

## 36. Industrial 1 & 1A Zones

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	<b>General</b>		
<b>2.1 Bluff Community Board</b>	General	Details need to be more prescriptive for new building in this zone regarding what is and is not allowed.	Not stated. It is considered the submitter requests the following: Council develops more prescriptive standards for new buildings within the Industrial 1 and 1A Zones.
<b>2.3 Bluff Community Board</b>	General	Council should consider some form of amenity provision for new buildings (e.g. landscaping such as that undertaken at the new Talley's premises on Foreshore Road).	Not stated. It is considered the submitter requests the following: Council develops provisions requiring new buildings to provide some form of landscaping or screening along road frontages.
<b>116.5 Kylie Fowler</b>	Industrial 1A Zone	The submitter does not support the Industrial 1A (Marine) Zone. The submitter states the importance of the maintenance of the vista between the Bluff town and the water. The submitter believes that to regain a connection with the marine environment, this area would be best zoned for dive shops, bait and tackle, cafes and tourism providers, rather than industrial activities that could potentially result in large buildings	Not specified
<b>SECTION 2.29 ISSUES. OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES</b>			
	<b>General</b>		
<b>84.2 Leven Investments Ltd, Victoria Estate Trust, Russell Cunningham Properties Ltd and Showgrounds Mall Ltd</b>	Objectives and Policies	<p>Oppose in relation to the application of the objectives and policies to the land between Victoria Ave, the railway line, Beatrice Street and the Waihopai River.</p> <p>The submitter considers that these provisions are not appropriate as the land has already been developed as a mixed use business zone, and that the range of activities listed for this Zone do not reflect the nature of activities already established on this area of land</p>	<p>Introduce plan provisions for a new Business 6 Zone (details of the proposed Business 6 Zone set out in submission).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Change the proposed zoning of the land from Industrial 1 to Business 6 Zone</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Planning map 8 to show Business 6 Zone in this area</p>

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	<b>Introduction</b>		
<b>90.15 H W Richardson Group Ltd</b>	Introduction	Oppose. The submitter considers that the requirement to restrict the hours of operation of activities and site size is unnecessary. The submitter considers these restrictions are not effects based and have the potential to unduly restrict activities with effects that are potentially less than minor	Amend the Introduction to 2.29 as follows: “...In order not to unduly affect or dominate nearby residential areas, activities within the Industrial 1 Zone will be required to manage their operations <del>within a site of less than one hectare and to confine their hours of operation to the normal working day (7.00 am – 10.00 pm).</del> <u>in accordance with the performance standards relevant to the zone.</u> ”
	<b>2.29.3 Policies</b>		
<b>103.56 Invercargill Airport Ltd</b>	Policy 2 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>53.48 NZ Transport Agency</b>	Policy 15 – Connectivity and Circulation	Support. The submitter suggest that if sites are well connected there will be a reduced requirement for vehicles to make short trips on the State highway or other roads and this will help maintain the functionality and efficiency of State highways and other strategic arterial roads.	Retain Policy 15 as proposed.
<b>53.49 NZ Transport Agency</b>	Policy 16 – Connectivity and Circulation	Support.	Retain Policy 16 as proposed.
<b>53.50 NZ Transport Agency</b>	Policy 17 – Connectivity and Circulation	Support	Retain Policy 17 as proposed.

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
<b>SECTION 3.29 - RULES</b>			
<b>26.1 NZ Defence Force</b>	3.29	<p>Oppose (in part).</p> <p>The submitter considers that the list of activities permitted in the Industrial 1 Zone does not appropriately capture NZDF's operations at their Fox Street site.</p> <p>The submitter believes that the effects of NZDF's activities are not incompatible with the effects of those activities listed as permitted, and they should therefore be included in the list of permitted activities.</p>	Specifically recognise the existing use of the site owned by NZDF at 1C Fox Street (Lot 50 DP 397399) by including defence activities in the list of permitted activities in the Industrial 1 Zone.
<b>3.3(b) Department of Corrections</b>	Activity Status	The Proposed Plan fails to make adequate provision for social and government services. Corrections related service activities and the associated facilities are service oriented activities and should be permitted activities within the Industrial 1 (Light) Zone	That community based Corrections services are provided for as permitted activities in the Industrial 1 (Light) Zone
<b>81.3 Progressive Enterprises Ltd</b>	Activity Status	The submitter considers that this Zone should make some provision for large retail stores, specifically supermarkets, where opportunities for expansion or new development are not available within the appropriate Business zoned areas of the City. The submitter suggests criteria that could be used to make this assessment.	That large format retailing activities are provided for where other locations have been ruled out as not available. (Suggested assessment criteria included in submission)
<b>74.5 Bunnings Ltd</b>	3.29.1	The submitter considers that "Building Improvement Centres" should be permitted in this Zone. The submitter considers that the scale and nature of these activities would fit the expected amenity values of industrial areas and that the location of these activities within Industrial areas will not have adverse effects on the vibrancy of town centres.	Amend to include "Building Improvement Centres"
<b>75.3 McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Ltd</b>	3.29.1	The submitter considers that "drive-through restaurants" should be permitted activities in the zones which have a low expectation of amenity and generally do not generate reverse sensitivity issues due to their separation from residential areas.	Amend to include "Drive-through restaurants"
<b>84.3 Leven Investments Ltd, Victoria Estate</b>	3.29.1	Oppose. The submitter opposes the 400m <sup>2</sup> floor area limits for retail sales. The submitter considers that many existing activities require larger floor areas than this and any extension to these activities would require	Widen the list of permitted activities to incorporate all those currently undertaken in the area.

<b>Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name</b>	<b>Plan Provision</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Decision Requested</b>
<b>Trust, Russell Cunningham Properties Ltd and Showgrounds Mall Ltd</b>		resource consent.  The submitter is also concerned that Commercial Activities and Personal and Professional Services are not listed as permitted activities but are currently undertaken within the business park located on the land between Victoria Ave, the railway line, Beatrice Street and the Waihopai River.	Introduce plan provisions for a new Business 6 Zone (details of the proposed Business 6 Zone set out in submission). AND Change the proposed zoning of the land between Victoria Ave, the railway line, Beatrice Street and the Waihopai River from Industrial 1 to Business 6 Zone AND Amend Planning map 8 to show Business 6 Zone in this area
<b>90.26 H W Richardson Group Ltd</b>	3.29.1	Oppose. The submitter considers the clauses restricting hours of operation and the size of sites to be overly onerous and not effects based.	Retain the Enterprise Zoning and associated provisions; OR Rezone all of the submitter's sites AND Amend Rule 3.29.1 by removing the provisos (A) and (B) that restrict the hours of operation and the size of lots
<b>117.46 Southern District Health Board</b>	3.29.1	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 3.29.1 by adding a new item: “(M) Caretaker/custodian accommodation complying with Rule 3.13.7”
<b>101.18 NZ Fire Service Commission</b>	3.29.1	The submitter supports this provision given that it provides for the establishment of NZFS fire stations	Retain 3.29.1
<b>75.10 McDonalds Restaurants (NZ) Ltd</b>	3.29.2	The submitter supports the default discretionary activity status for activities not otherwise provided for	Retain 3.24.2
<b>90.27 H W Richardson Group Ltd</b>	3.29.4 Height of Structures	The submitter considers the 12m height restriction as overly onerous, particularly given the nature of its existing business interests and operation needs for large warehouse buildings	Retain the existing Enterprise Zone and associated provisions; OR Rezone all of the submitter's sites AND/OR

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
			Delete the 12m height requirement as it applies to the Industrial 1 Zone, particularly to the submitter's land AND/OR Increase the permitted height within the Industrial 1 zone to 25 m
<b>101.19 NZ Fire Service Commission</b>	3.29.4 Height of Structures	Oppose. The submitter is concerned that the height provision does not allow for fire hose drying towers.	Amend 3.29.4 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>22.1 Rockgas Limited</b>	Zoning	The submitter supports that proposed changes so long as they can continue to operate as it they currently do without any need for further compliance, and that the zoning provides for minor alterations to their activities. The submitter considers that its activities are appropriately located in the Industrial 1 Zone and that they are compatible with surrounding activities.	Not specifically stated but it is considered the submitter wishes to retain the proposed zoning.
<b>116.2 Kylie Fowler</b>	Zoning	The submitter does not support the zoning of the main street of Bluff as industrial, but should be zoned for tourist based non-industrial activity. The submitter believes that the activity status rules and the definition of light industry will enable activities such as storage in this area. The submitter believes that these activities will have adverse effects on the condition of Gore Street, the footpaths and has the potential to cause traffic flow and safety issues.  The effects of industrial activities can extend beyond their sites and can cause a nuisance where the industrial activity is not compatible with surrounding land uses.	Not specifically stated. Rezone Gore Street Bluff to enable tourist based non-industrial activities.
	<b>Zoning of 'Showgrounds area'</b>		
<b>Nind Electrical 44.1</b>	Zoning	The submitter opposes the rezoning of the "Showgrounds" development from Enterprise to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:	Retain current Enterprise Zoning

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is a mixed-use commercial area and should not be zoned industrial, but instead should reflect the business development that has occurred in the area.</li> <li>2. The area was zoned Enterprise under the operative District Plan. The development in the area has reflected the policy and zoning direction of the operative District Plan. A change in zoning is a reversal of previous Council decisions.</li> <li>3. The submitter states that the operative District Plan policy has directed businesses to the "Showgrounds" area and changing the zone would be detrimental to businesses that have invested and/or established there. It is believed that the change in zoning will affect the ability of these businesses to operate over the long term and will discourage further investment in the area, and may mean that property owners are required to go through a resource consent process before being able to develop and operate their business.</li> <li>4. The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning is an attempt to direct larger industries to the Industrial 4 (Awarua) Zone.</li> <li>5. The submitter believes that the zone change is contrary to the Council's aim of providing for the future wellbeing of the community through the creation and maintenance of jobs.</li> <li>6. The submitter states that while the "Showgrounds" development is not in the City Centre it is situated close to it and is well positioned to support the commercial needs of Invercargill in a central location.</li> <li>7. The development is an asset to the City, not a threat to the CBD.</li> </ol>	

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>8. The development provides for businesses that would have had difficulties locating in the city centre for reasons such as size of sites, need for on-site parking, and consent requirements associated with heritage sites.</p>	
<p><b>49. 1 Fraser Family Trust</b></p>	<p>Zoning</p>	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of the “Showgrounds” development from Enterprise to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is a mixed-use commercial area and should not be zoned industrial, but instead should reflect the business development that has occurred in the area.</li> <li>2. The area was zoned Enterprise under the operative District Plan. The development in the area has reflected the policy and zoning direction of the operative District Plan. A change in zoning is a reversal of previous Council decisions.</li> <li>3. The submitter states that the operative District Plan policy has directed businesses to the “Showgrounds” area and changing the zone would be detrimental to businesses that have invested and/or established there. It is believed that the change in zoning will affect the ability of these businesses to operate over the long term and will discourage further investment in the area, and may mean that property owners are required to go through a resource consent process before being able to develop and operate their business.</li> <li>4. The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning is an attempt to direct larger industries to the Industrial 4 (Awarua) Zone.</li> <li>5. The submitter believes that the zone change is contrary to the Council’s aim of providing for the future wellbeing of the</li> </ol>	<p>Not stated.</p>

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>community through the creation and maintenance of jobs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6. The submitter states that while the “Showgrounds” development is not in the City Centre it is situated close to it and is well positioned to support the commercial needs of Invercargill in a central location.</li> <li>7. The development is an asset to the City, not a threat to the CBD.</li> <li>8. The development provides for businesses that would have had difficulties locating in the city centre for reasons such as size of sites, need for on-site parking, and consent requirements associated with heritage sites.</li> </ol>	
<b>61.1 Blackwood Protector</b>	Zoning	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of the “Showgrounds” development from Enterprise to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is a mixed-use commercial area and should not be zoned industrial, but instead should reflect the business development that has occurred in the area.</li> <li>2. The area was zoned Enterprise under the operative District Plan. The development in the area has reflected the policy and zoning direction of the operative District Plan. A change in zoning is a reversal of previous Council decisions.</li> <li>3. The submitter states that the operative District Plan policy has directed businesses to the “Showgrounds” area and changing the zone would be detrimental to businesses that have invested and/or established there. It is believed that the change in zoning will affect the ability of these businesses to operate over the long term and will discourage further investment in the area, and may</li> </ol>	Retain current Enterprise Zoning



Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>mean that property owners are required to go through a resource consent process before being able to develop and operate their business.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning is an attempt to direct larger industries to the Industrial 4 (Awarua) Zone.</li> <li>5. The submitter believes that the zone change is contrary to the Council's aim of providing for the future wellbeing of the community through the creation and maintenance of jobs.</li> <li>6. The submitter states that while the "Showgrounds" development is not in the City Centre it is situated close to it and is well positioned to support the commercial needs of Invercargill in a central location.</li> <li>7. The development is an asset to the City, not a threat to the CBD.</li> <li>8. The development provides for businesses that would have had difficulties locating in the city centre for reasons such as size of sites, need for on-site parking, and consent requirements associated with heritage sites.</li> </ol>	
<b>84.1 Leven Investments Ltd, Victoria Estate Trust, Russell Cunningham Properties Ltd and Showgrounds Mall Ltd</b>	Zoning	<p>Oppose the zoning of land between Victoria Ave, the railway line, Beatrice Street and the Waihopai River.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the proposed zoning of the land warrants reconsideration as it does not reflect the established land use activities present in the area or permitted under the current Plan.</p> <p>The submitter considers that the zoning does not take into account development that has occurred to date which has required considerable</p>	<p>Introduce plan provisions for a new Business 6 Zone (details of the proposed Business 6 Zone set out in submission). AND Change the proposed zoning of the land from Industrial 1 to Business 6 Zone AND Amend Planning map 8 to show Business 6 Zone in this area</p>

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		investment from the developer, tenants and property owners.	
98.1 Ian and Sonya Crook	Zoning	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of the “Showgrounds” development from Enterprise to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is a mixed-use commercial area and should not be zoned industrial, but instead should reflect the business development that has occurred in the area.</li> <li>2. The area was zoned Enterprise under the operative District Plan. The development in the area has reflected the policy and zoning direction of the operative District Plan. A change in zoning is a reversal of previous Council decisions.</li> <li>3. The submitter states that the operative District Plan policy has directed businesses to the “Showgrounds” area and changing the zone would be detrimental to businesses that have invested and/or established there. It is believed that the change in zoning will affect the ability of these businesses to operate over the long term and will discourage further investment in the area, and may mean that property owners are required to go through a resource consent process before being able to develop and operate their business. The Enterprise Zoning reduced compliance costs</li> <li>4. The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning is an attempt to direct larger industries to the Industrial 4 (Awarua) Zone.</li> <li>5. The submitter believes that the zone change is contrary to the Council’s aim of providing for the future wellbeing of the community through the creation and maintenance of jobs.</li> <li>6. The submitter states that while the “Showgrounds” development is not in the City Centre it is situated close to it and is well positioned</li> </ol>	Retain current Enterprise Zoning

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>to support the commercial needs of Invercargill in a central location.</p> <p>7. The development is an asset to the City, not a threat to the CBD. It is located just outside the CBD with a future transport link to the north.</p> <p>8. The development provides for businesses that would have had difficulties locating in the city centre for reasons such as size of sites, need for on-site parking, and consent requirements associated with heritage sites.</p> <p>9. The establishment of the business park involved considerable investment</p> <p>10. The area appeals to businesses with mixed trading.</p>	
<b>108.1 Brendan Akeroyd – Stonewood Homes</b>	Zoning	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of the “Showgrounds” development from Enterprise to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is a mixed-use commercial area and should not be zoned industrial, but instead should reflect the business development that has occurred in the area.</li> <li>2. The submitter states that the development on the site reflect the policy direction and zoning of the operative District Plan</li> <li>3. Developers have purchased property in the area with a view to developing commercial activities in the future.</li> </ol>	Retain current Enterprise Zoning
<b>110.1 Dave Edminston (Invercargill)</b>	Zoning	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of the “Showgrounds” development from Enterprise to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:</p>	Retain current Enterprise Zoning

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Glass & Mirror Ltd)		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is a mixed-use commercial area and should not be zoned industrial, but instead should reflect the business development that has occurred in the area.</li> <li>2. The area was zoned Enterprise under the operative District Plan. The development in the area has reflected the policy and zoning direction of the operative District Plan. A change in zoning is a reversal of previous Council decisions.</li> <li>3. The submitter states that the operative District Plan policy has directed businesses to the "Showgrounds" area and changing the zone would be detrimental to businesses that have invested and/or established there. It is believed that the change in zoning will affect the ability of these businesses to operate over the long term and will discourage further investment in the area, and may mean that property owners are required to go through a resource consent process before being able to develop and operate their business.</li> <li>4. The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning is an attempt to direct larger industries to the Industrial 4 (Awarua) Zone.</li> <li>5. The submitter believes that the zone change is contrary to the Council's aim of providing for the future wellbeing of the community through the creation and maintenance of jobs.</li> <li>6. The submitter states that while the "Showgrounds" development is not in the City Centre it is situated close to it and is well positioned to support the commercial needs of Invercargill in a central location.</li> <li>7. The development is an asset to the City, not a threat to the CBD.</li> </ol>	

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>8. The development provides for businesses that would have had difficulties locating in the city centre for reasons such as size of sites, need for on-site parking, and consent requirements associated with heritage sites.</p>	
<p><b>111.1 Neville Hayes</b></p>	<p>Zoning of 18 Victoria Avenue</p>	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of 18 Victoria Avenue to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is a mixed-use commercial area and should not be zoned industrial, but instead should reflect the business development that has occurred in the area.</li> <li>2. The area was zoned Enterprise under the operative District Plan. The development in the area has reflected the policy and zoning direction of the operative District Plan. A change in zoning is a reversal of previous Council decisions.</li> <li>3. The submitter states that the operative District Plan policy has directed businesses to the “Showgrounds” area and changing the zone would be detrimental to businesses that have invested and/or established there. It is believed that the change in zoning will affect the ability of these businesses to operate over the long term and will discourage further investment in the area, and may mean that property owners are required to go through a resource consent process before being able to develop and operate their business.</li> <li>4. The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning is an attempt to direct larger industries to the Industrial 4 (Awarua) Zone.</li> <li>5. The submitter believes that the zone change is contrary to the Council’s aim of providing for the future wellbeing of the</li> </ol>	<p>Oppose the zoning of 18 Victoria Avenue as Industrial 1 and support a new Business 6 zone (details of proposed Business 6 Zone specified in submission)</p>

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>community through the creation and maintenance of jobs.</p> <p>6. The submitter states that while the “showgrounds” development is not in the City Centre it is situated close to it and is well positioned to support the commercial needs of Invercargill in a central location.</p> <p>7. The rezoning of the land to Industrial 1 fails to recognise the activities being carried out as existing uses as well as those activities which have been issued a Certificates of Compliance d in accordance with the Enterprise Sub-Area zoning.</p>	
<b>112.1 Marine South Limited</b>	Zoning	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of the “Showgrounds” development from Enterprise to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The submitter bought properties on Bill Richardson on the grounds that the Enterprise zoning ensured “future proofing” for their business.</li> <li>2. The Industrial 1 zoning would devalue their property</li> <li>3. The zoning does not reflect the current use of the area as mixed-use commercial development</li> <li>4. The Council has tried to attract new business into the area and is now changing it's view</li> </ol>	Retain the current district plan provisions as they relate to the Bill Richardson Drive area.
<b>113.1 Allan McPhee and John Lyons (A J Auto Electrical)</b>	Zoning	<p>The submitter opposes the rezoning of the “Showgrounds” development from Enterprise to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is a mixed-use commercial area and should not be zoned industrial, but instead should reflect the business development that has occurred in the area.</li> <li>2. The area was zoned Enterprise under the operative District Plan. The development in the area has reflected the policy and zoning direction of the operative District Plan. A change in zoning is a reversal of previous Council decisions.</li> </ol>	Retain current Enterprise Zoning

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3. The submitter states that the operative District Plan policy has directed businesses to the “Showgrounds” area and changing the zone would be detrimental to businesses that have invested and/or established there. It is believed that the change in zoning will affect the ability of these businesses to operate over the long term and will discourage further investment in the area, and may mean that property owners are required to go through a resource consent process before being able to develop and operate their business.</li> <li>4. The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning is an attempt to direct larger industries to the Industrial 4 (Awarua) Zone.</li> <li>5. The submitter believes that the zone change is contrary to the Council’s aim of providing for the future wellbeing of the community through the creation and maintenance of jobs.</li> <li>6. The submitter states that while the “Showgrounds” development is not in the City Centre it is situated close to it and is well positioned to support the commercial needs of Invercargill in a central location.</li> <li>7. The development is an asset to the City, not a threat to the CBD.</li> <li>8. The development provides for businesses that would have had difficulties locating in the city centre for reasons such as size of sites, need for on-site parking, and consent requirements associated with heritage sites.</li> </ol>	
<b>114.1 Chris O’Sullivan</b>	Zoning	The submitter opposes the rezoning of the “Showgrounds” development from Enterprise to Industrial 1 on the following grounds:	Retain current Enterprise Zoning

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The area is a mixed-use commercial area and should not be zoned industrial, but instead should reflect the business development that has occurred in the area.</li> <li>2. The area was zoned Enterprise under the operative District Plan. The development in the area has reflected the policy and zoning direction of the operative District Plan. A change in zoning is a reversal of previous Council decisions.</li> <li>3. The submitter states that the operative District Plan policy has directed businesses to the "Showgrounds" area and changing the zone would be detrimental to businesses that have invested and/or established there. It is believed that the change in zoning will affect the ability of these businesses to operate over the long term and will discourage further investment in the area, and may mean that property owners are required to go through a resource consent process before being able to develop and operate their business.</li> <li>4. The submitter is concerned that the change in zoning is an attempt to direct larger industries to the Industrial 4 (Awarua) Zone.</li> <li>5. The submitter believes that the zone change is contrary to the Council's aim of providing for the future wellbeing of the community through the creation and maintenance of jobs.</li> <li>6. The submitter states that while the "Showgrounds" development is not in the City Centre it is situated close to it and is well positioned to support the commercial needs of Invercargill in a central location.</li> <li>7. The development is an asset to the City, not a threat to the CBD.</li> </ol>	



Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		<p>8. The development provides for businesses that would have had difficulties locating in the city centre for reasons such as size of sites, need for on-site parking, and consent requirements associated with heritage sites.</p>	