

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.17	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Susan Dallas	25.28	Oppose	The submitter opposes fence and wall standards.	Delete Fences and Walls activity standards in their entirety from the District Plan.  (Inferred relief requested)	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.17	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Natasha Duncan-Sutherland	31.26	Oppose	Considers that a limit on fence heights to 1.2 metres will place children at risk of dog attacks. The submitter seeks no restriction on fence heights with the exception that a new rule is introduced that requires front fence heights of at least 6 feet where a large-breed dog is owned.	Delete any restriction on fence heights and introduce a new rule requiring a front fence of at least 6 feet on properties where a large-breed dog is owned.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Sheena McGuire	168.118	Amend	Notes that LFRZ Chapter does not contain a specific rail corridor building setback standard and there is no yard setback that applies.  Considers that setbacks are a common planning tool used to ensure the safe and efficient operation of activities such as the railway corridor, particularly when it may come into conflict with adjacent land uses. For rail, a setback provides a safe physical distance between a building and the railway corridor boundary. Heavy freight trains run on the railway lines through the Napier City District. Considers that without a sufficient setback, people painting their buildings, clearing gutters or doing works on their roof will need to access or foul the rail corridor. If a person or object encroaches onto the rail corridor, there is a substantial risk of injury or death for the person entering the rail corridor. Considers that a setback control has obvious safety benefits for the users of the land adjoining the rail corridor and users of the rail corridor. Also notes the efficiency benefits for rail operations, mitigating against the risk of train services being interrupted by unauthorised persons or objects entering the rail corridor.  Considers that without appropriate setback requirements, there is significant risk of adverse health and safety effects impacting people locating and working in proximity to the railway corridor. Seeks a new clause within LFRZ-S3 to require a 5m setback for structures and buildings from the rail corridor. Matters of discretion are also sought in the case that the setback cannot be achieved.	Amend as follows:  1. Any building or part of a building (including eaves and guttering) must not be erected closer than 20m from the Prebensen Drive and/or Severn Street boundary.  2. <u>No part of any building or structure may be located within a 5m setback from a boundary shared with a rail corridor.</u>  Matters of discretion are: 1. Amenity values 2. Character of the area, 3. <u>The safe and efficient operation of the rail network;</u> 4. <u>Compatibility with the surrounding environment; and</u> 5. The reason for the reduced setback.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Hus Narsai	205.7	Amend	Supports the provision for retail activities within the Large Format Retail zone. Considers that explicit provision should be made for trade suppliers within the zone.	Bunnings seeks for specific provision for trade suppliers in the Large Format Retail Zone with the following activity statuses: Trade suppliers with a GFA over 1,000m <sup>2</sup> – Permitted	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Hus Narsai	205.8	Oppose	LFRZ-R3 requires the provision of one indigenous specimen tree per 10 car parking spaces. This requirement is considered to be unnecessarily onerous given the requirement for a landscaping buffer to be provided.	Remove requirement for providing indigenous trees based on car parking spaces. This requirement does not recognise the functional and operational requirements of Bunnings with respect to the provision of car parking.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Hus Narsai	205.9	Oppose	Opposes the proposed restrictions on site coverage as they limit the potential scale of development and do not align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ – O3 and P2. Considers there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention.	Remove the proposed restrictions on impervious area and site intensity to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Hus Narsai	205.10	Oppose	Opposes the proposed restrictions on site coverage as they limit the potential scale of development and do not align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ – O3 and P2. Considers there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention.	Remove the proposed restrictions on impervious area and site intensity to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of Bunnings.	Open Submission

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Holly Jenkins	214.4	Amend	Support standards to manage the attractiveness and interface of at grade car parking areas in commercial zones. Considers the standards fail to recognise practicalities of supermarkets and other commercial activities and that standards require a large portion of a site to be occupied for this purpose. Considers an either/or approach appropriate to achieve landscaping outcomes	Seek that the landscaping requirement of NCZ-R7; LCZ-R10; LFRZ-R3; TCZ-R7; CCZ-R6 be an either/or:  1.Where the car parking area is at-grade:  a. 2 m wide landscaping strip comprised of indigenous plants is provided along the full frontage of the road (except for the vehicle crossing), and or b. one indigenous specimen tree is provided for every ten car parks.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.3	Amend	Supports the provision for hospitality activities within the Large Format Retail zone. Considers explicit provision should be made for drive through restaurants within the zone.	Seeks for specific provision for drive through restaurants in the Large Format Retail Zone with Drive through restaurants as Permitted activity	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Anitha Premraj Sam Goddard	216.4	Oppose	Opposes proposed restrictions on impervious area coverage limit the potential scale of development. Considers that the provisions fail to align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, LFRZ – O3 and P2	Delete the proposed restriction on the impervious area coverage to provide for greater flexibility in the type of activities within the LFRZ	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /	Sean Thompson	225.10	Amend	Considers that it is not self-evident from the analysis and rationale in the proposed plan, including in terms of s 32 RMA, why relocated buildings should be classified as non-complying in the NCZ, LCZ, LFRZ, LIZ and GIZ. It is accepted that relocated buildings should be discretionary in the Natural Open Space Zone, and there may be urban design and other considerations applicable to the Town Centre Zone and City Centre Zone which warrant different treatment.  Since a 2004 Central Otago Environment Court decision most local authorities in New Zealand have either adopted permitted activity classification for relocated buildings (with no standards) or provided for permitted activity status with prescribed performance standards.	Seeks to amend the LFRZ Rule as follows:  a. Provide for relocated buildings as a permitted activity in all relevant zones, excepting where a specified heritage or conservation or urban design consideration applies; b. For the relocated building rules in all zones, the removal of the requirement to deposit a monitoring fee at the same time as submitting the relocated building report; c. Amending the performance standards in relation to relocated buildings in accordance with the wording in the attached Schedule 1 (which can be found in the attached submission), to provide for: i. modification of the performance timeframes such that relocation on permanent foundation is required within two months, and twelve months is allowed for the completion of all reinstatement works; ii. provision for a pre-inspection report in the same or similar form as found in Schedule 2 (which can be found in the attached submission).  Consequential or further relief including to the relevant objectives, policies and provisions of the proposed plan in order to give effect to relief sought.  (The reasons are stated in detail in the full submission)	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Sam Goddard	238.8	Amend	Supports the provision for retail activities within the Large Format Retail zone however, it is considered that explicit provision should be made for supermarkets within the zone.	Include specific provision for supermarkets in the Large Format Retail Zone with the following activity statuses:  Supermarkets with a GFA over 1,000m <sup>2</sup> - Permitted	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Sam Goddard	238.9	Oppose	Submitter acknowledges the need to manage infrastructure demands resulting from development within the Large Format Retail Zone. However, opposes as the proposed restrictions on site intensity limit the potential scale of development and are not considered to align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ – O3 and P2. Considers that there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the impervious area and site intensity to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Sam Goddard	238.10	Oppose	Submitter acknowledges the need to manage infrastructure demands resulting from development within the Large Format Retail Zone, however, opposes the proposed restrictions on site intensity limit the potential scale of development and are not considered to align with the objectives and policies of the Large Format Retail Zone, particularly LFRZ – O3 and P2. Considers that there are other mechanisms to control stormwater run-off such as the provision of detention and retention for example.	Delete the proposed restrictions on the impervious area and site intensity to provide for greater flexibility in the site layout that would better suit the functional requirements of the submitter.	Open Submission

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.47	Oppose	Amend Rule LFR-R1 and 2 as this provision is considered to be too blunt in its current form and on larger sites limits development opportunities for LFR sites. While the range of tenancies can be broadened under Rule LFRZ-R1A (2), it is noted that the corresponding "broadening up" of the mix of tenancy sizes is not replicated in LFRZ-R2A.	Amend LFRZ-R1A to enable a greater range of smaller tenancies as part of an LFR development. Set the minimum GFA at 800sqm. Amend LFRZ-R1A (2) to 40%	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.48	Oppose	Amend Rule LFR-R1 and 2 as this provision is considered to be too blunt in its current form and on larger sites limits development opportunities for LFR sites. While the range of tenancies can be broadened under Rule LFRZ-R1A (2), it is noted that the corresponding "broadening up" of the mix of tenancy sizes is not replicated in LFRZ-R2A.  A corresponding amendment to allow for situations where larger sites are enabled to accommodate a larger range of hospitality facilities to cater for the typical demands and market sectors arising from a an LFR retail complex. That is not considered to have a significant potential for an adverse impact on the CBD core given the type, nature, and operating model of the typical; hospitality establishments in such LFR developments are not usually wanting to establish within a CBD type environment. Changes to the scale and number of such developments are sought including recognition of drive-thru establishments as being a suitable activity within the LFRZ.		Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table	Phil Stickney	263.49	Oppose	Oppose LFRZ-R3A as it is considered overly restrictive and onerous. A departure from landscape standards and the particular palette of planting required is not a matter that should be considered as a discretionary activity if not adhered to.	Delete or amend this rule to give effect to the relief sought.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table NA	Phil Stickney	263.50	Oppose	Oppose Rule LFRZ-R5 as it imposes a blanket coverage rule. The proposed rule is blunt and does not reflect the fact that the site development will be required to manage stormwater by way of quantifiable modelling and engineering design to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse environmental effects. The net result is to restrict development in an efficient manner on a scare land resource in Napier.	Delete the coverage requirements.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Phil Stickney	263.51	Oppose	Seeks amendment to the LFRZ rules table to include express recognition of ancillary offices or similar supporting activities within the Rules to ensure clarity, and to recognise the fundamental role of ancillary facilities and also complementary aspect of LFR activities but are not currently captured within the definition of retail activity per say.	Include provision and recognition for offices ancillary to a retail operation.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Phil Stickney	263.52	Oppose	The provision of supporting and complementary activities including service stations / EV car recharge stations are also expected within an LFRZ and are an expected aspect of the land use range in the context of an automobile driven form of retailing. These are currently not provided for within the LFRZ noting that a definition of service station is already contained within the Plan.	Include provision for service stations, EV charging stations and ancillary infrastructure.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.53	Oppose	Opposes a blanket standard in LFR-S4 and LFR-S5 as it is blunt and does not reflect the fact that the site development will be required to manage stormwater by way of quantifiable modelling and engineering design to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse environmental effects. The net result is to restrict development in an efficient manner on a scare land resource in Napier.	Delete the rule.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table	Phil Stickney	263.54	Oppose	Opposes the blanket standard in LFR-S4 and LFR-S5 as it is blunt and does not reflect the fact that the site development will be required to manage stormwater by way of quantifiable modelling and engineering design to avoid, remedy, or mitigate adverse environmental effects. The net result is to restrict development in an efficient manner on a scare land resource in Napier.	Delete the rule.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Assessment criteria /General	Phil Stickney	263.55	Amend	Amend assessment criteria to refine and tighten the consideration of activities against the Assessment Criteria within the Plan and reflect the amendments and changes sought in this submission. In particular, it is not considered reasonably necessary for a Permitted Activity which infringes a standard in The Plan, to fall to automatically being assessed again against the relevant Objectives and Policies of The Plan as a restricted Discretionary Activity.	Seeks the inclusion of more targeted Assessment Criteria that refine the scope of assessment to the range of effects that the infringement generates (either actual or potential) rather than a wider sweep of the Plan Objectives and Policies.	Open Submission

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Issues /LFRZ-I3: Traffic generation and demand on infrastructure services	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.135	Support	Supports I3, O5 and P4 as they recognize that large retail developments can have significant transport generation and effects on the transport network and encourage sufficient infrastructure provisions or mitigation measures.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Objectives /LFRZ-O5: Sustainable design and infrastructure	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.136	Support	Supports I3, O5 and P4 as they recognize that large retail developments can have significant transport generation and effects on the transport network and encourage sufficient infrastructure provisions or mitigation measures.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Policies /LFRZ-P4: Sustainable design and infrastructure	NZ Transport Agency Waka Kotahi Kelsey Watson	277.137	Support	Supports I3, O5 and P4 as they recognize that large retail developments can have significant transport generation and effects on the transport network and encourage sufficient infrastructure provisions or mitigation measures.	Retain as notified.	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone - Rules Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.67	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency requires the ability to construct and operate emergency service facilities (i.e., fire stations) in locations which will enable reasonable response times to fire and other emergencies. This means new fire stations may be necessary in any zone across the district in order to continue to achieve emergency response time commitments in situations where development occurs, and populations change. In this regard it is noted that Fire and Emergency is not a requiring authority under section 166 of the RMA, and therefore does not have the ability to designate land for the purposes of fire stations.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the effects of a fire station can be largely anticipated and, in the most part, do not differ to the effects of many activities that may be anticipated through rural and urban environments.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency requests that emergency service facilities are provided for as permitted activities in the larger, more extensive zones of the district to recognise the critical importance of emergency services to communities. In providing for emergency service facility as a permitted activity would mean that emergency service facilities would be controlled by the subsequent performance standards of each zone (such as height, height in relation to boundary, front yards, building coverage requirements).and the other relevant performance standards in other chapters (i.e., transport) to ensure that any effects are appropriately managed.</p>	<p>Seeks to include new permitted activity as follows:</p> <p><b>xxx-Rx: Emergency service facilities</b>  <b>Activity Status: Permitted</b></p> <p>N/A</p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission

# LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone

Section / Sub-section / Provision	Submitter Name	Submission number / Point Number	Position	Summary of Submission	Relief Summary	Link to Submission (click to open)
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /LFRZ- Large Format Retail Zone - Standards Table /General	Alec Duncan	288.86	Amend	<p>Fire and Emergency’s main area of concern is the provision of a water supply and access to this supply which will enable Fire and Emergency to operate effectively and efficiently to save lives and property in the event of a fire. This is best achieved through compliance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ 4509:2008.</p> <p>SNZ 4509:2008 sets out minimum water supply requirements required for firefighting water supply to both reticulated and non-reticulated areas. Where a development is unable to connect to the reticulated network, or the reticulated network has insufficient capacity and/or pressure, an alternative firefighting water source is required by Fire and Emergency. This could be from a dedicated firefighting water supply tank.</p> <p>Fire and Emergency notes that the subdivision chapter includes rules and standards applying to subdivision. Therefore, activities that do not require subdivision will not be subject to the servicing standards within, including SUB-S14 that applies to the subdivision of new lots only and requires a firefighting water supply.</p> <p>A new standard is therefore requested in all zones of which development of new buildings are enabled to ensure that new development is provided with a water supply suitable for firefighting purposes.</p> <p>In relation to new standard XXX-SX(1), it is expected that all reticulated water supply networks (whether private or public) will be fully compliant with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008 as required by the Code of Practice for Land Development and Subdivision Infrastructure and that new connections under the water supply bylaw will not be granted where there is insufficient capacity available within the water supply network for the proposed activity.</p>	<p>To include a new performance standard as follows:</p> <p>XXX-SX: Firefighting water supply</p> <p>1. All new developments must be connected to a public <u>reticulated water supply, where one is available.</u></p> <p>2. <u>Where the new development will not be connected to a public reticulated water supply, or where an additional level of service is required that exceeds the level of service provided by the reticulated system, the developer must demonstrate how an alternative and satisfactory firefighting water supply can be provided in accordance with the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Matter of discretion:</p> <p>1. <u>The extent of consistency with the requirements of the New Zealand Fire Service Firefighting Water Supplies Code of Practice SNZ PAS 4509:2008.</u></p> <p>Or</p> <p>To similar effect.</p> <p>And</p> <p>any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this new standard.</p>	Open Submission
LFRZ - Large Format Retail Zone /Policies /LFRZ-P4: Sustainable design and infrastructure	Alec Duncan	288.133	Support	<p>Supports this policy to the extent that it seeks to ensure sufficient infrastructure provision and/or mitigation measures to meet demand, including consideration of the effects of climate change.</p>	Retain as notified.	Open Submission