

32. Business 4 (Neighbourhood Shop) Zone

| Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name | Plan Provision | Summary of Submission | Decision Requested |
|---|--------------------------|---|--|
| SECTION 2.25 – ISSUES, OBJECTIVE AND POLICIES | | | |
| | 2.25.2 Objectives | | |
| 53.41 NZ Transport Agency | New objective | The submitter considers that the effects of spot zones have been underestimated in this section of the Plan. Neighbourhood shops as provided for are a useful method of dealing with travel demand management, however the Plan does not recognise that the traffic effects of these activities require careful management. The submitter notes that this matter has been reflected in the proposed inclusion of Policy 13, but that policy is unsupported by an appropriate objective. | Insert a new Objective 4 as follows: <i>The protection of the functional requirements of State highways from the effects of small scale commercial activities on sites within the Business 4 (Neighbourhood Shop) Zone, along highways.</i> |
| | 2.25.3 Policies | | |
| 80.7 Twisted World Ltd | Policy 7 Signage | Oppose. The submitter opposes the requirement that signage should relate to the activity being undertaken in the site. The submitter considers the policy should be effects based and that assessment carried out on a case-by-case basis. | Amend Policy 7 by deleting (A) and the explanation: “(A) Relates to the activity being undertaken on the premises on which the sign is situated.” |
| 65.65 ICC Environmental and Planning Services | Policy 8 Billboards | Oppose. The submitter considers the wording of this policy is too strong | Replace “prohibit” with another verb such as “restrict” |
| 80.8 Twisted World Ltd | Policy 8 Billboards | Oppose. The submitter considers this policy does not have planning rationale and believes that private billboards can have public appeal and interest as much as public bill boards | Delete Policy 8 |
| 65. 65 ICC Environmental and Planning Services | Policy 11 Demolition | The submitter questions why this policy is different to that in the Business 3 Zone, particularly why sites in this zone should be utilised for car parking or open space | No remedy specified |
| 65.66 ICC | Policy 12 Height | Support subject to amendment of typo | Reword: |

| Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name | Plan Provision | Summary of Submission | Decision Requested |
|---|-----------------------------|---|--|
| Environmental and Planning Services | of Structures | | "Any building higher than the residential neighbours two storeys in the Business 4 Zone would be out of scale with the <u>residential</u> neighbourhood." |
| 53.42 NZ Transport Agency | Policy 13 Car Parking | Support | Retain Policy 13 as proposed. |
| SECTION 3.26 RULES | | | |
| 117.45 Southern District Health Board | 3.26.1 Permitted activities | 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 3.26.1 by adding a new item: "(M) Caretaker/custodian accommodation complying with Rule 3.13.7" |
| 101.16 NZ Fire Service Commission | 3.26.1 Permitted activities | The submitter supports this provision given that it provides for the establishment of NZFS fire stations | Retain 3.26.1 |
| 101.17 NZ Fire Service Commission | 3.26.4 Height of Structures | Oppose. The submitter is concerned that the height provision does not allow for fire hose drying towers. | Amend 3.26.4 by including the following exemption: <u>"Except: that the maximum building height for hose drying towers associated with fire stations is 15 metres."</u> |