

Further Submission for the Proposed District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Privacy Statement

Your further submission must include your name, and an address for service (preferably email, but you can use a postal address). All information you include in this further submission, including your name and address for service, will be provided to other submitters and published on Hutt City Council's website. Paper copies may also be made available. Hutt City Council is required to collect and publish this information to carry out its functions under the Resource Management Act 1991 and to enable others to take part in the district plan process. The Council, other submitters, and the Environment Court may need to contact you during this process.

If your further submission does not include your name and an address for service, it will be rejected.

While the Council will retain all information provided in your further submission in secure council systems, all contact details will be removed from any documents published on Council's website once the district plan process is complete. However, your name and the contents of your further submission will still appear in these documents.

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. If you'd like to ask for a copy of your information, or to have it corrected, please contact us at contact@huttcity.govt.nz, call 04-570-6666, or write to us at Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040.

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

1. **This is a further submission from:**

Full Name	<small>Last</small> <input type="text"/> <small>First</small> <input type="text"/>	
Company/Organisation	<input type="text"/>	
Contact if different	<input type="text"/>	
Address	<small>Number</small> <input type="text"/> <small>Street</small> <input type="text"/>	
	<small>Suburb</small> <input type="text"/>	
	<small>City</small> <input type="text"/>	<small>Postcode</small> <input type="text"/>
Address for Service if different	<small>Postal Address</small> <input type="text"/>	
Phone	<small>Home</small> <input type="text"/>	<small>Work</small> <input type="text"/>
	<small>Mobile</small> <input type="text"/>	
Email	<input type="text"/>	

2. This is a **further submission** in support of or opposition to a submission on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan.

3. I consider that, under Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act, I may make a further submission because:

I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest

Please give details:

I have an interest in the Proposed Plan Change that is greater than the interest of the general public

Please give details:

I represent Hutt City Council

4. I support or oppose the submission of:

Name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

5. The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

6. The reasons for my support or opposition are:

Please give reasons:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

7. I seek that the whole or part [describe part] of the submission be allowed or disallowed:

Please give precise details:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

8. I wish do not wish to be heard in support of my submission

(Please tick one)

9. If others make a similar submission,

I will will not consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

(Please tick one)

Signature of submitter

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

Date

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

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP
Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

Original Submitter Name	Submitter Number / Sub Point	Submitter Decision Requested	Position	Reasons	Relief Sought
Definitions – Industrial Activity					
Argosy Property No 1 Ltd	237 / 03	Retain definition.	Support	TKL's original submission supported the proposed definition of Industrial Activity.	Allow
Oyster Management Ltd	272 / 02	Retain definition.	Support	TKL's original submission supported the proposed definition of Industrial Activity.	Allow
The Fuel Companies	471 / 34	Retain as notified	Support	TKL's original submission supported the proposed definition of Industrial Activity.	Allow
Waste Management NZ Ltd	461 / 10	Amend definition of Industrial Activity as follows: <i>means an activity that manufactures, fabricates, processes, packages, distributes, repairs, stores, or disposes of materials (including raw, processed, or partly processed materials) or goods. It includes any ancillary activity to the industrial activity.</i> <u>This includes waste management facilities.</u>	Support	TKL's original submission supported the proposed definition of Industrial Activity. We also see merit by including 'waste management facilities', which would be subject to a separate new definition.	Allow
Waste Management NZ Ltd	461 / 6	Add new definition for waste management facility as follows: <i>Waste management facility means a facility used for receiving waste for transfer, minimisation, treatment, disposal, or temporary storage. Includes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • resource recovery parks; • refuse transfer stations; and • recycling. <i>Excludes:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • landfills, managed fills and clean fills. 	Support	The proposed definition would provide for the 'processing' of waste materials prior to final disposal. This approach is consistent with the minimisation objectives for management of waste.	Allow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP**Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd**

Original Submitter Name	Submitter Number / Sub Point	Submitter Decision Requested	Position	Reasons	Relief Sought
Industrial Zone - GIZ-S1 (Height)					
Oyster Management Ltd	272 / 76	Retain as notified.	Support	TKL's original submission supported the proposed height limit standard GIZ-S1.	Allow
Noise – Rule Noise-R5					
Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporated Society	377 / 10a	Seeks amendments to these rules which ensures noise and vibration emitted from use of heavy vehicles / machinery is monitored on the site boundary, with HCC being able to require results of the monitoring at its discretion.	Oppose	District Plan rules should be based on compliance with measurable outcomes. Noise-R5.1(a) inappropriately sets out a subjective compliance assessment that vibration should not compromise public health or safety, or well-being and amenity values within any other site. Therefore, part (a) of the rule should be removed. Rules should reflect best practice and reference to NZ standards. The proposed subjective requirement would impose significant compliance costs on activities where vibration levels are being managed appropriately.	Disallow
	377 / 10b	Seeks amendments that require vibration to not be discernible on any residential land outside the subject development	Oppose	The amendment sought would continue the requirement for a subjective assessment - as it is subject to an individual's ability / sensitivity to discern vibration and determine the source of that vibration. In an urban environment, vibration can be generated from multiple sites including road traffic. Vibration from a specific activity must therefore be assessed objectively. It is appropriate for rules to be based on effects. Discernible vibration does not have an unacceptable adverse effect in all cases.	Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP

Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

Original Submitter Name	Submitter Number / Sub Point	Submitter Decision Requested	Position	Reasons	Relief Sought
	377 / 10c	Seeks amendments that identify a "Discretionary" activity status for vibration which is discernible outside the subject development site.	Oppose	As noted above, activity status should be based on objective measures of an effect, not whether vibration is subjectively discernible. The proposed change introduces uncertainty and is not effects-based.	Disallow
UDSD-02					
Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporated Society	377 / 2	Seeks amendments to objective or a new objective which addresses protecting existing residential communities from incompatible land use and development. (Refer to original submission).	Oppose	The existing plan framework already provides for the management of adverse effects on residential communities. Introducing additional objectives focused on "compatibility" risks creating vague or overly restrictive provisions that may constrain essential infrastructure without improving environmental outcomes	Disallow
Transport					
Wellington Regional Council	452 / 70	Seeks to insert a new row for subdivision as follows: <i>the subdivision of land which under this Plan has the capacity to accommodate 20 residential units.</i>	Oppose	The high trip generating activity (Table 8) already identifies 20+ residential units as a trigger. There is no need to target subdivisions separately.	Disallow
Natural Hazards					
Morgan Phillips	126 / 3	Seeks that any form of refuge [sic] or transfer station on the banks of the Te awa Kairangi Hutt River does not occur (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	This submission point does not relate to natural hazards and does not seek any amendment to natural hazard provisions. Notwithstanding this, transfer stations are significant infrastructure, important to ensure a well functioning urban area. Potential effects of waste management facilities can be managed with the appropriateness of management measures assessed during a consent process. Any prohibition of waste management facilities	Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP

Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

Original Submitter Name	Submitter Number / Sub Point	Submitter Decision Requested	Position	Reasons	Relief Sought
				would be contrary to the sustainable management of resources.	
Zones					
John Harrison	370 / 4	Add a policy for each of these zones classifying cleanfills, landfills and solid waste transfer stations, located within 500m of a residential zone, non-complying	Oppose	This blanket approach is overly restrictive, as it fails to account for the actual or potential effects of individual proposals, which can vary significantly depending on site context, design, mitigation measures, and operational management. The proposed threshold is arbitrary. The existing activity status of waste management activities in the Proposed District Plan allow for effective assessment of potential effects, including noise, traffic, and amenity, and allow for case-by-case decisions that must be assessed against the receiving environment. A non-complying status in all cases is inconsistent with effects-based planning and risks frustrating important infrastructure that supports urban growth and waste minimisation objectives. It also fails to account for land use in between residential areas and the waste management facility.	Disallow
Deborah Harrison	371 / 4	Add a policy for each of these zones classifying cleanfills, landfills and solid waste transfer stations, located within 500m of a residential zone, non-complying	Oppose		Disallow
Penny Birchall	372 / 4	Add a policy for each of these zones classifying cleanfills, landfills and solid waste transfer stations, located within 500m of a residential zone, non-complying	Oppose		Disallow
Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporated Society	377 / 7	Seeks, in the circumstance that 30 Benmore is rezoned from the General Rural Zone, that the new zone includes a "Non-complying" activity status for cleanfills, landfills and solid waste transfer stations within 500m of a residential zone. (Refer to original submission).	Oppose		Disallow
Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporated Society	377 / 8	Add a policy to zone chapters that directs prevention or avoidance of landfills, waste transfer stations, and waste recover park activities within 400m of an existing residential zone.	Oppose		Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP

Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

Original Submitter Name	Submitter Number / Sub Point	Submitter Decision Requested	Position	Reasons	Relief Sought
Rural Zones					
Shayne Hawtin	36 / 2	Seeks that industrial activities like land transfer stations should be confined to areas specifically zoned for industrial use and not within rural zones as a discretionary activity (inferred, refer to full submission)	Oppose	Whether a waste management facility is appropriate in the rural zone depends on the specific proposal, the nature of the site and receiving environment, and the extent to which effects can be avoided, remedied, or mitigated. The PDP provides for waste transfer stations as a discretionary activity status in the rural zone, which is appropriate because it enables a full assessment of effects through the resource consent process. This ensures that proposals are considered on their merits, consistent with the effects-based approach of the Resource Management Act. A blanket prohibition would not only be unduly restrictive but would also undermine the ability to provide regionally significant infrastructure in appropriate locations—particularly infrastructure that supports waste minimisation, urban growth, and the wellbeing of communities.	Disallow
Liesl Eksteen	136 / 3	Seeks that a waste station is not added to the area (Inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Lindsay Streefkerk	138 / 3	Seeks that a waste transfer station is not allowed in Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose		Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP

Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

General Rural Zone GRUZ 16 and GRUZ 17					
Murray Carpenter	166 / 2	Seeks that landfills and waste transfer stations are not discretionary activities (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Currently waste transfer facilities have a discretionary activity status in the rural zone, which is appropriate because it enables a full assessment of effects through the resource consent process. This ensures that proposals are considered on their merits, consistent with the effects-based approach of the Resource Management Act. The proposed plan should maintain the same provisions.	Disallow
Teresa Mazzola	306 / 2	Seeks that landfills and waste transfer stations are "non-permitted activities within General Rural zones". (Refer to original submission)	oppose		Disallow
Nicole Hawtin	345 / 2	Seeks that zoning of 30 Benmore Crescent, Manor Park does not permit discretionary activities such as a waste transfer station or landfill (inferred, refer to original submission).	Oppose		Disallow
John Harrison	370 / 2 370 / 3	Amend the activity status to Non-complying	Oppose		Disallow
Deborah Harrison	371 / 2	Amend the activity status to Non-complying	Oppose		Disallow
Penny Birchall	372 / 2 372 / 3	Amend the activity status to Non-complying	Oppose		Disallow
Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporated Society	377 / 5 377 / 6	GRUZ 16 amend the activity status to non complying GRUZ 17 amend the activity status to non complying or delete rule	Oppose		Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP

Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

Lynette Congdon	456 / 2	Seeks that the provisions of the Proposed District Plan which allow the construction and operation of a Waste Transfer Station are reconsidered (see original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
General Rural Zone – requested new provisions					
Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporated Society	377 / 9	Add the following policy or similar: "Require activities to be compatible with residential activities within adjoining Residential Zones."	Oppose	The focus should be on managing <i>effects at the receiving environment</i> , not requiring cross-zone compatibility in character or land use function. This policy risks being misapplied to unduly constrain essential infrastructure, including waste management facilities, even where those activities can demonstrate that adverse effects on neighbouring zones will be avoided, remedied, or mitigated to acceptable levels.	Disallow
Maps Natural & Coastal Hazard Overlays					
Manor Park and Haywards Residents Community Incorporated Society	377 / 3	Seeks amendments to the Flood Hazard Overlay to more accurately reflect hazards affecting 30 Benmore Crescent	Support	As per TKL's original submission the flood hazard maps relating to Manor Park are not accurate and flood information has been updated as a result of recent assessments.	Allow
Waste Management NZ Ltd	461 / 2a	Seeks that the flood overlay should be modified to reflect recent modelling undertaken by River Edge Consulting (shown in Figure 2 of the submission).	Support	As per TKL's original submission the flood hazard maps relating to Manor Park are not accurate and flood information has been updated as a result of recent assessments.	Allow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP

Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

Maps Zoning Commercial & Industrial					
Aalekha Gomes	76 / 2	Seeks that 30 Benmore Crescent is rezoned to mixed-use, residential and light industrial (inferred, see original submission)	Support in part	A number of rules and standards of the General Industrial Zone apply where a site “adjoins” or is “adjacent to” another zone. The proposal to rezone the railway corridor adjacent to 30 Benmore Crescent to be Medium Density Residential would invoke rules and standards that seek to maintain the residential amenity of the railway corridor.	Allow
Benmore Crescent - General					
Multiple	36/1, 38/5, 39/1, 40/1, 42/1, 43/1, 44/1, 46/1, 47/1, 49/1, 50/1, 51/1, 55/1, 56/1, 57/1, 58/1, 59/1, 60/1, 62/1, 65/1, 66/1, 68/1, 69/1, 70/1, 71/1, 72/1, 73/1, 74/1, 75/1, 76/1, 77/1, 78/1, 79/1, 80/1, 83/1, 85/1, 87/1, 88/1, 92/1, 96/1,	Seeks that the PDP provisions be retained or amended as required to ensure that any subdivision, land use, and development at 30 Benmore Place occurs in a way that avoids adverse effects on the natural environment and the existing residential Manor Park community, including its people, property, the transport network and public spaces. (Refer to original submission)	Oppose	<p>TKL disagrees that the proposed General Rural provisions for 30 Benmore Crescent are the most appropriate for the property given there is a need for more industrial land in the Hutt Valley that is well located to transport networks.</p> <p>All development should avoid or minimise adverse effects on the natural environment and surrounding community. These outcomes are already supported by the Resource Management Act and reflected in the Proposed District Plan’s provisions.</p> <p>However, to the extent that these submissions could result in additional site-specific restrictions or bespoke provisions for 30 Benmore Crescent, TKL considers that would be inappropriate.</p>	Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP

Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

	<p>102/1, 103/1, 105/1, 126/1, 127/1, 129/1, 130/1, 131/1, 132/1, 133/1, 134/1, 135/1, 136/1, 137/1, 138/1, 139/1, 140/1, 141/1, 142/1, 143/1, 144/1, 146/1, 147/1, 148/2, 149/2, 150/1, 151/1, 152/1, 153/1, 155/1, 156/1, 157/1, 158/1, 159/1, 160/1, 161/1, 162/1, 163/1, 164/1, 165/1, 166/1, 170/1, 172/1, 175/5, 176/1, 177/1, 179/1, 180/1, 185/1, 186/1, 188/1, 189/1, 191/1, 192/1, 193/1, 198/1, 201/1, 209/1, 210/1, 217/1, 219/1, 221/1, 222/1, 223/1, 226/1, 228/1,</p>			<p>The PDP is about finding appropriate zoning of land for the future sustainability of the City. To that end TKL considers that an Industrial Zone for 30 Benmore Crescent is appropriate for the long term needs of the City.</p> <p>The suitability of a specific development on this site — including any potential effects on people, property, the transport network and public spaces — is more appropriately considered through the subsequent resource consent process.</p> <p>We note that solid waste transfer stations are listed as discretionary activities under the operative general rural rules and the proposed general rural rules. Similarly a solid waste transfer station would be discretionary activity under the general industrial rules.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	--

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP**Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd**

	236/1, 250/5, 264/1, 265/1, 269/1, 275/1, 276,/1 289/1, 301/1, 305/1, 306/1, 345/1, 355/1, 356/1, 370/1, 371/1, 372/1, 382/1, 389/1, 390/1, 403/1, 406/1, 408/1, 456/1, 467/1, 485/1				
Howard McCabe	39 / 2	Seeks that a waste transfer station cannot occur at Benmore Crescent, Manor Park (decision inferred, see original submission)	Oppose	The PDP provisions for either the general rural zone and the general industrial zone categories a waste transfer station has a discretionary activity. TKL considers that the general industrial zone is appropriate for the site whether or not there is a waste transfer station. A waster transfer station is a specific activity that would be subject to a separate resource consent process.	Disallow
Yashika De Costa	92 / 2 92 / 3	Seeks that a waste transfer station does not occur at Benmore Crescent, Manor Park (decision inferred, see original submission). Seeks that a waste transfer station is not allowed in Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Geoffrey Rogers	103 / 2 103 / 3	Seeks that a waste transfer station is not allowed in Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Roy Connolly	105 / 2 105 / 3	Seeks that a waste transfer station does not occur at Benmore Crescent, Manor Park (decision inferred, see original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Morgan Phillips	126 / 3	Seeks that any form of refuge or transfer station on the banks of the Te awa Kairangi Hutt River does not occur (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose		Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP
Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

Chirag Patel	129 / 2 129 / 3	Seeks that a waste transfer station is not allowed in Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Disallow
Rowan De Costa	130 / 2 130 / 3	Seeks that a waste transfer station is not allowed in Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Disallow
Ashika Wijesinghe	133 / 2 133 / 3	Seeks that a waste transfer station does not occur at Benmore Crescent, Manor Park (decision inferred, see original submission)	Oppose	Disallow
Liesl Eksteen	136 / 2	Seeks that a waste station is not added to the area (Inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Disallow
Lindsay Streefkerk	138 / 2	Seeks that a waste transfer station is not allowed in Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Disallow
Steve Williams	148 / 2	Seeks that an industrial development, such as a waste transfer station is not undertaken at Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Disallow
Christine Williams	149 / 1 149 / 3	Seeks that an industrial development, such as a waste transfer station is not undertaken at Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Disallow
Sarah Lean	164 / 2	Seeks that a waste management site does not occur at 30 Benmore Crescent (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Disallow
Jeffrey Borra	165 / 2	Seeks that a waste management site does not occur at 30 Benmore Crescent (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Disallow
Rachel Stevenson	193 / 2	Seeks that a waste transfer station is not allowed in Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP

Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

Gavin Bint	221 / 2 221 / 3	Seeks that a waste management site does not occur at 30 Benmore Crescent (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Allison Thwaite	250 / 6	Seeks that a waste transfer station cannot occur at Benmore Crescent, Manor Park (decision inferred, see original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Richard Holt	356 / 2	Seeks that waste transfer station does not go ahead (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Maps Zoning Rural					
Grant Honey	45 / 1	Seeks to rezone Manor Park Waste Station site for house and light industry (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose	TKL opposes submissions that seek to retain the General Rural zoning of 30 Benmore Crescent or rezone the site to Residential or any zone other than General Industrial. TKL considers that the general industrial zone is appropriate for the site whether or not there is a waste transfer station. As set out in TKL's original submission, the site is not suited to rural activities and does not function as part of the rural environment. It is physically and visually separated from other rural land by urban infrastructure, including the rail corridor and transport routes, and is surrounded by urban land uses. Retaining a rural zoning does not reflect the site's strategic location or the existing infrastructure network it connects to. A General Industrial zoning is the most appropriate and efficient use of this land,	Disallow
Trevor Russ	57 / 2	Seeks that industrial proposals are not undertaken in Manor Park area (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Clem and Annette Thorn	223 / 2	Seeks that the General Rural Zone is retained for 30 Benmore Crescent (inferred, see original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Anee Rainey	292 / 1	Retain the current General Rural zoning for Manor Park (inferred, see original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Nicole Hawtin	345 / 3	Seeks that zoning of 30 Benmore Crescent, Manor Park does not permit discretionary activities such as a waste transfer station or landfill (inferred, refer to original submission).	Oppose		Disallow
Manor Park and Haywards Residents	377 / 4	Retain General Rural Zone for 30 Benmore Crescent as notified, or Rezone to a new bespoke zone or multiple split zones that contemplates a mix of open space, rural-lifestyle,	Oppose		Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP

Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd

Community Incorporated Society		residential and commercial mixed use activities; and prohibits industrial or commercial waste management related activities, including recovery parks		enabling development that contributes to economic growth and essential infrastructure provision while managing effects through established zone-based controls. Rezoning the site to Residential or retaining the Rural Zone would constrain its potential and fail to give effect to the National Policy Statement on Urban Development and the Wellington Regional Policy Statement's direction to provide sufficient development capacity for urban and industrial activities.	
Maps -Zoning / Moves between categories					
Sughandhi Fernandopulle	72 / 3	Seeks that 30 Benmore Crescent is rezoned to mixed-use, residential and light industrial (inferred, see original submission)	Oppose	TKL opposes submissions that seek to retain the General Rural zoning of 30 Benmore Crescent or rezone the site to Residential or any zone other than General Industrial. TKL considers that the general industrial zone is appropriate for the site whether or not there is a waste transfer station.	Disallow
Ruchira Fernandopulle	74 / 2		Oppose		Disallow
Bernard Fernandopulle	75 / 2		Oppose		Disallow
Carolyn Walters	87 / 2	Seeks that an industrial area is not allowed at Manor Park (inferred, refer to original submission)	Oppose		Disallow
Robert Alkema	198 / 1	Seeks that a more appropriate zoning needs to be applied to 30 Benmore Crescent.	Oppose		Disallow
Mukesh Chandra	201 / 6	Seeks that the zoning of Benmore Crescent is changed from Industrial to Rural	Oppose		Disallow

ATTACHMENT 1 – FURTHER SUBMISSION ON LHCC PDP**Submitter = Te Karearea Ltd (TKL) & Rosco Ice Cream Ltd**

Te Rūnanga o Toa Rangatira	353 / 9	Rezone 30 Benmore Crescent to special purpose industrial zone.	Support in part	TKL supports the intent of this submission, which recognises the need for tailored zoning provisions to reflect the strategic role of 30 Benmore Crescent in the city's infrastructure network. While TKL's primary submission seeks a General Industrial zoning, we support a Special Purpose Industrial Zone. This approach may allow for activity-specific provisions that support the establishment of regionally significant infrastructure in a way that is responsive to site-specific context and planning objectives	Allow
Waste Management NZ Ltd	461 / 3	Seeks that the rail corridor (as shown in figure 1 of original submission) adjacent to 30 Benmore Crescent be zoned General Industrial and opposes Medium Density Zoning	support	This is consistent with TKL's submission that sought a general industrial zone.	Allow