

Further Submission for the Proposed District Plan

Clause 8 of Schedule 1, Resource Management Act 1991

Privacy Statement

Your further submission must include your name, and an address for service (preferably email, but you can use a postal address). All information you include in this further submission, including your name and address for service, will be provided to other submitters and published on Hutt City Council's website. Paper copies may also be made available. Hutt City Council is required to collect and publish this information to carry out its functions under the Resource Management Act 1991 and to enable others to take part in the district plan process. The Council, other submitters, and the Environment Court may need to contact you during this process.

If your further submission does not include your name and an address for service, it will be rejected.

While the Council will retain all information provided in your further submission in secure council systems, all contact details will be removed from any documents published on Council's website once the district plan process is complete. However, your name and the contents of your further submission will still appear in these documents.

You have the right to ask for a copy of any personal information we hold about you, and to ask for it to be corrected if you think it is wrong. If you'd like to ask for a copy of your information, or to have it corrected, please contact us at contact@huttcity.govt.nz, call 04-570-6666, or write to us at Private Bag 31912, Lower Hutt 5040.

To: Chief Executive, Hutt City Council

1. This is a further submission from:

Full Name	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> Last First </div>	
Company/Organisation	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>	
Contact <i>if different</i>	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>	
Address	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> Number Street </div>	
	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Suburb </div>	
	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; display: flex; justify-content: space-between; padding: 2px 5px;"> City Postcode </div>	
Address for Service <i>if different</i>	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Postal Address </div>	
Phone	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Home </div>	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Work </div>
	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px 5px;"> Mobile </div>	
Email	<div style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; height: 20px;"></div>	

2. This is a **further submission** in support of or opposition to a submission on the Proposed Lower Hutt District Plan.

3. I consider that, under Clause 8 of the First Schedule of the Resource Management Act, I may make a further submission because:

I represent a relevant aspect of the public interest

Please give details:

I have an interest in the Proposed Plan Change that is greater than the interest of the general public

Please give details:

I represent Hutt City Council

4. I support or oppose the submission of:

Name and address of original submitter and submission number of original submission:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

5. The particular parts of the submission I support or oppose are:

Clearly indicate which parts of the original submission you support or oppose, together with any relevant provisions of the proposal

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

6. The reasons for my support or opposition are:

Please give reasons:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

7. I seek that the whole or part [*describe part*] of the submission be allowed or disallowed:

Please give precise details:

(Please use additional pages if you wish)

8. I **wish** **do not wish** to be heard in support of my submission

(Please tick one)

9. If others make a similar submission,

I **will** **will not** consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing

(Please tick one)

Signature of submitter

(or person authorised to sign on behalf of submitter)

	<i>Date</i>
--	-------------

A signature is not required if you make your submission by electronic means

To: Hutt City Council (“Council”)
district.plan@huttcity.govt.nz

Date: 22 July 2025

SUBMITTER DETAILS

Submitter Name: Bunnings Limited

Submitter No. 173

Address for Service: Barker & Associates Ltd
Attn Ashleigh Wharam / Matt Norwell
Level 2, 60 Cuba Street,
Te Aro, Wellington 6011

Email: AshleighW@barker.co.nz / MattN@barker.co.nz

IN ACCORDANCE WITH CLAUSE 8(1) OF THE FIRST SCHEDULE OF THE RMA

Bunnings Limited have an interest in the proposed district plan greater than the interest that the general public has because the submitter currently operates two stores within the Hutt City district and future District Plan provisions will be important to any future operation and development of Bunnings’ in Hutt City.

ATTENDANCE AT COUNCIL HEARING

Bunnings Limited wishes to be heard (attend and speak at the Council hearing) in support of our submission. If others make a submission, Bunnings Limited will consider presenting a joint case with them at the hearing.

Person authorised to sign on behalf of Bunnings Limited.



Matt Norwell
Director

Submitter		Their Submission				Bunnings Ltd Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.2b	TR-Transport	Amend	Considers the plan should include recognition of operational and functional needs recognises that restaurants should be supported for the positive contribution they make to the viability and function of centres.	Amend matters of discretion in rule (TR-R3.2) as follows: "Matters of discretion are restricted to: ... <u>3. The operational and functional needs of the activity to exceed the high trip generation threshold.</u> 4. Effects on the capacity, safety, efficiency, and multi-modal function of the transport network. 45. Whether safe and effective access can be provided and maintained for emergency service vehicles to the site and within the transport network. 56. The design of transport facilities and their integration with the transport network. 67. Whether any improvements to the transport network are proposed or required as a <u>direct</u> result of the <u>proposed</u> activity, and a financial contribution has been made in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Contributions chapter. ..."	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission (173.2) to recognise the operational and function need of the HTGA in the matters of discretion.	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.6	EW-Earthworks	Amend	Considers the 500m ² limit does not reflect the generally larger scale of sites and required earthworks to enable commercial and industrial activities and	Amend clause (2) of the rule as follows: "2. The area of earthworks must not exceed <u>2500m²</u> 500m² per site in any 12-month period."	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission (173.4) which seeks to have the earthworks limit increased to 3000m ² .	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.7	FC-Financial Contributions	Oppose	Considers chapter does not provide sufficient guidance as to how/when Financial Contributions would be required by Council. Has potential to disincentivise development. Is in direct conflict with s108(10)(b) of the RMA as the level of contribution is not clearly determined in the PDP.	Seeks that the FC chapter is reconsidered "to reduce discretion and provide clearer guidance for council and developers."	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.5	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.8	NOISE-Noise NOISE-APP1	Oppose in part	Considers that noise limits should be as per the MCZ standard of 65 dB as per day / evening as these are appropriate for the adjacent zones.	Seeks that the where zone of the receiving site is one of Local Centre Zone, Mixed Use Zone or an Open Space and Recreation Zone, the noise limits in the table are amended as follows: • Night Limit (10:00pm - 7:00am): " 55 <u>65</u> dB LAeq (15min); 75 dB LAFmax	Support		Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.10b	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone	Oppose in part	Policy seeks to protect adverse effects on amenity and vitality therefore if the car parking is not visible then this policy should not apply.	Amend policy as follows: "2. Potentially incompatible activities include: ..."	Support	Aligns with Bunnings Ltd submission (173.6) to recognise that if the car parking is not visible then	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				Bunnings Ltd Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		MCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)		Drive-through activities seek to provide on-site parking, this policy would deter development in commercial zones.	f. Carparking at ground level <u>visible at the street edge or public space</u> on sites subject to the Active Street Frontage Overlay; and ..."		Policy MCZ-P3 should not apply.	
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.13b	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-R18 (Carparking activities)	- Oppose in part	Rule as notified does not make it clear whether the reconfiguration of an existing carpark requires resource consent.	Amend rule as follows: "1. Activity status: Permitted Where: ... <u>d. The carparking is related to the reconfiguration of an existing carpark area; or</u> <u>e. The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging."</u>	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission (173.7) that seeks to provide for reconfiguration of an existing carpark, accessible parking and electric vehicle charging spaces as permitted activities.	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.15a	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S4 (Active frontages – Buildings and structures)	- Oppose in part		Amend standard as follows: "On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay, <u>any new buildings shall provide the following:</u> ... 3. The buildings must not have a featureless façade on the front boundary of more than 3-4 m in width at any part of the building between 0.5m and 2.5m in height above footpath level <u>and roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.</u> ... 6. The <u>Any new</u> building must have the principal public entrance on: ... 7. Roller shutter doors, security grilles, screens or similar structures fitted to the facade of any building on the front boundary must be at least 50% visually transparent.	Support	Supports Bunnings submission 173.8a	Allow submission
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.15c	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S5 (Active frontages – Required verandahs)	- Oppose in part		Amend standard as follows: "Where any building is constructed, added to, or altered on a site with a frontage in the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B, it must provide a verandah or canopy in legal road along the length of the Active Street Frontage Overlay that: ..."	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.8b	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission					Bunnings Ltd Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position		Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
McDonald's Restaurants (NZ) Limited	174.16b	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S8 (Location and design of carparking)	-	Oppose in part	Does not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as restaurants in particular, which have loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts.	Amend standard as follows: "On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B: 1. Carparking must only be located: ... c. shielded from the Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B by a building, <u>or</u> d. <u>otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u> 2. Carparking may not be served by a <u>new</u> vehicle crossing across an Active Street Frontage Overlay A or B. On any site subject to an Active Street Frontage Overlay C: 3. Carparking must only be located within or underneath a building, on top of a building at least 3 metres above ground level, beside a building accounting for no more than 50% of the width of the site, or behind a building, <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space.</u> ..."	Support	Aligns with Bunnings Ltd submission (173.9) which considers that these rules do not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as supermarkets in particular, which have integral back-of-house and loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.8	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)	-	Oppose in part	Policy identifies ground-level car parking as a potentially incompatible activity within the Active Street Frontage Overlay. Carparking is a standalone activity even when ancillary to an otherwise permitted activity This suggests the zone is only supportive of part of a land use and not those components (carparking) which allow it function Heavy focus in policy on urban design outcomes For permitted land use activities which rely on car parking to function, difficult to achieve alignment.	Amend the policy direction to recognise the functional realities of activities that are located in the Metropolitan Centre Zone and serve the community	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.6.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.9	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P4 (Likely incompatible activities)	-	Oppose in part	Where an existing vehicle crossing in the overlay, is the only crossing serving an activity, should be able to retained without being considered incompatible. Other objectives and policies are strong enough to achieve purpose without total removal of existing environment	Amend policy to exclude existing vehicle crossings on Active Street Frontage Overlay B, from being likely incompatible.	Support	Aligns with Bunnings Ltd submissions points regarding applicability of Active Frontage controls to existing development.	Allow submission
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.10	MCZ Metropolitan Centre Zone	-	Oppose in part	Potential for alterations to require consent, due to existing building design not complying with Active Frontage Controls, even if alteration not modifying external building form	Amend provision to create a separate permitted activity rule for 'alterations', or Amend provision so that 'alterations' are only required to achieve compliance with criteria MCZ-R4(b) and (c)	Support	Aligns with Bunnings Ltd submissions points regarding applicability of	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				Bunnings Ltd Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		MCZ-R4 (Alterations and additions to existing buildings and structures)					Active Frontage controls to existing development.	
Woolworths New Zealand Limited	271.15	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S6 (Active frontages - Existing vehicle crossings)		As notified, the Standard does not provide for development in Active Frontage Overlay A or B, unless existing vehicle crossings are removed. Non-compliance likely even for modest development not related to vehicle access. Overly restrictive for established land uses Reference in discretion matter #5 about closing crossings has no supporting context in chapter overview, objectives or policies, unclear if means temporary or permanent closure. Closing public access to existing land uses	Amend standard to include an exception that this standard not apply to an existing access where it is the only public vehicle access to the site. Amend matters of discretion as follows: "Matters of discretion if the standard is breached: ... 5. Effects on the current or potential future ability of the road to be closed to general motor vehicle traffic. ..."	Support	Aligns with Bunnings Ltd submissions points regarding applicability of Active Frontage controls to existing development.	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.13	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-P3 (Potentially incompatible activities)	Oppose	If carparking not visible no effect on visual amenity, will deter development in zone for supermarkets that seek to provide onsite customer parking		Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.6.	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.19	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S4	Oppose	Considers that "In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it can be appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity."		Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.8a which recognises the intent of the active street frontage controls but considers that they do not appropriately recognise existing development.	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.20	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S5	Oppose	Considers that "In FSNI's experience, centres and commercial areas have a mixture of street typologies. Most have at least one main shopping street and while it can be appropriate that these streets have high levels of activation, there are secondary frontages or streets are less important retail streets and have lower levels of pedestrian activity."		Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.8b which recognises the intent of the active street frontage controls but considers that they do not appropriately recognise existing development.	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.28	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone	Oppose		Seeks that CCZ-R18, MCZ-R18, LCZ-R13 and NCZ-R13 should provide for reconfiguration of an existing	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.6.	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				Bunnings Ltd Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		MCZ-R18			carpark, accessible parking and electric vehicle charging spaces as permitted activities. Suggested additional wording to the rules: <u>x. The carparking is the reconfiguration of an existing carpark area (including where that reconfiguration results in a change to the type and/or number of parking or loading spaces provided) within the existing site boundary, provided that the existing carpark area within the site is not expanded; or</u> <u>x. The parking spaces are for accessible parking or electric vehicle charging.</u>			
Foodstuffs North Island	239.32	MCZ - Metropolitan Centre Zone MCZ-S8	Oppose	Considers that "these rules do not recognise the specific operational and functional requirement of activities, such as supermarkets in particular, which have integral back-of-house and loading requirements as part of their store formats that are usually located at the rear of buildings with the main entrance then located at the front of the building. This restricts the opportunity to provide parking at the rear of the building to comply with these standards while creating functional site layouts.", plus other reasons not specific to this relief - see original submission.	Seeks that CZ-S8, MCZ-S8 and LCZ-S8 should provide for car parking that is not visible from the street frontage as a permitted activity. Suggested additional wording to the standards: <u>or otherwise not visible at the street edge or public space</u>	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.9.	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.14	GIZ - General Industrial Zone GIZ-S5 (Landscaping and screening)	Oppose in part		GIZ-S5.1 is amended by adding: <u>"On any site subject to an Industrial Main Through Route Frontage Overlay, any new buildings shall provide the following: Landscaping is required on the front 3 metres of any site fronting on to a street with the Industrial Main Through Route Frontage Overlay."</u>	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.11.	Allow submission
Foodstuffs North Island	239.15	GIZ - General Industrial Zone GIZ-R3 (Construction of new buildings and structures and alterations and additions to existing buildings and structures)	Oppose in part		GIZ-R3.1.b is amended by adding: "The new buildings, the new structures, the alterations, or the additions, are for the purpose of an activity permitted by one or more of rules GIZ-R4 through GIZ-R17, or a heavy industrial activity, <u>or for an existing activity on the site.</u>	Support	Supports Bunnings Ltd submission 173.12.	Allow submission
Z Energy Limited	468.55	GIZ - General Industrial Zone GIZ-P4 (Other potentially	Support in part	Policy should focus on activities supporting the role and purpose of the GIZ. Provides for potentially incompatible activities provided the role of commercial centres is protected. Suggests assessment of alternative options and sites in other zones will be required and could then be	Amend policy as follows: Avoid commercial and community activities unless they:	Support	Aligns with Bunnings Ltd submission points that consider trade supply retail	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				Bunnings Ltd Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		incompatible activities)		used as justification for an activity that compromises other GIZ activities	<p>1. Are ancillary to a permitted activity and support the purpose of the zone, or</p> <p>2. Primarily serve the immediate area within the zone, or</p> <p>3. Have similar adverse effects and requirements <u>of a nature and scale that is compatible with the General Industrial activities that mean they are better located in an Industrial Zone than anywhere else</u> (for example, trade supply retail activities and yard-based retail activities), or</p> <p>4. Primarily serve surrounding suburbs but a suitable available site is unlikely to be available for the activity in a commercial centre (for example, supermarkets) <u>Are of a nature and scale that does not undermine the hierarchy of Centres, or</u></p> <p>5. Have significant co-location benefits with existing industrial activities or research activities in an Industrial Zone. When these activities are not avoided, they are managed to avoid significant reverse sensitivity issues for industry, including heavy industry that is an existing activity."</p>		is suitable in the General Industrial Zone.	
BP Oil New Zealand Ltd, Mobil Oil New Zealand Ltd and Z Energy Ltd (the Fuel Companies)	471.259	GIZ - General Industrial Zone GIZ-P4 (Other potentially incompatible activities)	Support in part	Should focus on activities supporting the role and purpose of the General Industrial Zone. As proposed, the emphasis on maintaining the centres hierarchy provides for activities that are incompatible with the zone to establish in the zone, provided the role of commercial centres is protected. Suggests assessment of alternative options and sites in other zones could justify an activity that compromises other General Industrial Zone activities. All reverse sensitivity effects should be avoided, not just significant reverse sensitivity effects.	<p>Amend GIZ-P4 as follows:</p> <p>Avoid commercial and community activities unless they:</p> <p>1. Are ancillary to a permitted activity and support the purpose of the zone, or</p> <p>2. Primarily serve the immediate area within the zone, or</p> <p>3. Have similar adverse effects and requirements <u>of a nature and scale that is compatible with the General Industrial activities that mean they are better located in an Industrial Zone than anywhere else</u> (for example, trade supply retail activities and yard-based retail activities), or</p> <p>4. Primarily serve surrounding suburbs but a suitable available site is unlikely to be available for the activity in a commercial centre (for example, supermarkets) <u>Are of a nature and scale that does not undermine the hierarchy of Centres, or</u></p>	Support	Aligns with Bunnings Ltd submission points that consider trade supply retail is suitable in the General Industrial Zone.	Allow submission

Submitter		Their Submission				Bunnings Ltd Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
					5. Have significant co-location benefits with existing industrial activities or research activities in an Industrial Zone. When these activities are not avoided, they are managed to avoid significant reverse sensitivity issues for industry, including heavy industry that is an existing activity."			
Enviro NZ	323.078	GIZ – General Industrial Zone GIZ-P4 (Other potentially incompatible activities)	Oppose	Considers that "The policy requires a stricter focus on reducing the criteria on when other activities are compatible in the zone. Given the number of permitted activities in the zone, returning the focus to the purpose of the zone ensures compatibility to the core purpose. Qualifying the scale of trade supply retail and yard-based retail will ensure that big box retail is not supported by the policy. Reverse sensitivity to industrial activities only becomes apparent when complaints are made which is too late to 'manage' them, and it is considered that the word 'significant' is not required. Site and building design is considered a better option if the activity is to be allowed."	Amend "Avoid commercial and community activities unless they: 1. Are ancillary to an <u>industrial or research permitted</u> activity and support the purpose of the zone, or 2. Primarily serve the immediate area within the zone, or 3. Have similar adverse effects and requirements to industrial activities that mean they are better located in an Industrial Zone than anywhere else (for example, small-scale trade supply retail activities and yard-based retail activities), or 4. Primarily serve surrounding suburbs but a suitable available site is unlikely to be available for the activity in a commercial centre (for example, supermarkets), or 5. Have significant co-location benefits with existing industrial activities or research activities in an Industrial Zone. When these activities are not avoided, they are <u>designed</u> managed to avoid significant reverse sensitivity issues for industry, including heavy industry that is an existing activity."	Oppose	This contradicts Bunnings Ltd submission 173.10 which supports the provision for trade supply retail activity within the General Industrial Zone.	Reject submission
Enviro NZ	323.088	GIZ – General Industrial Zone GIZ-R15 (Trade supply retail activities)	Support in part	Considers that "Limiting the establishment of trade supply retailing over a 200m ² threshold with a discretionary activity status will ensure that suitably narrow exceptions allow these activities to occur. The rule is currently too weak and will lead to cumulative effects, negating the purpose of the zone for industrial activities"	Amend GIZ-R15.1.a "...The activity is ancillary to an industrial activity <u>on the same site, and or...</u> "	Oppose	This contradicts Bunnings Ltd submission 173.10 which supports the provision for trade supply retail activity within the General Industrial Zone and considers that the controls (a – c) should be removed as a Permitted activity consent status is appropriate in the Industrial zone.	Reject submission
Enviro NZ	323.089	GIZ – General Industrial Zone	Support in part	Considers that "Limiting the establishment of trade supply retailing over a 200m ² threshold with a discretionary activity status will ensure that suitably narrow exceptions	Delete clause GIZ-R15.1.c [inferred] - "... The indoor part of the activity takes place in an existing building ... "	Oppose	This contradicts Bunnings Ltd submission 173.10 which supports the	Reject submission

Submitter		Their Submission				Bunnings Ltd Further Submission		
Submitter	Sub No	Plan Part	Position	Summary of Submission	Decisions Requested	Position	Reason	Relief
		GIZ-R15 (Trade supply retail activities)		allow these activities to occur. The rule is currently too weak and will lead to cumulative effects, negating the purpose of the zone for industrial activities"			provision for trade supply retail activity within the General Industrial Zone and considers that the controls (a – c) should be removed as a Permitted activity consent status is appropriate in the Industrial zone.	
Enviro NZ	323.090	GIZ – General Industrial Zone GIZ-R15 (Trade supply retail activities)	Support in part	Considers that "Limiting the establishment of trade supply retailing over a 200m ² threshold with a discretionary activity status will ensure that suitably narrow exceptions allow these activities to occur. The rule is currently too weak and will lead to cumulative effects, negating the purpose of the zone for industrial activities"	Amend the activity status of GIZ-R15.2 from Restricted Discretionary to Discretionary	Oppose	This contradicts Bunnings Ltd submission 173.10 which supports the provision for trade supply retail activity within the General Industrial Zone and considers that a Permitted activity consent status is appropriate in the Industrial zone.	Reject submission