

### 33. Business 5 (Rural Service) Zone

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	<b>General</b>		
<b>53.43 NZ Transport Agency</b>	General	The submitter supports the description of the Business 5 Zone and the inclusion of a Concept Plan for this zone. The submitter agrees with the explanation that providing for the co-location of activities in one contiguous area on one side of the highway will prevent ribbon development and minimise vehicle movements across the State highway.	Retain the description of the Business 5 (Rural Service) Zone as proposed.
<b>107.24 A4 Simpson Architects Limited</b>	General	The submitter opposes this Zone. The submitter states that the reasons for the existence of the zone are not clear and is concerned that there are no permitted activities in the Zone. The submitter is concerned that the relevant Concept Plan does not detail discretionary activities	Delete Zone and revert to Rural zoning
<b>SECTION 2.26 – ISSUES, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES</b>			
	<b>2.26.2 Objectives</b>		
<b>53.44 NZ Transport Agency</b>	New Objective	The submitter supports the philosophy behind the establishment of the Business 5 zone, but considers that the effects of spot zones have been underestimated in this section of the Plan. The submitter states that appropriately located Rural Service type retail zones provide an opportunity for convenience and efficiency for rural activities, and are a useful method of dealing with travel demand management. The submitter considers, however, that 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 Policies 1 and 17, but that these policies are unsupported by an appropriate objective.	Insert a new Objective 3 as follows: <u>“The protection of the functional requirements of State highways from the effects of small scale commercial activities on sites within the Business 5 (Rural Service) Zone, along highways.”</u>
	<b>2.26.3 Policies</b>		
<b>53.45 NZ Transport</b>	Policy 1 – Business (Rural	Support	Retain Policy 1 as proposed.

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Agency	Service) Zone		Amend typographical error in Policy 1 as follows: “To establish and implement a Business 5 Zone at or near the intersection of State highways 6 and <del>98</del> 99 and on the <del>east</del> west side of State Highway 6, in order.....”
88.25 Federated Farmers	Policy 1 – Business (Rural Service) Zone	Support in part. The submitter considers that the majority of rural servicing businesses are already established outside this zone and these businesses should be able to operate from their current locations into the future, and that this intention should be made explicit in the relevant provisions. The submitter also suggests that new rural businesses should be able to utilise premises outside the zone previously used for rural servicing activities in order not to make the cost of setting up a rural servicing business in Invercargill uneconomic.	Amend the wording of the policy as follows:  <b>Policy 1 Business (Rural Service) Zone:</b> To establish and implement a Business 5 Zone at or near the intersection of State Highways 6 and 98 and on the east side of State Highway 6, in order to provide an appropriate and convenient location for activities <u>not currently established</u> , which:  (A) Supply goods and services primarily to the rural sector and (B) Which require easy and convenient access to the rural sector without perpetrating ribbon development.
65.68 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”
53.46 NZ Transport Agency	Policy 17 - Connectivity	Support.	Retain Policy 17 as proposed.
<b>SECTION 3.27 RULES</b>			
88.93 Federated	Rule 3.27.4	Oppose. The submitter considers that a maximum building height of 10m	The submitter recommends a 15 metre height limit for

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Farmers		is unrealistic considering the nature of the agricultural equipment likely to be housed in such buildings, and the land efficiencies and cost-effectiveness of having offices and staff facilities located on a storey above display areas.	buildings in this zone.
<b>ZONING</b>			
<b>93.1 K G Richardson and Sons Ltd</b>	Zoning	<p>The submitter opposes the Rural 1 zoning of the submitter's land on the north west corner of the "Lorneville Roundabout", and considers that it should be rezoned as Business 5 (Rural Service) Zone. The submitter considers the Business 5 Zone would be more appropriate given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. the location of the land in relation to the existing Business 5 Zone and other light industry/rural servicing type activities</li> <li>b. the location of the land in relation to transportation routes</li> <li>c. the history of the site, including industrial, residential and commercial activities and the inability of the land to be utilised as a viable farming unit</li> <li>d. the ability of the site to use on-site servicing options</li> <li>e. the resource consent for the properties allowing for rural service and light industrial activities</li> </ul>	Rezone the submitter's property on the north west corner of the "Lorneville Roundabout" Business 5