

## 31. Business 3 Zone

Submitter Name/Submission No. and Point	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
<b>SECTION 2.24 - ISSUES, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES</b>			
	<b>Introduction</b>		
<b>65.61 ICC Environmental and Planning Services</b>	Introduction	The submitter notes that there are no areas zoned as Business 3 that fit within the definition outlined in (C).	Remove clause (C) from the introduction
	<b>2.24.3 Policies</b>		
<b>3.4 Department of Corrections</b>	Policy 1 Business 3 (Specialist Commercial) Zone	The Objectives and Policies in the proposed plan fail to make adequate provision for the full range of community and government services.	Amend the explanation to Policy 1 by deleting the last sentence as follows:  “ <b>Explanation:</b> ...  The zone is not intended to make provision for the likes of a shopping mall, where retail franchises are grouped within a hall or building and the retail activity is more “comparison” in nature. <del>Neither is the zone intended to make provision for office buildings.</del> ”
<b>65.62 ICC Environmental and Planning Services</b>	Policy 1 Business 3 (Specialist Commercial) Zone	Support subject to amendment of typo	Remove comma between the words “locations” and “which”
<b>28.2 Harvey Norman Properties (NZ) Ltd and Harvey Norman Stores (NZ) Pty Ltd</b>	Policy 2 Activities and Policy 3 Protection of Business 1 Zone	Oppose. The submitter considers that the general thrust of the objectives is to provide for “destination” specialist retail which is more typically associated with Large Format Retail or supermarket activities, and that Policy 2 and 3, by seeking to restrict the range and scale of activities within the zone, therefore contradicts the overall intent of the zone.	Delete Policy 2  Amend Policy 3 as follows: <i>‘Protection of Business 1 Zone: To <del>restrict</del> manage the range and scale of activities within the Business 3 zone to avoid erosion of critical mass within the Central Business District’.</i>

Submitter Name/Submission No. and Point	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
<b>103.54 Invercargill Airport Ltd</b>	Policy 5 Noise	Oppose in part. The submitter believes that there should be provisions relating specifically to the management of noise sensitive activities affected by the airport noise contours	Insert additional policies for areas affected by the airport noise contours that: a. set out to prohibit noise sensitive activities; and b. to require existing buildings containing noise sensitive activities in these areas to be appropriately designed to mitigate the effects of aircraft noise.
<b>53.38 NZ Transport Agency</b>	Policy 10 Signage	The submitter considers that the intent of Policy 10 (A) is insufficiently clear as to what the nuisance effects of signage are to the State highway. The submitter considers that this policy should be reworded to define what the effects of concern are in this regard.	Reword Policy 10 (A) as follows: <u>"To provide for signage associated with business and activities within the Business 3 Zone, while avoiding nuisance to users of the airport and the Railway, and avoiding safety impacts and distraction for users of the State highway."</u>
<b>53.39 NZ Transport Agency</b>	Policy 11 Billboards	Support. However, the submitter notes that no definition of billboard appears to have been incorporated in the Plan. 'Billboard' as a term can relate to either the content of the sign, or its size, and this requires clarification.	Either: (a) Amend the wording to refer to hoardings, which are defined in the Plan; or (b) Insert a definition of billboard.
<b>65.63 ICC Environmental and Planning Services</b>	Policy 11 Billboards	Oppose. The submitter considers the wording of this policy is too strong	Replace "prohibit" with another verb such as "restrict"
<b>103.55 Invercargill Airport Ltd</b>	2.24.3 Policy 15 Height of Structures	Support. The submitter considers it appropriate to acknowledge that areas within this zone are affected by obstacle limitation surfaces and that this will impact on the height of buildings	Retain Policy 15
<b>53.40 NZ Transport Agency</b>	Policy 16 Connectivity and Circulation	The submitter considers that Policy 16 (B) is not clear as to the Council's policy on activities affecting the State Highways within this zone. The policy identifies recognition and maintenance of the functionality of the State highway, however the explanation does not provide additional detail as to how this will occur or what it means. The submitter considers it likely that the Council is expecting to adopt an approach similar to that in other Business Zones in the Plan, and as such, we seek a similar relief.	Reword Policy 16 (B) as follows: <u>"To avoid impacts of activities within the zone on the functionality of the State highway network."</u>  Amend the explanation to the policy by adding the below sentence: <u>"Failure to provide parking, loading and manoeuvre areas can result in the use of the State highway for these activities, which means that the efficiency and</u>

Submitter Name/Submission No. and Point	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
			<u>effectiveness of the highway can be compromised."</u>
<b>65.64 ICC Environmental and Planning Services</b>	Additional Policy CPTED	The submitter notes that there are no policies specifically relating to CPTED within the Business 3 Zone and suggests that there could be a policy "encouraging" CPTED principles to be considered to be consistent with the objectives and policies in the other Business zones.	Include a Policy – Crime prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED) <u>"To encourage the following CPTED principles are incorporated into the design of buildings and public spaces:</u> (A) <u>Awareness of the environment</u> (B) <u>Visibility by others</u> (C) <u>Finding help"</u>
<b>3.25 RULES</b>			
<b>74.11 Bunnings Ltd</b>	General – Bulk and location rules	Support. The submitter considers these provisions provide an acceptable balance between enabling developing and maintaining amenity	General support for bulk and location controls
<b>75.16 McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Ltd</b>	General – Bulk and location rules	Support. The submitter considers these provisions provide an acceptable balance between enabling developing and maintaining amenity	General support for bulk and location controls
<b>28.1 Harvey Norman Properties (NZ) Ltd and Harvey Norman Stores (NZ) Pty Ltd</b>	3.25.1 (H)	Oppose. The submitter considers that the rule contradicts the overall intent of the Business 3 (Specialist Retail) Zone which is to provide for activities that cannot locate in centres and are destination stores and vehicle orientated.  The submitter explains that Large Format Retail activities such as Harvey Norman are key retail anchors and destination activities that draw customers from a wide catchment, including rural Southland. Harvey Norman itself is vehicle orientated as a result of this destination function and due to some of the large goods it sells. Large Format Retail stores have large footprints that are often less suited or unable to located in central CBD locations and are better located on the fringe of the CBD where there are good transport connections and where they	Amend Rule 3.25.1(H) to allow for retail stores with a Gross Floor Area of greater than 400m2 as a permitted activity.

Submitter Name/Submission No. and Point	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>can support the role and function of smaller speciality retail and other core activities occurring in the CBD.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the provision of smaller stores outside the CBD is more likely to undermine the CBD than the provision of Large Format Retail activity in such locations.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the proposed Business 1, Business 2 and Business 4 zones all allow retail sales regardless of size.</p>	
<b>74.4 Bunnings Ltd</b>	3.25.1	The submitter considers that "Building Improvement Centres" should be permitted in this Zone as it considers that these activities are suitable in areas identified for large format, destination retail stores.	Amend 3.25.1 by inserting "Building Improvement Centres"
<b>75.2 MacDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Ltd</b>	3.25.1	The submitter considers that "Drive-through restaurants" should be permitted in this Zone as it considers that these activities are appropriate within this Zone. The submitter considers that drive-through restaurants have different characteristics from traditional restaurants due to their vehicle-based destination characteristics, and do not consider that they will detract from the vibrancy and vitality of the CBD	Amend 3.25.1 by inserting "Drive-through restaurants"
<b>117.44 Southern District Health Board</b>	3.25.1	The submitter supports the provision in part subject to amendment. The submitter believes that caretaker / custodian accommodation should be a permitted activity, subject to acoustic insulation rules	Amend 3.25.1 by adding a new item: "(M) Caretaker/custodian accommodation complying with Rule 3.13.7"
<b>101.14 NZ Fire Service Commission</b>	3.25.1 Permitted activities	The submitter supports this provision given that it provides for the establishment of NZFS fire stations	Retain 3.25.1
<b>28.4 Harvey Norman Properties (NZ) Ltd and Harvey Norman Stores (NZ) Pty Ltd</b>	3.25.4 (A)	The submitter supports this provision as it allows for a maximum height which is suitable for a specialist commercial zone and reflects the scale of existing activities and the size of the site.	Not stated.

Submitter Name/Submission No. and Point	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
<b>101.15 NZ Fire Service Commission</b>	3.25.4 Height of Structures	Oppose. The submitter is concerned that the height provision does not allow for fire hose drying towers.	Amend 3.24.4 by including the following exemption: <u>"Except: that the maximum building height for hose drying towers associated with fire stations is 15 metres."</u>
<b>ZONING</b>			
<b>28.3 Harvey Norman Properties (NZ) Ltd and Harvey Norman Stores (NZ) Pty Ltd</b>	Zoning	The submitter supports the proposed Business 3 zoning, subject to the changes requested in submission point 28.1 and 28.2 below, as it represents a positive change from the Domicile Sub-area zoning under the Operative Plan and more appropriately recognises the existing activity on the site.	Not stated.
<b>99.1 Sandra Cooper</b>	Zoning	<p>The submitter considers that 102, 110, 116 and 120 Elles Road should be rezoned Business 3, not Residential 1.</p> <p>The area is currently being used for some destination retailing and services, and the submitter would like to develop the remainder as a veterinary clinic.</p> <p>The submitter considers that these activities cause little adverse effects, the location is appropriate for this type of activity particularly in terms of visibility. The submitter considers that at least part of the site would not be desirable and would not be appropriate for residential development</p>	Rezone 102, 110, 116 and 120 Elles Road as Business 3