



## **OPERATIVE SOUTHLAND DISTRICT PLAN 2001**

### **TE ANAU INDUSTRIAL RESOURCE AREA EXPANSION PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 5**

#### **Summary of Decisions Requested by Persons making Submissions**

IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 7 OF THE  
FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991

Prepared by: SDC Resource Management Department staff - Luke McSoriley

Date: 5 December 2009

1. **Submitters and Addresses for Service (numbered as received)**

No	Submitter	Address	Wish to be Heard	Joint Case
1.	Noeline Lois Evans	42 Lawson Burrows Crescent, Te Anau 9600	N	N
2.	E A Loose	8 Sunderland Street, Te Anau 9600	N	Not stated
3.	David Thomas Healy	D T Healy, 8 Donald Ross Place, Te Anau 9600	N	N
4.	Bill Verrall	32 Howden Street, Te Anau 9600	Y	Perhaps
5.	Gary Andrew Barnes	61 Fergus Square, Te Anau 9600	N	N
6.	Lu Tyree	PO Box 10, Te Anau 9640	N	Y
7.	Neil Rutherford Borland	22 Botting Place, Waverley, Dunedin 9013	N	Y
8.	Paul Phelan	79 Sandy Brown Road, Te Anau 9600	Not stated	Y
9.	Margaret Alison Northmore	PO Box 9201, Wellington 6141	Not stated	Not stated
10.	Te Ao Mārama Incorporated	C/- D Whaanga, Te Ao Mārama Incorporated, PO Box 7078, South Invercargill 9844	N	N
11.	Fish and Game Southland	Jacob Smyth, Southland Fish and Game, PO Box 159, Invercargill 9840	Y	Y
12.	Arthur John Henderson	78 Dublin Street, Invercargill 9810	N	N
13.	New Zealand Transport Agency	PO Box 5245, Dunedin 9058	Y	Y
14.	Director General of the Department of Conservation	C/- Community Relations Manager, Department of Conservation, PO Box 743, Invercargill 9840	Y	Y
15.	Environment Southland	Private Bag 90116, Invercargill 9840	Not Stated	Not Stated
16.	Christopher Edward Hughes	RD 1, Te Anau 9679	Y	Y
17.	Glenys Kay Dickson	68 Norton Street, Gore 9710	N	Y
18.	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	C/- Kristina Mead, Beca Carter Hollings & Ferner Limited, PO Box 13960, Christchurch 8141	Y	Y

2. **Summary of Decisions Requested by Persons making submissions on Proposed Plan Change No. 5: Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion**

<b>Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion</b>			
<b>Submitter number/point</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>
1.	Noeline Lois Evans	I agree with the proposed Industrial Resource Area Expansion.	Not stated.
2.	E A Loose	I support this Plan Change as Te Anau develops there will be further need to have land available for industry. The proposed area is very suitable for this purpose.	That the area indicated on the map becomes an Industrial Resource Area.
3.	David Thomas Healy	I support this proposed Plan Change because it is a good idea keeping all industry in the one area.	Not stated.
4.	Bill Verrall	If possible the relocation - over time - of the existing industrial zone should occur in the proposed Buchanan zone. It is ridiculous to house the industrial zone 'cheek by jowl' with residential expansion. Also a major scenic eyesore for new residential growth on a higher level as the town spreads outward. A longer term approach needs to be taken to the set up of the industrial area. No consent - industrial or residential should be made to this area until it is adequately protected from flooding.	Resite industrial area. Protect the area immediately to the west of the Upukerora River and all Te Anau from river flooding.
5.	Gary Andrew Barnes	Supports all four proposed Plan Changes.	Not stated.
6.	Lu Tyree	I support the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion except the area backing on to Blatch Road opposite the existing subdivided sections on Riverside. Access to the Industrial Resource Area should be off Sandy Brown Road and thus protect residential sections on Blatch Road.	Council should reduce size of Industrial Resource Area to keep the industrial area away from existing Blatch Road subdivision and residences.
7.	Neil Rutherford Borland	I support the proposal - space for industrial development must be provided for and the location is suitable.	I support the Plan Change.

<b>Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion</b>			
<b>Submitter number/point</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>
8.	Paul Phelan	<p>Oppose proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increased noise, traffic, dust and rubbish in the area.</li> <li>2. Increased residential developments close to proposed industrial area.</li> <li>3. No proposed shelter belt (planting of trees) between the two areas.</li> <li>4. Increased industrial traffic on Sandy Brown Road - noise, speed, safety and road maintenance.</li> </ol>	Not stated.
9.	Margaret Alison Northmore	I support this proposal.	Not stated.
10.	Te Ao Mārama Incorporated	Te Ao Mārama Incorporated having viewed the information provided on the four proposed Plan Changes to the SDC Plan 2001 which related to Te Anau township and adjoining areas submit as follows. Plan Change 5 is supported.	Not stated.
11.	Fish and Game Southland	<p>The proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion would be located to the east of the existing industrial area toward the Upukerora River. We are concerned that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A change in zoning to cater for industrial development will result in an increase in run-off and stormwater in the future;</li> <li>2. Any untreated discharges of run-off and stormwater to the Upukerora River could result in a lowering of water quality and reduction in native and sport fish habitat; and</li> <li>3. The visual amenity of the Upukerora River would be reduced if industrial buildings are constructed close to the river.</li> </ol> <p>It is unclear whether there is currently any reticulated stormwater system or sewerage servicing the proposed Plan Change area.</p>	We are opposed to the proposed Plan Change 5 and wish to see it declined.

<b>Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion</b>			
<b>Submitter number/point</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>
11.	Continued	<p>We are concerned that the Section 32 report does not adequately address issues with respect to the potential for the amenity values of the Upukerora River and its terraced margins to be diminished by the subdivision, use and development of the area.</p> <p>We are concerned that the Section 32 report does not provide any suggestions or comment on how the visual effects of development within the Plan Change area which is parallel to the Upukerora River will be managed and/or mitigated. We consider that it is erroneous to claim that the proposed Plan Change will maintain the amenity values of the area because they are influenced by existing industrial use. The proposal will sanction industrial development closer to the Upukerora River and its margins than is currently the case.</p> <p>We are aware that conditions were imposed on the Wickham subdivision which restricted building to sites set back from the Upukerora River. The proposed Plan Change should include design controls, including rules governing density, height, colour schemes and site coverage and rules providing for the creation of a buffer scenic zone utilising plantings and any natural contours of the land to screen industrial development from the Upukerora River. A combination of landscaping and plantings could serve as a buffer to noise from industrial activities which are likely to be ongoing should the proposed Plan Change proceed.</p>	

<b>Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion</b>			
<b>Submitter number/point</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>
11.	Continued	<p>Opposed to Plan Change 5 in the absence of sufficient detail and certainty being included with respect to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4. The supply of water and the treatment and disposal of stormwater, run-off and sewage from within the expansion area;</li> <li>5. The use of pervious surfaces, water holding and stormwater design options that minimise adverse effects of water flows on existing water bodies within and adjoining the expansion area;</li> <li>6. The capture and re-use of water within the expansion area; and</li> <li>7. Design controls, including rules governing density, height, colour schemes and site coverage and the creation of a buffer scenic zone utilising plantings and any natural contours of the land to screen industrial development from the Upukerora River.</li> </ol>	
12.	Arthur John Henderson	I support the specific provisions in Plan Change 5. This is a sensible proposal which gives scope for expansion in an area adjoining the existing Industrial area. Handy enough to be convenient and relatively out of the sight.	That the proposed Plan Change be adopted.

<b>Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion</b>			
<b>Submitter number/point</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>
13.	New Zealand Transport Agency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NZTA is concerned about the actual and potential effects of the proposed Plan Change on the Milford Road (SH 94)/Blatch Road intersection. NZTA has been involved in a number of consents within the subject site and in most cases has sought to protect this intersection from any increase in traffic movements associated with an increase in industrial activity. Access to the subject site is primarily via Sandy Brown Road, and should continue to be so until such times as the Milford Road (SH 94)/Blatch Road intersection has been upgraded. The proposed Plan Change will place additional pressure on this intersection, which will in turn result in pressure for the NZTA to improve the intersection. It is NZTA's view that it should be incumbent on developers within the new Industrial Resource Area to address the effects of their activities.</li> <li>2. NZTA suggests the proposed Plan Change should include provisions for establishing a threshold whereby developers in the new Industrial Resource Area are required to contribute towards upgrading the Milford Road (SH 94)/Blatch Road intersection and accommodate associated traffic movements. Alternatively the proposed Plan Change should be amended to restrict access to the subject site to the existing access off Sandy Brown Road.</li> </ol>	That if the Council accept the proposed Plan Change, it does so subject to considering, and where appropriate, implementing the change requested in this submission or similar outcomes.

<b>Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion</b>			
<b>Submitter number/point</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>
14.	Director General of the Department of Conservation	<p>The Department of Conservation is tasked with the preservation so far as practicable of all indigenous freshwater fisheries and protection of freshwater fish habitats.</p> <p>As detailed in within Section 3.6 of the District Plan “Higher building densities cab adversely impact on ground and surface water quality and quantity”. As a result, Council should establish rules, policies and procedures to manage stormwater run-off and discharge from activities located within the expanded industrial resource area so that it does not negatively impact on the adjacent Upukerora River.</p> <p>That Council work with Environment Southland to ensure that appropriate rules, policies and procedures exist to manage stormwater run-off and discharge from activities located within the expanded industrial resource area.</p>	That Council consider developing a landscape plan for the eastern boundary of the proposed Industrial Resource Area, thus ensuring that the natural values users associate with the Upukerora River are not impacted by the Industrial Resource Area expansion.
15.	Environment Southland	Environment Southland does not feel it is necessary to submit on Plan Changes 5, 6 or 7 to the District Plan.	Environment Southland’s previous comments to the discussion document released by Southland District Council regarding possible Te Anau Plan Changes have been addressed to our satisfaction.
16.	Christopher Edward Hughes	I support the industrial expansion but the proposed boundary may need altering.	Not stated.
17.	Glenys Kay Dickson	I support the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion with careful planning to mitigate run-off into the Upukerora River.	Changes to the District Plan to reflect this proposal. Careful management of greywater.

<b>Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion</b>			
<b>Submitter number/point</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>
18.	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. NZFS are responsible for ensuring the provision of appropriate fire-fighting water supplies and access suitable for fire-fighting purposes. Appropriate fire-fighting water supplies and access must be made available.</li> <li>2. The Plan Change states that “the site is capable of servicing for water”. No description is given of the level of service capable. The reticulated supply in the existing industrial area is FW3. Given this supply, future building consents should limit the size of buildings and types of hazards permitted. If an application is made for a higher Fire Hazard Category, the reticulated supply will need to be boosted or adequate on-site storage provided.</li> <li>3. The New Zealand Fire-Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice allows for the provision of ‘alternative fire-fighting water sources’. If an alternative source of fire-fighting water is chosen the applicant should seek the advice and approval of the NZFS to ensure that the access and flow provided meet the standards of the Code of Practice.</li> <li>4. The on-site storage required for industrial activities will vary depending on the size of the fire cells, the activities undertaken on-site and the level of reticulation. In the event that an appropriate fire-fighting water supply is not established on each allotment within the extended area then the operational efficiency of the NZFS may be compromised.</li> </ol>	NZFS seeks confirmation that development within the Industrial Area will meet the Code of Practice. This may involve limiting the activities which can occur within the extended area to those that fall within the FW3 classification or requiring additional storage for those that exceed this classification.

3. **Summary of Decisions Requested by Persons making submissions on Proposed Plan Change No. 5: Industrial Resource Area Expansion - General Comments**

<b>Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion</b>			
<b>Submitter number/point</b>	<b>Submitter</b>	<b>Summary of Submission</b>	<b>Summary of Decision Requested</b>
14.	Director General of the Department of Conservation	<p>Te Anau has a long history of occupation and further notes that while some sites of historic significance have been recorded, it is likely that other sites have yet to be recorded.</p> <p>The Department of Conservation has a responsibility to advocate for the conservation of natural and historic resources generally.</p>	The Director General would be supportive of Council emphasising the importance of undertaking appropriate archaeological investigations in this area prior to undertaking works which may damage historic resources.