



OPERATIVE SOUTHLAND DISTRICT PLAN 2001

TE ANAU URBAN RESOURCE AREA EXPANSION PROPOSED PLAN CHANGE NO. 6

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 - Jennifer Green

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.	David Thomas Healy	8 Donald Ross Place, Te Anau 9600	N	N
3.	E A Loose	8 Sutherland Street, Te Anau 9600	N	Not stated
4.	Gary Andrew Barnes	61 Fergus Square, PO Box 85, Te Anau 9600	N	N
5.	Bill Verrall	37 Howden Street, Te Anau 9600	Y	Perhaps
6.	Lu Tyree	PO Box 10, Te Anau 9640	N	Y
7.	Mark Deaker/Fiordland Lifestyle Properties Limited	PO Box 98, Te Anau 9640	N	N
8.	Te Ao Mārama Incorporated	C/- D Whaanga, Te Ao Mārama Incorporated, PO Box 7078, South Invercargill 9844	N	Not stated
9.	Margaret Alison Northmore	PO Box 9201, Wellington 6141	Not stated	Not stated
10.	Hanna Katrina Taylor	38 Goodall Street, Hillsborough, Auckland 1042	N	Y
11.	Norma Dorothy McDonald	34 Black Lane, RD 2, Te Anau 9672	N	Y
12.	Russel Duncan McDonald	34 Black Lane, RD 2, Te Anau 9672	N	Y
13.	Lyndon Noel and Lynn Therese Moffitt	38 Sandy Brown Road, RD 1, Te Anau 9679	Not stated	Y
14.	Fish and Game Southland	PO Box 159, Invercargill 9840	Y	Y
15.	William Arthur Black	113 State Highway 94, Te Anau 9600	N	Y
16.	Shirley Black	113 State Highway 94, Te Anau 9600	N	Y
17.	Dorothy Catherine Cromb	9 Black Lane, RD 2, Te Anau 9672	N	Y
18.	Donald Maxwell Cromb	9 Black Lane, RD 2, Te Anau 9672	N	Not stated
19.	The Lot Holders of Te Runga Subdivision	C/- Donald Cromb, 9 Black Lane, RD 2, Te Anau 9672	Y	Y
20.	Ebel (Abel) Kremer on behalf of Mr G and Mr D Deaker	PO Box 101, Te Anau 9640	N	N
21.	Robert Hunter Milne	141 Terrace Street, Invercargill 9810	N	Not stated
22.	Arthur John Henderson	78 Dublin Street, Invercargill 9810	N	N
23.	Michael Kelly Bergin and Melissa Jane Barry	185 Te Anau Mossburn Highway, RD 2, Te Anau 9672	Y	Y
24.	Michael Kelly Bergin and Melissa Jane Barry	185 Te Anau Mossburn Highway, RD 2, Te Anau 9672	Y	Y
25.	Glenda Margaret Bell	12 Charles Nairn Road, RD 1, Te Anau 9679	Not stated	Not stated

No	Submitter	Address	Wish to be Heard	Joint Case
26.	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	C/- Kristina Mead, Beca Carter Hollings & Ferner Ltd, PO Box 13960, Christchurch 8141	Y	N
27.	New Zealand Transport Agency	PO Box 5245, Dunedin 9058	Y	Y
28.	Environment Southland	Private Bag 90116, Invercargill 9840	Not stated	Not stated
29.	Christopher Edward Hughes	RD 1, Te Anau 9679	Y	Y
30.	Glenys Kay Dickson	68 Norton Street, Gore 9710	N	Y
31.	Director General of the Department of Conservation	C/- Community Relations Manager, Department of Conservation, PO Box 743, Invercargill 9840	Y	Y
32.	Junelle Marie Galland	Elmwood Station, RD 1, Te Anau 9679	N	Y

2. **Summary of Decisions Requested by Persons making submissions on Proposed Plan Change No. 6: Te Anau Urban Resource Area Expansion**

Proposed Plan Change No. 6 - Te Anau Urban Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
1.	Noeline Lois Evans	Support if current infrastructure can cope.	Not stated.
2.	Donald Thomas Healy	Supports the expansion of the area bordering SH 94 and Sandy Brown Road but not the area north-west of SH 94 or the Milford Road which incorporates Oraka Street, Aparima Drive etc as in the past this part of the Lakefront has flooded.	Not stated.
3.	E A Loose	Supports in part the bulk of the area. There will be a need in the future for further land to be available for housing. Development close to the Lake is subject to liquefaction and Tsunami.	Agree with the Plan Change but there needs to be serious thought given to effects from earthquakes.
4.	Gary Andrew Barnes	Supports all four proposed plan changes.	Not stated.
5.	Bill Verrall	No consent - industrial or residential, should be made to this area until it is adequately protected from flooding.	Delay current decision on Plan Changes 5, 6 and 8. Protect the area immediately west of the Upukerora River and all of Te Anau from river flooding.
6.	Lu Tyree	Conditionally support the new proposed Urban Resource Areas with the exception of: (a) The land at Blue Gum Point - should be in the Lakeside Protection Area (b) All land currently undeveloped in the Lakeside Protection Area should remain protected reserve i.e. undeveloped.	Amend the proposed Urban Resource Area boundary to exclude the Lakeside Protection Area from urban expansion.
7.	Mark Deaker/Fiordland Lifestyle Properties Limited	No issue with the proposed zone changes - current rural zoning of property has not been an issue either.	Not stated.
8.	Te Ao Mārama Incorporated	The proposal is supported.	Not stated.
9.	Margaret Alison Northmore	I support this proposal	Not stated.

Proposed Plan Change No. 6 - Te Anau Urban Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
10.	Hanna Katrina Taylor	Oppose the extension of the Urban Resource Area beyond the extent of the current subdivisions.	Extension of the Urban Resource Area to include the existing subdivisions but not the farmland to the east of the Delta subdivision.
11.	Norma Dorothy McDonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wish to retain rural lifestyle. 2. Covenant prevents further subdivision. 3. Private road maintained by residents. 4. Own water supply and do not have or require street lighting and footpaths. 5. No advantage to land owners in Te Runga or to Council in becoming "urban". 	Exclude the Te Runga subdivision from Plan Change 6.
12.	Russel Duncan McDonald	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wish to retain rural lifestyle. 2. Covenant prevents further subdivision. 3. Private road maintained by residents. 4. Own water supply and do not have or require street lighting and footpaths. 5. No advantage to land owners in Te Runga or to Council in becoming "urban". 	Exclude the Te Runga subdivision from Plan Change 6.
13.	Lyndon Noel and Lynn Therese Moffitt	To oppose that all land within the proposed Urban Resource Area expansion be automatically zoned/rated urban.	That lifestyle blocks still pay rural rates until such time an application is applied for to subdivide the land. That we should not be penalised because other landowners have subdivided around us.
14.	Fish and Game Southland	We are not opposed to plan Change 6.	We would like to see more detail with respect to stormwater management including the use of soakholes and permeable surfaces.
15.	William Arthur Black	I oppose part of the proposed Urban Resource Area expansion, our properties on SH 94 and Sandy Brown Road are used for farming and will be for some time. If the changes proceed what will the rates be?	I'll seek to have my properties left as rural.

Proposed Plan Change No. 6 - Te Anau Urban Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
16.	Shirley Black	I oppose part of the proposed Urban Resource Area expansion, our properties on SH 94 and Sandy Brown Road our properties on SH 94 and Sandy Brown Road are used for farming and will be for the foreseeable future. If the changes proceed rates are likely to increase. There is enough urban expansion happening on the lakeside of the town without taking in the area east of Te Anau.	I'll seek to have my properties left as rural.
17.	Dorothy Catherine Cromb	We purchased a section in the Te Runga subdivision to retire in a rural environment. Te Runga has covenants which prohibit further subdivision/development. We wish to see consolidation of the present areas under development - Heritage, Delta, Fiordland Estate, Alpine Terrace. We understand rates would increase if included in an urban area. We see no advantage in becoming urban as we do not have the services of town sections.	Status quo.
18.	Donald Maxwell Cromb	We purchased a section in the Te Runga subdivision to retire in a rural environment. Te Runga has covenants which prohibit further subdivision/development. We wish to see consolidation of the present areas under development - Heritage, Delta, Fiordland Estate, Alpine Terrace. We understand rates would increase if included in an urban area. We see no advantage in becoming urban as we do not have the services of town sections.	Status quo.

Proposed Plan Change No. 6 - Te Anau Urban Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
19.	The Lot Holders of Te Runga Subdivision C/- Donald Cromb	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Blocks purchased with the vision of living in a semi-rural environment. 2. Te Runga subdivision has covenants which prohibit further subdivision and other development. 3. Te Runga subdivision is a private subdivision owned by shareholders. 4. Support existing consented subdivisions with town size sections of less than approx 4,000 m² being included in the urban area. 5. Cannot see any advantages in becoming urban. 6. We provide and maintain our own road, water and do not have footpaths or lighting. 	That the urban area does not extend to include Te Runga subdivision.
20.	Ebel (Abel) Kremer on behalf of Mr G and Mr D Deaker	Conditionally supported - that the SDC consent approval dated 29 August 1984 continues to apply without any variations, thus providing the Deaker's with existing land utilisation rights under the proposed re-zoning of this land from rural to urban.	That Proposed Plan Change 6 includes the following conditions: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The SDC 1984 consent approval is maintained without variations. 2. The Deaker's existing land utilisation rights continue to be recognised by the SDC and maintain the support and approval of the SDC.
21.	Robert Hunter Milne	Oppose. Why has residential development been approved prior to a zoning change? Council has contravened its own District Plan.	What section of the District Plan allows for the existing subdivision of rural zoned land?
22.	Arthur John Henderson	I support the specific provisions in Plan Change 6. The Plan Change integrates recent urban expansion into Te Anau.	That the proposed Plan Change be adopted.
23.	Michael Kelly Bergin and Melissa Jane Barry	Exclude Lots 4 and 10, DP 375332 from the Plan Change. These lots are part of the Te Runga subdivision and do not have water, footpaths, street lighting and cannot be subdivided further. Do not see any advantages in being included in the Urban Resource Area expansion.	We would like to see the boundaries to the east amended.

Proposed Plan Change No. 6 - Te Anau Urban Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
24.	Michael Kelly Bergin and Melissa Jane Barry	Exclude Sec 35, Blk IX, Mararoa SD and Lot 1, DP 375332 from the Plan Change. The land was purchased with the intention to farm sustainably, if it was rezoned to urban this would not be financially viable. The lots are not reticulated and do not have footpaths or street lighting. Do not see any advantages in being included in the Urban Resource Area expansion	We want the boundaries to the east changed.
25.	Glenda Margaret Bell	It is sensible to consolidate and formalise the existing land use of the area. I am in favour of the proposed expansion to the Urban Resource Area on the proviso that in the future the Council ensures these sections are developed first before further urban development occurs on non-urban zoned land.	I am in favour of the proposed expansion to the Urban Resource Area on the proviso that in the future the Council ensures these sections are developed first before further urban development occurs on non-urban zoned land.
26.	New Zealand Fire Service Commission	Ensure the provision of appropriate firefighting water supplies and access suitable for fire fighting purposes. The existing residential supply (FW2 supply) needs to be maintained as a minimum within the proposed expanded urban area. Where reticulated water supplies are unavailable or inadequate, the advice and approval of the NZFS should be sought to ensure the access and flow provided meets the standards of the Code of Practice. In the event that an appropriate fire fighting water supply is not established on each allotment within the expanded area, then the operational efficiency of the NZFS may be compromised.	The NZFS seeks confirmation that the reticulated water network within the extended residential area is able to meet the Code of Practice, with a minimum of a FW2 supply.

Proposed Plan Change No. 6 - Te Anau Urban Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
27.	New Zealand Transport Agency	NZTA neither supports or opposes the proposed Plan Change. Encouraged to see Council better defining how the Urban Resource Area should expand in Te Anau. NZTA wishes to ensure that there are appropriate connections to the State highway to reflect and accommodate traffic movements associated with urban expansion in the identified areas. Is there scope to identify what the thresholds might be, to proactively address improvements in the transport system, in particular, improvements to intersections where the State highway meets the appropriate local arterial roads?	If the Council is of a mind to accept the proposed Plan Change then the thresholds need to be identified to proactively address improvements in the transport system, in particular, improvements to intersections where the State highway meets the appropriate local arterial roads.
28.	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.
29.	Christopher Edward Hughes	I do not want Te Runga subdivision included in the urban area. (a) Purchased Te Runga so we could be semi-rural, not urban. (b) There are strict covenants to prevent further subdivision, dwelling quality, colour, etc. (c) Located within a 100 kph speed zone. (d) Additional service costs - currently only have sewerage. (e) No advantages to be included - extra costs for both Council and ratepayers.	(a) Support the inclusion of consented sections in subdivisions (section size less than approx. 4,000 m ²) to urban area. (b) A town should grow from a nucleus with cohesion and inclusion. (c) Before further subdivisions are consented we need to use the utilities and facilities already provided. (d) Further expansion will only put pressure on existing subdivisions that have not been built on. (e) If care is not taken empty sections on older subdivisions will not be sold and built on.

Proposed Plan Change No. 6 - Te Anau Urban Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
30.	Glenys Kay Dickson	I support the changes proposed to the urban resource area. I would like to see developers paying the full cost of essential services to new development. I would like careful planning to mitigate any water runoff from any new development into Lake Te Anau.	Change the District Plan to reflect the urban resource area expansion. Developers pay full cost of new development, not ratepayers. Management of grey-water in any new development.
31.	Director General of the Department of Conservation	In general supports this proposal as it ensures that any subdivision within these zones and west of the Upukerora River would be required to connect to the Te Anau reticulated sewerage system, being included in the Te Anau Urban Resource Area. Such action avoids the risks associated with domestic sewerage systems failing and impacting on both natural watercourses and the adjacent national park.	That Council requires that all subdivisions within the Urban Resource Area connect to reticulated sewerage services.
32.	Junelle Marie Galland	To oppose Te Runga subdivision being included in the proposed Urban Resource Area expansion. This is a private development maintained by a corporate body and it be of no advantage to be included into the urban zoning - increased rates for no apparent benefit.	Not stated.

3. **Summary of Decisions Requested by Persons making submissions on Proposed Plan Change No. 6: Urban Resource Area Expansion - General Comments**

Proposed Plan Change No. 6 - Te Anau Urban Resource Area Expansion			
Submitter number/point	Submitter	Summary of Submission	Summary of Decision Requested
31.	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.