

DDPR_feedback_0394s	
Name	David Duff
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 30 22 07:03:25 pm
Notes	fudd08
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
	Noise
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
	Strongly oppose
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	NOISE-R4 PER-1 and PER-2
Q4	Feedback/Comments
	Along the Humber Street area in the General Industrial Zone the new noise level PER-1 suggested is good however compared it to the restrictions in PER-2, it does not appear to be realistic when approximately 20 metres east the level increases to 70 dB at all times. Is this an error ? PER-2 levels and hours should be changed to be closer to PER-1.
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q6	Feedback/Comments
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here
	My comments are to encourage more businesses to come to this area.

DDPR_feedback_0396s	
Name	David Duff
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 30 22 08:08:11 pm
Notes	fudd08
Q 1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
	General Industrial Zone
Q 2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
	Strongly oppose
Q 3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	GIZ-S3 Building setback from a road boundary.
Q 4	Feedback/Comments
	Presently the setback in Business 3 Zone is 2m from the road boundary, the draft states 10m. This must be an error and appears to have been copied from Business 4 or 6 ? It would not be suitable for the sections in the Humber Street area to set back 10m.
Q 5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	GIZ-S4 Setback from internal boundaries 1.
Q 6	Feedback/Comments
	4.5m should be reduced to 3m to 3.5m, enough gap to allow vehicles through.
Q 7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	GIZ-S5 Height in relation to boundary
Q 8	Feedback/Comments
	4m would be a better height, it would give a better commercial building option for the developer.
Q 9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	GIZ-S6 Landscaping along the road boundary
Q 10	Feedback/Comments
	Surely this is an error ? The Business 3 Rule is 1m AND "there is no requirement to plant trees in the Business 3 Zone". This draft suggestion clearly would not be suitable for the 1/4 acre sections of the existing zones.
Q 11	supporting documents?
	0
Q 12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here

GIZ-S7 Landscaping of internal boundaries

This is an error too ? I do not believe that this would work in the Business 3 zone.

GIZ-S8 Hours of operation

I do not agree that the next business 20m away (the next boundary) can operate "All Hours" at 70dB while the business on the boundary has the restrictions. The operating hours and visitors, customers, or deliveries to the activity rules should be changed to give more operating hours.

DDPR_feedback_0414s		
	Name	David Duff
	Organisation	
	Email	██████████
	Response Date	Aug 31 22 11:19:39 am
	Notes	fudd08
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on	
	Medium Density Residential Zone	
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?	
	Strongly oppose	
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
	Sorry I could not find a reference.	
Q4	Feedback/Comments	
	The setback to the General Industrial Zone boundary should be increased. Sound insulation should be of a high standard due to the GIZ noise levels.	
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q6	Feedback/Comments	
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q8	Feedback/Comments	
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:	
Q10	Feedback/Comments	
Q11	supporting documents?	
	0	
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here	

DDPR_feedback_0453s	
Name	David Duff
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 31 22 03:55:29 pm
Notes	fudd08
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
	Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
	Strongly oppose
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	SASM - in general
Q4	Feedback/Comments
	<p>Anything of importance will already be in the Treaty settlement with Ngai Tahu and that's alright. To "regard the whole of the Waitaki District as ancestral landscape, but they have identified a number of areas as having particular significance" - well what is the figure? Does that allow more areas to be added? A landowner is just that and he should not have to be concerned with this suggested new red tape. I agree that land owners have respected the sites under existing rules. I suspect these new draft plans are the beginning of stricter rules limiting land use in the future. If the minority want so much input to a property that they suggest is a SASM, they should purchase it with their own funds.</p> <p>The comment in the Mapping for Sites and Areas of Significance to Māori (SASM) clarified - "It is important to note that while the Draft District Plan would permit Mahika kai activities (customary gathering of food and natural materials) this does not override the need for landowner permission to be obtained to access private property". I doubt that WDC statement will be adhered to and arguments between trespassers and property owners will happen. Another unnecessary issue for a property owner to deal with.</p>
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	SASM-P2 Mana whenua involvement in resource management processes
Q6	Feedback/Comments
	A delay and more costs to the land owner - a WDC fee and a Mana whenua fee for the process.
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here

DDPR_feedback_0458s	
Name	David Duff
Organisation	
Email	
Response Date	Aug 31 22 04:39:18 pm
Notes	fudd08
Q1	Select the chapter you want to provide feedback on
	Signs
Q2	In general, to what extent do you support the contents of this chapter?
	Strongly oppose
Q3	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
	SIGN-P4 Signs on trailers, vehicles and vessels
Q4	Feedback/Comments
	Really ? Is this a problem ? Would this mean I cannot put a "For Sale" sign in my car window and park it on the side of the road? Or a trailer load of firewood, with a "For Sale" sign attached on the side, of the road? This would have to be the most ridiculous draft rule I have seen so far. Ease up on the rules WDC we're not a communist country.
Q5	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q6	Feedback/Comments
Q7	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q8	Feedback/Comments
Q9	Objective/Policy/Rule/Standard reference:
Q10	Feedback/Comments
Q11	supporting documents?
	0
Q12	If you need more space, or have any other general comments, please leave them here