

**SUMMARY OF PLANNING EVIDENCE OF DANIEL IAN THORNE ON BEHALF OF REAVERS (N.Z.) LIMITED – SUBMITTER 3340 ON STAGE 3 OF THE PROPOSED DISTRICT PLAN**

1. My name is Daniel Thorne. I have provided planning evidence in support of the submission of Reavers N.Z. Limited (**'Reavers'**), as set out in my evidence dated 29 May 2020.
2. This summary sets out the key points within my evidence, which is focused on a few specific building and activity standards relating to Chapter 18A – General Industrial Zone (**'GIZ'**), with particular regard to the Glenda Drive industrial context.
3. I consider controlled activity status for buildings within the GIZ is the most appropriate response in terms of enabling industrial activities and buildings in a manner that enables a pleasant level of amenity to be achieved, as sought by Objective 18A.2.3. In my mind, the broad range of assessment matters associated with a restricted discretionary activity status risk elevating design and appearance type matters over the more functional requirements of industrial / service activities. I also note that the zone provisions include a range of other standards relating to building setbacks, heights, coverage and outdoor storage, which if breached, provide Council with further opportunity to review, and potentially refuse, resource consent applications.
4. I acknowledge that the s42A Report has proposed a reduction in the notified minimum road boundary setback from 5m to 3m (for 'all other road boundaries'). Whilst I support this reduction, I consider that the Operative District Plan road boundary setback of 2m is the most appropriate outcome for the GIZ. A 2m building setback affords sufficient space for landscaping, enables buildings to engage with the street, and provides flexibility in building development and the location of outdoor storage areas so as to ensure the most efficient use of the industrial land resource.
5. Rule 18A.5.3(B) as notified requires a minimum internal boundary setback of 7m where a site adjoins any other zone outside of the GIZ. The Frankton GIZ is largely bisected by Glenda Drive such that most sites have an internal boundary that adjoins land zoned 'Informal Recreation' or the Frankton Flats B Special Zone (Activity Area E1 – Industrial). As a consequence of this, a large number of sites are subject to a 7m internal boundary setback, effectively reducing the availability of that land to be developed for industrial buildings without a potentially uncertain resource consent process.
6. With particular regard to the land holding of Reavers, this largely follows the alignment of SH6, with an approximately 10m strip of local purpose 'beautification' reserve, zoned Informal Recreation, separating the land from SH6. This land is partially landscaped in places, does not comprise any walkways, and due to the topography of SH6 which slopes up from the Shotover Bridge, is steep and serves to effectively obscure views of the industrial area from SH6 until nearing the intersection with Hardware Lane. I consider that the imposition of a 7m setback requirement from the Informal Recreation zoned land adjacent to the Reavers land holding is unreasonable, and not necessary to manage a potential amenity outcome along this boundary.

7. I acknowledge that the s42A Report has proposed a more enabling approach to trade suppliers, with the introduction of discretionary activity status and a policy framework which seeks to distinguish between wholesale and retail focused trade suppliers, with the latter to be avoided. Whilst I support the more enabling approach adopted, based on my evaluation of the evidence of Ms Hampson, I consider there to be no clear or pressing resource management issue with respect to trade suppliers locating within the GIZ, and that the policy response to distinguish between wholesale and retail trade suppliers as identified in the s42A Report is not warranted. In this regard, I suggest that if a trade supplier principally servicing the retail sector was advanced within the GIZ, it could arguably be more accurately defined as a 'retail activity', and potentially a 'large format retail activity' if over 500m<sup>2</sup> in area, both of which are prescribed prohibited activity status by the s42A Report.
8. Overall, I consider the minor changes I have proposed serve to enable a more efficient use of the industrial land resource, provide greater certainty for landowners and tenants, and maintain an appropriate level of amenity for the GIZ. To this end, I consider the changes more appropriately meet the objectives of the GIZ.
9. I am happy to take any questions.

**DATED** 13 August 2020

Daniel Ian Thorne