

42. Residential 1

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
SECTION TWO ISSUES, OBJECTIVES AND POLICIES			
2.36.1 Issues			
107.8 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	Issue 1	The submitter objects in part to Issue 1. The quality of the city's housing stock is not dependant on development and redevelopment. Refurbishment and maintenance of existing housing stock can ensure high quality residential accommodation. In addition areas of older housing stock that have been maintained can add considerably to the amenity of the City.	Amend the wording of Issue 1
107.5 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	Issue 3	The submitter opposes Issue (3) on the grounds that there is a conflict between point 3 and objective 3.	Delete paragraph 3 of 2.36.1 Issues.
2.36.2 Objectives			
78.13 Ministry of Education	Objective 4	Support because most schools are within the Residential 1 Zone	Retain Objective 4
53.58 NZ Transport Agency	Objective 7	Support.	Retain Objective 7 as proposed.
2.36.3 Policies			
78.16 Ministry of Education	Policies	Neutral. The submitter suggests that there is no policy that supports Objective 4	Include a Policy that supports educational activities and other communities activities
107.9 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	Policy 1 – Residential 1 Zone - Explanation	The submitter opposes the explanation to Policy 1 on the grounds that it does not relate to the policy.	Retain (E) as the explanation for Policy 1. Move the remainder of the explanation, (A) – (D), to the introduction for the residential sections of the Plan.
107.10 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	Policy 1 – Residential 1 Zone – Explanation (D)	The submitter opposes explanation (D) in part where it refers to population decline, as the 2013 Census data shows population growth	Delete “at worst population decline is a possibility” from Policy 2.36.3 Policy 1 Explanation, and all similar wording throughout the Plan.

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
53.59 NZ Transport Agency	Policy 3 – Urban Design	Support. The submitter suggests having a similar policy in place in the District Wide section of the plan to removed unnecessary duplication.	Retain Policy 3, but consider introducing it to the District Wide issues section of the Plan.
67.5 ICC Drainage Manager	Policy 4 Stormwater runoff	Support subject to amendment. The submitter notes that the policy refers to the incorporation of impermeable surfaces, where is should be referring to “permeable” surfaces. The submitter also considers the explanation requires rewording as it is currently inaccurate.	Amend Policy 4 by replacing “impermeable” with permeable” AND Amend the 2 nd sentence of the explanation to read: “... <u>Currently, Invercargill’s residential stormwater systems are designed for immediate runoff to the stormwater system of 55% of design rainfall, with the remaining 45% being retained within permeable surfaces such as lawns and gardens. Increasing areas of impermeable surfaces can compromise stormwater capacity...</u> ”
65.75 ICC Environmental and Planning Services	Policy 4 Stormwater runoff	Support, subject to amendment of the policy which the submitter believes inaccurately details the anticipated stormwater run-off percentages	Amend policy by either amending the wording to be accurate or remove this statistic.
107.11 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	Policy 4 Stormwater runoff	The submitter states that stormwater runoff can be mitigated by means other than those referred to in Policy 4.	Amend the Plan provisions in residential areas to acknowledge other means of addressing stormwater runoff
53.60 NZ Transport Agency	Policy 5 - Choice	Oppose. The submitter believes the policy is not consistent with the policy directive provided by Policy 1, and this contradiction creates confusion for plan users. Further, the submitter does not consider it appropriate to include a policy in the Plan that encourages a resource consent application in a manner such as this.	Amend Policy 5 (B) as follows: To encourage comprehensively designed medium density development in the Residential 1A zone.
107.13 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	2.36.3 Policy 5 Choice	The submitter opposes references to Queenstown, Te Anau and Manapouri which he believes have no relevance to the policy	Delete the first sentence of the explanation for 2.36.3 Policy 5.
65.76 ICC Environmental and Planning	2.36.3 Policy 6 Outdoor Living	Support subject to amendment of drafting error	Amend explanation as follows: “...Several lines of reasoning draw to a conclusion

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Services			that this minimum dimension should be <u>at least five and a half metres...</u> "
107.12 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	2.36.3 Policy 6 Outdoor Living	The submitter opposes this policy on the grounds that he believes Council should not be telling people how to design their outdoor living space	Delete 2.36.3 Policy 6
65.77 ICC Environmental and Planning Services	Policy 8 Space around buildings	Support subject to amendment of explanation which refers to the site coverage requirements that are inconsistent with the rules	Amend the explanation: "...if more than <u>35%</u> 40% of the site is covered..."
103.59 Invercargill Airport Ltd	2.36.3 Policy 9 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	Address reverse sensitivity issues for areas affected by the airport noise contours by inserting additional policies: a. to require new buildings, and alterations to existing buildings, containing noise sensitive activities in these areas to be appropriately designed to mitigate the effects of aircraft noise; and; b. to restrict the density of development in these areas.
107.14 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	2.36.3 Policy 12 Electrical Interference	The submitter opposes the inclusion of this provision on the grounds that he believes it is covered by relevant National Environmental Standards	Delete 2.36.3 Policy 12
65.78 ICC Environmental and Planning Services	Policy 13 Lightspill	Support subject to amendment of drafting error as the submitter considers the Council should not be taking responsibility for minimising lightspill	Amend wording: "To minimise <u>prevent nuisance from</u> lightspill"
53.61 NZ Transport Agency	Policy 21 - Car parking and vehicle manoeuvring	Support.	Retain Policy 21 as proposed.
65.78 ICC	Policy 21 Car	Support, subject to amendment of the explanation and the reasons given	Rewrite explanation to reflect the intention of the

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Environmental and Planning Services	parking and vehicle manoeuvring	for requiring on-site car parking	policy.
SECTION 3.34 RULES			
83.6 Philip Orr	General	The submitter considers that the matters of discretion are good and should be in every design of a home, however the submitter considers that design professionals should be able to provide the expected amenity within the recession planes without Council rules stipulating how this is to be achieved	Relief not specified
107.1 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	General - Outdoor living space	The submitter asserts that banning cars from the outdoor living area is unnecessary.	Relief not specified
78.19 Ministry of Education	Rule 3.34.1	Support inclusion of educational activities in the list of permitted activities	Retain 3.34.1
25.1 David Falconer	Rule 3.34.4	The submitter opposes the introduction of a maximum residential density of 400m ² per residence. The submitter believes that NZ is facing decreasing housing affordability and adding these restrictions on housing supply can contribute to making housing less affordable. The submitter argues that other cities have allowed greater residential density, especially in residential zones close to city centres.	The Residential 1A Zone should enable greater residential density of at least one residence per 300m ² and enable one residence per allotment with approved subdivision consent as at 30 July 2013.
72.2 Southland Registered Master Builders	3.34.4 Residential Density	The submitter considers that 400m ² is too large to subdivide in some areas.	Amend the residential density requirement to one residence per 350m ²
83.3 Philip Orr	3.34.4 Residential Density	The submitter questions the residential density of 400m ²	Not stated
107.15 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	3.34.4 Residential Density	Opposes the introduction of a minimum lot size of 400m ² . The submitter asserts that good design should be able to provide dwellings on sections smaller than 400m ² .	Delete Rule 3.34.4 Residential Density
65.110 ICC Environmental and Planning	3.34.8 Incidence of Sunlight and Outdoor Living	Support in part. The submitter considers that within the designated area of outdoor living space, conservatories should be able to be erected.	Amend 3.34.8 to include a statement that "Within the designated area of outdoor living space

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Services			conservatories may be erected”
83.4 Philip Orr	3.34.8 Incidence of Sunlight and Outdoor Living	<p>The submitter questions the 5.5m circle and the minimum area of 30 square metres. The submitter also raises concerns about the term “main glazing of main living area” suggesting that it may be better to replace this with “opening door to outdoor living space” to ensure that the area can be accessed from the living space.</p> <p>The submitter considers that there are alternative design options available to ensure solar gain between the hours of 9.30 and 15.30 on midwinter’s day, other than as stipulated within the proposed standard.</p>	Not specified.
107.20 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	3.34.8 Incidence of Sunlight and Outdoor Living	Oppose. The submitter is concerned about the potential restrictions for owners of buildings built under earlier District Plan and District Schemes on east west sections	Amend rule to provide for extensions to existing dwellings built to comply with historic yard requirements and located on east to west sections.
83.5 Philip Orr	3.34.12 Space Around Buildings	Oppose. The submitter considers the current wording unclear, particularly in relation to the required length of the yard.	Not specified
72.1 Southland Registered Master Builders	3.34.16 Site Coverage	Oppose. The submitter considers that 35% is too restrictive and could encourage people to build up.	Amend the site coverage limit to 40%
107.18 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	3.34.16 Site Coverage	<p>The submitter opposes the 35% site coverage limit throughout the Plan and the grounds that it is too restrictive.</p> <p>The submitter notes that the Plan provides for 10m in height, and that a structure that height will have more effect on residential amenity than a dwelling that exceeds 35% site coverage.</p>	Delete site coverage requirement
ZONING			
9.1 Southland Racing Club	Zoning	The submitter would like their land fronting onto Racecourse Road to be rezoned from Rural 2 to Residential 1. The submitter believes that given the recent Bupa development that a rural zoning of the submitter’s land would be inappropriate	Rezone the submitter’s land fronting onto Racecourse Road as Residential 1.
62.1 A4 Somerset Development Ltd	Zoning	The submitter would like their property at 12 Somerset Lane to be shown as entirely within the Residential 1 Zone, not split between the Rural 2 and Residential 1 Zones.	Rezone 12 Somerset Lane as entirely within the Residential 1 Zone

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		The submitter considers that the nature of the property and its environment is such that rural activities are not appropriate or probable, and its Rural zoning is contrary to Part 2 of the RMA.	
90.34 H W Richardson Group Ltd	Zoning	The submitter would like 33 Hunt Street and 1/33 Hunt Street zoned Residential 1 not Industrial 1, as the submitter considers this appropriate given the submitter's projections for the future use of the land and nature of the surrounding land uses	Rezone 33 Hunt Street and 1/33 Hunt Street as Residential 1
92.1 Bonish Consultants	Zoning	<p>The submitter would like the land bound by Mclvor Rd, North Rd, Northside Drive, and Donovan Park zoned Residential 1, not Rural 2 on the grounds that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The land is considered desirable for development shown by the significant level of development undertaken in recent years b. Residential 1 zoning with an outline development plan would ensure coherent development with good connectivity and reduce the likelihood of piecemeal development with a lack of coordination with adjacent areas c. The amenity of the area is suited to residential use with the level of existing development being such that it is unable to be practicably farmed 	Rezone the land bound by Mclvor Rd, North Rd, Northside Drive, and Donovan Park as Residential 1