

REPORT TO RESOURCE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Meeting Date: 1 - 3 JUNE 2010

Subject: DECISIONS ON PROVISIONS AND MATTERS RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 10 OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RESOURCE MANAGEMENT ACT 1991 - **TE ANAU INDUSTRIAL RESOURCE AREA EXPANSION PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 5 TO OPERATIVE SOUTHLAND DISTRICT PLAN 2001**

File No.: 360/35/4/10

Report by Mr Luke McSoriley, Senior Resource Management Planner - Policy dated 10 May 2010.

1. **SUMMARY OF REPORT**

This report has been commissioned by the Southland District Council (SDC) in accordance with Clause 10 of the First Schedule; and Section 42A of the Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) to consider all submissions received following the public notification of proposed Plan Change 5 and to make recommendations on those submissions and further submissions.

The background information to this Plan Change is contained within the Section 32 evaluation prepared for the Southland District Council at the time this plan change was notified. For reference purposes, this evaluation is attached to this report in Appendix 1.

A large number of properties in Te Anau's existing Industrial Resource Area as identified in the Operative District Plan have been developed and are currently occupied. The high occupancy rate of the existing Industrial Resource Area has meant that land available for further industrial development is limited in supply. Plan Change 5 seeks to ensure that there is capacity to meet current demand for industrial land in Te Anau while also providing a suitable area for future industrial growth.

The Section 32 report evaluated a range of options to achieve an effective planning regime with respect to providing for industrial development including retaining the status quo - make no change to the District Plan, expanding the existing Industrial Resource Area and establishing a new Industrial Resource Area in another part of Te Anau.

Signature

Author

Executive Staff

1. **SUMMARY OF REPORT Continued**

This report:

- outlines the statutory provisions relevant to the plan change process;
- discusses general issues
- discusses both the original and further submissions received following the public notification of this plan change;
- makes recommendations as to whether or not those submissions should be accepted or rejected; and
- concludes with an overall summary of the preceding discussion in the report.

A total of 19 submissions and 1 further submission were received on proposed Plan Change 5. Submissions received sought a range of outcomes and the submissions and further submission are discussed in more detail further in this report.

This report concludes that the most appropriate option available is an expansion of the existing Te Anau Industrial Resource Area. Providing an expanded area for industrial activity will ensure that there is capacity for current demand while also providing a suitable area for future industrial growth in Te Anau.

2. **RECOMMENDATION**

- (a) THAT THE REPORT ON SUBMISSIONS ON THE PROPOSED TE ANAU INDUSTRIAL RESOURCE AREA EXPANSION - PLAN CHANGE 5 BE RECEIVED BY THE COMMITTEE.
- (b) THAT THE COMMITTEE CONSIDERS PROVISIONS AND MATTERS RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS ON PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE 5.
- (c) THAT THE COMMITTEE CONSIDERS THE STAFF COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR DECISIONS ON SUBMISSIONS AS DETAILED IN THIS REPORT AND ANY FURTHER POINTS AS INDICATED AT THE MEETING.
- (d) THAT THE COMMITTEE MAKES DECISIONS ON PROVISIONS AND MATTERS RAISED IN SUBMISSIONS.

3. **REPORT**

3.1 **Background**

The Southland District Council and the Te Anau Community Board are seeking to provide a more coordinated approach to emerging environmental issues and growth pressures in the Te Anau Basin.

A large number of existing properties in the Te Anau Industrial Resource Area have been developed and are occupied by a range of businesses. This high occupancy rate has meant that land available for further industrial development is limited. Another indicator of industrial growth in Te Anau is the number of resource consent applications processed for this type of land use in recent years. A number of resource consent applications for industrial development in areas outside the existing Industrial Resource Area have been processed.

The Council has also noted an increase in the number of compliance issues associated with un-consented industrial activities being undertaken in Resource Areas where they are not permitted as of right.

3.2 **Options Considered**

The following options have been considered under Section 32 of the Resource Management Act 1991 (the Act):

- Retain status quo - make no change to the provisions of the Southland District Plan 2001.
- Locate a new Industrial Resource Area elsewhere in Te Anau.
- Expand Te Anau's existing Industrial Resource Area.

3.3 **Policy and Plan Considerations**

This section of the report briefly sets out the statutory framework within which the Council must consider submissions. Section 4 of the Section 32 report for proposed Plan Change 5 details further the key provisions of the Resource Management Act relevant to the proposed plan change (see Appendix 1).

Regional Policy Statement for Southland 1997

The Regional Policy Statement for Southland provides an overview of the resource management issues of the Southland region. It also states the objectives, policies and methods to achieve integrated management of the region's natural and physical resources. Southland District Council is required to give effect to the matters set out in the Regional Policy Statement under the Resource Management Act 1991. Section 5.10 'Built Environment' of the Regional Policy Statement details a number of provisions that are considered relevant to the proposed Te Anau Plan Changes including the following objectives and policies;

5.10.3 OBJECTIVES

Objective 10.1

To achieve the sustainable management of the built environment in such a way that the needs of future generations are met.

Objective 10.2

To maintain and enhance the environmental quality of the Region's built environment.

Objective 10.5

To minimise the adverse effects of the built environment on natural and physical resources.

5.10.4 POLICIES

Policy 10.1

Encourage development and use of the built environment that provides for the efficient use of existing facilities and infrastructure while simultaneously avoiding the development of unnecessary additional infrastructure.

Policy 10.7

Recognise that changes to one component of the built environment can have adverse effects on other components of the built environment.

Preparation, implementation and administration of District Plans is recognised in this section as a key method for achieving the built environment objectives outlined above.

5.10.5 METHODS OF IMPLEMENTATION

Method 10.5

Prepare, implement and administer Regional and District Plans

In preparing Regional and District Plans, regard is required to be given to the integrated management of the effects of the use, development and protection of land and associated resources.

Proposed Plan Change 5 is considered to be an appropriate method to achieve the built environment objectives outlined above. The Southland District Council will be able to give effect to the Regional Policy Statement 1997 if Proposed Plan Change 5 is approved.

Te Tangi a Taurira 2008

Iwi Management Plans must be taken into account when changing district plans. Te Tangi a Taurira - The Cry of the People is the relevant Ngāi Tahu ki Murihiku Natural Resource and Environmental Iwi Management Plan. The following policy from this document is considered relevant to proposed Plan Change 5;

3.5.7 Subdivision and Development

1. *Require iwi involvement in local authority planning processes that establish zoning provisions, including decisions pertaining to where subdivision and development is considered appropriate or inappropriate.*

The Southland District Council has formally consulted with the tāngata whenua of the area, through Te Rūnanga o Ngāi Tahu (iwi authority) and Te Ao Mārama Inc (the agency authorised to represent Te Rūnaka o Awarua, Hokonui Rūnanga, Ōraka/Aparima Rūnaka, Waihōpai Rūnaka). A submission in support of Plan Change 5 was received from Te Ao Mārama Inc.

3.4 Consideration of Community Views

The Te Anau Community Board and the Southland District Council have been discussing for some time a number of possible changes to the Southland District Plan 2001. The proposed Plan Changes seek to provide a more proactive response to growth management issues within the Te Anau Basin.

This Plan Change process began in 2007, with a series of workshops in Te Anau focussed on growth issues. Te Anau Community Board members and Southland District Council staff were involved in the initial workshops which were then followed by two public meetings in May and September 2007. A series of key concepts were presented as possible Plan Changes at these two public meetings.

The next step in the process involved the release of a discussion document entitled "Possible Te Anau Plan Changes" in June 2008. This document outlined six possible Plan Changes relating to Te Anau and the Council received 244 feedback responses. The community feedback received in response to the discussion document was reported back to the Te Anau Community Board in September 2008. This report included a summary of the feedback received and included staff recommendations on each of the six possible Plan Changes.

The Te Anau Community Board recommended that the Council proceed with three Plan Change proposals relating to an expanded Industrial Resource Area, expanded Urban Resource Area and a new Lakeside Protection Area.

Southland District Council publicly notified the Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion Proposed Plan Change 5 on the 17 October 2009. All Te Anau ward ratepayers were notified of the proposed Plan Changes and a Proposed Te Anau Plan Changes Summary document dated October 2009 was sent with the public notice.

Two question and answer sessions were held in Te Anau on 3 and 4 November 2009 and members of Council's Resource Management staff were available at these sessions to answer any questions from the public.

The submission period closed on Monday, 23 November 2009 and a total of 19 submissions were received on Plan Change No. 5. On 5 December 2009 Southland District Council publicly notified the availability of the summary of submissions and called for further submissions. Further submissions on the Proposed Plan Changes had to be received by the Southland District Council no later than 22 January 2010. One further submission was received on proposed Plan Change 5, however, this submission did not meet the requirements of the Resource Management Act 1991 and is considered invalid as Schedule 1, Part 1[6(5) requires a submission to be in the prescribed form.

3.5 **Financial Considerations**

The proposed Te Anau Plan Changes have been provided for in the Resource Planning Policy budget for the 2009 / 2010 financial year.

3.6 **Legal Considerations**

Section 73(1A) of the Resource Management Act 1991 states that a district plan may be changed by a territorial authority in the manner set out in Schedule 1 of the Act.

4.0 **STAFF COMMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON SUBMISSIONS**

This section of the report discusses the matters raised and decisions requested in submissions and makes recommendations as to how the Council can respond to these. The submissions have been grouped into support, partial support, opposition, partial opposition and neutral categories. An analysis of the issues raised in these submissions has then been undertaken under these category headings.

The submissions and further submission received on proposed Plan Change 5 are contained in Appendix 2. The summary of the decisions requested by the submitters is included under Section 7 of this report.

Submissions in Support:

1. Noeline Lois Evans
2. E A Loose
3. David Thomas Healy
5. Gary Andrew Barnes
7. Neil Rutherford Borland
9. Margaret Alison Northmore
10. Te Ao Mārama Incorporated
12. Arthur John Henderson
17. Glenys Kay Dickson
19. Glenda Margaret Bell

Issues: General Support for Plan Change, Water Run-off, Grey Water Management.

Decisions Requested in Submissions in Support

Submitters 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 17, and 19 have all submitted in support of proposed Plan Change 5.

Submitters 1, 5, 9, and 10 support proposed Plan Change 5 and do not elaborate further in their submissions as to the reasons for their support. A further submission in support of the proposed Plan Change was received from Submitter 9 but contained no comments.

Submitters 2, 7 and 12 submit that, as Te Anau develops, there needs to be land available for industry and that the proposed expansion area is suitable. Submitter 3 and 12 support keeping all industry in one area and Submitter 12 submits that the location is convenient and relatively out of sight.

Submitter 17 (Glenys Kay Dickson) supports proposed Plan Change 5 but raises the need for careful planning to mitigate run-off into the Upukerora River and advocates for careful management of grey water. Issues relating to water run-off and grey water management raised by Submitter 17 are discussed and addressed further in this report in the discussion on stormwater issues which were also raised by Submitter 11 (Fish and Game Southland).

Submitter 19 (Glenda Margaret Bell) has stated that expanded Industrial Resource Area will not be sufficient to cater for potential growth and has suggested that the area proposed for Plan Change 8 (the Buchanan Private Plan Change proposal) should be set aside for industrial use. The Section 32 report relating to proposed Plan Change 5 assessed the option of establishing a new Industrial Resource Area in another part of Te Anau. Tables 4 and 7 of the report provide an evaluation of this option. The report concludes that this option is not the most appropriate solution in terms of accommodating industrial development pressure in Te Anau.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Submissions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 10, 12 and 17 are **accepted**.

It is recommended that Submission 19 is **accepted in part** where it supports the proposed Plan Change.

Reason

Submissions 1, 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12 and 17 all support proposed Plan Change 5.

it In relation to Submission 19, the option of establishing an Industrial Resource Area elsewhere in Te Anau, has been assessed in the Section 32 report which concludes is not the most appropriate alternative.

Submissions in Partial Support:

- 6. Lu Tyree
- 16. Christopher Edward Hughes

Issues: Residential Amenity, Vehicle Access, Suggested Boundary Change.

Decisions Requested in Submissions in Partial Support

Submitters 6 and 16 support proposed Plan Change 5 but both raise concerns about the proposed boundaries of the expanded Industrial Resource Area.

Submitter 6 (Lu Tyree) states that the Council should reduce the size of the Industrial Resource Area so that it is kept away from existing Blatch Road subdivisions and residences. The proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion area will adjoin four properties with existing accesses off Blatch Road. These properties are located at 6, 14, 50 and 66 Blatch Road and these properties are 1.28, 1.28, 3.17 and 17 hectares in size (see plan Appendix 3). Three of these properties (Nos 6, 50 and 66) are in rural / residential use while the fourth (No. 14) is a church and education facility. The church facility was established in 2008 via resource consent No. 2008/298. There are no approved subdivision developments relating to these properties.

While the submitter wishes to see industrial activity kept away from adjoining Blatch Road residences, the small number of properties located off Blatch Road and their larger size and rural / residential nature will potentially limit the impact any industrial activity may have. The benefits of expanding the existing Industrial Resource Area as opposed to establishing a new Industrial Resource Area elsewhere in Te Anau were examined in the background Section 32 report. Consolidation of industrial activity in one area of the township was seen as an environmental benefit in the report's assessment of alternatives, benefits and costs. This report also notes that an alternative site for industrial development has not been established and locating a new Industrial Resource Area elsewhere in Te Anau could potentially result in industrial activity being located closer to higher density existing residential development. The area of the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion adjoins the existing Industrial Resource Area along its western boundary while parts of its eastern boundary adjoins public land alongside the Upukerora River. These factors along with the limited amount of residential activity located off Blatch Road all contribute to the suitability of this area for industrial development in my professional opinion.

Submitter 6 also states that access to the Industrial Resource Area should be off Sandy Brown Road and thus protect existing residential sections on Blatch Road. As discussed in further detail in the discussion on the NZTA submission (No. 13) access to the majority of the sections of the expanded Industrial Resource Area would be off Sandy Brown Road. The conditions of the approved Wickham subdivision prevent widespread access on to Blatch Road.

Submitter 16 (Christopher Hughes) states that he supports the Industrial Resource Area expansion but submits that the proposed boundary may need altering. His submission does not elaborate further on the reasons why the boundary needs altering or identify where it needs to be altered. However his submission has brought to the Council's attention an issue relating to the southern boundary of the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion. The southern boundary of proposed Plan Change 5 does not follow the lot boundaries of the approved Wickham development (2007/122) please see Appendix 8. In 2007 subdivision and land use resource consents were granted for a 39 allotment development at 106 Sandy Brown Road and 42 Blatch Road, Te Anau. Plan Change 5 seeks to align the boundary of the expanded Industrial Resource Area with this consented development. The proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion as a result covers part of an adjoining property. It is therefore recommended that this submission is accepted and the boundary of the proposed Plan Change 5, the expanded Industrial Resource Area, is amended to follow the southern lot boundaries of the approved Wickham subdivision as detailed in the map in Appendix 4.

Recommendation

It is recommended that Submissions 6 and 16 are **accepted** where they support proposed Plan Change 5.

It is recommended that Submission 6 is **rejected in part** where it requests a reduction in the size of the proposed Industrial Resource Area along Blatch Road.

It is recommended that Submission 16 is **accepted in part** where it requests an alteration to the boundary of the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion.

It is therefore further recommended that the southern boundary of the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion is amended so that it follows the southern lot boundary of the approved Wickham subdivision as detailed in the amended District Plan map in Appendix 5.

Reason

The submissions support proposed Plan Change 5.

A reduction in the size of the proposed Industrial Resource Area along Blatch Road is not considered appropriate in my opinion for the reasons outlined in the discussion above.

An alteration to the southern boundary of the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion is considered appropriate for the reasons outlined in the discussion above.

Submission in Opposition:

4. Bill Verrall

Issues: Alternative Location, Residential Amenity, Flooding.

Decisions Requested in Submission in Opposition

Mr Verrall would like the Industrial Resource Area resited and suggests that the area proposed for Plan Change 8 (the Buchanan Private Plan Change proposal) would be suitable. The Section 32 report relating to proposed Plan Change 5 assessed the option of establishing a new Industrial Resource Area in another part of Te Anau. Tables 4 and 7 of the report provide an evaluation of this option. The report concludes that this option is not the most appropriate solution in terms of accommodating industrial development pressure in Te Anau.

Mr Verrall is concerned that industrial activity would be located too close to residential areas as a result of the Plan Change and would be a 'scenic eyesore'. The discussion above on Submission 6 details the limited rural / residential development that is located along Blatch Road to the north and east of the proposed industrial expansion area. This discussion concludes that the limited amount of residential activity located off Blatch Road contributes to the suitability of this area for industrial development. The potential visual impact of industrial development on the Upukerora River is discussed in further detail below in the discussion on the submission from Fish and Game Southland (Submitter 11).

Aside from these Blatch Road properties, the other adjoining property that could potentially be developed for residential use is a 49 hectare property located to the south at 70 Sandy Brown Road (see Appendix 3). A 115 lot residential subdivision known as the Riverside development (2004/212) has been approved on this property. The approved scheme plan for this development is attached in Appendix 7. At the time of writing this report no development had commenced on this site. The approved Riverside scheme plan details the possibility of a future commercial development within the Industrial Resource Expansion area. Lot 149 of the approved scheme plan (Appendix 7) details a proposed future commercial lot. The subsequent granting of resource consent for a 39 allotment industrial development on Lot 149 known as the Wickham development (see Appendix 8) is one of the key reasons why this area has been identified as being appropriate for the expansion of the Industrial Resource Area. In addition the approved Riverside scheme also includes a 1 hectare recreation reserve that would be located between the closest residential lots of the Riverside development and the southern lots of the approved Wickham development. This recreation reserve would in my opinion act as a buffer between the industrial and residential land uses detailed in these approved schemes.

Mr Verrall also raises concerns relating to flooding and suggests the area immediately to the west of the Upukerora River and all Te Anau be protected from river flooding. In regard to potential flood hazard issues from the Upukerora River on the area of land encompassed by the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion Environment Southland has assessed the proposal and provided an assessment of the potential for inundation. This assessment concludes that the likelihood of the area being flooded is extremely small and the flood risk is acceptable (see Appendix 6).

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission is **rejected**.

Reason

The option of establishing an Industrial Resource Area elsewhere in Te Anau has been assessed in the Section 32 report which concludes it is not the most appropriate alternative.

In relation to existing Blatch Road rural / residential properties and also the nearest residential properties in the Riverside development, as outlined in the discussion above the proposed expansion of the Industrial resource Area is not likely to have a significant impact on residential amenity. The likelihood of the proposed expanded Industrial Resource Area being flooded is extremely small and the flood risk is deemed acceptable.

Submission in Opposition:

8. Paul Phelan

Issues: Increased noise, traffic, dust, rubbish. Road safety and maintenance, lack of shelter belt planting.

Decisions Requested in Submissions in Opposition

Mr Phelan's concerns relating to the potential for increased noise, traffic, dust and rubbish in the area are noted, and it is acknowledged that industrial activities can generate adverse environmental impacts that are not compatible with residential activities. However, for reasons already outlined above in this report, the properties to which the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion relates to are considered appropriate for industrial activity.

As noted above in response to the concerns of Submitter 6, the approved Riverside development to the south of the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion area incorporates a buffer of reserve land. This reserve land is located between the closest residential allotments of the Riverside development and the proposed southern boundary of the expanded Industrial Resource Area. This buffer is likely to mitigate any effects on residential amenity from future industrial activity that could be established on the expanded Industrial Resource Area. If the approved Riverside development does not proceed in my opinion, any potential amenity effects would be mitigated by the existing rural use of the property and its low residential density. In addition if any new development proposals for residential activity on this property are proposed in the future, residential amenity issues can be re-examined through the resource consent process. The property that the Riverside development relates to is located within the proposed Urban Resource Area expansion under proposed Plan Change 6. If Plan Change 6 is approved, there is a 4.5 metre side yard requirement for any industrial activity that would adjoin this property. In addition Rule AME.4 - 'Landscaping' of the Southland District Plan 2001 (see Appendix 11) would apply to the southern boundary of the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion. This rule requires a 3 metre wide strip of landscaping in order to provide adequate screening of industrial sites where they can be seen from any residential area. The rule requires such strips to be planted in dense evergreen trees or shrubs upon the completion of any new industrial building or commencement of any operation or process. In my opinion this rule would also mitigate any potential amenity issues between residential and industrial activities.

In relation to adjoining properties on Blatch Road, as there are only four properties on this road and as such the potential impact of industrial development on residential amenity is effectively limited. As discussed above the benefits of expanding the existing Industrial Resource Area as opposed to establishing a new Industrial Resource Area elsewhere in Te Anau were examined in the background Section 32 report. Consolidation of industrial activity in one area of the township was seen as an environmental benefit in the report's assessment of alternatives, benefits and costs.

This report also notes that an alternative site for industrial development has not been established and locating a new Industrial Resource Area elsewhere in Te Anau could potentially result in industrial activity being located closer to higher density residential development. This in turn could potentially result in a greater impact on residential or rural amenity. The Section 32 report relating to proposed Plan Change 5 establishes that there is a need for an expanded Industrial Resource Area to ensure that there is capacity to meet demand for industrial land in Te Anau. Provision of industrial land may also prevent industrial activities taking place in unsuitable locations. The Resource Management department of Council has in recent times had to address non-compliance issues related to industrial businesses operating in residential or rural areas of Te Anau. An expanded Industrial Resource Area will provide additional land for industrial use and could help reduce amenity conflicts between residential and industrial activities.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission is **rejected**.

Reason

The option of establishing an Industrial Resource Area elsewhere in Te Anau has been assessed in the Section 32 report which concludes it is not the most appropriate alternative. In relation to existing Blatch Road rural / residential properties and also the nearest residential properties in the Riverside development, as outlined in the discussion above the proposed expansion of the Industrial resource Area is not likely to have a significant impact on residential amenity.

Submission in Opposition:

11. Fish and Game Southland

Issues: Increased runoff and stormwater, lowering of water quality, reduction in native and sport fish habitat, effects on visual amenity of the Upukerora River.

Decisions Requested in Submissions in Opposition

The concerns raised in the Fish and Game submission on proposed Plan Change 5 are acknowledged and are discussed in further detail below. Included in Appendix 12 of this report is a memorandum that includes comments from the Council's Water and Wastewater department that clarifies some of the issues raised in relation to the provision of services to an expanded Industrial Resource Area.

Water, Stormwater and Wastewater Services

The existing Industrial Resource Area in Te Anau is currently serviced by a stormwater main which runs through the industrial area before discharging into the Upukerora River (see map Appendix 11). The discharge point for this existing stormwater main is beside the Upukerora Bridge on the Te Anau Milford Highway. Any future development within the expanded Industrial Resource Area would either be required to connect to the existing stormwater main or alternatively install a new stormwater treatment system (if a new subdivision development is proposed).

The Regional Water Plan for Southland 2010 contains two rules that relate directly to stormwater discharges and are considered relevant to Fish and Game Southland's submission. Rules 11 and 12 of the Regional Water Plan have resulted in Southland District Council making an application for a 'global' discharge resource consent for stormwater discharges in Te Anau. This resource consent would cover the discharge of stormwater into both surface water (Rule 11) and into or on to land (Rule 12) from the Te Anau Township.

As part of this resource consent application, an Assessment of Environmental Effects (AEE) has been prepared and this identifies the scale and significance of the stormwater discharge activities and also details stormwater treatment and mitigation measures. If resource consent is granted it is likely to be subject to conditions imposed to mitigate the adverse environmental effects of discharges to stormwater.

In regard to the concerns raised in Fish and Game Southland's submission the requirements of the Regional Water Plan for Southland 2010 are likely to result in stormwater design options that will mitigate the adverse effects of existing stormwater infrastructure. Any large scale subdivisions or land use resource consent proposals within the expanded Industrial Resource Area are also likely to need separate stormwater discharge permits from Environment Southland under these rules. As such, any consented or new development proposals within the expanded Industrial Resource Area will have to meet a higher standard of stormwater discharge as a result of the Regional Water Plan 2010.

Amenity Values

Fish and Game Southland's submission raises concerns about potential effects on the visual amenity of the Upukerora River from the construction of industrial buildings in an expanded Industrial Resource Area.

The approved Wickham development which covers two of the three lots that the Industrial Resource Area expansion relates to was approved subject to 5 landscaping conditions (see Appendix 9). These conditions require a 3 metre wide Local Purpose reserve ('Segregation Strip') along the eastern boundaries of Lots 35 and 36, with these being two of the three lots that adjoin Blatch Road. The third lot, which adjoins Blatch Road, has a narrow angled boundary where it adjoins the Road and as such it is considered unlikely that a large building would be constructed near the Blatch Road boundary of this property. If the Wickham development proceeds, it is considered that these landscaping conditions will mitigate any potential impact on the amenity of the Upukerora River. Fish and Game Southland submitted on this resource consent application and supported the stormwater and visual mitigation measures which were eventually imposed as resource consent conditions.

In relation to the third lot (Lot 1 DP 306215) which the plan application relates to there is an existing industrial activity occupying part of this site but a large area of this property is currently unoccupied. If proposed Plan Change 5 were approved, any industrial activity would be subject to the requirements of Rule AME.4 - 'Landscaping' of the Southland District Plan 2001 (see Appendix 11). This rule requires a 3 metre wide strip of landscaping in order to provide adequate screening of industrial sites where they can be seen from any recreational area, water body or public road. The rule requires such strips to be planted in dense evergreen trees or shrubs upon the completion of any new industrial building or commencement of any operation or process. This rule would also apply to the two properties that the approved Wickham subdivision relates to if the consented development did not proceed and any new industrial buildings or activities were proposed.

The requirements of Rule AME.4 - 'Landscaping' will mitigate the visual effect on the Upukerora River of any development within the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion. This rule would also apply to the two southern lots covered by proposed Plan Change 5 if the approved Wickham development did not proceed.

I consider that the proposed Plan Change if approved will result in industrial buildings and development occurring closer to the Upukerora River than at present, and that this could result in additional visual effects. However, the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion, if approved, will not be located directly adjacent the Upukerora River. There is a Council owned reserve (R57) located between the northern section of the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion and the Upukerora River (see Appendix 5). The Department of Conservation also owns a parcel of land approximately 1 hectare in size which is situated between this Council owned reserve and Blatch Road. The aerial photograph attached in Appendix 3 provides an overview of the location of the river and the area of the proposed Plan Change. It is noted that the river channel of the Upukerora River is dynamic and subject to change and can therefore at different times be closer or further away from the expanded Industrial Resource Area if approved.

As noted in the Section 32 report in addition to the approved Wickham development there is existing industrial development already occupying parts of the proposed Plan Change area. There is an existing contracting business located at 112 Sandy Brown Road (see Appendix 3). A resource consent has also been approved for a heliport development (2006/085) with access off Blatch Road (see Appendix 13) and this is also within the proposed Plan Change area. The Section 32 report concludes that these existing and approved industrial developments add to the suitability of this area for industrial activity.

Industrial Performance Standards

Fish and Game Southland's submission highlights an absence of sufficient detail in regard to design controls, including rules governing density, height, colour schemes and site coverage and the creation of a buffer utilising plantings to screen industrial development from the Upukerora River. The Southland District Plan 2001 contains performance standards which any development in the District's Industrial Resource Areas must adhere to. The height limit for buildings and structures in Industrial Resource Areas is 12 metres while the 3 metre landscaping strip requirement of Rule AME.4 - 'Landscaping' has been outlined above. The performance standards also require front, side and rear yards but these are only required where industrial sites adjoin major transportation routes or Urban Resource Areas and as such would not apply to the expanded Industrial Resource Area if approved.

The concerns outlined in the submission relating to a lack of detail in the objectives and policies of the Plan which relate to Industrial Resource Areas is an issue that the Council is looking to address in the review of the Southland District Plan 2001. This is likely to result in new performance standards for the District's Industrial Resource Areas in the second generation Southland District Plan. The Industrial Resource Area performance standards relate to all Industrial Resource Areas across the Southland District. As a result, changes to the performance standards of the Industrial Resource Area provisions of the Plan will be likely to need to occur as part of the District Plan review. Proposed Plan Change 5 proposes an expansion of Te Anau's existing Industrial Resource Area and does not propose changes to the existing performance standards of the Southland District Plan 2001.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission is **rejected**.

Reason

While Fish and Game Southland's concerns relating to amenity are acknowledged I consider that existing landscaping conditions relating to the approved Wickham development plus the 3 metre landscaping strip requirement of Rule AME.4 - 'Landscaping' will mitigate the visual effects of future industrial development within the Plan Change area. It is acknowledged that the proposed Plan Change if approved will result in industrial buildings and development occurring closer to the Upukerora River. However, the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion if approved will not be located directly adjacent the Upukerora River. In addition existing and approved industrial developments within the proposed Plan Change area add to its suitability for industrial activity, it also means that the existing area is far from pristine.

The alternative options of retaining the status quo (make no change to the district Plan) or establishing an Industrial Resource Area elsewhere in Te Anau have been assessed in the Section 32 report prepared for proposed Plan Change 5. The Section 32 report concludes that the proposed Industrial Resource Area Plan expansion is the most appropriate method of enabling the community to provide for its social and economic wellbeing.

In regard to concerns relating to stormwater and water quality it is considered that appropriate rules, policies and procedures already exist that enable Council to manage stormwater run-off and discharge from industrial development in the expanded Industrial Resource Area.

Neutral Submissions:

13. New Zealand Transport Agency (NZTA)

Issues; Effects on the Milford Road (SH 94)/ Blatch Road intersection.

Decisions Requested in Neutral Submissions

NZTA raises concerns about the actual and potential effects of the proposed Plan Change on the Milford Road (SH 94) / Blatch Road intersection. NZTA suggests that the proposed Plan Change should include provisions for establishing a threshold whereby developers in the expanded Industrial Resource Area are required to contribute towards upgrading this intersection to 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.

Similar concerns were also raised by NZTA when it submitted on the approved Wickham development. In response to NZTA's concerns regarding the upgrading of the Blatch Road / S.H 94 intersection Council's decision on this application included the following condition;

6. *Roading*

6.5 *That the portion of Lot 38 between its intersection with Road 2 and Blatch Road shall be illustrated as a separate additional allotment on the scheme plan of subdivision, which shall vest in Southland District Council as Local Purpose Reserve (Road).*

Pursuant to Section 113 of the Act, the reasons for this decision are:

- (e) *The Committee has required, in relation to the issue of any proposed linkage between Road 1 and Blatch Road, that an additional allotment be created which will vest in the Southland District Council as Local Purpose Reserve (Road). This will provide the Council with the potential future ability to link Road 1 with Blatch Road should this be required in the future, but the Council does not wish to see this linkage formed at this point in time. The status of land tenure as Local Purpose Reserve (Road) will enable the Council to hold this area for future development if appropriate and necessary, but unformed at the current point in time, and therefore enable the Council to fence this area accordingly to prevent vehicular access.*

The approved Wickham subdivision covers two of the three lots that the proposed Plan Change relates to and if this development occurs, access from the development on to Blatch Road is effectively controlled by this condition.

The third lot (Lot 1 DP 306215) covered by the proposed Plan Change is located to the north of the proposed industrial expansion area and is in different ownership. This property is partly occupied by an existing contracting business, is just under 5 ha in size and has legal road frontage on to Blatch Road. The existing access to this property is located off Sandy Brown Road. If a development proposal involving subdivision were proposed on this lot conditions restricting access on to Blatch Road or requiring access to Sandy Brown Road could be imposed. However as there is no approved development relating to this site there are no conditions currently restricting access to Blatch Road. Potentially if proposed Plan Change 5 is approved industrial development could occur on this property and a new access could be formed to Blatch Road.

There is also the possibility that the Wickham development does not proceed. The proposed Plan Change would result in industrial activity being a permitted activity on all three lots which the Plan change relates to and as all three lots legal road frontage to Blatch Road access to the road could not be restricted by the Council. However it is noted that given the size of the three lots with the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion area it may be unlikely that industrial development occurs without subdivision of these properties into smaller industrial lots. If applications for subdivision are received on any of the three lots the plan change relates to conditions restricting access on to Blatch Road could be imposed.

NZTA suggests that the proposed Plan Change 5 should include provisions for establishing a threshold whereby developers in the expanded Industrial Resource Area are required to contribute towards upgrading this intersection to accommodate associated traffic movements. Under Rule FIN.8 'Roading' of the existing Southland District Plan 2001 there is provision for financial contributions where subdivision or land development is proposed and the land involved fronts a legal road. However this would not require provision of financial contributions towards roading upgrades if industrial development were proposed in an expanded Industrial Resource Area and the activity was permitted. If subdivision was not proposed or resource consent was not required there would be no ability to require financial contributions.

As part of the review of the Southland District Plan 2001 the Council will be reassessing the financial contribution provisions and the Industrial Resource Area provisions of the Plan. There is a possibility that some of the concerns outlined in the submission could be addressed in the Plan review. The Industrial Resource Area performance standards relate to all Industrial Resource Areas across the Southland District.

As a result, changes to the performance standards of the Industrial Resource Area and the financial contributions provisions of the Plan will need to occur as part of the overall District Plan review.

Further to NZTA's concerns relating to the Blatch Road and State Highway 94 intersection this intersection has recently been upgraded. The upgrading of the intersection has occurred as a result of conditions imposed by way of two approved resource consent applications relating to 6 and 42 Blatch Road. These resource consent approvals were for a heliport development (2006/085) and a church facility (2008/298). The intersection has now been upgraded to NZTA Diagram D standard as detailed in Diagram 4 in Section 6.6 of the Southland District Plan 2001 (see Appendix 14.) As the upgrade works at this intersection have only taken place recently, it is not known if these works alleviated any of NZTA's concerns. NZTA may be able to elaborate further on this at the hearing.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission is **rejected**.

Reason

Access to Blatch Road from the two of the three properties located within the Industrial Resource Area expansion proposal is restricted if the approved Wickham development proceeds. The third property has an existing formed access to Sandy Brown Road. If any new subdivision developments are proposed within the industrial resource expansion area issues relating to access can be assessed and potentially conditions imposed that restrict access to Blatch Road. In addition the Blatch Road and State Highway 94 intersection has recently been upgraded.

Neutral Submissions:

14. Department of Conservation

Issues: Stormwater, Impacts on Upukerora River.

Decisions Requested in Neutral Submissions

The Department of Conservation (DOC) has raised concerns relating to stormwater run-off and discharge from activities located on the expanded Industrial Resource Area. As noted in the discussion of the Fish and Game Southland submission (No. 11) there are existing rules, policies and procedures that enable Southland District Council to effectively manage stormwater run-off and discharge from any future development in the expanded industrial area. In addition the requirements of the Regional Water Plan for Southland 2010 provide additional requirements relating to stormwater run-off and discharge from activities located within the expanded Industrial Resource Area.

In regard to the DOC suggestion that Council consider developing a landscape plan for the eastern boundary of the proposed Industrial Resource Area the existing landscaping conditions relating to the approved Wickham development plus the 3 metre landscaping strip requirement of Rule AME.4 - 'Landscaping' will mitigate the visual effects of future industrial development within the Plan Change area.

The Council notes DOC comments as to the validity of Objective 4.7.11 of the Southland District Plan 2001 and this is being assessed as part of the District Plan review project.

The Council acknowledges that Te Anau has a long history of occupation and that some sites of historic significance may not yet have been identified. The Historic Places Act 1993 makes it unlawful for any person to destroy, damage or modify the whole or any part of an archaeological site without the prior authority of the New Zealand Historic Places Trust. This is the case regardless of whether the land on which the site is located is designated, or the activity is permitted under the District or Regional Plan or a resource or building consent has been granted.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission is **rejected**.

Reason

Appropriate rules, policies and procedures already exist that enable Council to manage stormwater run-off and discharge from potential development in the expanded Industrial Resource Area.

The existing landscaping conditions relating to the approved Wickham development plus the 3 metre landscaping strip requirement of Rule AME.4 - 'Landscaping' will mitigate the visual effects of future industrial development within the Plan Change area.

Neutral Submission:

15. Environment Southland

No specific issues raised.

Decisions Requested in Neutral Submissions

Environment Southland's previous comments by way of our original letter, dated 18 July 2008, to the discussion document released by the Southland District Council regarding possible Te Anau Plan Changes, have been addressed to our satisfaction.

It is recommended that the submission is **accepted**.

Reason

Environment Southland's previous comments regarding possible Te Anau Plan Changes have been addressed to their satisfaction.

Neutral Submission:

18. New Zealand Fire Service Commission

Issue: Provision of water services for fire fighting purposes.

Decisions Requested in Neutral Submissions

The New Zealand Fire Service (NZFS) has submitted specifically in relation to the provision of water supplies suitable for fire fighting purposes. NZFS seeks confirmation that any development within the expanded Industrial Area will meet the New Zealand Fire-Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.

The approved Wickham subdivision application was approved subject to the following condition:

8 Water

That the consent holder shall provide reticulated water supply to proposed Lots 1-36 within the subdivision in accordance with the approved plans and specifications and complies with SNZ PAS 4509:2003 New Zealand Fire Service Fire Fighting Water Supplies Code of Practice.

Any future development within the expanded Industrial Resource Area that requires subdivision and / or landuse consents could be subject to similar conditions.

There is a possibility that industrial development could occur within an expanded Industrial Resource Area as a permitted activity without the need for resource consent. Council's Water and Waste Services department have provided comment in this regard (see Appendix 12). Their comments note that if an application is received that requires a higher fire category it would be the responsibility of the applicant to adequately meet requirements of SNZ PAS 4509:2008. Council's Water and Waste Services Department also note that the reticulated supply within the proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion area will continue to meet FW3 standard. Future building consents will need to limit building size and types of hazard permitted.

Recommendation

It is recommended that the submission is **accepted**.

Reason

The points raised in the NZFS submission in relation to the provision of water are accepted for the reasons outlined in the discussion above.

5. **SUMMARY**

This report has outlined the statutory provisions relevant to the plan change process and provided an overview of the background to proposed Plan Change 5. The submissions received on proposed Plan Change 5 have been discussed along with the decisions requested in these submissions. Recommendations as to whether or not those submissions should be accepted or rejected have then been made. The hearing of these submissions on the proposed Plan Change will occur on 1 - 3 June 2010 at the Distinction Te Anau Hotel and Villas, 64 Lakefront Drive Te Anau. Following the hearing all parties will be notified of the decision of the Committee.

Luke McSoriley
SENIOR RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNER - POLICY

6.0 **LIST OF SUBMITTERS****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	37 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
19.	Glenda Margaret Bell	12 Charles Nairn Road RD 1 Te Anau 9679	Not Stated	Not Stated

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

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
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.

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
8.	Paul Phelan	<p>Oppose proposal because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Increased noise, traffic, dust and rubbish in the area. 2. Increased residential developments close to proposed industrial area. 3. No proposed shelter belt (planting of trees) between the two areas. 4. Increased industrial traffic on Sandy Brown Road - noise, speed, safety and road maintenance. 	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"> 1. A change in zoning to cater for industrial development will result in an increase in run-off and stormwater in the future; 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 3. The visual amenity of the Upukerora River would be reduced if industrial buildings are constructed close to the river. <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.

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
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>	

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
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"> 4. The supply of water and the treatment and disposal of stormwater, run-off and sewage from within the expansion area; 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; 6. The capture and re-use of water within the expansion area; and 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. 	
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.

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
13.	New Zealand Transport Agency	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 	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.

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
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 can 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.

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
18.	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 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. 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. 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. 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. 	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.

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
19.	Glenda Margaret Bell	<p>In favour of the proposed expansion, as much of the land has already been used industrially and it is sensible to consolidate and formalise the existing use of the land in the area.</p> <p>Questions why all of the land that lies east of Sandy Brown Road, west of the Upukerora River and south of S.H.94 is not included within the proposed expanded industrial area. The new expanded area will not be sufficient to cater for the potential needs of the town as it grows.</p>	<p>Suggests a solution to the lack of industrial land would be to set aside the land within the Buchanan private plan change proposal area (Plan Change 8) for industrial use.</p>

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

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
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.

8.0 **FURTHER SUBMISSIONS**

Further Submissions

Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Further Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
9.	Margaret Alison Northmore	Further submission form provides no comments.	Not specified

9. **APPENDICES**

Appendix 1

Section 32 Report Proposed Plan Change No. 5 - Te Anau Industrial Resource Area Expansion

Appendix 2

Submissions and Further Submission

Appendix 3

Aerial Photograph of Blatch Road Properties and 70 Sandy Brown Road

Appendix 4

Map showing change to southern boundary of proposed Industrial Resource Area expansion

Appendix 5

Amended District Plan Map

Appendix 6

Flood Hazard Comments from Environment Southland

Appendix 7

Map of Approved Riverside Development

Appendix 8

Map of Approved Wickham Development

Appendix 9

Landscaping Conditions of Approved Wickham Development

Appendix 10

Rule AME.4 'Landscaping' of the Southland District Plan 2001

Appendix 11

Map of Services

Appendix 12

Memo from Water and Wastewater Services

Appendix 13

Approved Heliport Development

Appendix 14

NZTA Diagram D standard as detailed in Diagram 4 in Section 6.6 of the Southland District Plan 2001