie's office as to why we hadn't been visited. (OK They were not aware we were permanently living here) An arrangement was made for Allan to visit again to discuss plan change 46. We walked around property again and Allan agreed to have pegs put back in so we could see where proposed roads were to go. During conversation that day while perusing the paperwork. We both voiced concerns re road 2. Mr Dippie suggested he could turn Road 2 into a RING ROAD and drew it on our copy of the plan We are a little confused about why this never made it to his PC46 application.

ROADING

Road 2 on the plan. The Proposed road is directly in line with our living areas We envisage increased noise and lights at night will be of nuisance factor. The road also gives connection for traffic to proposed Road 3. The height of Bunds on either side of Proposed roads are not given but we imagine with the height of heavy traffic vehicles they would remain visible. Heavy traffic turning in or out of Road 2 and then turning in or out of road 3 and onto Ballantyne Road will result in a huge increase of motor and gear change noise. Should PC46 be approved it would be better as a RING ROAD as previously discussed. This would also keep Industrial traffic separate and distanced from Rural General Zone and proposed Residential.

Road 3 on the plan should be deleted. The land would be better bunded and landscaped to give increased mitigation in consideration of our property and other neighbouring residents. Access to planned residential development, using proposed road 4 connecting as planned to Mr Gordons now proposed residential which would then keep traffic separate from the industrial area and no doubt in time to come roads will also come off Orchard road as development increases. My other concern re this road was Allans comment to us. "if too many object to this road then the other option is you will have buildings to your boundary." Should the road not go ahead I would hope the council still respect the need for an open space between Rural and Industrial!!

HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS: We object to 7 metre height which is approved for Industrial B. No bunding and planting is going to screen buildings from us fully for at least 10 years Some conditions imposed in height and colour for buildings on land closer to Riverbank Road properties may soften the impact should PC 46 be approved.

LANDSCAPING SCREENING MITIGATION:

Whilst we accept that the green buffer space would provide a degree of mitigation It is imperative that a condition be imposed of an expected combined height of mounding and plants before building can commenced. This is important for not only mitigation of built form but the inevitable increase of noise dust and pollution that goes with Industry. We are already experiencing increase of noise engineering and mechanical and sandblasting at times very repetitive and unpleasant and this is from buildings further up Ballantyne Road and Frederick Street

STAGING We believe staging as condition in PC36 Ballantyne Road Precinct should remain as approved Stage one and Stage 2 and if Plan Change 46 is approved would this proposed area of Industrial B become stage3?

Once the land is subdivided and sold there is no guarantee of the height colour or design .We have concerns with COLOURS and building materials especially as these buildings are actually going to be very close. Concrete Panel buildings look like bunkers! Not nice to look at from Residential!! Morgan Engineering roof and trim is a prime example a red roof and trim that absolutely glares in the sun ,whereas Claas have new Denim Blue rear and sides as in photograph which blends into the mountain landscape. We discussed our concerns of Colour with Mr Dippie and he said maybe it could be a condition on some of the buildings at least closer to our property. Buildings may look presentable on Ballantyne Road frontage but we need consideration from our direct view of sides and backs of properties proposed to be built. We do not want to be looking directly at machinery and other equipment or rubbish that sits outside such industrial sites. See photos examples

Proposed Residential extension.

Rural general Zone allows people to have lifestyles of choice. On the boundary, consideration for a buffer of plantings and possibly creation of sections of a larger area eg acre blocks alongside the buffer then developing smaller lots.

Thankyou for the opportunity to speak further to our submission