

51. Section Five - Appendices

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Appendix I - Information to Accompany Applications		
18.105 Environment Southland	2(g)	The submitter suggests adding an introductory statement “Whether or not the site is mapped as being within or adjacent to a hazard overlay. The submitter believes applicants or their representatives are overly reliant on the hazard overlays, especially the flood overlay, to indicate the actual or potential existence of hazards, but the flood hazard overlay does not map all areas subject to actual or potential inundation.	Preface the existing statement with statement “Whether or not the site is mapped as being within or adjacent to a hazard overlay,”
65.123 ICC Environmental and Planning Services	3	Support subject to amendment. The submitter notes that s219 of the RMA has been repealed and therefore should be removed from the provision of the Plan	Remove reference to s219 of the RMA
18.106 Environment Southland	3(d)(vi)	The submitter suggests that the locations of watercourses should be required to be shown on applications because they are relevant to natural hazard, public access and protection of waterways from stock provisions of the Plan.	Amend the provision to read “Topographical features including <u>watercourses</u> , buildings, fences and hedges”
18.107 Environment Southland	3(d)(viii)	The submitter suggests the provision should be consistent with 2(g) of Appendix I. The submitter also suggests that the consideration of hazards, in particular the flood hazard, should not be limited to areas identified on the hazard information maps.	Amend the provision to read “Whether or not the site is mapped as being within or adjacent to a hazard overlay, an assessment of how the proposal will affect or be affected by any hazard, and any measures proposed to avoid, remedy or mitigate these effects and the effects of those measures and where necessary the required hazard assessment form completed by a suitably qualified expert and signed as accepted by the applicant.”
115.8 New Zealand Historic Places Trust	2(i)	The submitter states that as with the requirements of subdivision applications, it is appropriate for applications for land use consent to provide information on the location of significant heritage values at	Add the following clause to Appendix I.2(i): <i>(?) The location of any significant heritage features or</i>

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		the time of lodging an application.	<u>archaeological sites, including any feature that is listed in Appendix II of this Plan.</u>
	Appendix II – Heritage Record		
65.124 ICC Environmental and Planning Services	Identifier column	The submitter notes that there are some identifiers that are out-of-date and should be accurate as at the date the Proposed Plan becomes operative	Update the identifier column of the Heritage Record
115.9 New Zealand Historic Places Trust	General	The submitter supports the inclusion of the Heritage Record in the District Plan and that the NZHPT registrations are recognised. However, the submitter questions the exclusion of the Shaw's Building at 146 from the Heritage Record. The submitter states that this building was listed in the operative District Plan and that they are not aware that the building had been demolished or removed.	Adopt Appendix II Heritage Record in its current form except for the following amendment: Add <u>Shaw's Building, 146 Dee St, Invercargill</u> to the Record if this building still exists.
116.4 Kylie Fowler	D B Bluff Hotel (Flynn's Club Hotel) – Reference Number 1	The submitter asserts that the Club Hotel in Bluff is not listed with NZHPT and should be removed from the Appendix	Remove the listing of the D B Bluff Hotel (Flynn's Club Hotel) from Appendix II
7.3 Southern District Health Board	Southland Hospital (Former) - Reference Number 47	The submitter asserts that the "Southland Hospital (Former) should not be included in the District Plan. They believe the extent of listing within the New Zealand Historic Places Trust registration is inaccurate because of the demolition of a number of buildings covered by this listing. The legal description of the listing covered the whole hospital site, whereas the buildings are only located on some of the parcels of land listed. There is also an outstanding resource consent application to demolish more of the structures covered by this listing. The submitter believes that the buildings are at risk of collapse and are not suitable for use as a Hospital Activity. The submitter believes that the need to obtain resource consent to modify or demolish the buildings covered by this listing does not allow for the sustainable management of the Hospital site.	Remove the listing of the "Southland Hospital (Former) from Appendix II
65.125 ICC Environmental	Spotlight (Former Macaulays Building	The submitter notes that the legal description for 33 Leven Street should be updated	Replace the legal description with: "Lot 1 DP 387059"

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
and Planning Services	Façade) Reference Number 155		
	Appendix III – Statutory Acknowledgements		
77.67 Te Runaka o Waihopai and Te Runaka o Awarua	1.6 More Information	Update address details	Amend address to: Toitu Te Whenua Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu 71 Corsair Drive Wigram P O Box 13046 Christchurch 8141
	Appendix IV – Schedule of Requirements and Designations		
78.28 Ministry of Education	Designation 7 Bluff Community School	Support subject to amendment correcting legal description	Amend legal description as follows: “Lots 1-12 Block VII DP 225_Campbelltown Hundred
78.28 Ministry of Education	Designation 17 James Hargest College – Senior Campus	Support subject to amendment of typo	Amend school description as follows: “James Hargest College – Senior Campus”
78.29 Ministry of Education	Designation 18 New River Primary School	Support subject to amendment of address and legal description	Amend address to read: “117 Elizabeth Street and 407 Ness Street , Invercargill” AND Amend legal description to read: “...Part Lots 1 and Let 3 DP2205, Lot 8 DP9827”
78.30 Ministry of Education	Designation 29 Southland Girls' High School	Support subject to amendment of address	Amend address to read: “328 and 350 Tweed Street, Invercargill”
79.1 KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Designation 54	Support in part. The submitter notes that the requiring authority is now KiwiRail Holdings Ltd, not New Zealand Railways Corporation	Amend designation 54 by inserting KiwiRail Holdings Ltd as the requiring authority
16.1 Roger	Designation 62	Oppose. The submitter is concerned the Notice of Requirement	Not stated.

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Leader		documentation appears to include contradictory references to the maximum height of structures on the site (the description of the nature of the work refers to a maximum height of 10m while the proposed conditions in Appendix D refer to a maximum height of 11m). The submitter is also concerned that the noise levels could be greater than they are now, and questions whether any provisions will be made for noise control.	
27.1 Denis Harvey	Designation 62 – Notice of Requirement – Appendix D Item 1.	Oppose. The submitter is concerned at the conflicting information provided in the Notice of Requirement documentation that refers to two different maximum height standards for structure, and considers this anomaly needs to be clarified, as does the question of the type of structure that would be extending to the maximum height. The submitter strongly objects to the inclusion in the designation of the right to erect tall structures without notification to potentially affected parties i.e. neighbours	Not stated.
27.2 Denis Harvey	Designation 62 Notice of Requirement – Appendix D Item 3.	The submitter does not consider their property to be ‘publicly accessible’ and that this affords them no protection from electric and magnetic fields.	That the clause ‘within publicly accessible areas’ should be changed to ‘beyond the substation boundary’ or ‘at the boundary of neighbouring properties’.
27.3 Denis Harvey	Designation 62 Notice of Requirement – Appendix D Item 4.	The submitter notes that this clause does not make any reference to low frequency noise emissions from the site. The submitter explains that the transformer currently on the site emits a low frequency humming noise and that as a result of testing following a complaint it was agreed that a noise attenuating barrier be erected to alleviate the problem, which took place soon after the substation was commissioned.	That the designation should incorporate a ‘requirement’ that noise barriers be erected around any equipment emitting low frequency noise.
102.23 Chorus NZ Ltd	Chorus’s designations	The submitter considers that the conditions on their designations should be included in the District Plan	Include the conditions as proposed by Chorus in the District Plan
104.21 Telecom NZ Ltd	Telecom’s designations	The submitter considers that the conditions on their designations should be included in the District Plan	Include the conditions as proposed by Telecom in the District Plan as they apply to Telecom’s designations
104.22 Telecom NZ Ltd	Telecom’s designations	The submitter has identified a number of errors, in particular: Designation 46 - Telecom NZ Ltd is the primary and sole requiring	Amend the Schedule of Requirements and Designations to accurately reflect the submitter’s

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		authority, not the secondary requiring authority Designation 43 and 45 – Telecom NZ has sought secondary designations for these sites and would like this recorded	reflect the submitter's status
	Appendix VI – Noise Sensitive Insulation Requirements		
103.73 Invercargill Airport Ltd	General	Support. The Airport considers the standards are consistent with current best practice.	Retain Appendix VI
117.50 Southern District Health Board		The submitter supports the provisions subject to amendments. The submitter believes that provisions are practical and enabling noise sensitive activities indoors without reasonable noise while sustainably managing nearby airport physical resources of the District, however notes typographical errors.	Support provisions, subject to amendments: a. After heading “OCB” amend “40dB” to “40 dBA” b. After heading “SESEB” amend “65Db” to “65 dB” and amend “40Db” to “40 dBA”
	Appendix VII Hazardous Substances		
64.23 Department of Conservation	Ecotoxic hazardous substances	Oppose in part. The base class thresholds for ecotoxic hazardous substances do not reflect the quantity or toxicity of the hazardous substances to be stored.	Review Appendix VII to reflect the toxicity and quantity of the active ingredients such as 1080, brodifacoum, pindone and diphacinone found in baits used in pest animal control operations
71.68 NZAS Ltd	General	Oppose. The submitter opposes the inclusion of this Appendix, in particular because the submitter considers the limits are inconsistent with those set under the HSNO Act and associated regulations	Delete Appendix VII
	Appendix VIII – Transport Standards		
79.38 KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	New Standard	The submitter suggests that a new standard be inserted to require sightlines around railway level crossings. The submitter has developed an access way restriction and ‘sight triangles’ which create areas free of physical obstructions (erected, placed or grown). The diagram is sought to address the need to avoid the poor location of land uses including structures, vegetation and signage which can	Inset new standard for “Safe Sightline Distances” as provided in submission entitled “Railway Level Crossing Sight Triangles and Explanations”

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
		obstruct the required safety sightlines for railway level crossings.	
53.87 NZ Transport Agency	1. Car Parking Standards - (3)	Support. The submitter considers that the use of the term “access route” is uncertain, as access routes can refer to State highway functions, through to footpaths and cycleways. A more appropriate term would be footpath in this instance.	Amend standard 3 as follows: (3) <i>Where the required parking area is outside the building, it shall connect to the building via a footpath.</i>
53.88 NZ Transport Agency	1. Car Parking Standards - (4)	Support. The submitter considers that the use of the term is vague, and could potentially be misconstrued as referring to standards for road development.	Amend standard 4 by either: (a) Amending the standard to refer to on site parking or carpark aisle areas; or (b) Inserting a definition of “vehicle circulation routes”.
53.89 NZ Transport Agency	1. Car Parking Standards - (4)(a)	The submitter considers it is not clear not clear whether the “pedestrian access route” referred to in this standard has the same meaning as “access route” referred to in standard 3. For consistency, the same term should be used for both, and in our view that term should be footpath.	Amend standard 4 (a) as follows: <i>Where pedestrians have to use the vehicles circulation route to reach a footpath the widths shall be increased by 800mm.</i>
53.90 NZ Transport Agency	1. Car Parking Standards - (7)	Oppose The submitter does not the inclusion of provisions applying to the servicing of building by courier vans only. This does not take business growth or existing use rights into consideration, and will result in inadequate loading facilities for some activities.	Delete standard 7.
53.91 NZ Transport Agency	2. Manoeuvring Standard	The submitter considers the standard would benefit from better use of explanatory labels, and should be titled as being for private motor cars.	Amend the standard to clearly identify that it relates to manoeuvring for private motor cars, and provide better labels to enhance understanding and legibility.
69.15 Roading Manager	2. Manoeuvring Standard	Support in part. The submitter considers that the drawing should be noted as that for a “standard car” and is not appropriate for other sizes of vehicles	Amend the diagram to note that it is for a “standard car”
	Appendix IX – Schedule of Heavy Industries		
15.40 Ballance Agri-Nutrients		The submitter considers that the term ‘fertiliser works’ is inconsistent with other language used within the schedule and is somewhat	That Section Five – Appendix IX – Schedule of Heavy Industries be adopted as notified with the exception of

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
Ltd		ambiguous, and notes that the terms 'manufacture' and 'storage' are used throughout the schedule and provide a more accurate description of activities.	'fertiliser works', which Ballance seek to be amended to ' <u>Fertiliser manufacture, processing and storage</u> '.
34.10 Silver Fern Farms Ltd		Support with amendment. The submitter explains that their operations encompass modern integrated slaughter and further processing facilities, far removed from the freezing works of old, and that a change in terminology would better reflect the operation.	Retain inclusion of descriptors to include Silver Fern Farms activities in the appendix for the purpose of being included under the definition of Heavy Industrial and therefore a permitted activity in Industrial 3. However, change the terminology to better reflect modern operations. It is suggested that the terms "Abattoir and Slaughterhouse" and "Meat works – killing, freezing and packing" are replaced with " <u>Meat processing facility</u> ".
120.3 Open Country Dairy Ltd		The submitter considers that dairy processing should be included in the definition of Heavy Industry	Amend Appendix IX to include Dairy Processing in the Schedule of Heavy Industries defined as permitted activities in the Industrial 3 (Large) Zone
	Appendix X – Concept Plans		
NZ Transport Agency 53.92	General	Support. The submitter notes that the format of the Concept Plans is not standards and considers that some plans are illegible.	Standardise the format of concept plans used, and ensure their legibility.
107.25 A4 Simpson Architects Limited	1. Concept Plan – CBD – July 2013	The submitter opposes the inclusion of the CBD concept Plan in the District Plan	Replace the concept plan with an alternative concept plan developed by the submitter
	Appendix XI – Council's Reticulated Sewerage Systems		
70.3 ICC Water Services Manager	General	The submitter considers that this should be extended to included ICC water reticulation network as there is a strong link between the provision of water and sewerage services.	Extend to include the ICC reticulated water network

Submission No. and Point / Submitter Name	Plan Provision	Summary of Submission	Decision Requested
	Appendix XII – NES For Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to Protect Human Health		
13.15 Z Energy Ltd	General	Support. The submitter supports the inclusion of the NES in the District Plan	Retain.
65.126 ICC Environmental and Planning Services	HAIL	The submitter considers that it would be useful to include the HAIL in the District Plan	Include the HAIL List in the Appendix