

## H10 Residential Zone - Appendix I: Table of submission points

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
2.1	Brett Wilkinson	Oppose	Amend the minimum lot size for the Residential Zone from 450m <sup>2</sup> to 400m <sup>2</sup> and initially apply this minimum to sites that have a road frontage AND Amend the building platform/building area for the Residential Zone to 50% of the lot area (ie: 200m <sup>2</sup> ).	There is a requirement for more infill housing to make a better use of utilities already in place and save costs for the same. To reduce the continuing subdivision of farmland and or productive land. Front sites can be smaller as the berm and road are open space and provide necessary amenity.	Reject	33
FS1386.1	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1136.8	Shaun McGuire	Oppose	Amend to have minimum lot size 300 sq metres and building area 75% for the reasons stated in this submission.	with the amended lot size reduced to 300 sq metres and building area 75%	Accept	
3.1	Gulab Bilimoria for Bilimoria Consulting Ltd	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission states support for 22 Residential Zone.	No reasons provided.	Accept	39
FS1386.2	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
22.1	Bill McDonald	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions to require new titles within the proposed Residential Zone abutting the Harrisville Motocross Track to recognise there is a motor sport facility nearby by requiring 'no complaint covenants' and extra sound-proofing for new dwellings.	Residential activities and motocross activities are not always compatible. The Pukekohe Motor Cycle Club and its track form a significant part of the local community and the broader sport of motocross in New Zealand.	Reject	38
FS1386.17	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
23.1	Alarn Young for Kawasaki NZ	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions to require new titles within the proposed Residential Zone abutting the Harrisville Motocross Track to recognise there is a motor sport facility nearby requiring 'no complaint covenants' and extra sound-proofing for new dwellings.	Residential activities and motocross activities are not always compatible. The Pukekohe Motor Cycle Club and its track form a significant part of the local community and the broader sport of motocross in New Zealand.	Reject	38
FS1386.18	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1200.9	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 23.1.	No complaints covenants are not lawful. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission. We oppose this submission for the same reason identified above.	Accept	
24.1	Lewis Heels	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions to require new titles within the proposed Residential Zone abutting the Harrisville Motocross Track to recognise there is a motor sport facility nearby requiring 'no complaint covenants' and extra sound-proofing for new dwellings.	Residential activities and motocross activities are not always compatible. The Pukekohe Motor Cycle Club and its track form a significant part of the local community and the broader sport of motocross in New Zealand.	Reject	38
FS1386.19	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1200.10	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 24.1.	No complaints covenants are not lawful. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission. We oppose this submission for the same reason identified above.	Accept	
25.1	Maurice Hayman	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions to require new titles within the proposed Residential Zone abutting the Harrisville Motocross Track to recognise there is a motorsport facility nearby, have a 'no complaints covenant' and require new dwellings to have extra sound-proofing.	Residential activities and motocross activities are not always compatible. The Pukekohe Motor Cycle Club and its track form a significant part of the local community and the broader sport of motocross in New Zealand.	Reject	38
FS1386.20	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1200.11	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 25.1.	No complaints covenants are not lawful. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission. We oppose this submission for the same reason identified above.	Accept	
26.1	Brian Leathem	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions to require new titles within the proposed Residential Zone abutting the Harrisville Motocross Track to recognise there is a motorsport facility nearby, have a 'no complaints covenant' and require new dwellings to have extra sound-proofing.	Residential activities and motocross activities are not always compatible. The Pukekohe Motor Cycle Club and its track are a significant part of the local community and the broader sport of motocross in New Zealand. This motorsport facility has also been established for years and has hosted international events. It is supported by a huge number of competitors nationwide.	Reject	38
FS1386.21	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1200.12	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 26.1.	No complaints covenants are not lawful. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission. We oppose this submission for the same reason identified above.	Accept	
27.1	Josh Charlwood	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions to require new titles within the proposed Residential Zone abutting the Harrisville Motocross Track at 115 Geraghty Maber Road to recognise there is a motor sport facility nearby, have a 'no complaints covenant' and require new dwellings to have extra sound-proofing.	The property at 115 Harrisville Road abuts the eastern boundary of the well-established motor sport facility. The track operation should therefore take precedence and not be subjected to any noise complaints if the property at 115 Harrisville Road is rezoned for residential	Reject	38

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				purposes. The Harrisville Motorcross Track has been in existence for many years and is a top internationally recognised facility.		
FS1386.22	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1200.13	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 27.1.	No complaints covenants are not lawful. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission. We oppose this submission for the same reason identified above.	Accept	
29.1	Wayne Reilly	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions to require new titles within the proposed Residential Zone abutting the Harrisville Motocross Track to recognise there is motor sport facility nearby, have a 'no complaints covenant,' regarding noise and dust, and require new dwellings to have extra sound-proofing.	Residential activities and motocross activities are not always compatible. The Pukekohe Motor Cycle Club and its track form a significant part of the local community and the broader sport of motocross in New Zealand.	Reject	38
FS1386.24	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1200.14	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 29.1.	No complaints covenants are not lawful. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission. We oppose this	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>submission for the same reason identified above.</i>		
32.1	<b>Rupert Copping</b>	Oppose	Add provisions to require new titles within the proposed Residential Zone abutting the Harrisville Motocross Track to recognise there is a motor sport facility nearby requiring 'no complaint covenants' and extra sound-proofing for new dwellings.	The Harrisville motocross track and the Pukekohe Motor Cycle Club are a significant part of the local community and are of high importance to the broader sport of motocross in New Zealand. It is proposed to rezone land abutting this facility to residential and the two land uses are not always compatible. This change needs to be thoroughly thought through to ensure that problems are not created in the future and as a minimum there should be a covenant on the title referring to the proximity of a motor sport facility, the acceptance of the facility and the inability to complain about noise or dust from activities.	Reject	38
FS1386.26	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FS1200.15	<i>Gerardus Aarts &amp; Yvonne Gemma Aarts</i>	Oppose	<i>Oppose submission point 32.1.</i>	<i>No complaints covenants are not lawful. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission. We oppose this submission for the same reason identified above.</i>	Accept	
33.2	<b>Tim Shepherd for Cyclespot Euro</b>	Oppose	Add a requirement that any new titles that are created in the Residential Zone around or nearby the Harrisville motocross track recognise the motor sport facility and are subject to no-complaints covenants in regards to noise and dust and are required to have extra sound proofing in any new dwelling.	The Harrisville motocross track and the Pukekohe Motor Cycle Club are a significant part of the local community and are of high importance o the broader sport of motocross in New Zealand. It is proposed to rezone land abutting this facility to residential and the two land uses are not always compatible. This change needs to be thoroughly though through to ensure that problems are not created in the future and as a minimum there should be a covenant on the title referring to the proximity	Reject	38

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				of a motorsport facility, the acceptance of the facility and the inability to complain about noise or dust from activities.		
FS1200.17	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 33.2.	No complaints covenants are not lawful. We oppose this submission for the same reason identified above. The comments above are applicable to this submission.	Accept	
34.2	Brett Titchmarsh	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 PI(a)(iv) Building setback - Waterbodies to 10m from mean high water springs.	No reasons provided.	Reject	38
FS1386.28	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
35.4	Malcolm Titchmarsh	Support	No decision sought, but submission refers to 2346 Buckland Road, Tuakau.	No reasons provided.	Reject	39
FS1386.29	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
41.1	Perry Hughes	Neutral/Amend	Add a requirement that any new titles that are created in the Residential Zone alongside the Harrisville motocross track recognise the motor sport facility and are subject to	Having residential zoning alongside an established motor sport activity area is not appropriate. The Pukekohe Motorcycle club has the	Reject	38

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			no complaints covenants in regard to noise, and are required to have extra sound proofing in any new dwelling.	Harrisville motorcross track located right next to the proposed new Tuakau residential zoning. This facility is used by the surrounding community for motorcross events for many weekends during the summer.		
FS1386.33	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1200.18	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 41.1.	No complaints covenants are not lawful. We oppose this submission for the same reason identified above. The comments above are applicable to this submission.	Accept	
FS1200.8	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 41.1.	No complaints covenants are not lawful. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission. We oppose this submission for the same reason identified above.	Accept	
52.1	Roelof Lategan	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submitter opposes 22 Residential Zone.	No reason provided.	Reject	39
FS1386.40	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
65.2	Brent Greig	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision- General to require a minimum net site area of 300m2.	A 300m2 minimum net site area previously existed under the Franklin District Plan and provided choice and a range of housing typologies for Tuakau. 450m2 does not provide for efficient use of the residential land resource. The Discretionary Activity status for non-compliance will not attract confidence for applications or investment in Tuakau. The central area should be supported by a planning framework and intensification that recognises the transport links and the fact that Tuakau is 2.5km from the future urban zone of Auckland.	Reject	33
FS1386.51	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1136.3	Shaun McGuire	Support	The general public are requesting smaller land lots due to lifestyle choice and want less land to maintain with larger percentage of site covered with dwelling.		Reject	
65.3	Brent Greig	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 Building setback - Waterbodies to reduce the setback from the bank of any river from 23m to 10m.	The 23m setback for any building from the bank of any river is an inefficient use of residential land. A setback is appropriate and this should be 10m. The submitter notes this is the case in the Auckland Unitary Plan Residential Zones and can find no resource management justification or science as to why a more onerous 23m is deemed to be required in Waikato when the same issues of amenity, biodiversity and flood hazard avoidance exist.	Reject	5
FS1386.52	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>86.1</b>	<b>David Grigor for Grigor Construction Limited</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.3.9.1 P3 Building setbacks - All boundaries which requires a garage to be set back behind the facade of the dwelling.	Rule 16.3.9.1 is a significant constraint for residential development. There is no clear adverse effect from this activity and the submitter notes that the Auckland Unitary Plan (informed by a significant body of Urban Design advice and assessment), does not include this requirement in residential zones.	Accept	5
<b>123.3</b>	<b>Libby Gosling for Classic Builders Waikato Limited</b>	Not Stated	Delete Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (c) Restricted Discretionary Activities, which requires a minimum net site area of 300m2 for multi-unit development OR Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (c) Restricted Discretionary Activities to reduce the minimum net site area to less than 300m2 for each unit for multi-unit development.	Council already has discretion without being fixed on a specific value (e.g. 600m2 for a duplex). In Hamilton, the requirement for a duplex is 400m2.	Reject	13
<i>FS1386.104</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	
<i>FS1308.1</i>	<i>The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support in part.</i>	<i>We support the intent of this provision which is seeking greater flexibility for multi-unit developments. Residential development on smaller lots represents a sustainable use of the urban land resource where</i>	<i>Reject</i>	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				onsite and offsite amenity is maintained. The Plan has a comprehensive set of standards (rules) that helps to determine if a development is appropriate for the site area. There is no benefit in setting a minimum area for each unit. The outcomes sought by the submission will ensure variety in the future housing stock to help achieve policies 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.16, and 4.2.17.		
FS1187.4	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Support submission point 123.3.	The rule in the PWDP does not promote higher densities or compact development and will add to urban sprawl rather than housing intensification. Density should be appropriate to the physical attributes of the proposed development.	Reject	
FS1129.22	Auckland Council	Support	Null		Reject	
123.4	Libby Gosling for Classic Builders Waikato Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.2.4.1 PI (a) (vi) Earthworks - General requiring earthworks to be a minimum of 1.5m from all boundaries.	The submitters believe that this minimum setback is impractical, particularly as section sizes get smaller. Frequently a small batter or retaining wall is required near the boundary, but not at a scale that should require resource consent. The permitted yard requirement for the residential zone is 1.5m (to cladding), to build 1.5m from a boundary, it is necessary to undertake earthworks to create the footings etc. for the foundation which would be within this 1.5m area and trigger resource consent.	Reject	11
FS1092.7	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Support	Delete rule 16.2.4.1 PI (a) (vi) Earthworks - General.	This rule is very difficult to adhere to on steep blocks of land which rise above the road or fall below the road. As sections become smaller being unable to carry out any earthworks within 1.5M of each boundary can unnecessarily restrict the placement and design of a dwelling. It effectively removes a substantial percentage of land for use in the construction and design of a building.	Reject	
FS1308.2	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We agree that this minimum setback is impractical particularly as section sizes get smaller. It is often necessary to undertake earthworks to create the footings etc. for the foundation which would be within this 1.5m area and trigger resource consent.	Reject	
123.5	Libby Gosling for Classic Builders Waikato Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 PI (a) Building setbacks - All boundaries, to allow eaves to encroach over setbacks.	This is common in many other districts and allows sites to be more usable, particularly as sites become smaller.	Accept	5
123.6	Libby Gosling for Classic Builders Waikato Limited	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1 (a)(i) Subdivision - General, relating to minimum net site area.	The submitters support the removal of the 600m2 average lot size as in the Operative	Accept	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				District Plan. The submitters do not consider a 600m2 average lot size enables the efficient use of residentially zoned land. It restricts the submitter's ability to provide affordable housing due to reduced yield, and less efficiencies gained in servicing and development of the land. The submitters consider a 450m2 average lot size to be beneficial to provide some range and variation in lot sizes, or for policy framework to support lot size variation if discretionary activity resource consent is sought, to promote a range of typologies .		
FS1386.105	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1092.15	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Support	I support the retention of rule 16.4.1 (a) (i) Subdivision - General, relating to minimum net site area to allow more efficient use of residentially zoned land.	The submitters support the removal of the 600m2 average lot size as in the Operative District Plan. The submitters consider a 600m2 average lot size restricts the submitter's ability to provide affordable housing due to reduced yield, and less efficiencies gained in servicing and development of the land. The submitters consider a 450m2 average lot size to be beneficial to provide some range and variation within the subdivision and will also cater for increased demand for smaller lots for smaller houses.	Accept	
123.7	Libby Gosling for Classic Builders Waikato Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.2 (a)(i) Minor dwelling to reduce the minimum net site area 900m2 to enable Minor dwellings on smaller lots.	The submitters have experienced that minor dwellings are becoming more common for a variety of situations (e.g. investors, elderly parents, adult children saving for home deposit). Minor dwellings are often being constructed with new builds to provide an additional income stream for first home buyers and helping finance approval. In a new build situation,	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				minor dwellings can easily be integrated into the bulk of the primary dwelling. In Tauranga, sections 500m2 and over are allowed. In Queenstown, there is no minimum lot size to be entitled to a Minor dwelling but the submitters are frequently building them on lots of approximately 400m2. Whilst the submitters acknowledge that Tauranga and Queenstown are quite different to Waikato, they believe that 900m2 is too restrictive. The 900m2 limit will rule out the majority of new-build/greenfield subdivisions, because the lots sizes are too small.		
FS1092.8	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Support	We support the amendment of rule 16.3.2 (a) (i) Minor Dwellings - Reduce the minimum site area from 900M2 to enable minor dwellings on smaller lots. In our experience there is increasing demand for dual living spaces on the one block of land. This does not necessarily result in a larger buildings on the land but would allow for individual situations where an elderly parent needs care or adult children cannot afford their own home but need their own living spaces. Minor and major dwellings do not need to be large and both can be tastefully integrated into new builds. The 900m2 limit will rule out any minor dwelling on the majority of new builds as the lots are generally much smaller.	Current requirements for living environments must be acknowledged and planned for. There is a dire shortage of rental accommodation throughout New Zealand. Sensible planning will result in safe living environments for families. 'Big' is not necessarily 'best'. Smaller living areas are in demand so there is no valid reason to prohibit separate living areas on the one site, providing they are well designed and comply with the site coverage and other rules in the District Plan. We feel a reduction in the minimum site area from 900M2 to 700M2 would work well and would allow some larger lots (up to 700M2) within new subdivisions to accommodate the demand for minor dwellings.	Reject	
FS1386.106	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1092.12	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Not Stated	Null		Reject	
123.8	Libby Gosling for Classic Builders Waikato Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight admission, as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane	This daylighting standard is too restrictive on smaller lots, and lots that have topographical	Accept in part	8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			rising at an angle of 3745 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.52.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	constraints and variations.		
FS1092.13	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Not Stated	Null		Accept	
FS1092.9	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Support	Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight Admission as proposed by the submitter.	We find in practice the operative District Plan Daylight Admission rule is very restrictive compared to many other council's daylight admission rules. The rule is particularly restrictive on smaller lots and lots with challenging topography which covers most land in Raglan. This rule has resulted in a 'sameness' of design in many new subdivisions compared to many other areas. There is no valid reason for such a restrict daylight admission rule.	Accept	
123.9	Libby Gosling for Classic Builders Waikato Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.3.8 Service court, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.3.8 Service court to allow for greater flexibility to how it can be achieved and delivered.	The current requirement results in dwellings being designed around a 15m2 space containing a 3m circle. 2m is an adequate width to allow wheelie bins etc., this would allow greater flexibility to provide these spaces in locations that are usable, and functional, rather than just wherever it is manageable to fit a 3m circle.	Accept	30
130.4	Kathleen Reid	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.10 PI Building - Horotiu Acoustic Area to make it clear that existing buildings do not have to comply with the insulation requirements.	The rule is not clear about the requirements to insulate existing buildings. It would be unfair and costly for existing buildings to be insulated.	Reject	18
FS1039.5	Colette Brown	Support	Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	Would be unfair and costly for existing buildings to be insulated. Rule not clear for existing buildings.	Reject	
181.1	Robert Smith	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision General	No reason provided.	Accept	33.2
FS1386.161	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
182.3	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission states general support for 22 Residential Zone except as otherwise noted in supplementary points within the submission document.	No reasons provided.	Accept	39
FS1386.164	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
182.6	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	Retain the Objectives and Policies in Section 4.2 Residential Zone, as notified.	The provisions provide a suitable framework to facilitate a residential environment.	Accept in part	39
FS1386.167	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
182.7	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	Retain the Objectives and Policies in Section 4.4 Residential and Village Zones - Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour, as notified.	The provisions provide a suitable framework to facilitate a residential environment.	Accept	18
183.1	Tracey Smith	Support	Retain Rule 16.4 Subdivision.	No reasons provided.	Accept	33
FS1386.172	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
212.1	Ron Pollock on behalf of Community Living Trust	Support	Retain 22 Residential Zone in terms of combining Residential, Residential 2, Living Zones and Medium density housing areas into a single Residential Zone.	This will allow more intensive development of properties throughout the new Residential Zone; which in turn supports Integration with local services and facilities, including public transport development initiatives. This decision to combine the 4 zones into 1 Residential Zone further supports Councils previous decision to accept our submission in 2005 to change our Mason Road property from Rural to Living Zone during the last District Plan Review.	Accept	39
FS1386.225	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
213.1	Anita Torres	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1(a)(i) Subdivision - General, as follows: (i) Proposed lots must have a minimum net site area of 450400m <sup>2</sup> , except where the proposed lot is an access allotment or utility allotment or reserve to vest;	The change to require a minimum of 450m <sup>2</sup> is onerous to landowners wishing to subdivide. Many lots are based on a multiple of 400m <sup>2</sup> , i.e. 800m <sup>2</sup> , 1200m <sup>2</sup> and so on. A land size requirement of 400m <sup>2</sup> is sufficient to preserve green space while still allowing for a reasonable amount of growth and a decent return on the land investment that many landowners have	Reject	33



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				already made.		
FS1386.226	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
243.2	Shaun McGuire	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policies 4.2.2 to 4.2.10 to enable more intensive development.	The policies and subsequent rules are unnecessarily restrictive for a greenfield development. The amendments set out in subsequent submission points will be a better fit for the strategic direction whilst still providing a quality residential character.	Reject	39
FS1386.234	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1377.45	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and zones.	Reject	
243.4	Shaun McGuire	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 Height - Building general to increase the maximum height of any building from 7.5m to 8.0m.	8.0 metres is generally considered as the standard. This allows existing plans to be used reducing unnecessary extra costs for building due to redesign. 7.5 metres causes difficulties with standard pitched roofs.	Accept	27

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1377.46	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and zones.	Accept	
FS1261.10	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission points and amend the maximum building height in the Residential Zone to 8m.	The Operative Plan (Franklin section) provides for a permitted building height of 8m. A permitted maximum building height of 8m is generally considered as the default standard. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the Residential Zones of the surrounding districts (e.g. Auckland, Waipa and Thames-Coromandel). There is no clear justification for a maximum building height of 7.5m in the s32 reports.	Accept	
FS1297.16	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the maximum building height in the Residential Zone to 8m.	The operative plan (Franklin Section) provides for a permitted building height of 8m. A permitted maximum building height of 8m is generally considered as the standard. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa, and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
243.5	Shaun McGuire	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.5 Daylight admission, to change the rising angle of the height control plane from 37 degrees to 45 degrees.	The proposed height control plane is too restrictive to build a two-storey dwelling on a 450m <sup>2</sup> site. It makes it difficult to provide acceptable living space in the upper levels of the dwelling. More common is 45 degrees, and 55 degrees on the north face. This suits the roof design of 45 degrees pitch.	Accept	8
FS1377.47	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. Should be a minimum of 45o.	Accept	
FS1261.14	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provision so that the angle used to calculate daylight admission is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive. 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
FS1297.20	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provision so that the angle is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa, and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
243.6	Shaun McGuire	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 (a)(ii) Subdivision - General, to read as follows: (ii) Proposed lots must be able to connect to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater, if they are available, otherwise a engineer designed waste water and	Some areas in Tuakau have limited wastewater and stormwater reticulation. There are many small individually owned lots. The costs to install infrastructure for smaller lots is prohibitively	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>stormwater disposal system acceptable to the Waikato District Council engineering department may be used.</u>	expensive. This would make the subdivision of these lots not viable. Allowing modern engineer designed wastewater and stormwater systems can adequately dispose of the wastewater and stormwater on site as is being used successfully in the area presently.		
FS1386.235	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
243.7	Shaun McGuire	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 (a)(iv) Subdivision - General.	Due to the existing infrastructure and previous planning in place, this rule is inappropriate and unnecessarily restrictive for subdivision in Tuakau. The historic pattern of sections lend themselves well to subdivide in approximate half to provide 2 sections over 450m2 with a right of way to a rear site. This would mean most lots created would be a rear site. This rule would prevent this. Tuakau in these older area with existing 1011m2 section is different to subdividing large open areas of farm land because certain infrastructure already exists.	Reject	33
FS1386.236	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
244.1	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Support	Retain Rule 16.1.2 P3 Permitted Activities A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village.	More appropriate to have retirement villages in residential zones.	Accept	22
FS1386.237	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
244.2	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P3 (a) Permitted Activities, to reduce the minimum area required for a retirement village in Raglan from 3ha to 1ha.	Raglan has very little flat land and retirement villages and facilities needs to be built on flat land to allow easy access. It is unlikely that there would be any area in Raglan of 3ha in which to develop a retirement village. The Ryman retirement village and complex in Gisborne consists of a three level apartment block with one level duplex units. The 3ha requirement should be reduced to 1ha to encourage and enable more retirement housing, especially when there is a dire shortage in Raglan. Attractive and functional retirement complexes are commonly developed on relatively small areas of land. There appears to be no valid reason for a minimum area of 3ha. 3ha is a huge area of land and would be difficult to find in most residential areas and expensive to purchase. This would necessitate demolishing existing properties in city areas. This is not practical or workable.	Reject	22
FS1386.238	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1276.31	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be disallowed.	A retirement village already existed at the foot of Stewart St. Panning controls failed to protect it. Until such controls are in place it seems pointless to build new villages, later susceptible to conversion to other forms of housing.	Accept	
244.3	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.2 (f) Permitted Activities to increase the maximum building height to allow for three level retirement developments.	Most apartment complexes for the incapacitated elderly are three levels. Setting a maximum building height of 8m would not allow three levels. The elderly feel secure in a unit or apartment that is easily accessible and close to staff and other residents. Helps reduce purchase costs for residents and development costs for providers.	Reject	22
FS1386.239	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
244.4	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (c) Restricted Discretionary Activities, to decrease the minimum site area required for duplexes to 200m2.	The minimum net side area of 300m2 for a duplex residential unit of land is too large. The trend for new developments in Australia is for smaller residential and duplex lot sizes. The average age in most western countries is steadily rising. More people live alone	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>and most do not want large lots and can often not afford to maintain them. People are busy and most do not want to spend time maintaining gardens and land, especially if they do not use them. The trend in Australia for small homes and duplexes is to have a small outdoor dining at the rear of their dwelling. Smaller lot sizes are very popular and very common in Australia, are most attractive once developed and allow development that is more intensive closer to cities. The small lots offer a lower cost entry level for sole home occupants or couples, which is they are so popular. Housing is fast becoming unaffordable for many people Making it possible for single people and couples to live in a new, modern, private, well designed, small home should be the aim of all councils as it would fill a desperate need and provide suitable dwellings for a large number of people who would otherwise not be able to afford them A well-planned duplex home on a small lot is preferable to living in an apartment.</p>		
FS1017.9	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
FS1017.6	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
FS1187.5	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Support submission point 244.4.	The rule in the PWDP does not promote higher densities or compact development and will add to urban sprawl rather than housing intensification. Density should be appropriate to the physical attributes of the proposed development.	Reject	
FS1129.23	Auckland Council	Support	Null		Reject	
FS1386.240	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
244.5	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (e) Restricted Discretionary Activities, to increase the maximum site coverage to 60%.	To allow for homes and duplexes to be built on smaller lots 300m2 minimum is not required for small duplexes Site coverage would need to be increased to 60% to allow for a reasonably sized home with 2 bedrooms and a garage on a 200m2-250m2 duplex site.	Reject	13
FSI 386.241	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FSI 187.6	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Support submission point 244.5.	Site coverage need to be increased to allow for a reasonably sized home on smaller sites.	Reject	
244.6	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (h) Restricted Discretionary Activities, to reduce the minimum living court area for studios and 1 bedroom units to 20m.	The trend is heading towards smaller lots and homes Most people, especially the elderly do not require or want to maintain large outdoor living areas and can purchase larger lots if they do There must be provision for those who do not want large sections or cannot afford or maintain large dwellings and sections There is no need to have such a large living court area imposed, especially when most small dwellings and apartments are only occupied by 1-2 people	Reject	13
FSI 386.242	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
244.7	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (h) Restricted Discretionary Activities, to reduce the minimum living court area for 2 bedroom units to 25m2.	The trend is heading towards smaller lots and homes Most people, especially the elderly do not require or want to maintain large outdoor living areas and can purchase larger lots if they do There must be provision for those who do not want large sections or cannot afford or maintain large dwellings and sections There is no need to have such a large living court area imposed, especially when most small dwellings and apartments are only occupied by 1-2 people.	Reject	13
FS1386.243	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
244.8	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities, to reduce first level and second level apartment minimum living court areas to 6m2.	There is a need to recognise that the trend and requirement is for dwellings Most people, especially the elderly do not require or want to maintain large outdoor living areas and can purchase larger lots if they do There must be provision for those who do not want large sections or cannot afford or maintain large dwellings and sections There is no need to have such a large living court area imposed, especially when most small dwellings and apartments are only occupied by 1-2 people In apartment complexes, due to the close proximity between neighbors it is not desirable	Reject	13



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				to have large outdoor living areas especially on upper levels as it can be dangerous (especially for elderly occupants) can create a noise problem for adjoining residents if too many people socialize on the lower and/or upper balconies Small apartments do not require large living court areas so they should be reduced to provide for those who do not require them Market forces dictate and people should have a choice.		
FS1386.244	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
244.9	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 Pl Height - Building general, to increase the maximum building height from 7.5m to 8.5m.	Residential buildings in subdivisions have become very generic in the past 10-15 years These restrictions have led to mundane residential design If someone wants to build a two level home with a higher pitched roof they should be able to providing the building complies with the height to boundary rules Two level homes occupy less site coverage and open up view shafts for the adjacent homes and particular for the homes located to the rear Setting unnecessary height restrictions for residential homes is not conducive to good design.	Reject	27
251.1	John Cunningham for Aparangi Retirement Village Trust	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to enable mixed use of commercial and residential on Waeranga Road, Te Kauwhata.	Te Kauwhata is a growth node for North Waikato and will need more commercial street frontage in the future. Mixed commercial/residential use of the Aparangi street frontage on Waeranga Road will future-proof the land use.	Reject	39

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
<b>251.2</b>	<b>John Cunningham for Aparangi Retirement Village Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide smaller section sizes for retirement villages.	Smaller section sizes, down to 225m2 will give better land utilization for the current Aparangi village. It will allow clusters of "mini-houses" which is a popular retirement village layout overseas and will come to New Zealand to give greater flexibility for independent living.	Reject	12
FS1004.3	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Tamahere Eventide Retirement Village	Support	Allow submission point 251.2.	Support the proposal to allow for smaller section sizes for retirement villages (down to 225m2).	Reject	
FS1005.7	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Atawhai Assisi Retirement Village	Support	Allow submission point 251.2.	Support the proposal to allow for smaller section sizes for retirement villages (down to 225m2).	Reject	
FS1202.8	New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Oppose submission point 251.2.	Any rezoning of land which enables more development than currently provided for must be planned to ensure that adverse effects (for example, on the transport network) including cumulative effects, are identified and addressed. The effects upon surrounding transport infrastructure of this rezoning have not been addressed.	Accept	
FS1386.253	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1386.255	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>259.1</b>	<b>Wendy Rowell for Pokeno Playcentre</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities by adding child care facility as a permitted activity.	ECE confers large benefit to the young, growing Pokeno community. It is appropriate for ECEs to be in the Residential Zone where people live. An ECE will not have adverse effects on residential and recreational activities. The only zone where the proposed plan permits ECEs is the Business Zone. In Pokeno this is a very limited area where pick up /drop offs will be dangerous. Wish to develop a site for the Pokeno playcentre, which we will lose due to the Pokeno school expansion.	Accept	22
<i>FS1386.259</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>275.2</b>	<b>Tim Foy for Waikare Golf Club (Te Kauwhata) Inc.</b>	Oppose	Amend the setback distance for the properties on the northern boundaries of Waikare Golf Club, Te Kauwhata from 1.5m to 10m.	Submitter's experience with minimum setback distances allowed for development on their western boundary and likely on their eastern boundary has, is or is likely to cause significant health and safety issues for residents and their families.	Reject	5
<i>FS1269.4</i>	<i>Housing New Zealand Corporation</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.</i>	Accept	
<b>276.3</b>	<b>Ted and Kathryn Letford</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain the ability in 22 Residential Zone to undertake multi-unit development AND Amend 22 Residential Zone to reduce the size of the net site area per residential unit for multi-unit development from 300m2 net site area to 150m2 average per apartment	Supports the ability to cater for Multi Unit Development. Recommend reconsidering 300m2 net site area per residential unit as they may be too large for this type of development. Suggests adopting a similar approach to HCC: 150m2 per apartment, 200m2 net site area per	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			and 200m2 net site area per half duplex to be similar to Hamilton City Council.	half duplex unit.		
FS1386.282	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1017.4	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
276.4	Ted and Kathryn Letford	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a) (iv) Subdivision General to increase the number of lots to 20 or more for when this rule is triggered.	Seems hard to work with. Submissions uses an example of a four lot subdivision with two front and two rear lots to illustrate that subdivision will not be able to achieve this rule. Would be difficult to obtain a parent title with a sufficiently long road frontage to make this work. Number of lots need to be raised for when this rule is triggered, suggests 20 lots or more.	Reject	33
FS1386.283	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
276.5	Ted and Kathryn Letford	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.6 Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans and conversions to	Supports the inclusion of Amendments to cross lease and flats plans. Supports the ability to	Accept	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			freehold.	convert from cross lease to fee simple title. This is an improvement on the Operative Plan, which has no provision for these.		
<b>289.2</b>	<b>Sarah and Dean Hewitt and McGill</b>	Not Stated	Retain the 450m2 minimum net site are for Residential Zone sites (Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision- General).	No reasons provided.	Accept	33
FS1386.294	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1369.8	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Oppose	Null	Topography restrictions will have a detrimental outcome to the environment.	Reject	
<b>297.9</b>	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.3 Residential built form and amenity as notified.	The ensure that there is an obligation to consider safety, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Accept	4
FS1269.9	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment; to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1386.311	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
299.2	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Support	Retain Section 4.2 Residential Zone as notified except where specific modification is sought elsewhere in the submission.	It provides a suitable framework to facilitate a residential environment.	Reject	39
FS1386.329	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
299.3	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Support	Retain Section 4.4 Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour as notified except where specific modification is sought elsewhere in the submission.	It provides a suitable framework to facilitate a residential environment.	Accept	18
299.6	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.2 Noise as notified.	The policy seeks to ensure lawfully established activities are protected and that setbacks are provided. This is agreed and will need to be supported with robust planning (for lawful establishment) and technical (acoustic) reporting where any setback is proposed.	Accept	18
299.7	2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.5 Objectionable odour as notified.	The policy seeks to ensure lawfully established activities are protected and that setbacks are provided. This is agreed and will need to be supported with robust planning (for lawful establishment) and technical (acoustic) reporting where any setback is proposed.	Accept	20
300.5	Rolande Paekau for The Te Whaanga 2B3B2 & 2B1 Ahu Whenua Trust	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Section 3.4 Multi-unit development in Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines. In particular the submission considers the natural character and essence of Raglan CBD will be significantly changed should 2-storey apartments or dwellings be erected along Wainui Road-Fire station area	The natural character and essence of Raglan's CBD would significantly change if 2-storey apartments or 2-storey dwellings are developed along Wainui Road and in the area of the fire station. This exploits the landscape values for tourism and economic gain with no benefits being provided to local tangata whenua.	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1386.336	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1276.224	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Reasons for WED's support are that all new CBD buildings have been 2 storey, whereas most older buildings are single storey. If allowed to continue this will change Raglan's character.	Reject	
305.1	John Joensen	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to allow for more high density housing within central Raglan, possibly as far as James Street.	Allow for higher density housing to alleviate the housing shortage within Raglan. Building smaller units will free up the bigger homes for families. Raglan businesses suffer during winter and need an increase in resident population. Reduces need to drive into town and reduces traffic congestion. Keeping standards high will enhance the town and create a more vibrant atmosphere.	Reject	39
FS1276.5	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	High density housing may affect the character of Raglan, and that development has, so far, exacerbated, rather than solved, the shortage of affordable housing in Raglan.	Accept	
FS1269.31	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment; to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
310.1	Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project	Neutral/Amend	Delete the minimum unit areas from Rule 16.4.4 RD1 (a) (iv) Multi-unit development. OR Amend Rule 16.4.4 RD1 (a) (iv) Multi-unit development by replacing the minimum unit areas with lower values for example Studio unit 30m2, One bedroom unit 40m2, Two Bedroom 50m2, Three bedroom 70m2.	Cost of building has risen such that in order to retain affordability, building smaller dwellings is necessary. Having fixed minimum sizes restricts those wanting to live in a much smaller space in order to meet the Building Code and retain accessible building cost. The attached Raglan Housing Study (attached to the submission) recommends investigating the commercial potential for alternative forms of housing that depart from traditional single	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				site/detached dwelling (e.h. multi-units/townhouses). Whaingaroa/Raglan Affordable Housing Project highlights need for Raglan community to generate and explore all possible options to provide affordable houses.		
FS1386.360	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1276.6	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed in some areas.	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities	Reject	
FS1269.32	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
<b>310.2</b>	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Residential Zone Subdivision Rule 16.4.4 RD1 (b), by including the following: (xi) Positive effects for affordable housing.	Affordability of housing should be enabled by objectives and Rules of District Plan. WRAP highlight need for Raglan community to generate and explore all possible options to provide affordable houses.	Reject	13
FS1269.33	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1276.7	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed in some areas.	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities	Reject	
FS1386.361	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
310.6	Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project	Neutral/Amend	Add a new objective to 4.2- Residential Zone as the follows: <u>Objective: To provide for a range of opportunities for affordable housing that enables low and moderate income people to live in the district in accommodation that suits their needs.</u>	Affordability of housing should be enabled by objectives and Rules of the District Plan.	Reject	35
FS1386.363	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1269.35	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment; to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
310.7	Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project	Neutral/Amend	Add the following policies to 4.2-Residential Zone as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>Policy 1: Enable affordable housing by allowing residential densities that make economical and best use of available land in existing residential areas. Policy 2: New housing developments will include affordable housing as part of the development plan. Policy 3: Allow access for developers of affordable housing to lower cost structure of consent and regulation requirements. Policy 4: Encourage multi-unit residential developments subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment. Policy 5: Take into account positive effects for the community of affordable housing when assessing resource consent applications.</u>	Affordability of housing should be enabled by the objectives and rules of the District Plan.	Reject	35
FS1386.364	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1276.15	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed subject to adding 'subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment' to 1.	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities.	Reject	
FS1269.36	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
<b>310.8</b>	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.1 P1- Dwelling as follows: <del>One dwelling within a site</del> <u>Two dwellings within a site, where the combined floor areas do not exceed 'X' percentage of the section.</u>	Increasing building density in residential zoned land increases the availability of affordable housing. Increasing density while meeting the height to boundary and other restrictions requires building smaller dwellings or multi-unit dwellings. 16.3 currently restricts the numbers of dwellings per site and the size of those buildings therefore requiring discretionary resource consent adding to the cost of development. Amending Rule 16.3 as suggested enables affordable development design in residential zoned land to maximize number of dwellings on a site without discretionary consent. Other councils have made similar changes (e.g. Auckland, Wellington) to enable increased density by right within the rules of the plan.	Accept	13
FS1386.365	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1276.18	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed subject to adding 'subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment.'	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities.	Accept	
<b>310.9</b>	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add new rule to Rule, 16.3.1 P2 Dwelling as follows: <u>(a) Three dwellings within a site, if at least two of the dwellings are small houses each with a gross floor area of less than 45m<sup>2</sup>.</u>	Increasing building density in residential zoned land can increase the availability of affordable housing. Increasing density while meeting the height to boundary and other restrictions requires building smaller dwellings or multi-unit dwellings. Rule 16.3 currently restricts the numbers of dwellings per site and the size of those buildings therefore requiring discretionary resource consent adding to the cost of development. Amending Rule 16.3 as suggested enables affordable development design in residential zoned land to maximize number of dwellings on a site without discretionary consent. Other councils have made similar changes (e.g. Auckland, Wellington) to enable increased density by right within the rules of the plan.	Reject	
FS1386.366	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FS1308.13	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support the submission to allow more than one primary dwelling per site. This is similar to our submission which seeks to allow up to three dwellings as a permitted activity through amendments to the multi-unit housing provisions. However, we	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				see no valid reason to restrict the size of the dwelling if there is compliance with the bulk location standards.		
FS1276.19	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed subject to adding 'subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment.'	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities.	Reject	
326.3	Charlie Young for Raglan Chamber of Commerce	Neutral/Amend	Add a new policy and objective to Section 4.2 Residential Zone, as follows (or similar wording): <u>Objective: To provide for a range of opportunities for affordable housing that enables low and moderate income people to live in the district in accommodation that suits their needs. Policy 1: Enable affordable housing by allowing residential densities that make economical and best use of available land in existing residential areas. Policy 2: New housing development will include affordable housing as part of the development plan. Policy 3: Allow access for developers of affordable housing to lower cost structure of consent and regulation requirements. Policy 4: Encourage multi-unit residential developments subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment. Policy 5: Take into account the positive effects for the community of affordable housing when assessing resource consent applications.</u>	Affordability of housing should be enabled by the objectives and Rules of the District Plan. Housing developments have a focus on providing good quality homes which meet the needs of individual communities at a cost that enables those at all income levels to afford a decent place to live are supported in the consent and development processes. Clearly housing affordability throughout District needs to be supported. Lack of affordable housing is having a severe impact on businesses trying to retain staff in communities. Other NZ District Councils have recognized housing crisis and have activated affordable housing policies and initiatives. Policies need to be incorporated into the district plan.	Reject	35
FS1269.102	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1386.380	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1377.52	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports the intent of recognising housing affordability but that can be achieved through a number of means. District Plans can do so by providing for more housing and greater development potential. It is not a matter that is typically addressed	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>in the contents of district plans.</i>		
<b>326.4</b>	<b>Charlie Young for Raglan Chamber of Commerce</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.4.4 RD1 (a)(iv) Multi-unit development OR Amend Rule 16.4.4 RD1 (a)(iv) Multi-unit development by decreasing the Multi-unit development minimum unit areas, for example Studio unit 30m2, One bedroom unit 40m2, Two bedroom 50m2 and Three bedroom 70m2.	Affordability of housing should be enabled by the rules of the District Plan. The cost of building has risen such that in order to retain affordability, building smaller dwellings is necessary. Having fixed minimum sizes in the rules restricts those wanting to live in a much smaller space to meet Building Code and retain accessible building cost. Housing developments have a focus on providing good quality homes which meet the needs of individual communities at a cost that enables those at all income levels to afford a decent place to live are supported in the consent and development processes. Clearly housing affordability throughout District needs to be supported. Lack of affordable housing is having a severe impact on businesses trying to retain staff in communities. Other NZ District Councils have recognised housing crisis and have activated affordable housing policies and initiatives.	Reject	13
FS1269.103	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment; to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1269.104	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment; to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1386.381	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>326.6</b>	<b>Charlie Young for Raglan Chamber of Commerce</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3 Land use, so that the number of dwellings and the definition of a minor dwelling allow for more than one primary dwelling and one minor dwelling	Increasing building density in residential-zoned land can increase the availability of affordable housing. Increasing density requires building	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			per site. The submission sets out some examples of possible amendments to rules, e.g.: Rule 16.3.1 P1 Two dwellings within a site where the combined floor areas do not exceed x percentage of the section. New Rule 16.3.1.P2 Three dwellings within a site, if at least two of the dwellings are small houses each with a gross floor area of less than 45m2.	smaller dwellings or multi-unit dwellings. Rule 16.3 restricts the number of dwellings and therefore adds cost through requiring a resource consent. These changes enable affordable housing design to maximise the number of dwellings on a site without discretionary consent.		
FS1386.383	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1269.105	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment; to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
326.7	Charlie Young for Raglan Chamber of Commerce	Not Stated	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 16.4.4 RD1(b)- Multi-unit development as follows: (xi) <u>Positive effects for affordable housing.</u>	Affordability of housing should be enabled by rules of the District Plan. Clearly housing affordability throughout District needs to be supported. Lack of affordable housing is having a severe impact on businesses trying to retain staff in communities. Other NZ District Councils have recognised housing crisis and have activated affordable housing policies and initiatives. The cost of building has risen such that, in order to retain affordability, building smaller dwellings is necessary.	Reject	13
FS1386.384	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1269.106	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment; to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
<b>326.8</b>	<b>Charlie Young for Raglan Chamber of Commerce</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.7 PI (iii) Living Court, by changing "80m2" to "40m2".	Increasing building density in residential zoned land can increase the availability of affordable housing. Increasing density while meeting the height to boundary and other restrictions requires building smaller dwellings or multi-unit dwellings. 16.3 currently restricts the numbers of dwellings per site and the size of those buildings therefore requiring discretionary resource consent adding to the cost of development. Amending 16.3 as suggested enables affordable development design in residential zoned land to maximize the number of dwellings on a site without discretionary consent. Other councils have made similar changes (Auckland, Wellington) to enable increased density by right within the rules of the plan.	Reject	29
FS1269.107	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
<b>326.9</b>	<b>Charlie Young for Raglan Chamber of Commerce</b>	Not Stated	Delete Rule 16.3.9.1 P3 Building setback - All boundaries AND Add a matter of discretion to Rule 16.3.9.1 RD1 Building setbacks - all boundaries, as follows: (viii) <u>Positive effects for affordable housing.</u>	Increasing building density in residential zoned land can increase the availability of affordable housing. Increasing density while meeting the height to boundary and other restrictions requires building smaller dwellings or multi-unit dwellings. 16.3 currently restricts the numbers of dwellings per site and the size of those buildings therefore requiring discretionary resource consent adding to the cost of development. Amending 16.3 as suggested enables affordable development design in residential zoned land to maximize the number of dwellings on a site without discretionary consent. Other councils have made similar changes (Auckland, Wellington) to enable increased density by right within the rules of the plan.	Reject	5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission is addressed
FS1269.108	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
367.2	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Section 4.4 Residential and Village Zones - Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour.	No reasons provided.	Accept	18
FS1386.545	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
368.7	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.2.14 - Earthworks, to read as follows; Earthworks facilitate <u>efficient</u> subdivision, use and development.	Every effort should be made to integrate the significant majority of the earthworks required for the development of individual house lots with the overall bulk subdivision earthworks. This significantly reduces the requirement for secondary earthworks and reduces both on-site and off-site effects related to erosion, sediment, dust and noise from machinery. Designing and undertaking of earthworks as a 'cut to fill balance' significantly limits on-site and/or off-site movement of material Earthworks, amendments proposed to recognise the focus of earthworks must be to enable the overall efficient development of the subdivision, as earthworks can be a significant component of the works. Furthermore the earthworks profile is often dictated by the engineering requirements of providing roads and services at appropriate gradients, in turn able to provide efficient and safe connection to individual lots.	Reject	11
368.8	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.15(a)(iv) - Earthworks, to read as follows: The importation and exportation of cleanfill is avoided in the Residential Zone.	Every effort should be made to integrate the significant majority of the earthworks required for the development of individual house lots with	Reject	11



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the overall bulk subdivision earthworks. This significantly reduces the requirement for secondary earthworks and reduces both on-site and off-site effects related to erosion, sediment, dust and noise from machinery. The amendment proposed is to promote a 'cut to fill balance' in earthworks design in order to reduce the earthworks period and avoid off site effects from earthworks resulting from the importation or exportation on or off a site of large volumes of material. The exception is the removal of unsuitable material, contaminated material or excess topsoil from development sites. Designing and undertaking of earthworks as a 'cut to fill balance' significantly limits on-site and/or off-site movement of material		
FS1308.22	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	<i>There are certain sites where clean fill is required to be imported or exported to ensure that development can occur. It is not always possible to achieve a cut to fill balance, particularly where Structure Plan signals the protection of ridgeline or hills.</i>	Accept	
FS1061.4	Campbell Tyson	Oppose	Seek submission point 368.8 be disallowed.	<i>This policy is contradictory to the objective 4.2.14(a) which states that earthworks facilitate subdivision, use and development. Case law has determined the use of the word 'avoid' means 'do not allow' without exception. However, clean fill may be required in residential zoned sites to enable greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes. The requirement to avoid filling in all circumstances will restrict the ability to develop residential land where balanced cut to fill earthworks are inappropriate or cannot be achieved, particularly where adjoining properties have already undertaken bulk earthworks and there is insufficient material within a subject property to match their levels.</i>	Accept	
368.9	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Delete Policy 4.2.15(d) - Earthworks.	If land has been zoned for residential purposes than the shape, contour and landscape characteristics of the land will change, because it will be converted from open land, likely in horticultural or pastoral use, to urban development. Unless the land is specifically identified and protected for its landscape and/or character attributes the most important outcome is the efficient development of the land to achieve the use it is zoned for. Creating an attractive development will be a product of the	Reject	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				design and construction of the subdivision, not the retention of existing land-form. Issues related to the change in the appearance of the land need to have been addressed at the time the zone was changed.		
FS1377.69	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports amendments that recognise that it may not always be practicable to maintain such landscape characteristics during urban development and there may be other ways to mitigate that effect.	Reject	
FS1061.5	Campbell Tyson	Support	Seek that submission point 368.9 be allowed.	This policy is contradictory to the objective 4.2.14(a) which states that earthworks facilitate subdivision, use and development.	Reject	
414.1	Chris Rayner	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to give consideration and guidelines to alternative collective living arrangement within the Living Zone. For instance, a large site of more than 1 acre with multiple dwellings on the site in a form of communal living.	As land becomes more and more expensive, especially in Raglan. The simple aim of infill and further subdivision of land is not suited to everyone and the Council should be encouraging and enabling other forms of sustainable communal living that provide accommodation and community for people. Perhaps some of the rules that apply for papakainga could be used as a guide for more groups of people to create alternative communal living on private land.	Reject	39
435.7	Jade Hyslop	Oppose	Add rules to 22 Residential Zone, to provide for protection of defined views from public places to harbour, coast and natural backdrops which include at least the following defined views: (a) From SH23 (north of Maungatawhiri Road) to Kaitoke Creek. (b) All existing views of the bar from Main Road, Bow Street and Norrie Avenue. (c) All existing views of Karioi from Raglan CBD. (d) From Wainui Road to the coast between the Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp. (e) From SH23 summit to Karioi. (f) AroAro salt marsh from Wallis Street. AND Amend the Planning maps for any consequential relief to give effect to this submission point.	Rules in each zone chapter are needed to apply Outstanding Natural Features and Landscapes Objective 3.3.3a.) And in Raglan to apply Business and Business Town Centre Zone Policy 4.5.14a.iii.)- Raglan Town Centre. Views are an inherent part of retaining Raglan's seaside character. Raglan's community plan, 'Raglan Naturally,' contains 6 references to views. RMA s5 states purpose of RMA which includes reference to social, economic and cultural wellbeings, of which Raglan Naturally sets out that the Raglan community clearly expressed such wellbeings include protection of views. At the last plan revision, Council accepted views were important but change needed to occur via a variation which has not happened and thus needs to be a part of the plan. Excluding an important part of Raglan Naturally is to deny the value of public participation. Plan protects views of navigation beacons. Other authorities' district plans show protection of other views is possible, e.g. Auckland and Hastings	Reject	37

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1258.46	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not provide sufficient detail to determine the precise spatial extent of the view protection areas and does not define what 'protection' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.	Accept	
FS1329.5	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose. Disallow the introduction of protected viewshafts.	The submission seeks to introduce rules that protect defined views. It is unclear in the submission what is to be protected and the extent of the viewshafts sought to be protected. The consequences of introducing protected views without specific landscape and visual assessment are unclear.	Accept	
445.8	Heather Perring for BTW Company	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities to facilitate ease of residential building in new structure planned areas as follows: <u>P2 Residential or multi-unit development, in accordance with an approved structure plan created after 18 July 2018.</u>	Developer led and Council led structure planning should be encouraged to reach up front agreements with local communities on the essential bulk and location standards to create developments suited to the location rather than a 'one size fits all' approach or ad hoc development. Provisions are needed to enable well planned multi-unit developments on smaller sites, rather than across a multiple owned structure planned area.	Reject	22
FS1388.295	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
445.9	Heather Perring for BTW Company	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, by deleting RD1 (a multi-unit development) and consequently creating a new controlled activity rule for multi-unit development.	Developer led and Council led structure planning should be encouraged to reach up front agreements with local communities on the essential bulk and location standards to create developments suited to the location rather than a 'one size fits all' approach or ad hoc development. Provisions are needed to enable	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				well planned multi-unit developments on smaller sites, rather than across a multiple owned structure planned area.		
FS1388.296	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1388.338	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
457.1	Anna Cunningham	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P4(b) Home occupation, by reinstating the condition in Rule 21.11 in the Operative Waikato District Plan that requires the storage of materials or machinery associated with the non-residential activity to not be visible from a public road or neighbouring residential property.	The proposed rule that requires materials or machinery to be stored within a building is very restrictive and not always possible. If the equipment is shielded from view by a fence (for example), no person is adversely affected.	Accept	22
FS1388.350	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
457.2	Anna Cunningham	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General, by reinstating the condition in Rule 21.69.1 (b) of the Operative Waikato District Plan which enables alternative methods of water supply and stormwater, land drainage and wastewater disposal that comply with the engineering standards in Appendix B.	On-site water collection and wastewater disposal are very feasible and this is often the most cost-effective and ecologically sound option for sections (currently an option for sections over 2500m <sup>2</sup> ). It would be a shame to lose this option.	Reject	33
FS1388.351	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FS1114.18	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Support in part.	FENZ is neutral on whether alternative methods of water supply in the residential zone should be enabled. It does however wish to reiterate the importance, as set out in its submission, of having appropriate levels of water supply for firefighting purposes (whether reticulated or non-reticulated) and that the provision or allowance of alternative methods of water supply as sought by this submission should not replace that requirement.	Reject	
463.3	Environmental Management Solutions Limited	Oppose	Delete contaminated land from Rule 16.4.7 Title boundaries - contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas. AND Add a new set of rules specifically relating to contaminated land that align with National Environmental Standard for	The submitter considers it unacceptable and nonsensical to include Contaminated Land in with notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas, significant amenity landscapes etc. The provisions set out within	Accept	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to protect Human Health provisions (sections 30 and 31 of the Wellington City Council Plan provides an example of this).	the rules contradict those detailed within the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 which overrides any planning provision. Regulation 5(5) of the NESCS specifies subdivision as an activity to which the standard applies where an activity that can be found on the Ministry for Environment Hazardous Activities and Industries List has, is or is more likely than not to have occurred on a property. The regulations have a specific pathway to follow. In many cases, it is through the subdivision application that a report investigating and identifying the contamination on a property is identified. This may include several areas, large or small irrespective of proposed subdivision boundaries. For subdivision to be enabled, soil contaminant concentrations have to meet the soil contaminant standards set by the NESCS or the site has to be satisfactorily managed. It is considered most appropriate for potentially contaminated land to have a separate rule that reflects the requirements of the NESCS.		
FS1388.371	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
464.5	Perry Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.18 Multi-unit development, as follows: (a) <u>Ensure Enable</u> multi-unit residential subdivision <u>and mixed use</u> development is <u>to be</u> designed in a way that: (i) provides a <u>wide</u> range of housing types; (ii) Addresses and integrates with adjacent residential development, town centres and public open space <u>while recognising the importance of multi-unit developments</u> role in addressing	It will promote the sustainable management of resources. It will achieve the purpose of the Resource Management Act 1991. It is not contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991. The Plan contains provisions to enable higher density residential outcomes which are beneficial.	Reject	12

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			housing supply: ... (v) Maintains the amenity values of neighbouring sites. (b) Encourage developments that promote the outcomes of the Waikato District Council's multi-unit development urban design guidelines (Appendix 3.4), in particular section 3 ... (b)(iv) Ensuring design is contextually appropriate and promotes local characteristics to contribute to community identity; (v) Designs that respond to and promote the public interface by the provision of: A. Streets, communities and public places; ... AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to address the concerns raised in the submission.			
FS1388.378	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1087.8	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 464.5.	The submission seeks to enable residential intensification in close proximity to the Horotiu Industrial Estate, which is identified as a regionally significant industrial node.	Accept	
464.8	Perry Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Delete the minimum lot size from Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (c) Restricted Discretionary Activities AND Add a matter of discretion to Rule 16.1.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities, to address lot size AND Delete the minimum living court areas and dimensions from Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (h) Restricted Discretionary Activities. AND Add a matter of discretion to Rule 16.1.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities, to address living court areas and dimensions. AND Amend Rule 16.1.4 D3 Discretionary Activities as follows:	The requirement per unit and living court areas should be based on specific design considerations for a Multi-Unit development rather than a nominal area. The matter should be assessed as part of Council's restricted discretion for a Restricted Discretionary Activity application. To reflect previous submission points, as a consequential amendment. The amendment retains these matters as a specific matter of restricted discretion under RD1. To reflect correct cross referencing.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Any Multi-unit development that does not comply with Rule 16.1.3 RD1 <u>except for Rules 16.1.3 RD1 (c) and (h).</u> AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to address the concerns raised in the submission.			
FS1388.381	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1308.53	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support the intent of this provision which is seeking greater flexibility for multi-unit developments. We agree that more flexibility is required to enable multi-unit development. I agree with the submitter's comment that the 3000m <sup>2</sup> net lot size will not provide for or encourage intensification of an existing urban area or facilitate housing variety. We support greater flexibility in the multi-unit housing rules where they promote more intensive development. The outcomes sought by the submission will ensure variety in the future housing stock to help achieve policies 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.16 and 4.2.17.	Reject	
464.9	Perry Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a) (i) Subdivision - General, to reduce the minimum lot size as follows: (a)(i) Proposed lots must have a minimum net site area of 450m <sup>2</sup> 400m <sup>2</sup> , except where the proposed lot is an access allotment or utility allotment or reserve to vest; AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to address the concerns raised in the submission.	Greater residential density will better meet housing needs in the District and help avoid sprawl. The Plan contains provisions to enable higher density residential outcomes, which is beneficial.	Reject	33
FS1388.382	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>466.4</b>	<b>Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P10 Permitted Activities to encompass all existing commercial vegetable production activities on land that has been rezoned residential/urban.	The submitter supports commercial vegetable production being a Permitted Activity in the Residential West Te Kauwhata area, however, considers that this Permitted Activity status should be extended to encompass all areas of existing commercial vegetable production that has been rezoned residential.	Reject	22
<i>FS1388.400</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
<b>466.9</b>	<b>Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 Building setback - Waterbodies to change setback requirements to 30m from a lake and 20m from a watercourse.	The submitter supports this rule, however question the basis for a 23m setback and consider that setback distances should be aligned throughout the plan and consistent with existing setback requirements. Wetland as described in the RMA includes permanently or intermittently wet areas, shallow water, and land water margins that support a natural ecosystem of plants and animals that are adapted to wet conditions. Without a size requirement or specification to indigenous vegetation, it is considered that this could refer to any intermittently wet area that has plant life and therefore careful consideration should be	Reject	5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				given to required setback.		
FS1388.403	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
496.5	Andrea Millar for The Department of Corrections	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P7 Permitted Activities, to provide an exclusion for a community corrections activity as follows: P7 Community activity - Activity Specific Conditions: <u>Excluding a community correction activity.</u> Nil AND Any other consequential amendments required to give effect to this relief.	The submission is seeking community correction activities be a subset of community activities. This would result in community correction activities being permitted in the Residential Zone. This is not an appropriate outcome for the zone, as the activity has the potential to result in adverse effects on residential character and amenity. It is appropriate that any community corrections activity in the Residential Zone is subject to a resource consent application to assess the effects on the environment.	Reject	
FS1269.136	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment; to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1388.492	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
542.3	Mark Sillence	Neutral/Amend	Amend 22: Residential Zone, so that the existing old quarter acre titles on the eastern side of Geraghtys Road, Tuakau that already contain a dwelling remain without change but possibly enable every 5th or 6th title in this location to contain no more than two dwellings.	Development in this location should be in keeping with the spacious residential environments located on McEvoy Avenue, Coolen Place, St Johns Avenue and Thorn Road, Tuakau.	Reject	33.2
FS1388.749	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
596.1	Raewyn Detmar on behalf of Pokeno Playcentre	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities, to add a Childcare Facility as a Permitted Activity.	Supports a play centre being in close vicinity to residential homes. Does not support childcare centres being in amongst the commercial buildings as per the current rules.	Accept	22
FS1388.1003	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
607.1	Stephanie Hooper	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities by adding childcare facility as a permitted activity.	Pokeno Playcentre is due to lose its facility as Pokeno School is reclaiming the land for expansion. Early childcare education allows great benefits for preschools and families within the Pokeno community. The Plan permits that early childcare education is in the Business Zone	Accept	22

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				only. Within the Business Zone adds further risk to children on the road during drop offs and pick up times.		
FS1387.1	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
617.1	Nicole Falkner for Pokeno Playcentre	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities, by adding childcare facility as a permitted activity.	Early childcare education provides a large benefit to the young, growing community of Pokeno. Appropriate for early childcare education centres to be located in Residential Zone, close to where people reside. Will not have adverse effects on residential activities. Only zone permitting early childcare education centres is the Business Zone, however the area is limited resulting in dangerous pickups/drop offs. Losing current site due to expansion of school.	Accept	22
FS1387.11	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
625.1	Sharon Burman on behalf of Kainui Homes	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General, for greater intensification of existing residential properties by allowing	Reduced costs for establishing new subdivision amenities. Subdivision of a smaller size would	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			subdivisions of properties to 420m2 as opposed to the 450m2 set in the District Plan.	enable intensive use of sections within the residential area which would mean slower urban sprawl into rural areas. Large sections within town boundaries could create more properties required for home dwellings. Opportunity for home ownership and meeting housing needs. Sections of smaller size have in the past been previously set.		
FS1387.19	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
662.4	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1(c) Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: (c) The minimum net site area per residential unit is 300200m2.	Rule 16.1.3 provides clear guidance for increasing residential density and infill development. The area requirement for multi-unit developments needs to be reduced to 200m2 for each dwelling unit, as such an area will allow for efficient residential intensification without the need for a more onerous development assessment. Whilst many residential properties will be constrained in obtaining a 200m2 net site area, a satisfactory urban design can be achieved on smaller allotments.	Reject	13
FS1387.97	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FSI129.24	Auckland Council	Support	Null		Reject	
662.6	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight admission as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 37 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.53m above ground level at every point of the site boundary	This will align with other district plans in the region and will provide a consistent standard for development. Greater housing choice will be enabled.	Reject	8
662.7	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.3.8 PI (a)(i) Service Court, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.3.8 PI (b) Service Court to require a dimension of at least a 3m diagonal line that is no less than 1.5m in width rather than the 3m diameter requirement.	Supports a 15m <sup>2</sup> service court. Does not agree that a 3m diameter shape factor is appropriate given that service areas should be discreet areas and hence located to the side or rear of a property. A 3m diameter circle is not conducive to discreetly locating a service court.	Accept	30
662.8	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 PI (a) Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: (i) 23m from the margin of any: A. lake <u>over 4ha</u> ; and B. wetland; (ii) 23m from the bank of any river (other than the Waikato and Waipa Rivers); ... (v) <u>10m from a managed wetland</u> AND Any consequential amendments.	A wetland as defined under the RMA is broad reaching and covers many features. Having a nominal 23m setback applied to such a wide variation of water features is inappropriate and introduces significant inefficiencies which is contrary to Part 2 of the RMA and the sustainable management of natural and physical resources. A lake can constitute a large array of waterbodies and therefore a starting point of 4ha should be used before the setback applies.	Reject	5
FSI387.99	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
662.9	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.1 RD1 Subdivision - General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 Subdivision - General as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: ... (iii) Where roads are to be vested in Council, and where practicable, they must follow a grid layout; ... (v) Where the subdivision is within a structure plan area, neighbourhood centres within the site are provided in general accordance with that structure plan document. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: ... (ix) General consistency with any relevant structure plan or master plan including the provision of neighbourhood parks, reserved and neighbourhood centres;	Grid road layouts are obviously the most efficient transportation design, however when developing land for residential land use, natural features will need to be provided for and could prevent a grid layout. The amendments sought recognise a grid roading layout is not always achievable. The amendments recognise on-site variables as opposed to strict adherence to high-level structure planning documents.	Reject	33
FS1387.100	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
679.4	Greenways Orchards Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.3 RD1 (a)(ii) Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area as follows: (a) Proposed lots within Te Kauwhata West Residential Area must comply with all of the following conditions: ... (ii) Have a minimum average net site area of 875m <sup>2</sup> -700m <sup>2</sup> ;	The proposed minimum average net site area of 875m <sup>2</sup> is an inefficient use of land that fails to account for anticipated growth in the area. It fails to give effect to the Future Proof Strategy which seeks a more compact urban form and greater densities in existing settlements. It does not achieve the minimum density required by strategic Policy 4.1.5.	Reject	34
FS1387.152	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1150.2	Te Kauwhata Land Limited	Support	The 875 m <sup>2</sup> average does not result in an efficient use of land	Allow the submission, but rather than amend the minimum average net site area, delete the Te Kauwhata West residential zone and replace it with a standard residential zoning	Reject	
FS1318.5	Viaduct Harbour Nominees Limited	Support	If deletion of Rule above advanced by WDC- this change is to be made.	Reduce minimum average area to 700m <sup>2</sup> to support greater density.	Reject	
<b>681.2</b>	<b>Lavalla Farms Limited</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a)(i) Subdivision - General, and the 450m <sup>2</sup> minimum net site area for greenfield subdivision.	Supports the minimum lot size of 450m <sup>2</sup> for greenfield subdivision.	Accept	33
FS1387.241	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
<b>681.3</b>	<b>Lavalla Farms Limited</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1 RDI(b)(ii) Subdivision - General, relating to variation in lot sizes.	The intended residential development for the submitter's property indicates a range of lot sizes with medium densities around the existing community facilities and larger lots to the north adjoining the proposed Village and Rural Zones. This assessment criterion will therefore provide for a variety of built forms and housing choice that aligns with the strategic direction set out in Policy 4.1.10(i). Ensures that subdivision can be designed to provide variety and choice in housing types.	Accept	33.7
FS1387.242	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
681.4	Lavalla Farms Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a)(iii) Subdivision - General and make it a matter of discretion.	The establishment of grid patterns may not be appropriate for all sites due to topographical or other physical constraints. For example, the submitter's property at 131 Dominion Road contains a number of buildings, streams and steep areas. There is no section 32 analysis to justify the requirement for a grid layout. The appropriateness of a grid layout should therefore be listed as a matter of discretion rather than a rule.	Accept	33
FS1387.243	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
681.5	Lavalla Farms Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13 (a) Subdivision creating reserves, and make it a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and this rule will therefore result in unjustified costs to developers and purchasers. The rule is arbitrary and may not be appropriate for all types of reserves and developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage as indicated with the subdivision concept plan provided with the submission. There is no section 32 analysis to	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				justify the 50% threshold. The extent of road frontage for a proposed reserve should therefore be a matter of discretion rather than a rule.		
<b>681.7</b>	<b>Lavalla Farms Limited</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General, with the exception of RDI (a)(iii), which is addressed elsewhere in the submission.	Provides for the efficient use of land resources. Enables the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district.	Accept	33.2
FS1387.245	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
<b>684.4</b>	<b>Janet Elaine McRobbie</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission recognises that the importation of fill to enable residential development is appropriate in Rule 16.2.4.1 Earthworks- General and questions whether this would be a permitted activity (P2) or a non-complying activity (NC1).	The submitter states that the provision seems to be workable but is interested in the thoughts of other submitters. Cleanfill may be required to enable greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes but it is unclear whether this is permitted P2 or whether resource consent to a non-complying activity NC1 is required. NC1 would be too restrictive and needs to be more lenient to enable greenfield development.	Reject	11
<b>684.5</b>	<b>Janet Elaine McRobbie</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - Road frontage, by replacing the proposed requirements with the equivalent provisions in the Operative District Plan: Franklin Section (Rule 26.6.4 Frontage to Road (Vehicular Access Requirement)).	There is no analysis in the section 32 analysis to justify the requirement for a lot to have a 15m road frontage (other than an access allotment, utility allotment or a lot containing a right of way or access leg). Opposes Council prescribing a minimum frontage.	Reject	33
FS1134.63	Counties Power Limited	Oppose	Seeks that the submission not be allowed.	The road frontage should not be reduced from 15m as it may create adverse effects on existing infrastructure and may also limit proposed infrastructure that would be located within road	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				reserves.		
<b>684.6</b>	<b>Janet Elaine McRobbie</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.12 - Building platform, by replacing the proposed requirements with the equivalent provision in the Operative District Plan: Franklin Section (Rule 26.6.1 Shape Factor).	There is no section 32 analysis to justify the proposed requirements for a building platform. Opposes the size of the shape factors.	Reject	33
FS1387.252	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
<b>684.7</b>	<b>Janet Elaine McRobbie</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13 RDI (a) Subdivision creating reserves, and make it a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the proposed rule will result in additional costs for developers and purchasers. The rule sets out an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types or developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. The submitter has provided a subdivision concept plan that appropriately responds to the characteristics of their sites. The section 32 analysis does not justify the 50% threshold and this matter should be considered as a matter of discretion.	Reject	33
<b>684.8</b>	<b>Janet Elaine McRobbie</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, by replacing the proposed provisions with the equivalent rule in the Operative District Plan: Franklin Section (Rule 11.5 Esplanade Reserves and Strips).	While esplanade reserves and strips enable public access and recreation, their provision needs to be assessed on a case by case basis and Council should allow a waiver or width reduction in certain circumstances.	Reject	33
<b>687.5</b>	<b>Campbell Tyson</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13 RDI (a) Subdivision creating reserves, and make it a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. The enforcement of the rule may	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				increase the cost of development which could be passed onto purchasers. This is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types or developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. We have analysed the site and its surroundings to identify the constraints and opportunities and the attached Subdivision Concept Plan has been designed to respond with these findings. There is no analysis in the s32 stating why the 50% rule has been applied. While this may be a principle to follow it should not be enforced through a rule.		
<b>687.8</b>	<b>Campbell Tyson</b>	Support	Retain the general residential subdivision provisions in Rule 16.4.3 Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area, as proposed in the District Plan, with the exception of Rule 16.4.3(a)(ii) (which is addressed elsewhere in the submission).	It enables the subdivision of land to provide for growth within the district.	Reject	34
FS1387.273	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1318.6	Viaduct Harbour Nominees Limited	Support	Support in part the use of general residential rules with no exception.	Support efficient and compact growth support WRC RPS HH/ha.	Reject	
<b>687.9</b>	<b>Campbell Tyson</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.3(a)(ii) Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area, to reduce the minimum average to 700m <sup>2</sup> .	To support efficient and compact growth Inefficient use of land that fails to take into account the anticipated growth for the area Fails to give effect to the Future Proof Strategy identified in Section 1.5.1 of the Plan that seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a more compact urban form based on concentrating growth in	Reject	34

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and around Hamilton (67%) and the larger settlements of the district (21%). This involves a reduction in the relative share of the population outside of the subregion's existing major settlements through tighter control over rural-residential development and encouraging greater urban densities in existing settlements. Average residential lot size of 875m <sup>2</sup> is considered to be an inefficient use of the residential land resource. Does not achieve the minimum density required by strategic Policy 4.1.5. This is an inconsistency between the rules and the Plan's objectives. The rule should give effect to the Plan, therefore, this should be rectified.		
FS1318.7	Viaduct Harbour Nominees Limited	Support	If general residential rules are not acceptable. This submission is supported in whole.	Reduce minimum to 700m <sup>2</sup> - Reasons as above.	Reject	
FS1150.3	Te Kauwhata Land Limited	Support	Reduction in average lot size, but standard residential development should be enabled rather than 700m <sup>2</sup> average lot size	Subject to application of standard residential zoning and rules (including subdivision rules) to the site	Reject	
FS1387.274	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
688.2	Gerardus & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General, with the exception of Rule 16.4.1 (a)(iii) (which is addressed elsewhere in the submission).	Provides for the efficient use of the land resources Enables the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district	Accept	33.2
FS1387.277	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
688.3	Gerardus & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(iii) Subdivision - General, and make this a matter of discretion.	While grid layouts result in increased permeability, legibility and walkability of residential areas, the establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate to all sites. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a grid layout. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding the relevance or practicality of this rule. While grid layouts are an accepted urban design principle for good subdivision design they are not an absolute response. Therefore, they should be used as a principle and not enforced through a rule.	Accept	33
FS1387.278	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
688.4	Gerardus & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - Road Frontage, to match the Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section Rule 26.6.4 Frontage to Road (Vehicular Access Requirement) provisions.	The submitter opposes Council prescribing a minimum frontage. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding the relevance or practicality of this rule.	Reject	33
FS1134.64	Counties Power Limited	Oppose	Seek that submission point not be allowed.	The road frontage should not be reduced from 15m as it may create adverse effects on existing infrastructure and may also limit proposed	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				infrastructure that would be located within road reserves.		
688.5	Gerardus & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.12 Subdivision - Building Platform, to match the Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section Rule 26.6.1 Shape Factor.	The submitter opposes the size of the shape factors. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding the relevance or practicality of this rule.	Reject	33
FS1387.279	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
688.6	Gerardus & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13 RDI (a) Subdivision creating reserves, and make this a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. The enforcement of the rule may increase the cost of development which could be passed onto purchasers. This is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types or developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. The site and its surroundings have been analysed to identify the constraints and opportunities and the attached Subdivision Concept Plan has been designed to respond with these findings. There is no analysis in the s32 stating why the 50% rule has been applied. While this may be a principle to follow it should not be enforced through a rule.	Reject	33
689.1	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Retain the general residential subdivision provisions in 22 Residential Zone, with the exception of submission points below.	Provides for the efficient use of the land resources Enables the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district	Accept	33
FS1387.281	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>689.4</b>	<b>Greig Developments No 2 Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission recognises the importation of fill to enable residential development is appropriate in Rule 16.2.4.1 Earthworks - General and questions whether this would be a permitted activity (P2) or a non-complying activity (NC1).	These provisions seem to be workable but the submitters are interested in the thoughts of other submitters. Clean-fill may be required in residential zoned sites to enable green-field land to develop for residential purposes. It is unclear whether this is a P2 permitted activity or a NC1 non-complying activity. NC1 would be too restrictive and needs to be more lenient to enable green-field development within residential zones.	Reject	11
<b>689.5</b>	<b>Greig Developments No 2 Limited</b>	Oppose	Add a new provision P2 to Rule 16.3.1 Dwelling that permits a multi-unit development of up to three dwellings, with similar standards to Rule 16.1.3 RDI (including proposed amendments) applied as permitted activity standards AND Amend Rule 16.3.1 Dwelling to ensure that this rule does not apply to multi-unit developments.	The current rule is too restrictive Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings will allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary Resource Consent costs and time delays where the effects could be managed through permitted activity standards There are a number of larger (more than 1000m2) sections within the older existing residential areas in Tuakau, Te Kauwhata, Ngaruawahia and Pokeno. These areas are often close to the Town Centre. Intensification of these sites should be encouraged given their proximity to existing services. This will allow existing land to be developed more efficiently without the need to subdivide the land allowing landowners to build additional dwellings on existing lots. Permitted standards can control amenity effects to ensure that neighboring sites are not affected. This approach is consistent with the Operative	Reject	13



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				District Plan - Franklin Section where up to three dwellings can be constructed on properties without Resource Consent provided permitted standards would be achieved.		
FS1387.284	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
689.6	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight admission as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>37</del> 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary	It is inconsistent with previous Planning documents which are less restrictive It is too restrictive for urban areas Adequate amenity and daylight for adjoining sites can be achieved with a less restrictive control plane The 37-degree angle is difficult to calculate	Accept	8
FS1261.15	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provisions so that the angle used to calculate daylight admission is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive. 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
FS1297.21	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provision so that the angle is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa, and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
FS1377.195	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. 37 degrees is difficult to calculate.	Accept	
689.7	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.6 PI Building coverage as follows The total building coverage must not exceed <del>50%</del> 40%	Opposes the 40% site coverage as the height limit does not enable the efficient use of urban land and fails to increase the development	Reject	6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				capacity of existing urban areas. To allow the greater utilization of residential zoned land to support the strategic direction outlines in Section A and Chapter B 4.1 of the Plan supports increase densities and housing choice throughout the district. This approach is consistent with the Operative District Plan - Franklin Section		
<b>689.8</b>	<b>Greig Developments No 2 Limited</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.7 P1 (a) Living court, as follows: (a) A living court must be provided for each dwelling that meets all of the following conditions: ... (iii) When located on the ground floor, it has a minimum area of <del>804</del> 10m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of <del>3m</del> 4m in any direction; and (iv) When located on a balcony of an above ground apartment, it must have a minimum area of <del>10</del> 15m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of 2m in any direction. AND Amend Rule 16.3.7 P2 (a) Living court as follows: A living court must be provided for each minor dwelling that meets all of the following conditions ... P2 (a) ... (iii) When located on the ground floor it has a minimum area of <del>10</del> 40m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of 24m in any direction; (iv) When located on a balcony of an above ground apartment, it must have a minimum area of <del>8</del> 15m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of <del>1.6</del> 2m in any direction.	Excessive sized outdoor living areas will restrict the ability to develop the urban land. The size standards exceed the existing Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section standard which requires up to 60m <sup>2</sup> of the outdoor living area The perception of urban living is changing and people no longer need large outdoor areas Smaller outdoor living courts have been adopted by Auckland Council to promote a more compact living approach and should be adopted by Waikato District Council to achieve the strategic objectives Reducing the minimum outdoor living court allows for variety in lifestyle and lower maintenance Rule 16.3.8 (Service court) requires an additional service court, which ensures adequate outdoor space for living and other domestic requirements.	Reject	29
<b>689.9</b>	<b>Greig Developments No 2 Limited</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.8 P1(a) Service court as follows: (a) A service court must be provided for each dwelling and minor dwelling each with all of the following dimensions: (i) minimum area of <del>5</del> 15m <sup>2</sup> ; and (ii) contains a circle of at least <del>2</del> 3m diameter.	The Plan requires excessive service court for modern urban living. Excessive service courts will restrict the ability to develop urban land efficiently There is no assessment in the Section 32 analysis to support the size of the service court	Accept	30
FS1261.22	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend 16.3.8 accordingly.	Reducing the spatial requirement for service courts will allow for the more efficient development of urban land. The s32 analysis does not provide any evidence supporting the size of the service court.	Accept	
FS1297.28	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission points and amend 16.3.8 accordingly.	Reducing the spatial requirement for service courts will allow for the more efficient development of urban land. The s32 analysis does not provide any evidence supporting the size of the service court.	Accept	
FS1377.196	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and flexibility in controls. Reducing the spatial requirement for service courts will allow for the more efficient development	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>of urban land.</i>		
<b>693.7</b>	<b>Alstra (2012) Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.3.9.2 Building setback - sensitive land use, except for the amendments sought below; AND Add to Rule 16.3.9.2 Building setback - sensitive land use a new clause (vi) as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>(vi) 300m from the closest point of a building on another site associated with an intensive farming activity.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	The addition provides an additional implementation method to protect the existing recognised intensive farming operations within Ngaruawahia. It would be expected that that should the proposal default to a discretionary activity, due to being within that 300m buffer, Alstra would be considered an affected party by council. As a lifelong Ngaruawahia resident, the submitter is encouraged by the residential growth of their town and does not seek to stifle this growth. There are legal methods Alstra can implement to both allow the continued operation of the intensive farms and allow appropriate development around these operations.	Accept	33
FS1317.1	Quinn Haven Investments Limited and M & S Draper	Oppose	Null	<i>The further submitter's property is located abutting the submitter's intensive farming activity. The further submitter's land is zoned Residential, so sensitive land use is anticipated on it. The development of the further submitter's land will assist in meeting the strategic objectives of the Council and Future Proof with respect to supporting residential growth in Ngaruawahia. A curfew of 300m encompasses the entire property owned by the further submitters rendering the land difficult to be developed for its intended purpose, as failure to comply with this rule would require a Discretionary Activity resource consent. There is also land within 300m of the submitter's property which is already zoned and developed for sensitive (residential) activity, and implementation of this proposed rule would unfairly restrict improvements of new buildings on properties within the existing residential area. While the existence of the intensive farming activity is acknowledged, the further submitter considers that the effects of that activity should be internalised; that is, potential effects spilling out beyond the boundaries of that site should be managed and mitigated by that landowner/consent holder to ensure no adverse effect on the wider environment.</i>	Reject	
<b>693.8</b>	<b>Alstra (2012) Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.2.1.1 Noise- General, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Rule 16.2.1.1 PI Noise - General as follows (or words to similar effect): Farming noise (including intensive	Supports the rule as it provides for current farming activities to occur, now including intensive farming. As intensive poultry farming practices general emit low amounts of noise, apart for in the summer months when the	Reject	18

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			farming), and noise generated by emergency generators and emergency sirens. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	fans are needed more regularly to ensure adequate temperature for the birds, the operations that Alstra run are within the noise regulations that are required for a permitted activity.		
FS1317.2	Quinn Haven Investments Limited and M & S Draper	Oppose	Null	Intensive Farming activities have the potential to create effects that are not akin to normal farming practice (e.g. animal density is significantly greater than normal farming practice). Intensive farming activities should be subject to the listed dB standards of 16.2.1.1(P2).	Accept	
693.9	Alstra (2012) Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.7 RDI (a) (iii) (A) Title boundaries - contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Rule 16.4.7 RDI (a) Title boundaries - contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas as follows (or words to similar effect): Subdivision of land containing adjoining or adjacent to contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and Aggregate Extraction Area must comply with all of the following conditions... AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	Support is given in relation to the requirement for a 300m setback from any intensive farm within the Waikato District, however the wording of the proposed rule seems to indicate that the land being subdivided must contain the intensive farm. To provide for the subdivision of adjoining or adjacent land as well, providing reverse sensitivity protection for the existing Alstra sites.	Accept	33
FS1317.3	Quinn Haven Investments Limited and M & S Draper	Oppose	Null	With respect to intensive farming, it is understood that the purpose of this rules as written by WDC is to ensure that intensive farming activities are contained within an appropriately sized allotment with sufficient buffers in order to be able to maintain internalisation of effects- and also to ensure that the consented activity is contained within one Record of Title that can be effectively managed by one landowner. It is expected that the purpose of the rule is not to limit development of neighbouring sites, but to ensure that such intensive farming activities are managed so that they do not create reverse sensitivity issues. Implementation of the amendment as requested by the submitter would mean that the subdivision of the further submitter's land defaults to a Non-Complying Activity.	Reject	
FS1387.375	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
698.2	<b>Simon Dromgool on behalf of Christine Dromgool John and Caroline Vincent Mark Dromgool</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.3.2 PI (a)(iii) Minor Dwelling, to remove the 70m2 limitation.	The floor area maximum of 70m2 for a minor dwelling is too restrictive, and if a section size of 900m2 plus is required then the only restriction should be a maximum total footprint size as a percentage of the total site area. The objective of any modern residential development should be to maximise the usage of available land.	Reject	13
FS1387.780	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
698.3	<b>Simon Dromgool on behalf of Christine Dromgool John and Caroline Vincent Mark Dromgool</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight Admission, to 45 degrees at 2.7 metre boundary height.	The proposed plan specifying a 37 degree angle off a 2.5 metre boundary height is too restrictive and not in line with the more common 45 degree angle off a 2.7 boundary height. When a low angle is specified by some Councils it is usually only on the southern boundary and is in conjunction with a higher 55 degree angle on the northern boundary. A 37 degree angle negates the ability to effectively build a 2 storey dwelling and the submitter struggles to see Council's reasoning for this. The ability to build 2 storey dwelling is more effective use of any given land	Accept in part	8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				area.		
698.4	Simon Dromgool on behalf of Christine Dromgool John and Caroline Vincent Mark Dromgool	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a)(iv) Subdivision General, requiring the number of rear lots being no more than 15%.	The 15% requirement has no place in the existing layout of the Tuakau township with existing roads in a grid pattern of 5 chain (or 100 mtrs) spacing meaning that rear lots are inevitable to utilise the land area effectively. As long as rear sites are over 450m2 and accessible by an appropriate ROW they should be allowable. The 15% requirement is illogical and unworkable.	Reject	33
FS1387.781	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
699.2	Eastside Heights Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a)(iii) Subdivision - General, to replace the word "must" with "should" which requires roads to be a grid layout; AND Any consequential changes.	This is restrictive. It may not always be possible given topography that may require curvilinear layout - a grid is described in the Proposed District Plan as predominantly rectilinear. The subject site does not have a flat topography. Use of the word "must" will result in a forced performance failure and that subdivision will fall to a full Discretionary Activity.	Reject	33
FS1387.783	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>699.3</b>	<b>Eastside Heights Ltd</b>	Support	Retain the rules in 22 Residential Zone, in particular Rule 16.4 Subdivision and any sub sequential amendments.	No reasons provided.	Accept	33
FS1387.784	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
<b>720.1</b>	<b>Spencer and Isabelle Wheeler</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.1 PR1 to change the Prohibited activity status for any building, structure, objects or vegetation to Non-complying activity status.	Supported by Raglan Coastguard, Raglan Fishing Club and the Waikato Regional Harbormaster (support letters attached to submission) that the Navigational beacon be lifted. Lifting of beacon would allow current height restriction which runs right through submitters 1920s bach at 12 Long Street, Raglan to be lifted and prohibited activity status for anything over 1.5m must reflect such change. Non-complying status will still give WDC planners scope to ensure any new building on the site does not interfere with the beacon's raised height. Submitter referred to previous submission made in 2005 relating to the same issue. In 2005 submission submitter opposed imposition of height restriction on two grounds- a.) Unduly restricted their ability to build on their property, b.) Height restriction plan wouldn't solve visibility issues surrounding navigation beacon. Previous submission also stated there were problems with the visibility of the navigational beacons. Submitter does not want to be placed in the same impossible position they were back in 2005 regarding height	Reject	22

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				restrictions and needing to replace the existing old building.		
FSI387.794	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
732.4	Lucy Smith for Terra Firma Resources ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities, for a community activity at Puketirini, to the list of permitted activities in the Residential Zone as follows: Activity: ... P* Community activity (Puketirini) Activity-specific conditions: ... (a) Must be within development at Puketirini	The submitter prefers that a broader definition of community activities applies to development at Puketirini to give more flexibility as to possible land uses.	Reject	22
FSI387.812	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
732.5	Lucy Smith for Terra Firma Resources ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P10 Agricultural, Horticultural and Viticultural Activities, to allow these activities to occur on the land requested to be rezoned to Residential prior to commencing housing development, by adding text as follows: Activity: ... P10 Agricultural, horticultural and viticultural activities Activity-specific conditions: ... (a) Must be within the Residential West Te Kauwhata Area Residential Puketirini Area prior commencement of	Current grazing activities should be able to continue for as long as possible but are to cease once residential development commences on the Puketirini block.	Reject	22



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			development or within the commencement of development.			
FSI387.813	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
732.6	Lucy Smith for Terra Firma Resources Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities for a commercial activity to the list of permitted activities as follows, provided that it is within the area at Puketirini which is requested to be rezoned Business or, alternatively, where a business overlay could apply: Activity: ... P* Commercial activity Activity-specific conditions: ... (a) <u>Must be within the Puketirini Business Overlay</u>	A business overlay, as an alternative to a Business Zone, will allow commercial activities to establish within the requested Puketirini residential development.	Reject	22
FSI387.814	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
732.7	Lucy Smith for Terra Firma Resources Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.2 Servicing and Hours of Operation - Bankart Street and Wainui Road Business Overlay Area, by adding text as follows to ensure that the stated hours of operation apply to the Puketirini Business Overlay Area: Rule 16.2.2 Servicing and Hours of Operation - Bankart Street and Wainui Road Business Overlay Area PI The	The stated hours of operation are appropriate for business activities within the requested Puketirini residential development.	Reject	25

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			loading and unloading of vehicles and the receiving of customers and deliveries associated with a commercial activity within the Bankart Street and Wainui Road Business Overlay Area <u>and the Puketirini Business Overlay Area</u> may occur between 7.30am and 6.30pm.			
<b>749.2</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Policy 4.2.12 Outdoor living court - Multi- unit development. AND Amend Policy 4.2.18(a) - Multi unit Development as follows: Ensure multi-unit residential subdivision and development is designed in a way that: i. provides a range of housing types; ii. <del>Addresses and</del> Integrates with adjacent residential development, town centres and public open space; iii. <del>Addresses</del> <u>Manages</u> and responds to the constraints of the site, including <del>typography</del> <u>topography</u> , natural features and heritage values; iv. <u>Provides usable and accessible outdoor living courts that maximises light access, functionality and privacy;</u> <del>iv.</del> Supports an integrated transport network, including walking and cycling connections to public open space network; v. <del>Maintains the amenity values of neighbouring sites.</del> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	There is an existing policy proposed on Multi-unit development (Policy 4.2.18) There is no need to differentiate and create a separate policy on outdoor living court related to multi-unit development. It is best the policy words are added into 4.2.18(a).	Accept	9
FS1371.29	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	<i>Lakeside Development Limited seek that the submission made in relation to supporting multi-unit development be provided through amending development standards for residential development that will enable a range of housing typologies in areas marked for residential development be allowed.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Will encourage design innovation in providing a variety of housing typologies within areas marked for intensification.</li> <li>• Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991.</li> <li>• Will enable the well-being of the community.</li> <li>• Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations.</li> <li>• Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets.</li> <li>• Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</li> </ul>	Accept	
FS1387.989	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
751.7	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1P3(a) Earthworks - General as follows: (a) Earthworks for purposes other than creating a building platform for residential purposes within a site, using imported fill material must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Not exceed a total volume of 20100m <sup>3</sup> ; (ii) Not exceed a depth of 1.5m; ...	Cleanfill may be required in residential zones sites to enable greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes. The requirement to avoid filling in all circumstances may restrict development. The importation volume is too low to enable development	Reject	11
751.8	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 NCI Earthworks - General to be considered a restricted discretionary activity, rather than a non-complying activity and read as follows: <del>NC1RD2</del> Earthworks including the importation of cleanfill to a site.	Cleanfill may be required in residential zoned sites to enable greenfield land to be developed. The requirement to avoid filling in all circumstances may restrict the ability to develop residential land where balanced cut to fill earthworks are inappropriate or cannot be achieved. The importation volume is too low to enable residential development. Non-complying status is too restrictive.	Reject	11
751.9	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 16.3.1 Dwelling as follows: <del>P2 Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings added as a Permitted Activity.</del> AND Add similar standards as Rule 16.1.3 RD1 [including proposed amendments] as permitted activity standards. AND Amend Rule 16.3.1 Dwelling to state that the rule does not apply to multi-unit developments.	Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings should be a Permitted Activity. This will allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary resource consent costs and time delays where the effects could be managed through permitted standards. There are a number of larger sections within the older existing residential areas within Tuakau, Te Kauwhata, Ngaruawahia and Pokeno and are often located close to Town Centres. These sites could accommodate low-rise apartments and multi-unit development to achieve the policy directions of the Proposed District Plan. Allow existing land to be developed more efficiently without the need to subdivide the land. Permitted standards can control amenity effects to ensure that neighbouring sites are not affected. Approach has been taken by Auckland Council where additional dwellings can be constructed on properties without resource consent provided	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				permitted standards can be achieved.		
FS1387.1071	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1379.300	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought, as it would result in more subdivision in the Rural Zone. It would result in unplanned growth and land fragmentation within HCC's Area of Interest. Growth should be directed to existing towns and areas identified for growth, in line with the Future Proof Strategy and the WRPS. The Rural Zoning also helps protect the productive nature of the land.	Accept	
768.2	Don Jacobs	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission supports the intent of the supporting information behind residential plan change density in the Proposed Waikato District Plan.	No reasons provided.	Accept	39
FS1387.1161	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
780.6	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporation on behalf of	Oppose	Add provisions to 22 - Residential Zone, to restrict further holiday accommodation in Raglan's residential and business areas.	Raglan is very short of permanent accommodation and the Plan makes no provision for affordable properties protected from use for	Reject	39

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>		AND Add provisions for an area of high density development near the cement silos, of similar height to them and to the density and design of a traditional European fishing village, available for low cost purchase and rental by permanent residents for leases of no less than a year.	holiday occupation.		
FS1269.66	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment; to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1387.1192	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>788.3</b>	<b>Susan Hall</b>	Oppose	Retain Rule 16.1.2 P9 (a) Permitted Activities as notified, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 16.1.2 P9 Permitted Activities for homestays, to be more regulated in Raglan, all homestays and holiday house accommodation to be registered with Council, and to prohibit new owners of existing houses or newly built houses from offering homestay accommodation or holiday rentals, unless they live onsite at the time of guests staying.	The submitter agrees with having no more than four temporary residents. The submitters had spoken with Waikato District Council regarding at least two residentially zoned properties having 15 or more short-term guests per night. However, the submitters were told that Council could investigate the complaints but not enter a property, nor had they any means to enforce the more than four persons per night rule. The submitters were told to bring this up at the next District Plan Review, hence this submission. Most 'Airbnb' and 'bookabach' listings in Raglan allow over five people to stay per night. It should be simple to regulate this as all of these are non-complying activities are listed online. This would allow the rules to be explained and therefore allow the Council to enforce these rules. As it is important for commercial businesses to have fire service and building warrants checked every year, it should be important for property owners running similar businesses out of residentially zoned properties.	Reject	22

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Raglan has a severe housing shortage for long-term tenants, but this can be helped by regulating the use of holiday houses, similar to what is done in Canada, European cities like Berlin, and other holiday towns in New Zealand like Queenstown. It would be easier to ban the use of new houses or new ownership from short-term rental use than retrospectively introducing this to those already relying on the income (as long as these existing house stick to the under five-person rule.) It should be possible for neighbours to complain if guest numbers and/or noise gets out of hand in a country living property as well.		
FS1276.248	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Raglan is increasingly being seen as a place for investment, rather than somewhere for owners to live and enjoy. Therefore more protection is needed to uphold RMA values.	Reject	
788.5	Susan Hall	Neutral/Amend	Add a new set of rules to 22 Residential Zone to provide for the protection of defined views from public places in Raglan to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops in the chapters on rural, residential, and business town centre zones, to include at least the following defined views: (a) From SH23 (north of Maungatawhiri Road) to Kaitoke Creek; (b) All existing views of the bar from Main Road, Bow Street, and Norrie Avenue; (c) All existing views of Karioi from Raglan CBD; (d) From Wainui Road to the coast between the Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp; (e) From SH23 summit to Karioi; and (f) AroAro salt marsh from Wallis Street. AND Amend the planning maps to identify defined views.	Views are an inherent part of retention of Raglan's seaside Character. The Raglan Naturally community plan contains six references to views as follows: "Relaxed lifestyles, a tranquil harbour, safe swimming beaches, black sand, internationally renowned surf ad spectacular coastal views are characteristic - the Waikato District's only seaside resort." "What We Don't Want - Buildings blocking views of harbour, coast and mountain." "Priorities for Action - The retention of access to, and views of the harbour, coast, and mountain from within Raglan." "What We Don't Want - Loss of access to or views of the harbour from parked cars, large trees or buildings." "Safeguard coastal views from Wainui Reserve." "Safeguarding the Environment - Maintain the coastal and harbour views, e.g. do not allow the planting of big trees, or the building of high fences or large buildings that destroy existing views." Section 5 of the RMA sets out the purpose (including District Plans) "protection of natural and physical resources in a way, or at a rate, which enables people and communities to provide for their social, economic, and cultural wellbeing." Raglan Naturally sets out how the Raglan community has expressed its views on their well-	Reject	37

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>beings. These very clearly include protection of views.</p> <p>At the last Plan revision, the Council accepted views as important, but said any change would need to occur through a variation to the District Plan. That has not happened, so it should be a part of this plan. To exclude such an important part of Raglan Naturally in the district plan review is to deny the value of public participation in which over 10% of Raglan's population took part. The plan protects views of the navigation beacons and district plans of other authorities, such as Auckland and Hastings show that protection of other views is possible. A policy should protect views, e.g. Auckland's protection of volcanic view shafts. Each chapter needs to apply Policy 3.3.3.</p>		
FS1329.16	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose. Disallow the introduction of protected viewshafts.	The submission seeks to introduce rules that protect defined views. It is unclear in the submission what is to be protected and the extent of the viewshafts sought to be protected. The consequences of introducing protected views without specific landscape and visual assessment are unclear.	Accept	
FS1276.155	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	This supports WED's submission that views should be protected by the Plan.	Reject	
800.3	Environmental Management Solutions Limited	Oppose	<p>Delete all provisions regarding contaminated land from Rule 16.4.7 (Title boundaries - contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas); AND</p> <p>Add a new set of rules specifically relating to contaminated land that align with the Resource Management National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to protect Human Health (Regulations 2011), such as Sections 30 and 31 of the Wellington City Council Plan.</p>	<p>The submitter considers it unacceptable and nonsensical to include contaminated land in with notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas, significant amenity landscapes etc. as is proposed. The provisions set out within the rules contradict those detailed within the Resource Management (National Environmental Standard for Assessing and Managing Contaminants in Soil to protect Human Health) Regulations 2011 (NESCO) which overrides any planning provision. Regulation 5(5) of the NESCO specifies subdivision as an activity to which the standards applies where an activity that can be found on the Ministry for the Environment Hazardous Activities and Industries List (HAIL) has, is or is more likely than not to have occurred on a property. The regulations have a specific pathway to follow. In many cases it is through the subdivision application that a report investigating and identifying the contamination on a property is identified. This may include several</p>	Accept	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				areas, large or small irrespective of proposed subdivision boundaries. For subdivision to be enabled soil contaminant standards set by the NESCS or the site has to be satisfactorily managed. It is considered most appropriate for potentially contaminated land to have a separate rule that reflects the requirements of the NESCS. Sections 30 and 31 of the Wellington City Council Plan provide an example of this.		
FS1387.1292	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
822.3	Bob MacLeod	Not Stated	Add to Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines, details and illustrations of water harvesting systems as per those attached to the submission.	Financial benefit of rainwater tanks to the community through the reduction in the cost of water and stormwater infrastructure. Ability of Council to reduce the cost of water and stormwater infrastructure is dependent on the cost benefit of 'Long Run Marginal Cost'. This is used for creating new water supplies and represent the change in cost if new water sources are brought forward or delayed.	Reject	33
FS1387.1304	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate</i>	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
822.5	Bob MacLeod	Not Stated	Add a new objective and policies to Section 4.2 Residential Zone, as follows: <u>Objective: To provide for a range of opportunities for affordable housing that enables low and moderate income people to live in the district in accommodation that suits their needs. Policies: 1) Enable affordable housing by allowing residential densities that make economical and best use of available land in existing residential areas. 2) New housing developments will include affordable housing as part of the development plan. 3) Allow access for developers of affordable housing to lower cost structure of consent and regulation requirements. 4) Encourage multi-unit residential developments subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment. 5) Take into account the positive effects for the community of affordable housing when assessing resource consent applications.</u>	Affordability of housing should be enabled by the objectives and rules of the district plan. Submission makes reference to the Raglan Housing study 2018 and Whaingaroa/Raglan Affordable Housing Project.	Reject	35
FS1276.16	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed subject to adding 'subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment' to 1.	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities.	Reject	
FS1387.1306	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1377.277	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports the intent of recognising housing affordability but that can be achieved through a number of means. District Plans can do so by providing for more housing types and choices and greater development potential. Affordable housing should not however be a compulsory requirement for all developments and is not a matter that is typically addressed in the contents of district plans.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
824.5	Bob MacLeod for Raglan Community Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 3.1 Section 8 Residential Subdivision Guidelines - Low Impact Urban Design, to add details and illustrations of water harvesting systems, similar to those attached to the submission.	The primary financial benefit of rainwater tanks to the community (in contrast to the individual property owner) is the potential reduction in the cost of water and stormwater infrastructure. The ability of Waikato District Council as the water authorities to reduce the cost of water and storm water infrastructure will depend on the economic cost benefit Long Run Marginal Cost.	Reject	33
FS1387.1307	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
824.7	Bob MacLeod for Raglan Community Board	Neutral/Amend	Add objectives and policies to Section 4.2 Residential Zone, as follows: <u>Objective: To provide for a range of opportunities for affordable housing that enables low and moderate income people to live in the district in accommodation that suits their needs. Policy 1: enable affordable housing by allowing residential densities that make economical and best use of available land in existing residential areas. Policy 2: new housing developments will include affordable housing as part of the development plan. Policy 3: allow access for developers of affordable housing to lower cost structure of consent and regulation requirements. Policy 4: encourage multi-unit residential developments subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment. Policy 5: take into account the positive effects for the community of affordable housing when assessing resource consent applications.</u>	Affordability of housing should be enabled by the objectives and rules of the plan.	Reject	35
FS1269.76	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment; to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1276.17	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed subject to adding 'subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment' to 1.	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.1309	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
829.1	<b>Whenua Holdings Waikato Limited</b>	Support	Retain Rules 16.1.2 PI Residential activity, as notified. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter supports the provision of these activities in the Residential Zone as a permitted activity subject to meeting all the relevant standards.	Accept	22
FS1387.1332	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
829.2	<b>Whenua Holdings Waikato Limited</b>	Support	Retain the activities set out under Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter supports the provision of these activities in the Residential Zone - Subdivision as a permitted activity subject to meeting all the relevant Residential Zone effect, building and infrastructure conditions.	Accept	33.2
FS1387.1333	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
829.7	Whenua Holdings Waikato Limited	Support	Retain Rule 16.1.2 P3 A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village, as notified; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter supports the provision of these activities in the Residential Zone as a permitted activity subject to meeting all the relevant standards.	Accept	22
FS1387.1338	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
838.3	Madsen Lawrie Consultants	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1(a)(iv) Subdivision - General to increase the allowable percentage of rear lots when creating 4 or more lots.	A rear lot percentage not exceeding 15% is unrealistic. If a site was to be subdivided to create 4 or more lots a requirement of less than 15% rear lots would mean that none of these lots would be able to be a rear lot. For many properties, the size and shape of the lot will dictate the rear lots are required to a percentage of up to 40%-50% to allow for appropriate future development and compliant building platforms and associated outdoor living/outlook spaces.	Reject	33
FS1387.1367	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>838.4</b>	<b>Madsen Lawrie Consultants</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.11(a) Subdivision - Road frontage to reduce the requirement for a 15m road frontage for every lot with a road boundary.	15m of road frontage is excessive and a high width requirement such as this will promote non-compliance with rear lot percentages in certain situations.	Reject	33
FS1134.67	Counties Power Limited	Oppose	Seek that the submission point not be allowed.	The road frontage should not be reduced from 15m as it may create adverse effects on existing infrastructure and may also limit proposed infrastructure that would be located within road reserves.	Accept	
<b>838.5</b>	<b>Madsen Lawrie Consultants</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.12(a) Subdivision - Building platform to reduce the size of the building platform required.	The proposed building platform sizes are large and a smaller size would be more suitable in the Residential Zone, particularly where multi-storey dwellings are appropriate.	Reject	33
FS1387.1368	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>853.3</b>	<b>Paul Manuell</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General, except for Rule 16.4.1 RD1(a)(iii); AND Delete Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(iii) Subdivision - General; AND Add new matter of discretion to Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (b)	Provides for efficient use of the land resources. Enables the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district.	Reject	33.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Subdivision - General, as follows: <u>Where roads are to be vested in Council, they must follow a grid layout.</u>			
FS1387.1391	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
853.4	Paul Manuell	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a)(iii) and make it a matter of discretion.	Accept the grid layouts result in increased permeability, legibility and walkability of residential areas, however the establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate. Sites with topographical, natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a grid layout. There may be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in s32 regarding relevance or practicality of this rule. Grid layouts are an accepted urban design principle for good subdivision design, yet they are not an absolute response and therefore be use as a principle not enforced through a rule.	Reject	33
FS1387.1392	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
853.5	Paul Manuell	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13 RD1(a) Subdivision creating reserves, and make it a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. Enforcement of this rule may increase the cost of development which could be passed onto purchasers. It is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types or developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. There is no analysis in the s32 stating why the 50% rule has been applied, and while this may be a principle to follow it should not be enforced through a plan.	Reject	33.14
871.3	Brendon John & Denise Louise Strong	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission recognises that the importation of fill to enable residential development is appropriate in Rule 16.2.4.1 Earthworks - General, and questions whether this would be a permitted activity (P2) or a non-complying activity (NCI).	These provisions seem to be workable but the submitter is interested in the thoughts of other submitters. Cleanfill may be required in residential zoned sites to enable greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes. It is unclear whether this is a P2 permitted activity or a NCI non-complying activity. NCI would be too restrictive and needs to be more lenient to enable greenfield development within residential zones.	Reject	11
871.4	Brendon John & Denise Louise Strong	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight admission, as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>37</del> 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above the ground level at every point of the site boundary.	Opposes the height control plane rising at an angle of 37 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above the ground level at every point of the site boundary for the following reasons: - Inconsistency with previous Planning documents which are less restrictive. - Too restrictive for urban areas. - Adequate amenity and daylight for adjoining sites can be achieved with a less restrictive control plane. - The 37 degree angle is difficult to calculate.	Accept	8
FS1297.25	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provision so that the angle is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa, and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
FS1261.19	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission points and amend the provision so that the	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			angle used to calculate daylight admission is changed to 45 degrees.	unnecessarily restrictive. 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa and Thames-Coromandel).		
871.5	Brendon John & Denise Louise Strong	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.6 PI Building Coverage, as follows: The total building coverage must not exceed 40 <u>50</u> %.	Opposes the 40% building coverage as the height limit does not enable the efficient use of urban land and fails to increase the development capacity of existing urban areas. Increasing building coverage to allow greater utilisation of residential zoned land to support the strategic direction outlined in Section A and Chapter B 4.1 of the Plan supports increase densities and housing choice throughout the district. This approach is consistent with the Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section.	Reject	6
871.6	Brendon John & Denise Louise Strong	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 Building Setback - Water bodies, to match Rule 24.3.6.3 Building setback - water bodies; AND Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 Building setbacks - Water bodies, as follows: Rule PI (a)(ii) ...from the bank of any <u>named</u> river ... <u>P3.A building must be set back a minimum of 10m from the bank of a perennial or intermittent named or unnamed stream.</u>	These are not consistent with other zones or the existing Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section provisions; a building must be set back a minimum of 10 metres from the bank of a perennial or intermittent stream. It is important to also define a stream to avoid confusion with the definition of a river. The RMA defines a river as "a continually or intermittently flowing body of freshwater; and includes a stream and modified watercourse." If a watercourse is named "Stream" then it should be subject to the appropriate setback by the Plan.	Reject	5
FS1371.43	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seek that the submission point in relation to clearly identifying waterbodies, specifically the difference between rivers and streams to be allowed.	Will allow for identification of all water bodies including perennial or intermittent stream to be allowed. Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will enable the well-being of the community. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject	
FS1387.1419	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1371.37	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seek that the submission made in relation to retaining the 10m building setbacks requirement along perennial and intermittent streams to be allowed.	Will allow for the appropriate setback of buildings form all waterbodies. Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will enable the wellbeing of the community. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Reject	
871.7	Brendon John & Denise Louise Strong	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13(a) Subdivision creating reserves and make it a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. The enforcement of the rule may increase the cost of development which could be passed onto the purchasers. This is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types or developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. There is no analysis in the s32 stating why the 50% rule has been applied. While this may be a principle to follow it should not be enforced through a rule.	Reject	33
871.8	Brendon John & Denise Louise Strong	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, by replacing with the Operative Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section Rule 11.5. Esplanade Reserves and Strips	The submitter accepts that esplanade reserves and esplanade strips enable public access and recreation. However, this needs to be assessed on a case by case basis and Council should allow a waiver or reduction in width in certain circumstances.	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
943.1	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.7 P1 (a)(iii) Living Court, as follows: (iii) When located on the ground floor, it has a minimum area of <del>80</del> 60m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of 4m in any direction; and AND Add a rule to Rule 16.3.7 Living Court, so that the living court is not facing south, similar to Hamilton City Council residential.	60m <sup>2</sup> allows for larger dwellings or additional bedrooms. Current plan and proposed plan have no requirements for the living court to not be facing south.	Reject	29
FS1387.1560	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
943.8	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.6 C1 - Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans and conversion to freehold, to make the activity a Permitted activity rather than a Controlled Activity. AND Amend Rule 16.4.6 D1 - Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans and conversion to freehold, to be a Restricted Discretionary activity status rather than a Discretionary Activity.	Sites are already developed where conversion causes no additional environmental effects and are simply a cadastral change. Discretionary activity status is too onerous.	Reject	33
943.9	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.6 C2 (b)(i) Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans and conversion to freehold.	The purpose of the boundary adjustment is stated in C2 (a) and as such, C2 (b)(i) is a duplication.	Accept	33
945.6	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (b) Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: <u>(k) The safe, effective and efficient operation, maintenance and upgrade of the gas network.</u> AND	The submitter seeks to include an additional matter over which Council's discretion shall be limited under RD1 (b) to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on the gas network inclusive of delivery points.	Accept	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.			
<b>945.7</b>	<b>First Gas Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new condition to Rule 16.2.4.1 P1 Earthworks general as follows: <u>(x) Earthworks to a depth of greater than 200mm must be located a minimum of 12m from the centre line of a gas transmission pipeline.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	To address reverse sensitivity effects, the submitter seeks the inclusion of an additional condition under the Earthworks-General Rules within the Residential Zone. It is requested to include an additional condition requiring a 12m setback from gas transmission pipelines where earthworks are proposed to a depth of greater than 200mm is requested within the Residential zone rules.	Reject	11
<b>945.8</b>	<b>First Gas Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 16.2.4.1 RDI (b) Earthworks - General as follows: <u>Effects on the safe, effective and efficient operation, maintenance and upgrade of infrastructure, including access.</u>	The submitter seeks to include an additional matter over which the Council's discretion shall be limited under RDI to address potential effects of earthworks on the gas network.	Reject	11
<b>945.9</b>	<b>First Gas Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add the following subdivision rule to Rule 16.4 Subdivision: <u>Subdivision - Site containing a gas transmission pipeline: a) The subdivision of land containing a gas transmission pipeline is a restricted discretionary activity. b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) The extent to which the subdivision design avoids or mitigates conflict with the gas infrastructure and activities. (ii) The ability for maintenance and inspection of pipelines including ensuring access to the pipelines. (iii) Consent notices on titles to ensure on-going compliance with AS2885 Pipelines- Gas and Liquid Petroleum - Parts 1 to 3. (iv) The outcome of any consultation with First Gas Limited.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	To address reverse sensitivity effects, the submitter seeks the inclusion of a new rule under the Subdivision rules within the Residential Zone. The addition of a new rule would make subdivision of a site containing a gas transmission pipeline a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept	33
<b>946.5</b>	<b>Dee Bond</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.2 Servicing and hours of operation - Bankart Street and Wainui Road Business Overlay Area, to include "Raglan".	No reasons provided.	Reject	25
<b>946.6</b>	<b>Dee Bond</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.6 P3 Building Coverage, to include "Raglan".	No reasons provided.	Reject	6
<b>946.8</b>	<b>Dee Bond</b>	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission questions with regards to Rule 16.3.9.1 P3 Boundary setbacks - All	No reasons provided.	Reject	5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			boundaries, why a garage should be set back behind the front facade of the dwelling. The submission considers a garage should be on the street frontage, with the home setback to reduce the street noise to the house.			
<b>946.9</b>	<b>Dee Bond</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P4(c) Home occupation, to be limited to 2 persons multiplied by the number of bedrooms.	Submitter does not think that the maximum number (2 persons) as notified, allows for a small business to be run from home and grow. Two people is an arbitrary number for which there is no logical basis. Submitter runs a business from home and has more than two. As long as there is adequate parking and sufficient toilets, the maximum number should not matter. Two people in total is too few.	Reject	22
<i>FS1387.1596</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	
<b>965.1</b>	<b>Sandra Ellmers for Sandra EllmersFamily Trust</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.13 (a) Subdivision creating reserves, by deleting the requirement for newly created reserves to have 50% of boundaries bordered by roads and replace instead with "all reserves to have public access".	To the submitter's knowledge there are no reserves in the district which have roads on 50% of their boundaries. Reserves which are used for the purpose of regular sports activity require parking and adequate road access but New Zealand's most iconic and frequented reserves are located on land identified as being of special significance because of location and/or natural beauty. Creating reserves within Structure Plan areas or newly created subdivisions should also, if possible, be based on the same principles. If land has an existing or established area of native bush or a particular feature, e.g. stream or wetland, it does not need to have adjoining roads on its boundaries to provide adequate access. The majority of the users could access by foot or	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				would be prepared to walk a reasonable distance to access the walkway. There should not be a requirement for reserves to have road boundaries, only to be accessible to the public.		
<b>965.2</b>	<b>Sandra Ellmers for Sandra EllmersFamily Trust</b>	Oppose	Delete the requirement for walkways to be at least 3m wide and be constructed for shared pedestrian and cycle use in Rule 16.4.15 (a) (i) Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways.	Much of the Waikato terrain is very undulating so many public walkways are located in bush and traverse very hilly and undulating ground, along streams and rivers or adjacent to wetlands, e.g. Bridle Veil Falls walkway. 3m is very wide and natural areas are not usually suitable for dual use by cyclists. Accessing by foot is often difficult due to the clay based soils and very wet climatic conditions in the Waikato. The priority for walkways should be that they are accessible and enjoyable for the public. The most popular walkway in Raglan goes from the top of Wainui Road down through the bush to Ngaranui Beach and is not suitable for cyclists. There is no public designated public parking and the walkway borders the road for only about 5m. The Bridle Veil walkway is of similar standard with only part of the track developed. Proposed rule will result in mundane walkways on flat ground, which is not what the public want. Very few areas in Raglan are of suitable terrain for cyclists and constructing a 3m walkway through bush areas and uneven terrain would be impossible, would interfere with the natural environment and would be financially prohibitive. Walkways should be developed and assessed on a one by one basis in consultation with the developer and/or public and not be subject to 'blanket' rules.	Reject	33
<i>FS1276.164</i>	<i>Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.</i>	<i>3m is a regional standard and needed for some tracks, but council's policy on trails recognises that different uses and standards exist.</i>	Accept	
<b>123.10</b>	<b>Libby Gosling for Classic Builders Waikato Limited</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9 Building setbacks to not apply to rear lots, or other lots where the garage door is not on a main street facing facade of the dwelling, e.g. laneways or side entry garages.	The rule needs clarifying. This rule should not be applied to rear lots or other Lots where the Garage door is not on main street facing facade of the dwelling (e.g. laneways). This rule should not apply to side entry garages.	Reject	5
<i>FS1092.14</i>	<i>Garth &amp; Sandra Ellmers</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Rule 16.3.9 needs to be amended as is far too restrictive. There are no variable setbacks for lots or boundaries which sit adjacent to walkways, access driveways, streams, public places or are on back sections. In these situations 'standard' setback</i>	<i>We agree that Rule 16.3.9 needs urgent amendment in total as it is far too restrictive for general use.</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>distances should not apply as the building setback will have little or no effect on in these situations. The road setback rules compared to many other areas in NZ are very restrictive. e.g. Tauranga Council have a 1.5M minimum road setback rule, compared to the current 6M in the Waikato District Plan. The 6M road setback leads to a monotonous street-scape and forces home owners to build more to the rear of the lot which is often impossible or very impractical.</i>			
182.10	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.2 Noise, as notified.	The policy seeks to ensure lawfully established activities are protected and that setbacks are provided. This is agreed and will need to be supported with robust planning (for lawful establishment) and technical (acoustic) reporting where any setback is proposed.	Accept	18
182.11	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.5 Objectionable odour, as notified.	The policy seeks to ensure lawfully established activities are protected and that setbacks are provided. This is agreed and will need to be supported with robust planning (for lawful establishment) and technical (acoustic) reporting where any setback is proposed.	Accept	20
182.14	Kirriemuir Trustee Limited	Support	Retain 22.1 to 16.4 Residential Zone, as notified.	The provisions provided for suitable controls expected within a residential environment.	Accept in part	39
FS1386.171	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
244.10	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend 16.4 4(a)(iv)Subdivision - Multi-unit development, to decrease all proposed minimum unit areas for multi-unit developments as follows: Studio and 1 Bedroom units decrease from 60m2 to 50m2 2 Bedroom units decrease from 80m2 to 70m2	There is little recognition in the Waikato District Plan that units and dwellings worldwide are downsizing. Due to the high cost of land and building and borrowed deposits required for a home, the result is that a very	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			3 Bedroom units decrease from 100m2 to 80m2	large number of people are locked out of home ownership. There must be options within a district plan to provide for smaller homes and units' that people can afford and there is not. Often units only have one permanent occupant, regardless of the size of the unit. 100m2 is a very large unit and larger than many standard homes so seems excessive and well outside the standard in most cities multi-unit developments If people require larger units they can purchase them but the option should be there to purchase units of various sizes.		
FS1386.245	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
244.11	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.12 (a)(i) Subdivision - Building Platform, to decrease the circle diameter building platform minimum from 18m to 14m.	To reflect and allow for the requirement for smaller dwellings and lots. Often lots are small, have a variable contour or shape so it is difficult to accommodate the proposed minimum platform requirements when designing a subdivision. Decreasing the minimum building platform will allow more sites to be built upon.	Reject	33
FS1386.246	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
244.12	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.12(a) (ii) Subdivision - Building Platform, to decrease the minimum dimension of a rectangle building platform from 200m2 to 160m2.	To reflect and allow for the requirement for smaller dwellings and lots. Often lots are small, have a variable contour or shape so it is difficult to accommodate the proposed minimum platform requirements when designing a subdivision. Decreasing the minimum building platform will allow more sites to be built upon.	Reject	33
FS1386.247	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
244.13	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.11 (a) Subdivision - Road frontage, to decrease the width of the road boundary from 15m to 14m.	The requirement for smaller homes and lots must be accommodated for in the District Plan. The submitter has had experience in developments in Perth and very tasteful homes are being developed with a road frontage width of 12m. The homes are specifically designed to suit narrower sites and the design and usability of the home is not compromised. Smaller sites allow more efficient use of often limited available land in city areas and there is a demand for them. Single occupant homes are now very common so it must be possible to build affordable small homes on small lots.	Reject	33
FS1134.62	Counties Power Limited	Oppose	Seeks that the submission not be allowed.	<i>The road frontage should not be reduced from 15m as it may create adverse effects on existing infrastructure and may also limit proposed</i>	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				infrastructure that would be located within road reserves.		
244.14	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight admission, to reduce the height control plane angle to be more in line with other NZ councils - a relaxation of the control plane angle when a proposed building is not adjacent to residence on one or more boundaries for example, lots adjoining public walkways, public parks, road, rear driveways, reserves etc.	The District Plan height control plane angle is onerous, out of kilter with other councils To reflect individual applications and boundary situations It leads to mundane residential designs In many cases is not needed due to buildings not having another home on adjacent boundaries If no other residence is affected, the control angle should be reduced.	Accept in part	8
244.15	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.6 PI Building coverage, to increase building coverage for homes from 40% to 50%.	The worldwide trend is for smaller lots due to costs Smaller lots are usually the first to sell The pace of life is much faster now Children do not play or use outside areas as much these days and often prefer to socialise away from their homes or undertake inside activities Homes now often cater for adult children who remain living with their families well into adulthood due to the high cost of renting or buying their first home so many homes are need 4-5 bedrooms and additional living areas Most people do not want large lawns or gardens anymore Very few homes in most cities in the western world would have the luxury of 60% their site being garden and not want it Many homeowners want media rooms, garages etc. but not large gardens or large lawns. Most states in Australia now allow much higher site coverage for homes to cater for the trend towards larger homes on smaller sections Land costs and developments costs have substantially increased over the past ten years and are likely to continue increasing.	Reject	6
244.16	Garth and Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.7 PI (a) Living court, to decrease the minimum area for a dwelling to 60m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of 3m in any direction, and when located on a balcony of an above ground apartment, decrease the minimum area to 6m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of 1.5 in any direction.	The trend in most western residential areas is for smaller lots and smaller houses Children do not play outside nearly as often as they used to and inside activities seem to be preferred, particularly with the massive growth and popularity of social media Adult family members prefer using media rooms or having multiple inside living areas and often an office More time is being spent inside	Reject	29

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>the home and this will continue Decreasing the minimum areas for living courts will not result in wholesale movement away from large gardens but would allow larger homes to be built on some of the lots available for sale Apartments do not need large outside living court areas - unless balconies are on the Northside of the building, they are seldom used If people do not want large living court areas they can buy a unit or apartment with a large outdoor living court if they choose - there is no need to regulate large living court areas The market will decide what they want and should have the option of choice Most people prefer more area inside their homes, not outside.</p>		
<b>244.17</b>	<b>Garth and Sandra Ellmers</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.3.9.1 PI (a) Building setbacks - All boundaries, as notified.	<p>The current 6m setback is unworkable, particularly in the Raglan area Most land zoned for residential housing in much of the Waikato, particularly Raglan, is undulating with many lots being steep and often difficult to access. As a result of the rules in the Operative Plan it was almost impossible for many homes in the district to be built with a 6m setback from the road so dispensations had to be applied for which causes many time delays in the processing of consents and unnecessary cost increases Any rule that is clearly not workable for much of the terrain in our district should be changed If so many dispensations need to be applied for then it is proof that a rule needs to be amended Homes built closer to the road are more secure so this should be allowable and encouraged Homes built closer to the road allow for a larger area behind the home for recreation, which is much safer than having children play in front of the home, on driveways and near the road.</p>	Reject	5
<b>244.18</b>	<b>Garth and Sandra Ellmers</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.4(a)(iii) Subdivision - Multi-unit development, to decrease minimum lot size per unit for multi-unit developments from 300m2 net site area to 200m2.	<p>Raglan is a popular holiday destination with a shortage of accommodation of a good standard. A large number of homes have converted their garages and sheds into sleep-outs which they rent out or rent rooms within their homes. These private dwellings often do not comply</p>	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				with many of the building or fire standards. In many ways Raglan is similar to what Mount Maunganui was about 40 years ago and has now become a sort after tourism destination. The Waikato District Plan must allow for continued growth in tourism and unit development is sorely needed to provide short and medium term accommodation, especially in the township area. The 300m2 minimum site area per unit is limiting and will increase the development costs, especially in areas close to the township. In other holiday areas multi units can be built with a 100m2 net site area so 300m2 seem excessive.		
FS1386.248	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1276.271	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be disallowed.	In many areas such density of development could change the character of the area and affect traffic and other services. Each such development should be considered on its merits.	Accept	
297.10	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.4(a)(iii) Front setback as follows: Providing for passive surveillance to roads, avoiding windowless walls to the street and conforming to national guidelines for CPTED principles.	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider national guidelines for CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	5
FS1269.10	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment; to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
297.11	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.10(c) Daylight and outlook as follows: Maintain and enhance attractive open space character of residential areas by ensuring that development is compatible in scale to surrounding activities and structures and has generous on-site landscaping, screening and street planting, <u>conforming to the national guidelines for CPTED.</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider national guidelines for CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	8
FS1269.11	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
297.12	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.12(a) Outdoor Living Court Multi-unit development as follows; Enable multi-unit development to provide usable, <u>safe</u> and accessible outdoor living courts in alternative ways...	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider national guidelines for CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	9
FS1269.12	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
297.13	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.13(a) Outdoor living court - Retirement villages as follows: Require outdoor living courts or communal outdoor living courts to be usable, <u>and accessible and safe (conforming to the national guidelines for CPTED.)</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider national guidelines for CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	10
297.14	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.2.15 Earthworks a new line as follows: <u>Manage the earthworks site to ensure that resources at the site are safe and to minimise the risk of victimisation</u>	Development sites are crime attractors Vehicles, tools and diesel have previously been targeted by criminals The inclusion of this wording ensures that there is an obligation through council policy to consider safety at development sites This should result in a reduction victimisations, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	11
FS1281.7	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Support	Support.	PVHL supports amendments to this policy, which enable emergency services to undertake their essential activities.	Reject	
FS1269.13	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
297.19	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.2.18(b) Multi-unit development a new line as follows: <u>Conform to the national guidelines for CPTED.</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider national guidelines for CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	12
FS1269.16	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
FS1386.312	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
297.20	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.2.19(a) Retirement villages a new line as follows: <u>Conforming to the national guidelines for CPTED.</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider national guidelines for CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	12
297.22	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.4.1 (a) Adverse effects of land use and development as follows: The health, and well-being and <u>safety</u> of people, communities and the environment are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development.	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider safety, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Accept	18
FS1269.17	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1114.3	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Null	FENZ supports the amendment of Objective 4.4.1 as it recognises the importance of protecting the health, safety and wellbeing of communities from the adverse effects of land use and development and better reflects section 5 of the RMA, which also refers to the safety of the community. This submission supports the intention sought in FENZ's submission point number 378.73 noting the slightly different wording change sought as follows: 4.4.1(a) The health, safety and well-being of people, communities and the environment are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development.	Accept	
297.23	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.4.3 Artificial outdoor lighting, except for the amendments sought below. AND Add to Policy 4.4.3 Artificial outdoor lighting a new line as follows: (d) <u>Conform to the national guidelines for CPTED.</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider security and CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	19
FS1269.18	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				primary submission.		
297.26	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs as notified.	The intention of this policy is in line with the Police Prevention First Model (taking every opportunity to prevent harm) and the Safer Journeys Strategy (reducing and preventing road related trauma) and the target to reduce road deaths every year by 5 percent.	Accept	
FS1134.20	Counties Power Limited	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is rejected.	The application of CPTED to infrastructure would not have any meaningful outcome as infrastructure sites e.g. substations are secured from the general public for safety reasons. In areas where CPTED is usually adopted all infrastructure tends to be underground.	Reject	
297.52	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines to prominently include the national guidelines for CPTED to provide further useful information, and not just listed as a reference.	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	33
FS1386.319	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
297.54	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 3.4 Multi-unit Development to prominently include the national guidelines for CPTED to provide further useful information, and not just listed as a reference.	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	13
FS1386.321	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1269.24	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
<b>297.55</b>	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Support	Retain Section 4.2 in Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines - Connectivity and Movement Networks - Outcomes Sought as notified.	To consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Accept	33
FS1386.322	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
FS1269.25	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
<b>297.56</b>	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 4.3 Page 10, second row of the table in Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines to provide clarification about pedestrian and cyclist linkages within the guideline around avoiding cul-de-sacs.	To consider CPTED, reducing victimization, making people safe and feel safe. The use of access ways must consider CPTED considerations such as multiple exit points and avoiding entrapment spots.	Reject	33
FS1386.323	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1269.26	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
<b>297.57</b>	<b>Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend 4.3 Page 12 in Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines relating to rear lots to have stronger wording about conforming to CPTED guidelines.	To consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe. Rear lots have become a crime attractor at other locations within the Police District, lack of good visibility, sightlines and casual surveillance are key as are elements such as concealment and lack of adequate lighting within the design. Police would like to advise developers of how to avoid replicating the design failings of other sites with rear parking lots.	Reject	33
FS1386.324	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1269.27	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
<b>299.10</b>	<b>2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited</b>	Not Stated	Retain Section 16.3 Building as notified except where modifications are sought elsewhere in the submission.	It provide for suitable controls expected within a residential environment.	Accept in part	39
<b>299.11</b>	<b>2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited</b>	Not Stated	Retain Section 16.4 Subdivision as notified, except where modifications are sought elsewhere in the submission.	It provide for suitable controls expected within a residential environment.	Accept	33
FS1386.333	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>299.17</b>	<b>2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited</b>	Support	Retain Section 16.1 Activities, except where modifications are sought elsewhere in the submission.	It provide for suitable controls expected within a residential environment.	Accept in part	22
FS1386.334	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
<b>299.18</b>	<b>2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rules 16.2.4.1 P1, P2, and P3 Earthworks-General to clarify how these rules work together. AND Any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought.	It is uncertain if the provisions of P1 need to be met when relying on P2 and P3. In particular, it is uncertain whether earthworks that does not involve importation of fill but is for a building platform, would fall within P1 or P2.	Accept	11
<b>299.20</b>	<b>2SEN Limited and Tuakau Estates Limited</b>	Not Stated	Retain Section 16.2 Effects, as notified, except where modifications are sought elsewhere in the submission.	It provide for suitable controls expected within a residential environment.	Accept in part	24
<b>310.10</b>	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 RD1 Building setbacks - All boundaries, to include the following: (v) (iii) <u>Positive effects for affordable housing.</u>	Amending Rule 16.3 as suggested enables affordable development design in residential zoned land to maximize the number of dwellings on a site without discretionary consent. Other councils have made similar changes, e.g.	Reject	5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Auckland & Wellington, to enable increased density by right within the rules of the plan.		
FS1276.20	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed subject to adding 'subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment.'	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities.	Reject	
FS1269.37	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
<b>310.11</b>	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (b) Subdivision - General by including the following: xi.) <u>Positive effects for affordable housing.</u>	To insert consideration of affordability in housing development into the focus for Council discretion when considering development consents for subdivision.	Reject	33
FS1386.367	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1269.38	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1276.25	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Affordable housing is needed.	Reject	
<b>310.13</b>	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.7 PI (iii)- Living court by changing the 80m2 requirement to 40m2.	Decreasing living court requirements will enable more dwellings to be situated on a single site. Increasing building density in residential zoned land can increase the availability of affordable housing. Increasing density while meeting the height to boundary and other restrictions requires building smaller dwellings or multi-unit dwellings. Rule 16.3 currently restricts the numbers of dwellings per site and the size of those buildings therefore requiring discretionary resource consent adding to the cost of development. Amending Rule 16.3 as suggested enables affordable development design in residential zoned land to maximize number of	Reject	29

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				dwelling on a site without discretionary consent. Other councils have made similar changes (e.g. Auckland, Wellington) to enable increased density by right within the rules of the plan.		
FS1276.22	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed subject to adding 'subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment.'	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities.	Reject	
FS1269.39	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
<b>310.14</b>	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.1 Dwelling, to allow more than one primary dwelling and one minor dwelling per site.	Increased building density in residential zoned land can increase the availability of affordable housing. Rule 16.3 currently restricts numbers of dwellings per site therefore requiring discretionary resource consent adding to the cost of development. Amending Rule 16.3 as suggested enables affordable development design in residential zoned land to maximize the number of dwellings on a site without discretionary consent. Other councils have made similar changes, e.g. Auckland & Wellington, to enable increased density by right within the rules of the plan.	Accept	13
FS1276.23	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed subject to adding 'subject to appropriate safeguards to amenities and the environment.'	Affordable housing is needed, but large scale building has not so far created affordable housing and can destroy other amenities.	Accept	
FS1269.40	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
FS1308.14	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support the submission to allow more than one primary dwelling per site. This is similar to our submission which seeks to allow up to three dwellings as a permitted activity through amendments to the multi-unit housing provisions. However, we see no valid reason to restrict the size of the dwelling if there is compliance with the bulk location standards.	Accept	
FS1386.369	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>310.16</b>	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete the setback requirement for garages in Rule 16.3.9.1 Building setbacks - All boundaries.	Increasing density whilst meeting height-boundary and other restrictions requires building smaller dwellings or multi-unit dwellings. Amending Rule 16.3 as suggested enables affordable development design in residential zoned land to maximize the number of dwellings on a site without discretionary consent. Other councils have made similar changes, e.g. Auckland & Wellington, to enable increased density by right within the rules of the plan.	Reject	5
<i>FS1276.26</i>	<i>Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed subject to restricting to suitable areas where amenities and the environment won't suffer.</i>	<i>Affordable housing is needed, but that such changes won't necessarily create it. Cars are less likely to be needed in future, so the rule should first consider that aspect.</i>	Reject	
<i>FS1269.101</i>	<i>Housing New Zealand Corporation</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support in part.</i>	<i>Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.</i>	Reject	
<b>310.17</b>	<b>Fiona McNabb for Whaingaroa Raglan Affordable Housing Project</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.3.9.1 P3 Building setbacks - All boundaries.	Increasing density whilst meeting height-boundary and other restrictions requires building smaller dwellings or multi-unit dwellings. Amending Rule 16.3 as suggested enables affordable development design in residential zoned land to maximize the number of dwellings on a site without discretionary consent. Other councils have made similar changes, e.g. Auckland & Wellington, to enable increased density by right within the rules of the plan.	Reject	5
<b>326.10</b>	<b>Charlie Young for Raglan Chamber of Commerce</b>	Not Stated	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (b) Subdivision - general, as follows: <u>(xi) Positive effects for affordable housing.</u>	Inserts a consideration of affordability in housing development into the focus for Council discretion when considering development consents for subdivision. Clearly housing affordability throughout District needs to be supported. Lack of affordable housing is having a severe impact on businesses trying to retain staff in communities. Other NZ District Councils have recognised housing crisis and have activated affordable housing policies and initiatives.	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1269.109	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
<b>367.20</b>	<b>Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P4 Permitted Activities, by increasing the number of non-permanent residents working for home occupations to 2x the number of bedrooms.	Restrictions limit those running businesses from home as there are potentially more than 4 people working. Place a ratio of 2x number of bedrooms as long as ensuring sufficient car parking spaces available including toilet facilities will allow for greater growth for small businesses instead of leasing a small office/warehouse which increases overheads and extra costs.	Reject	22
<b>367.21</b>	<b>Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P5 Permitted Activities, by increasing operating hours or allowing exemptions for temporary activities.	Increasing/allowing exemptions to hours will allow events, e.g. weddings, to continue as they may run past 8.30pm.	Reject	16
FS1386.552	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>367.22</b>	<b>Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P9 Permitted Activities, by increasing the homestay guests to 2x the number of bedrooms as long as there is sufficient and toilets.	Place a ratio of 2x number of bedrooms as long as ensuring sufficient car parking spaces are available.	Reject	22
FS1386.553	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>367.23</b>	<b>Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.2 Servicing and hours of operation - Bankart Street and Wainui Road Business Overlay Area, to provide clarification that it relates to Raglan.	Adds clarity.	Reject	25
<b>368.10</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 4.2.16 Housing Options and AND Retain Policy 4.2.17 Housing Types AND Retain Policy 4.2.18 Multi-Unit Development AND Amend rules to ensure the directions in the objectives and policies and the associated rules align.	The diversity of housing sought will not enabled if rules do not enable flexibility in lot enable flexibility in lot and dwelling size and dwelling type within a development, particularly a large scale development where variation enables a cross section of the community to all be provided for.	Accept in part	12
<b>368.11</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Policy 4.2.2 Character OR Amend the Proposed District Plan to identify the view points from public spaces and extent of views to be retained.	Character is vague as to its application, to require roads to follow natural contours could potentially be contradictory to the applicable engineering standards and therefore limit the safety and/or multi modal transport efficiency of a development. Further, requiring the promotion of views and vistas from public spaces to the hinterland beyond is uncertain unless the viewpoints have been identified in the District Plan and the extent of views to be retained is also identified. Unless this certainty can be provided these Policies should be deleted.	Reject	4
<i>FS1386.560</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
368.19	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Add Show homes as a permitted activity in the Residential Zone AND Add a carpark requirement for show homes over and above that which applies to a standard residential dwelling such that two additional car park spaces be provided AND Add controls on signage for show homes in keeping with Rule 16.2.7.1 Signs permitted activity for real estate signs.	Show homes are residential in character and in a residential subdivision a show home will be on-sold as a residential dwelling once the subdivision sales are completed (if not before). So long as additional car parking is provided for staff and customers, with signage controlled to an appropriate level there appears to be no reason that show homes should require specific land use consent.	Reject	22
FS1386.563	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
368.20	Ian McAlley	Support	Retain Rule 16.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as notified AND Add rules for multi-unit development to enable it in all residential areas of the District where connection is available, or will be available to reticulated services.	The active provision of multi-unit development assists in enabling different development densities assists in providing a variety of housing types and achieving the required densities of development as per the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Reject	13
FS1061.8	Campbell Tyson	Support	Seek that submission point 368.20 be allowed.	While the policy directive support variety in housing types the provisions of the Plan encourage a typical suburban form rather than enabling medium density development.	Reject	
368.21	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 Earthworks, to enable the assessment of bulk earthworks as part of a subdivision to be assessed as permitted activity where consent has been received from the Waikato Regional Council for those earthworks.	Earthworks need to be accepted as part of the land development process. Large scale earthworks are undertaken by experienced contractors under the control of the Waikato Regional Council with appropriate monitoring and enforcement. For the District Council to double up on earthworks control when the Regional Council is already actively managing this process is not a good use of time and resource and such inefficiencies should be avoided.	Reject	11
FS1061.9	Campbell Tyson	Support	Seek that submission point 368.21 be allowed.	The earthworks thresholds need to be lenient enough to ensure the land can be developed without	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>additional consents. Permitted land use standards should be able to control the adverse effects of any works.</i>		
<b>368.22</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.2.4.1 NCI - Earthworks - General, the assessment of the importation of cleanfill to a site as a non-complying activity.	Assessment of the importation of cleanfill to a site as a non-complying activity is overly onerous as this may be required to bring appropriate material onto a site where such material is required to meet engineering requirements.	Reject	11
<i>FS1061.10</i>	<i>Campbell Tyson</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seek that submission point 368.22 be allowed.</i>	<i>Cleanfill may be required in residential zoned sites to enable greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes. The requirement to avoid filling in all circumstances may restrict the ability to develop residential land where balanced cut to fill earthworks are inappropriate or cannot be achieved. The importation volume is too low to enable residential development. The Non-Complying status is too restrictive and needs to be more lenient to enable greenfield development within residential zones.</i>	Reject	
<b>368.23</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1, to only require assessment of amenity and landscape effects related to earthworks where the earthworks are occurring in an area clearly defined in the Plan as being protected for its landscape and/or natural character values.	Assessment of amenity and landscape effects of earthworks should only occur where the earthworks are occurring in an area that is clearly defined as being protected for its landscape and/or natural character values.	Reject	11
<i>FS1061.11</i>	<i>Campbell Tyson</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seek that submission point 368.23 be allowed.</i>	<i>The use of residential land needs to be recognised as the highest priority unless a feature within the land is specifically identified as having other attributes worthy of retention.</i>	Reject	
<i>FS1308.20</i>	<i>The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Agree that the assessment of the importation of clean fill to a site as a non-complying activity is overly onerous. Fill may be required to meet engineering requirements.</i>	Reject	
<b>368.24</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.4.P2 Fences or Walls - Road boundaries and reserve Zone boundaries, to read as follows: <del>Any Fences or walls between the erected within the applicable building setbacks under Rule 16.3.9 on a site and along on the northern common</del> boundary of the Residential Zone between Wayside Road and Travers Road, Te Kauwhata, adjacent to the <del>and</del> Country Living Zones <del>between Wayside Road and Travers Road, Te Kauwhata</del> must be of a rural-type post and wire or post and rail construction.	The amended rule makes it clear that the requirement for a rural-type post and wire or post and rail fence is only required on the zone boundary between the Country Living and the Residential Zones.	Accept	
<b>368.25</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.5 Daylight Admission, to enable the height control plane to be measured from the top of a retaining wall where that retaining wall was included in the design of the subdivision and constructed as part of the	If retaining walls have been developed at the time of subdivision then prospective purchasers can see the completed building platforms and therefore can ascertain that a dwelling will be	Reject	8



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			subdivision prior to individual houses being built.	located on top of the wall. As such measuring the height control plane from the site boundary that could be at the bottom of the wall is overly restrictive and potentially leads to unnecessary land use consents being required.		
<b>368.26</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.6 P2 Building Coverage, to make the building coverage allowance in the Te Kauwhata Residential West Area the same as the Residential Zone 40%.	The Proposed Plan does not identify why the building coverage allowance in the Te Kauwhata Residential West Area should be any less than the rest of the Residential Zone. Reducing the permitted building coverage in the Te Kauwhata Residential West Area will lead to less efficient use of the land resource.	Reject	6
<i>FS1061.12</i>	<i>Campbell Tyson</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seek that submission point 368.26 be allowed.</i>	<i>Increase building coverage to allow greater utilisation of residential zoned land to support the strategic direction outlined in Section A and Chapter B 4.1 of the Plan supports increased densities and housing choice throughout the district.</i>	Reject	
<b>368.27</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1(a)(4) Subdivision - General, to enable 25% of lots to be rear lots.	The amendment to Rule 16.4.1(a)(4) is proposed to enable more efficient and flexible subdivision design. As all subdivision is a restricted discretionary activity Council has the ability to have input into the subdivision design in the assessment process.	Reject	33.7
<i>FS1386.564</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
<i>FS1061.13</i>	<i>Campbell Tyson</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Seek that submission point 368.27 be allowed.</i>	<i>This is not able to be achieved on some sites due to the configuration of the site and topographical constraints which mean the creation of roads will be difficult. There is no assessment in the s32 analysis to support the 15% standard.</i>	Reject	
<b>368.28</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 (b) Subdivision - General, to ensure it	The amendment to Rule 16.4.1(b)(ix) is	Accept	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			only relates to structure plans or master plans notified within the Proposed Plan.	proposed as referencing other documents such as structure plans or master plans not notified with the Proposed Plan creates uncertainty in terms of being able to effectively assess the issues associated with a particular project. Certainty is required to enable appropriate planning to occur, both for Council and for private landowners/developers to ensure that the relevant requirements of the District Plan can be administered with both efficiency and certainty. Not being able to submit on these other documents takes away the ability to assess the compatibility of the documents with the proposed rules and/or assessment criteria and vice versa.		
FS1386.565	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>368.29</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Not Stated	Delete Rule 16.4.3 Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to apply the standard residential subdivision provisions to this area.	Where land has been zoned for residential development, the applicable rules should promote the efficient development of that land for that purpose. Efficiently developing residential zoned land for housing limits the potential that urban development will spread into surrounding rural areas. The Te Kauwhata West Residential Area proposed minimum and average lot size will not achieve the required outcomes defined for residential density under the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. As such the Proposed Plan will not be giving effect to the Regional Policy Statement, therefore the standard Residential Zone provisions are more appropriate. Policy 4.7.13 - Residential Zone - Te Kauwhata Ecological and	Reject	34

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				West Residential Areas (b) only requires that 'Subdivision is designed and located in the Te Kauwhata West Residential Area to achieve the minimum lot size ...' therefore the proposed average lot size, being significantly larger than the minimum is not supported by the applicable policy. Notwithstanding, the outcomes identified in Future Proof and incorporated into the Waikato Regional Policy Statement of achieving a minimum residential density of 12-15 households per hectare in the Residential Zone, must be achieved in order to enable growth across the Region to be adequately managed and provided for. All other rules related to development must be aligned to this required outcome, thereby making development efficient in both the short and the long term. The minimum lot size of 650m <sup>2</sup> in the Te Kauwhata West Residential Area will not achieve the 12-15 households per hectare required under the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.		
FS1318.4	Viaduct Harbour Nominees Limited	Support	Whole submission be allowed in preference to further submissions below.	To provide for the efficient use of land for development density in PDP will not support growth of WRPS HH/ha.	Reject	
FS1386.566	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1061.14	Campbell Tyson	Support	Seek that submission point 368.29 be allowed.	Oppose the Te Kauwhata West Residential Area for the following reasons: Inefficient use of land that fails to take into account the anticipated growth for the area. Fails to give effect to the Future Proof Strategy identified in 1.5.1 of the Plan that seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a more	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				compact urban form based on concentrating growth in and around Hamilton (67%) and the larger settlements of the district (21%). This involves a reduction in the relative share of the population outside of the sub region's existing major settlements through tighter control over rural-residential development and encouraging greater urban densities in existing settlements. Average residential lot size of 875m <sup>2</sup> is considered to be an inefficient use of the Residential land resource. Does not achieve the minimum density required by Strategic Policy 4.1.5. This is an inconsistency between the rules and the Plan's objectives. Therefore, for the rule to give effect to the Plan, this should be rectified.		
368.30	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.4 A Multi-Unit development, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend rules for multi-unit development to enable them in all residential areas of the District where connection is available, or will be available to reticulated services.	The active provision of multi-unit development assists in enabling different development densities, assists in providing a variety of housing types and assists in achieving the required densities of development as per the Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Reject	13
368.31	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Amend the reference in Rule 16.4.4(b)(viii) Multi Unit development, to structure and master planning to clarify that it only refers to structure or master plans that are contained within the notified version of the Proposed Plan.	Reference in Rule 16.4.4(b)(viii) to structure and master planning needs to be amended to clarify that it only refers to structure or master plans that are contained within the notified version of the Proposed Plan, otherwise new provisions within the Proposed Plan could be referring to documents outside of the Plan that submitters have not had the chance to consider and submit on.	Reject	13
FS1386.567	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate.</i>		
<b>368.32</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.13 Subdivision creating reserves, and the associated matters that Council has restricted its discretion to with regard to structure and master planning to clarify that these references only relate to structure or master plans that are contained within the notified version of the Proposed Plan.	Reference in Rule 16.4.13 to structure and master planning needs to be amended to clarify that it only refers to structure or master plans that are contained within the notified version of the Proposed Plan, otherwise new provisions within the Proposed Plan could be referring to documents outside of the Plan that submitters have not had the chance to consider and submit on.	Reject	33
<b>368.33</b>	<b>Ian McAlley</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Section 3 of Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines, to limit the consideration of the "site and contextual analysis" to how the subdivision/development will integrate with the immediately surrounding existing and/or proposed development.	Some of the matters proposed for assessment under section 3.3 "Landform and Vegetation" are more appropriately assessed at the time a zoning change is undertaken rather than in reaction to an individual development. Where land has been zoned for residential development the Plan and assessment process must promote the efficient development of that land for that purpose. Efficiently developing residential zoned land for housing limits the potential that urban development will spread into surrounding rural areas. Assessment by way of subjective elements not clearly defined in the Plan leads to uncertainty, delays and increased costs. Where landform elements are clearly assessed and defined and included in the Plan at the time (re)zoning takes place ensures that development can be appropriately undertaken across whole settlements, rather than being assessed on an ad-hoc, site by site basis. Also, where development is occurring within an environment set aside for larger scale change than the individual development being assessed, the larger scale change (the future state) must be considered. This ensures the context the proposal is assessed within is the end result, incorporating the change as enabled by the rezoning that has occurred. Use of subjective assessment methods can lead to re-litigation by way of assessment of outcomes considered to already be enabled by way of the underlying zoning. Such uncertain and potentially protracted assessment processes are counterproductive to development occurring efficiently where such assessment should have occurred at the time a piece of land was	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				considered for rezoning for more intensive, or alternative forms of development.		
FS1386.568	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
368.38	Ian McAlley	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Objectives and Policies to promote the efficient development of Residential Zoned land for that purpose.	Efficiently developing residentially zoned land for housing limits the potential that urban development will spread into surrounding rural areas.	Reject	39
372.16	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.3 Restricted Discretionary activities, as it relates to Pokeno and Tuakau as follows: A Multi-Unit development that meets all of the following conditions: (a) The Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 16.2; (b) The Land Use - Building rules in Rule 16.3, except the following rules do not apply: (i) Rule 16.3.1, Dwelling; (ii) Rule 16.3.8 Building coverage; (iii) Rule 16.3.9 Living court; (iv) Rule 16.3.10 Service court; (e) <del>The minimum net site area per residential unit is 300m<sup>2</sup>;</del> (d) The Multi-Unit development is connected to public wastewater and water reticulation..... OR Add an alternative residential zone for Pokeno and Tuakau which provides for terraced housing.	Growth can be accommodated within Pokeno and Tuakau through expanding the urban areas or through enabling greater densities within existing urban areas. The proposed plan seeks to accommodate growth within Tuakau and Pokeno through increasing the urban footprints of these towns. Within the proposed Residential zone there are provisions for multiunit development, however each unit must have a minimum net site area of 300m <sup>2</sup> . The minimum site area for vacant lot subdivision is 450m <sup>2</sup> . The proposed rules within the residential zone will not provide for intensification of the existing urban area nor will they result in a range of housing typologies that facilitate housing choice. The proposed rezoning of rural land for urban development and the zone rules will generate further urban sprawl on land and will result in a loss of prime soil. Furthermore, the lack of variety in housing typologies facilitated within the Residential and Village zones will result in a lack of housing choice to cater for a variety of incomes in and around Tuakau and Pokeno. Higher minimum	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>densities than those proposed are more appropriate for established residential areas immediately adjacent to the Business Town Centre zones. Higher residential densities around this zone would better support public transport and other infrastructure, the commercial vitality of the town centre and promote people living, working and playing in their local town centres. The provision of other bulk and location requirements, site coverage and the assessment criteria included for this type of activity are sufficient enough to address the likely impacts on amenity and residential character, whilst encouraging alternative types of housing design and delivering on the typology enabled by these provisions. An alternative to the above is to enable a new zone to be included within established residential areas, such as within walking distance from existing Business Town Centre zoned areas. This could be a more dense residential zone, or one that enables slightly increased building envelopes to enable in-fill and additional residential development to occur close to town centres.</p>		
FS1187.8	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Support submission point 372.16.	<p>The rules in the PWDP within the residential zone will not provide for intensification of the existing urban area nor will they result in a range of housing typologies that facilitate housing choice. Higher minimum densities than those proposed are more appropriate for established residential areas immediately adjacent to the Business Town Centre zones. Higher residential densities around this zone would better support public transport and other infrastructure, the commercial vitality of the town centre and promote people living, working and playing in their local town centres.</p>	Reject	
FS1202.77	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 372.16.	<p>Transport Agency supports Council maintaining discretion because the extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.</p>	Reject	
FS1269.113	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	<p>Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.</p>	Reject	
FS1136.2	Shaun McGuire	Support	Support ability to have smaller sites to forefil a need		Reject	
FS1388.4	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear</p>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1308.23	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support the intent of this provision which is seeking greater flexibility for multi-unit developments. We agree that more flexibility is required to enable multi-unit development. I agree with the submitter's comment that the 3000m2 net lot size will not provide for or encourage intensification of an existing urban area or facilitate housing variety. We support greater flexibility in the multi-unit housing rules where they promote more intensive development. The outcomes sought by the submission will ensure variety in the future housing stock to help achieve policies 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.16, and 4.2.17.	Reject	
FS1377.74	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and zones.	Reject	
378.21	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities as a permitted activity: <u>x. Emergency services training and management activities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand opposes the range of activities listed in 16.1.2 as permitted activities as there is no provision made for emergency services training and management activities. Fire and Emergency New Zealand seek the rule be expanded to provide for emergency services training and management activities in order to better achieve the sustainable management purpose of the Act and better enable Fire and Emergency New Zealand to achieve its statutory function by facilitating firefighting and emergency response.	Reject	22
FS1388.27	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FSI035.127	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Reject	
378.22	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.3 as a Restricted Discretionary Activity: (i) Emergency service facilities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand opposes Rule 16.1.3 to the extent that no provision is made for emergency services facilities. As provision is not made under this rule, emergency service facilities would instead default to non-complying activities under Rule 16.1.5. Fire and Emergency New Zealand considers the default non-complying activity status is overly restrictive and inappropriate and therefore seek the inclusion of emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary activity to provide for emergency services in the Residential Zone for the following reasons: Fire stations must be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximize their coverage and response times so that they can efficiently and effectively provide for health and safety of people and communities by being able to respond to emergency call outs in a timely way, thus avoiding or mitigating the potential for adverse effects associate with fire hazard and other emergencies; The actual or potential effects of fire stations are minor and can be adequately predicted and subsequently managed by conditions of consent and subsequent matters for control; Restricted Discretionary activity status will better implement the Objectives and Policies of the Proposed District Plan. Restricted Discretionary activity status better achieves the purpose of the RMA and better enables the submitter to meet its statutory obligations.	Reject	22
FSI388.28	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1035.128	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Reject	
378.23	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 16.2.1.1 Noise - General.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Rule 16.2.1.1 as it permits noise generated by emergency sirens. This exemption appropriately provides for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand and enables them to meet its statutory obligations in a manner that provides for the on-going health and safety of people and communities.	Accept	18
FS1316.41	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 378.23 in part with amendment as per submission point 693.8.	Support retention of rule but with amendment to PI to make specific reference to intensive farming noting that Alstra Poultry have two existing activities located in the Residential Zone of the proposed plan.	Accept	
FS1035.129	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	
378.25	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 Height - Building general, as follows: <u>This standard does not apply to emergency service facilities and hose drying towers up to 15m associated with emergency service facilities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand oppose the height requirements of Rule 16.3.3. The inclusion of a specific exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying towers in order to appropriately provide for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand. Fire stations are single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height. Some fire stations also include a hose drying tower between 12-15m in height. The inclusion of an exemption would better provide for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of Fire and Emergency New Zealand.	Accept	27
FS1035.131	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	
378.26	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 16.3.9.3- Building setback - Waterbodies.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand considers that the standard will safeguard the wellbeing of communities in accordance with the purpose of	Accept in part	27

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the RMA and the purpose of Fire and Emergency New Zealand in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.		
FS1388.30	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1035.132	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	
378.27	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision general, to the extent that subdivision is a restricted discretionary activity and proposed lots must connect to a public-reticulated water supply AND Amend Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General, as follows: (x) Provision of infrastructure, <u>including water supply for firefighting purposes.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand generally supports Rule 16.4.1 to the extent that subdivision is a Restricted Discretionary activity and requires that proposed lots in the Residential Zone must connect to public-reticulated water supply. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity.	Accept	33
FS1388.31	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1035.133	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	
<b>378.28</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.2 Subdivision - Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area, to the extent that subdivision is a restricted discretionary activity and proposed lots must connect to a public-reticulated water supply. AND Amend Rule 16.4.2(b)(x) Subdivision - Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area, as follows: (x) Provision of infrastructure, including water supply for firefighting purposes. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand generally supports Rule 16.4.2 to the extent that subdivision in the Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area is a Restricted Discretionary activity and requires that proposed lots in the Residential Zone must connect to a public-reticulated water supply. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity.	Accept	34
FS1388.32	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
FS1035.134	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	
<b>378.29</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.3 Te Kauwhata West Residential Area, to the extent that subdivision is a Restricted Discretionary Activity and requires proposed lots to connect to public-reticulated water supply AND Amend Rule 16.4.3 Te Kauwhata West Residential Area, as follows: (x) Provision of infrastructure, <u>including water supply for firefighting purposes.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand generally supports Rule 16.4.3 to the extent that subdivision is in the Te Kauwhata West Residential Area is a Restricted Discretionary activity and requires that proposed lots in the Residential zone must connect to public-reticulated water supply. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity.	Accept	34

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1388.33	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1035.135	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	
378.30	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.4 Subdivision - Multi-unit development, to the extent that subdivision is a restricted discretionary activity and requires connections to water reticulation AND Amend Rule 16.4.4(b)(x) Subdivision - Multi-unit development, as follows: (x) Provision of infrastructure to individual units; including water supply for firefighting purposes. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand generally supports Rule 16.4.1 to the extent that subdivision in the form of multi-unit development in the Residential Zone is a Restricted Discretionary activity and requires connection to water reticulation. Subdivision that does not comply is a Discretionary Activity.	Accept	13
FS1035.136	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	
378.66	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new objective to Section 4.2 Residential Zone, as follows: <u>Objective 4.2.2(x) To recognise and provide for non-residential activities that contribute to the health, safety and wellbeing of the community while managing their potential adverse effects to ensure that the activities complement the amenity values of the District's residential areas.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	The provisions for non-residential activities in the Residential Zone focus on the management of effects rather than the opportunities of the activity. Emergency services have a functional and operational need to be located in close proximity to the communities they serve. This objective will better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.	Reject	39
FS1388.52	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1035.173	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Reject	
378.67	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.21 Maintain residential purpose, to the extent that the provision anticipates non-residential activities in the Residential Zone. AND Amend Policy 4.2.21 - Maintain residential purpose as follows: Restrict the establishment of <u>non-residential commercial or industrial activities</u> , unless the activity has a strategic or operational need to locate within a residential zone, and the effects of such activities on the character and amenity of residential zones are insignificant. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) supports in part Policy 4.2.21 to the extent that the provision anticipate non-residential activities in the Residential Zone, but considers that the provisions focus on the management of effects, rather than an outcome that provides clear direction in relation to the appropriateness of some non-residential activities in the Residential Zone. For instance, providing for emergency services that have a functional and operational need to be located in close proximity to the communities they serve. Amendments sought better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.	Reject	14
FS1388.53	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1035.174	Pareoranga Te Kata.	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Reject	
<b>378.68</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.23 Non-residential activities, to the extent that the provision anticipates non-residential activities in the Residential Zone AND Amend Policy 4.2.23(iii) Non-residential activities as follows: (iii) Enabling non-residential activities that provide for the health, safety and well-being of the community and that service or support an identified local need AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand (FENZ) supports in part Policy 4.2.23 to the extent that the provision anticipate non-residential activities in the Residential Zone, but considers that the provisions focus on the management of effects, rather than an outcome that provides clear direction in relation to the appropriateness of some non-residential activities in the Residential Zone. For instance, providing for emergency services that have a functional and operational need to be located in close proximity to the communities they serve. Amendments sought better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.	Accept	16
FS1388.54	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1035.175	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	
<b>378.73</b>	<b>Fire and Emergency New Zealand</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 4.4.1 Adverse effects of land use and development, to the extent that recognition is given to the health and well-being of communities and are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development AND Amend Objective 4.4.1 (a) Adverse effects of land use and development as follows: 4.4.1 (a) The health, safety and well-being of people, communities and the environment are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports Objective 4.4.1 to the extent that recognition is given to the health and wellbeing of communities and are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development. However, Fire and Emergency New Zealand recommends the wording better reflect section 5 of the RMA, which also refers to the safety of the community.	Accept	18.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.			
FS1035.180	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.	Accept	
386.11	<b>Pokeno Village Holdings Limited</b>	Not Stated	Retain Rule 16.3.5 RDI Daylight admission where non-compliance with the daylight admission standards is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity.	Any non-compliance with Rule 16.3.5 should also be assessed as a restricted discretionary activity rather than a full discretionary activity.	Accept in part	8
386.16	<b>Pokeno Village Holdings Limited</b>	Not Stated	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 PI Height - Building general, as follows: PI The maximum height of any building must not exceed 7.5m 8m. AND Any consequential amendments to Rule 16.3.5 Daylight Admission such as taking the recession plane angle measurement from an elevation of 3m (rather than the proposed 2.5m) above ground level.	The Operative District Plan provides for a permitted building height of 8m. There is no compelling basis for reducing the permitted building height by 0.5m. The submitter has been unable to find any section 32 analysis that provides justification for this approach. Consequential amendments may also be necessary to the daylight admission control Rule 16.3.5.	Accept	
FS1261.11	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission points and amend the maximum building height in the Residential Zone to 8m.	The Operative Plan (Franklin section) provides for a permitted building height of 8m. A permitted maximum building height of 8m is generally considered as the default standard. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the Residential Zones of the surrounding districts (e.g. Auckland, Waipa and Thames-Coromandel). There is no clear justification for a maximum building height of 7.5m in the s32 reports.	Accept	
FS1297.17	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the maximum building height in the Residential Zone to 8m.	The operative plan (Franklin Section) provides for a permitted building height of 8m. A permitted maximum building height of 8m is generally considered as the standard. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa, and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
FS1377.82	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential.	Accept	
386.17	<b>Pokeno Village Holdings Limited</b>	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan so that any non-compliance with the permitted building height is assessed as a restricted discretionary activity.	Rule 16.3.3.1 of the PWDP requires any non-compliance with the permitted building height rule to be assessed as a full discretionary activity. This is inappropriate because the environmental effects of any such non-compliance are easily identifiable (relating to residential amenity, privacy, overshadowing and dominance)	Accept	27
FS1269.120	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1388.86	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
405.61	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add matters of discretion to Rule 16.4.1 RDI (b) Subdivision - General as follows: <u>The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure assets; The consideration of the nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of existing infrastructure assets.</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Accept	33
FS1211.49	First Gas Limited on behalf of First Gas	Support	Allow	First Gas supports the intention of the proposed amendment to Rule 16.4.1 RDI(b) which seeks to ensure subdivision within the Residential Zone does not impact adversely on existing infrastructure and in particular access. While First Gas supports the intent of submission point 405.61, ultimately First Gas seeks an additional rule which would make subdivision of a site containing a gas transmission pipeline a restricted discretionary activity as outlined in the original submission.	Accept	
433.22	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 PI Building setback - Water bodies, as follows: (a) Any building that is not a maimai must be setback a minimum of: ... AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Maimai should be exempt from this rule because they are already controlled by the Building Act 2004 and need to be an adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not compromise hunter safety. There should be the same or similar provisions as the Waikato Regional Plan which permits maimai subject to a maximum area of 10m2 and height of 2.5m measured from floor level.	Reject	5
FS1223.79	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
433.23	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.4 PI Building setback - Environmental Protection Area, as follows: A building <u>that is not a maimai</u> must be set back a minimum of 3m from an Environmental Protection Area. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Maimai should be exempt from this rule because they are already controlled by the Building Act 2004 and need to be an adequate size to maintain safe shooting zones and not compromise hunter safety. There should be the same or similar provisions as the Waikato Regional Plan which permits maimai subject to a maximum area of 10m <sup>2</sup> and height of 2.5m measured from floor level.	Reject	31
435.13	Jade Hyslop	Oppose	Amend Home stay provisions in Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities, to provide for registration of Homestay or Visitor accommodation.	Raglan requires a plan similar to Queenstown to avoid more residential accommodation becoming available to only visitors. Since residents tend to move to and from surrounding country areas, the same policy needs to apply there.	Reject	22
435.17	Jade Hyslop	Neutral/Amend	Add to 22 Residential Zone rules to the effect that: <u>Construction of commercial building within sight of SH23 at Raglan is a permitted activity if it will be screened from SH23 by planting with indigenous species that will achieve an average height of 3m after 5 years, mature to over 9m in the residential zone and 12m in the business zone and be of sufficient density to visually screen the activity from SH23. Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity is a discretionary activity.</u>	Zone extensions have increase the extent of urban development along the main approach to Raglan, that could be mitigated by screening further development.	Reject	39
435.23	Jade Hyslop	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.2.22-Bankart Street and Wainui Street. AND Add provision to Chapter 4: Urban Environment for Wi Neera Street.	Oppose as the area behind corrugated iron on Wi Neera Street is still be developed and residents will be forced out of their homes by rate rises, overlooking, noise etc. Raglan needs housing for locals far more than extra holiday apartments.	Reject	
FS1276.167	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.	WED supports development of a Raglan Structure Plan and opposes extension of Raglan CBD until the	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				area behind corrugated iron on Wi Neera Street is still be developed. A structure plan is needed to determine the size of Raglan and its services. As part of that provision needs to be made for affordable housing.		
445.10	Heather Perring for BTW Company	Neutral/Amend	Add a new controlled activity to Rule 16.4 Subdivision, to facilitate ease of subdivision in new structure planned areas: C1 Subdivision in accordance with an approved structure plan created after 18 July 2018.	Developer led and Council led structure planning should be encouraged to reach up front agreements with local communities on the essential bulk and location standards to create developments suited to the location rather than a 'one size fits all' approach or ad hoc development.	Reject	33
FS1388.297	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1308.52	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	For the same reasons provided in submission point 420.1, we oppose the inclusion of any rule prohibiting any form of subdivision.	Reject	
464.15	Perry Group Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (b) Restricted Discretionary Activities, to correct the cross-referencing as follows: (ii) <del>16.3.8-16.3.6</del> (iii) <del>16.3.9</del> 16.3.7 (iv) <del>16.3.10</del> 16.3.8	Correcting cross referencing error. The matter should be assessed as part of Council's restricted discretion for a Restricted Discretionary Activity application. To reflect previous submission points, as a consequential amendment. The amendment retains these matters as a specific matter of restricted discretion under RD1. To reflect correct cross referencing.	Reject	13
FS1388.387	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1316.40	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 464.15.	Support the correction of cross-referencing error in Rule 16.1.3 RDI(b) and in particular to ensure that the setbacks outlined in Rule 16.1.3.9 apply to Multi Unit Developments.	Reject	
464.17	Perry Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RDI (b) Subdivision - General, by setting fewer matters of discretion as follows: (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) Subdivision layout; (ii) Shape of lots and variation in lot sizes; (iii) Ability of lots to accommodate a practical building platform including geotechnical stability for building; (iii) Likely location of future buildings and their potential effects on the environment; (v) Avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards; (vi) Amenity values and streetscape landscaping; (vii) Consistency with the matters contained within Appendix 3.1 (Residential Subdivision Guidelines); (viii) Vehicle and pedestrian networks; (ix) Consistency with any relevant structure plan or master plan including the provision of neighbourhood parks, reserves and neighbourhood centres; and (x) Provision of infrastructure. AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to address the concerns raised in the submission.	It represents the most appropriate means of exercising the Waikato District Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of other available means. Some of the changes proposed are therefore not more appropriate in terms of section 32 and other provisions of the Resource Management Act 1991.	Reject	33
FS1388.389	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				appropriate.		
FS1272.3	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Null	The future location of buildings is a key part of ensuring that new development is integrated with the existing environment, including on existing infrastructure and amenity values. The Proposed Plan contains a range of objectives, policies and rules relating to the location of new buildings (eg setbacks), and the deletions sought by the submitter would be inconsistent with this approach. The full list of matters of discretion should be retained.	Accept	
464.18	Perry Group Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.4 RDI (a) (iii) Subdivision - Multi-unit development. AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to address the concerns raised in the submission.	The rule is confusing and poorly drafted. Subdivision should be guided by the land use consent process and there should be no minimum lot size for Multi-Unit development subdivision where a land use consent has been proposed under Rule 16.1.3. There should be no minimum lot size applicable to the underlying site as this is subject to a separate land use consent process (which is design led).	Reject	13
FS1388.390	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
464.19	Perry Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities, to specify that any application for a resource consent for a Multi-Unit development made under this rule shall not be notified or served on affected persons. AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to address the concerns raised in the submission.	The proposed amendment provides certainty and efficiency in terms of process. Council's matters of restricted discretion and compliance with land use effects under Rule 16.2 adequately address matters of adverse effects at external boundaries.	Reject	13
FS1388.391	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1087.4	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 464.19.	The outcome requested by the submitter does not achieve the purpose of the RMA.	Accept	
464.20	Perry Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 16.3.3.1 PI Height - Building general an exception for multi-unit development as follows: <u>The exception shall be Multi-unit development where the height of any building must not exceed 10m.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to address the concerns raised in the submission.	A building height of 7.5m is insufficient to effectively and efficiently provide for Multi-Unit development.	Reject	
464.21	Perry Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.4 RD1 (b) (vii) Multi-unit development, by removing reference to the use of design guidelines as a criteria AND Add a matter of discretion to Rule 16.1.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: <u>A design report shall be submitted by a suitably qualified and experienced professional which assesses the Multi-Unit Development in accordance with the NZ Urban Design Protocol.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to address the concerns raised in the submission.	The consideration of consistency with design guidance should more appropriately be considered as a matter at the time of the land use consent, in accordance with Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (a) in the right-hand column of the table, (rather than at subdivision stage). Requiring consistency with design "guidelines" as a "criteria" is inappropriate as the guidelines provide "guidance" only and may restrict the consideration of changes to design and innovation. The submitter sees no reason why the guidelines cannot remain in the plan for reference, however the criteria should instead reflect (in terms of a level of detail provided) those requirements in the NZ Urban Design Protocol.	Reject	13
FS1388.392	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
466.35	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.15 (c) Earthworks to include provision for ancillary rural earthworks associated with existing activities AND Amend Policy 4.2.15 Earthworks to consider reverse sensitivity issues associated with ancillary rural earthworks associated with existing activities.	Where rezoning has included high-class soils that are currently used for commercial vegetable production, then ancillary rural earthworks should be enabled and this policy should reflect this. The policy should also consider the reverse sensitivity issues likely to develop from residential development occurring around ongoing commercial vegetable production activities that are unable to relocate elsewhere.	Reject	11
466.65	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Oppose	Delete requirement for 1.5m setback from boundary where effects are mitigated from Rule 16.2.4.1 P1 Earthworks - General.	The submitter questions the requirement for 1.5m setback from all boundaries where appropriate erosion and sediment controls are in place and effects are mitigated and consider that this is unworkable.	Reject	11
471.31	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.1 D1 - Dwelling to be a restricted discretionary activity as follows: <del>D1-RD1</del> A dwelling that does not comply with Rule 16.3.1 P1. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Activities failing a permitted standard should be a restricted discretionary activity, not a discretionary activity.	Reject	13
FS1388.455	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1261.12	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend the activity status for dwellings not complying with 16.3.3.1 to Restricted Discretionary.	A dwelling not complying with maximum requirement for building height should not be assessed as a Discretionary Activity. Instead it should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity. This represents better planning practice as a non-compliance of this nature is only minor does not warrant the full discretion of Council when assessing an application for resource consent.	Reject	
FS1261.9	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend the activity status for dwellings not complying with 16.3.1 to Restricted Discretionary.	A proposal for more than one dwelling per site should not be assessed as a Discretionary Activity; instead it should be assessed as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. This represents better planning practice as a non-compliance of this nature does not warrant the full discretion of Council when assessing an application for resource consent.	Reject	
FS1377.115	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL seeks amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation. HVL also supports accurate mapping of SNAs.	Reject	
FS1297.18	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend activity status for dwellings not complying with 16.3.3.1 to Restricted Discretionary.	A dwelling not complying with the maximum requirement for building height should not be assessed as a Discretionary Activity. Instead it should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Reject	
FS1297.15	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend activity status for dwellings not complying with 16.3.1 to Restricted Discretionary.	A dwelling that is not a Permitted Activity should not be assessed as a Discretionary Activity. Instead it should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Reject	
<b>471.35</b>	<b>Andrew Wood for CKL</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P3 (a) Permitted Activities, to enable retirement villages on a site that has a net area less than 3ha or require resource consent at this scale. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	There should be better use of standards for a permitted retirement village if that is to be a permitted activity.	Reject	21
FS1017.14	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
FS1017.5	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
FS1187.2	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Support submission point 471.35.	Finding an area of land over 3 hectares in size in the Residential zone will be challenging. Retirement villages can range in their design including individual detached units, townhouses and apartment-style units in a multi-story building. A minimum site size of 3 hectares will add to urban sprawl rather than provide housing intensification close to existing town centres.	Reject	
FS1388.457	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
471.36	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P4 (e) Permitted Activities, as follows: (e) Machinery may <u>only</u> be operated between 7.30am and 9pm on any day. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Insert text for clarification.	Accept	22
FSI388.458	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FSI187.3	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Support	Support submission point 471.36.	The rule in the PWDP does not promote higher densities or compact development and will add to urban sprawl rather than housing intensification. Density should be appropriate to the physical attributes of the proposed development.	Accept	
471.37	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (c) Restricted Discretionary Activities, so that the minimum net site area for multi-unit developments is reduced to 150m2 or 200m2 per residential unit based on average site area (rather than 300m2 per residential unit based on net site area). AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	A minimum average of 300m2 net site area does not encourage intensification of infill sites, more so on greenfields land, which often is not inappropriate. There needs to be more alignment with minimum unit sizes in the subdivision standards for the Residential Zone.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1388.459	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1269.125	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1129.20	Auckland Council	Support	Null		Reject	
<b>471.38</b>	<b>Andrew Wood for CKL</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 PI (a)(ii) Earthworks - General, by increasing the allowable volume from 250m3 to 500m3. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	A volume of 250m3 can easily be exceeded and due to topography or ground conditions resource consent should not be required in this instance. A maximum volume of 500m3 will allow for variations in topography or ground conditions. The effects of earthworks are well understood and can be managed via performance standards. The volumes are very restrictive and have no bearing on building or development scale.	Reject	11
FS1269.126	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1308.65	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We agree that the Permitted standard is too low and should be increased.	Reject	
<b>471.39</b>	<b>Andrew Wood for CKL</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.2 PI (a)(i) Minor dwelling, by reducing the net site area requirement from 900m2 to 600m2. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	A net site area of 900m2 is too large given the maximum gross floor area of 70m2 for a minor dwelling. A net site area of 900m2 is very near to enabling the creation of a new site.	Reject	13
FS1388.460	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1308.66	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	This is consistent with our submission. A net site area of 900m <sup>2</sup> is too large given the maximum gross floor area of 70m <sup>2</sup> for a minor dwelling.	Reject	
471.40	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.7 P1 Living court, to reduce the minimum living court area from 80m <sup>2</sup> to 60m <sup>2</sup> per single standalone dwelling, with the potential to require larger dwellings to have an additional 20m <sup>2</sup> . AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	The requirement for the living court to be 80m <sup>2</sup> is excessive. A 60m <sup>2</sup> living court will provide for larger dwellings or additional bedrooms.	Reject	29
471.41	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 P1 (a)(ii) Building setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: (ii) 13m from the <del>edge of an indicative road</del> ; centre line of an indicative road if it has not been constructed and vested. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Indicative roads do not have legal boundaries and therefore the planning maps show only their indicative location. The planning maps are not drawn at a scale to accurately determine a boundary. The centre of an indicate road provides a useful degree of variance.	Reject	13
471.42	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 P3 Building setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: A garage <del>door facing the street</del> must be set back behind the front facade of the dwelling. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Not all garages in front of dwelling facades result in bad design outcomes.	Accept	5297.56
471.43	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Delete the term "lot" from Rule 16.4.1 RDI Subdivision - General, and replace with "site" AND Any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to the relief sought and ensure consistency across the District Plan.	Consistency is required across the District Plan.	Reject	33
FS1388.461	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
471.44	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(ii) Subdivision - General, as follows: (ii) Where roads are to be vested in Council, they <u>must should</u> follow a grid layout; AND Any consequential amendments to give effect to the relief sought.	It may not always be possible for roads to follow a grid layout as topography make require a curvilinear layout. Use of the word "must" will result in forced failure of the performance standard and a resulting discretionary activity status.	Reject	33
FS1388.462	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1287.18	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Blue Wallace seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.	The Submitter supports this submission point in principle, as it is substantively similar to the Blue Wallace submission point and acknowledges that it is not always practical to follow a grid layout. The less definitive wording is more appropriate than how it is currently worded.	Reject	
471.45	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission considers minimum unit size standards (as contained in Rule 16.4.4 Subdivision-Multi unit development) should be a land use requirement. Subdivision around existing or lawfully established units should be enabled.	The minimum standards should be a land use requirement. Subdivision around existing or lawfully established units should be enabled.	Reject	
FS1308.67	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	This is consistent without submission which seeks to amend the provision to allow subdivision around existing dwellings or in accordance with approved land use consent.	Reject	
FS1388.463	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
471.46	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.5 C1 Subdivision - Boundary adjustments to be a permitted activity rather than a controlled activity. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Minor boundary adjustments that maintain compliance with bulk and location standards should be a permitted activity subject to appropriate standards.	Accept	33
FS1388.464	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
471.47	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.6 Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans and conversion to freehold, by: deleting references to alterations to exclusive use areas; and enabling permitted activity amendments in certain circumstances. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	A change to an exclusive use area is not deemed to be a subdivision under section 218 of the Resource Management Act and, because this is a private covenant matter, it is not able to be controlled by Council. It is appropriate for some amendments to flats plans and/or units plans to be a permitted activity.	Reject	33
471.50	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.2 D1 Minor dwelling to be restricted discretionary activity as follows: <del>D1</del> RD1 A minor dwelling that does not comply with Rule 16.3.2 P1.	Activities failing a permitted standard should be a restricted discretionary activity, not a discretionary activity.	Accept	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Any consequential amendments necessary.			
FS1308.68	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	Discretionary Activity status is too restrictive for minor infringements listed in submission points 471.50 - 471.56.	Accept	
FS1269.127	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
471.51	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 D1 Height - Building general to be a restricted discretionary activity as follows: <del>D1RD1</del> Any building that does not comply with Rule 16.3.3.1 P1. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Activities failing a permitted standard should be a restricted discretionary activity, not a discretionary activity.	Accept	27
FS1269.128	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
471.53	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.6 D1 Building coverage to be a restricted discretionary activity as follows: <del>D1RD1</del> Total building coverage that does not comply with Rule 16.3.6 P1, P2 or P3. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Activities failing a permitted standard should be a restricted discretionary activity, not a discretionary activity.	Accept	6
FS1308.182	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	• Discretionary Activity status is too restrictive for minor infringements listed in submission points 471.53.	Reject	
FS1269.130	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
471.54	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.7 D1 Living court to be a restricted discretionary activity as follows: <del>D1RD1</del> A living court that does not comply with Rule 16.3.7 P1 or P2. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Activities failing a permitted standard should be a restricted discretionary activity, not a discretionary activity.	Accept	29
FS1308.183	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	• Discretionary Activity status is too restrictive for minor infringements listed in submission points 471.54.	Reject	
FS1269.131	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
471.55	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.8 D1 Service court to be a restricted discretionary activity as follows: <del>D1RD1</del> A service court that does not comply with Rule 16.3.8 P1. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Activities failing a permitted standard should be a restricted discretionary activity, not a discretionary activity.	Accept	30
FS1308.184	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	• Discretionary Activity status is too restrictive for minor infringements listed in submission points	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				471.55.		
FS1269.132	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
471.56	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.1.4 D1 and D2 Discretionary activities AND Add these rules to Rule 16.1.3 Restricted Discretionary activities. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Permitted activities failing standards should be restricted discretionary activities not discretionary.	Reject	22
FS1388.467	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1308.69	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	Discretionary Activity status is too restrictive for minor infringements listed in submission points 471.50 - 471.56.	Reject	
FS1269.133	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
FS1017.3	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
489.10	Ann-Maree Gladding	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision - General, as follows: (i) Proposed lots must have a minimum net site area of 450m <sup>2</sup> 400m <sup>2</sup> , except where the proposed lot is an access allotment or utility allotment or reserve to vest;	A 450m <sup>2</sup> minimum lot size is too large and restrictive. Smaller lot sizes are generally more popular now for easier maintenance and 400m <sup>2</sup> is still large enough to fit a decent sized dwelling.	Reject	33
FS1388.480	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
489.11	Ann-Maree Gladding	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a)(iv) Subdivision - General, to have an area requirement of 1ha or similar before triggering a "rear lot" rule.	The draft rule does not seem to be very workable for smaller infill subdivisions. This rule should only be applicable to larger subdivision sites.	Reject	33
FS1388.481	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
499.18	Adrian Morton	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.14(b) Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips to require the developer of lots 4ha to provide esplanade facilities that will include as a minimum a 1.8m wide timber edge gravel path walkway and 10% of area landscape planting.	To promote the development and linkages of esplanade areas to increase the areas walking and cycling facilities.	Rejected	33
524.43	Anna Noakes	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.14 Earthworks, as notified.	Earthworks that facilitate residential subdivision is supported	Accept	11
FS1287.20	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Blue Wallace seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.	This submission point shares the view of the Submitter that the objective is suitable and should be retained.	Accept	
535.20	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.16 Housing options.	The submitter supports the focus on a range of housing options within the Residential Zone.	Accept	12
FS1388.694	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective,	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
535.21	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Amend Policy 4.2.17 Housing types, by introducing a suite of policies including those on other housing types and high design quality. AND Amend the wider zone provisions as a consequential amendment. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	As Future Proof and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement seek compact development in existing towns and villages. The submitter seeks to better understand how and where growth will be accommodated. However the objective and policies are focused on maintaining the character of the Residential Zone. Duplex or multi-unit development may not necessarily maintain the status quo. Additional policies would allow focus on positive changes in terms of affordability and choice of housing.	Reject	12
FS1388.695	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1377.129	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and zones.	Reject	
FS1269.143	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Reject	
553.38	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Rule 16.1.2 P2, P4, and P6 Permitted Activities.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs	Accept	22

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.		
FS1388.793	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
559.45	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 4.2.15 Earthworks a new clause 'f' as follows: (a) ... (f) Earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that they do not adversely affect historic heritage and cultural values.	The submitter supports Policy 4.2.15 Earthworks in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of earthworks. The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the RMA.	Accept	11
559.80	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.2.7.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance. AND Amend Rule 16.2.7.1 RD1 to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance. AND Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter. AND Provide for any consequential amendments as required.	The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage. While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes. The generic, zoned based approach does not reflect the need to assess the suitability of a signage proposal	Reject	21

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				against the specific heritage values of the individual building or site. The generic approach has the potential to cause adverse effects of historic heritage and Maaori sites of significance. To avoid adverse effects to heritage items and Maaori sites of significance it would be more appropriate for any signage on heritage items and Maaori sites of Significance to be elevated to a restricted discretionary activity level of assessment and subject to the matters of discretion already included (i.e. (vi) and (vii)).		
<b>567.13</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add a new condition to Rule 16.4.14 - Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, as follows: <u>must be bordered by park edge roading for safety, environment, amenity and urban design purposes.</u> AND Add an additional provision for Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips in all sections of the Proposed District Plan where esplanade reserves are referred to as follows: <u>must be bordered by park edge roading for safety, environment, amenity and urban design purposes.</u>	Esplanade strip can be a stream, river or coastal. Sections backing onto a waterbody can become dumping ground. Road frontage and walkway adjacent to an esplanade lends to passive surveillance and a healthy environment for both the waterbody and people using it.	Reject	33
FS1308.78	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	While we agree that safety, environmental, amenity and urban design issues are relevant concerns for esplanade reserves the requirement for these reserves to be bordered by park edge roading would be onerous, economically unfeasible, given the cost of roading, and in some circumstances impractical given topographical and other constraints along river, stream and coastal margins. These issues would better be addressed through matters of discretion or design standards so they can be included where practical and feasible.	Accept	
FS1371.9	Lakeside Development Limited	Oppose	Lakeside Developments Limited seeks that the submission point requiring all esplanade reserves and strips to be bordered by a park edge road be declined.	It is not considered appropriate to require all esplanade reserves or strips to be bordered by a park edge road. Such a requirement needs to be assessed within the context of the proposed esplanade reserve or strip to determine whether it is the most appropriate method in achieving improved road safety, character and amenity values. It will not promote the sustainable management of resource and will not achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. It will not enable the wellbeing of the community. It will not meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. It will not	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. It will not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</i>		
<b>567.15</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Table 4.3 in Appendix 3.1 - Residential Subdivision Guidelines to include ticks for all small (s) and medium (m) for connectivity and movement networks.	Over time often small developments intensify. If there is not good urban design from the outset a good outcome can never be attained.	Reject	33
<b>567.16</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Table 5.3 in Appendix 3.1 - Residential Subdivision Guidelines to include ticks for all small (s) for guidelines for neighbourhood character.	Small developments can intensify over time and if good urban design is not achieved at the onset, it cannot be attained in the future.	Reject	33
<b>567.17</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Tables 6.3 in Appendix 3.1 - Residential Subdivision Guidelines to include ticks for all small (s) and medium (m).	Over time often small developments intensify. If there is not good urban design from the outset, a good outcome can never be attained.	Reject	33
<b>567.18</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Tables 7.3 in Appendix 3.1 - Residential Subdivision Guidelines to include ticks for all small (s) and medium (m).	Over time often small developments intensify. If there is not good urban design from the outset, a good outcome can never be attained.	Reject	33
<b>567.19</b>	<b>Ngati Tamaoho Trust</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Table 8.3 in Appendix 3.1 - Residential Subdivision Guidelines to show intention for offline stormwater treatment.	Not clear if wetlands and waterbodies are to be protected outside of stormwater devices and stormwater can be discharged into them only after pre-treatment. No specific decision sought but submission considers all stormwater treatment must be "offline" to any natural waterbody in the context of Section 8 of Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines. No specific decision sought but submission considers wetlands should be promoted as they provide shade, terrestrial habitat and contaminant removal. Pictures in 8.3 of Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines show ponds as treatment devices. Ponds are not successful in maintaining water quality. No specific decision sought, but submission considers Section 8.3 Guidelines in Appendix 3.1 Residential Subdivision Guidelines is not clear that natural wetlands/streams/ponds/watercourses are to be protected outside of stormwater devices and	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				water can be discharged into them only following pre-treatment.		
<b>578.27</b>	<b>Ports of Auckland Limited</b>	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 16.1.2 P3 to remove retirement villages as a permitted activity within the Residential Zone. AND Amend Rule 16.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, to include rules relating to new or altered retirement villages as follows: RD2 A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village that meets all of the following conditions: (a) The Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 16.2, except that the following rules do not apply. (i) Rule 16.2.7 (Signs); (b) The Land Use - Buildings rules in Rule 16.3, except the following rules do not apply: (i) Rule 16.3.1 (Dwelling); (ii) Rule 16.3.3 (Building Height); (iii) Rule 16.3.7 (Living Court) (iv) Rule 16.3.8 (Service Court) (c) The site or combination of sites where the retirement village is proposed to be located has a minimum net site area of 3ha; (d) The site is either serviced by or within 400m walking distance of public transport; (e) The site is connected to public water and wastewater infrastructure; (f) Minimum living court or balcony area and dimensions: (i) Apartment - 10m<sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimensions horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; (ii) Studio unit or 1-bedroom unit - 12.5m<sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; or (iii) 2 or more bedroomed unit - 15m<sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; (g) Minimum service court is either: (i) Apartment - Communal outdoor space (i.e. no individual service courts required); or (ii) All other units - 10m<sup>2</sup> for each unit; (f) Building height does not exceed 8m, except for 15% of the total building coverage, where buildings may be up to 10m high. Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (a) Density of the development; (b) Adequacy of the information provided to address matters specified, and outcomes sought, within Sections 3, 4, 5 and 6 of Appendix XX (Multi-unit Design Guideline) (c) Avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards (d) Geotechnical suitability for building (e) Amenity values and streetscapes (f) Avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities (g) Protection of noise sensitive activities from the effects of noise generated by industrial activities. AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>Concerned that the residential intensification that would be enabled through a retirement village has the potential to adversely affect the efficient operation of the Horotiu Industrial Park. Concerned that traffic generation associated with the permitted retirement villages will not be appropriately managed by the Proposed District Plan as they have unlimited density. Concerned that the density of permitted retirement villages will not be appropriately managed and therefore will not protect amenity of the receiving Residential Zone. Such an approach would be consistent with the approach taken by the Proposed District plan for 'Multi-unit' development and these are arguably smaller density and built form outcomes compared to that enabled for 'Retirement villages'.</p>	Reject	22
FSI388.847	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1187.7	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 578.27.	This is a site-specific submission that will have major implications on all areas of the Waikato District.	Accept	
578.28	Ports of Auckland Limited	Oppose	Add matters of discretion to Rule 16.1.3RD1 to give consideration of reverse sensitivity effects as follows: (a) Density of the development;... (j) Provision of infrastructure to individual units, (k) <u>Avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities;</u> (l) <u>Protection of noise sensitive activities from the effects of noise generated by industrial activities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	FutureProof recognises that residential development in this area needs to be carefully considered. There is a risk that significant residential intensification of the type that would be enabled by the Proposed District Plan would implicate the efficient operation of the Horotiu Industrial Park. If multi-unit housing development rule is retained, it is critical to ensure that the Horotiu Industrial Park is not adversely affected by considering reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	13
FS1388.848	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1269.49	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment; to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
578.29	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	<p>Add a permitted activity rule to Rule 16.3.10 to manage reverse sensitivity effects associated with noise, as follows: <u>P2 Activities sensitive to noise must be subject to a restrictive no-complaint covenant in favour of Ports of Auckland Limited. For the purposes of this rule a 'restrictive non-complaint covenant' is defined as a restrictive covenant registered on the Title to the property or a binding agreement to covenant, in favour of the Horotiu Industrial Park, by the landowner (and binding any successors in title) not to complain as to effects generated by the lawful operation of industrial activities from the Park. The restrictive no-complaint covenant is limited to the effects that could be lawfully generated by industrial activities at the time the agreement to covenant is entered into. This does not require the covenantor to forego any right to lodge submissions in respect of resource consent applications or plan changes in relation to industrial activities (although an industrial restrictive non-complaint covenant may do so).</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 16.3.10 RD1 Building-Horotiu Acoustic Area, as follows: (a) Construction, addition to or alteration of a building that does not comply with Rule 16.3.10-<del>P1</del></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>The Proposed Plan enables the intensification of activities that are sensitive to noise within close proximity to the Horotiu Industrial Park. The RPS provides clear direction that the Proposed Plan should minimise potential reverse sensitivity effects. The Proposed District Plan should provide clear direction on where and how sensitive activities should be enabled within the vicinity of the Horotiu Industrial Park to avoid and mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects. Considers it is appropriate to require new buildings and the alteration of existing buildings within the Horotiu area to be subject to 'no complaints' covenants in favour of Ports of Auckland Ltd, and be subject to minimum acoustic insulation requirements which can be achieved through amendments to the Noise Control Boundary. This overlay should be applied to the entirety of the Horotiu residential area. Such measures will provide for the ongoing lawful operation and establishment of industrial activities.</p>	Reject	18
FS1313.17	Perry Group Limited	Oppose	<p>Seek that the further provision be disallowed unless clarity is provided as to how this mechanism will occur and how effective it will be in relation to managing effects on amenity.</p>	<p>It is unclear how the restrictive 'no complaints' covenant will be imposed and whether this complaints covenant is required over ALL land as sought in the submission within the Residential zone, including maps.</p>	Accept	
FS1269.50	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	<p>Oppose in part.</p>	<p>Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.</p>	Accept	
578.82	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	<p>Add a matter of discretion to Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (b) Subdivision - General, to give consideration to reverse sensitivity effects as follows: Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) Subdivision layout;... (xi) <u>Avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities.</u> AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>Generally supportive of the subdivision requirements set out but note that consideration of reverse sensitivity effects, particularly in regards to the Horotiu Industrial Park has not been included as a matter of discretion.</p>	Reject	33
FS1388.869	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	<p>Null</p>	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear</p>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1269.53	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
578.83	Ports of Auckland Limited	Not Stated	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 16.4.4RDI(b) Subdivision - Multi-unit development, to give consideration to reverse sensitivity effects as follows: Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) Subdivision layout including common boundary and party walls for the Multi-unit development; ... (xi) <u>Avoidance of reverse sensitivity effects on industrial activities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make alternative or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Generally supportive of the subdivision requirements set out but note that consideration of reverse sensitivity effects, particularly in regards to the Horotiu Industrial Park has not been included as a matter of discretion.	Reject	13
FS1388.870	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1269.54	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
588.56	Peter Buchan for Woolworths	Not Stated	Retain Rule 16.1.5 Non-complying Activities, insofar as	Supports the non-complying activity status for	Accept	22



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>NZ Ltd</b>		supermarkets are more appropriately accommodated in zones that provide principally for commercial activities.	supermarkets within the Residential Zone as it will suitably assess the activity under section 104D of the Act and this approach is generally consistent with other plans in the region.		
FS1388.991	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
<b>598.10</b>	<b>Withers Family Trust</b>	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.14 Earthworks.	Earthworks that facilitate residential subdivision are supported.	Accept	11
FS1287.25	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Blue Wallace seek that the submission point be allowed in full	This submission point shares the view of the Submitter that the objective is suitable and should be retained.	Accept	
<b>602.28</b>	<b>Greig Metcalfe</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.2.7.1 P3(a) Sign - general as follows: (a) Any real estate 'for sale' sign relating to the site on which it is located must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) There is no more than 1 sign per agency measuring 600mm x 900mm per road frontage of the site to which the sign relates; (ii) There is no more than 1 sign measuring 1800mm x 1200mm per site to which the sign relates; (iii) There is no more than 1 real estate header sign measuring 1800mm x 1200mm on one other site; (ii) (iv) The sign is not illuminated; (iii) (v) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (iv) (vi) The sign does not project into or over road reserve. (vii) Any real estate sign shall be removed from display within 60 days of sale/lease or upon settlement, whichever is the earliest. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	The notified rules for real estate signs are too restrictive. Corner sites should be able to have additional sign opportunities without adversely affecting residential character and amenity. Allowance should be made for feature signs which are commonly used for properties going to auction or tender. Header signs should be able to be established on another sign (often on a high volume road) to direct purchasers to the site which is for sale (often on a low volume road).	Reject	21
<b>606.10</b>	<b>Bill Wasley for Future Proof Implementation Committee</b>	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.16 Housing options.	This is consistent with a key Future Proof principle relating to providing housing choices.	Accept	12

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
662.10	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.4 RDI Subdivision - Multi-unit development, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.4.4 RDI (a)(iii) Subdivision - Multi-unit development to reduce the minimum net site area required to 200m2 for each unit.	Matches that or abutting territorial authorities. There is plenty of physical evidence that can be provided to assure that a 200m2 net site area is suitable to house multi-unit developments. Smaller net site areas will enable efficient use of land, particularly in regard to infill housing areas.	Reject	13
FS1387.101	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
662.11	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.13 RDI(a) Subdivision creating reserves as follows: (a) Every reserve, including where a reserve is identified within a structure plan or master plan (other than an esplanade reserve), proposed for vesting as part of the subdivision, must be bordered by roads <del>along at least 50% of its boundaries</del> as much as is practicable...	This rule seeks to impose a development constraint that may not feasibly be possible or practicable. Reserves should provide access from transportation corridors, on-site variables could mean that a 50% road frontage is not possible, thus defaulting the development to a high order planning assessment. It is understood that this provision is proposed (in part) to enable passive surveillance, however in many instances a 50% road boundary is unrealistic with other design considerations available for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles.	Reject	33
FS1070.2	Glenvale Stage 2 Limited	Support	Support in part. Remove requirement for reserves to feature at least 50% road frontage.	In principle, this submission is supported for requesting more flexibility to the rule, that will avoid affecting the activity status of an application, where the proposed rules were not met. This trend is supported by a number of other submissions listed below: 679.12, 681.5, 684.7, 687.5, 688.6, 689.14, 746.51, 751.23, 853.5, 871.7, 965.1. Key points of concern with the proposed rules are: a. The 50% road boundary along reserves requirement is	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				likely to be difficult and costly to achieve in most circumstances. It will likely reduce lot yield in urban subdivision, and increase roading and overall development costs. b. In the previous legacy plans (Waikato District Plan- Waikato Section and Waikato District Plan- Franklin Section) no rule of this nature existed and no analysis has been provided within the Section 32 report explaining why the 50% requirement has been introduced. c. Not all reserves are used for the same purpose, for example reserves that feature sporting grounds may require more road frontage for parking purposes, whereas other reserves intended to protect significant natural features do not require a lot of road frontage.		
FS1308.90	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We agree with the following: This rule seeks to impose a development constraint that may not feasibly be possible or practicable. Reserves should provide access from transportation corridors, on-site variables could mean that a 50% road frontage is not possible, thus defaulting the development to a high order planning assessment. It is understood that this provision is proposed (in part) to enable passive surveillance, however in many instances a 50% road boundary is unrealistic with other design considerations available for Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design principles. However, we believe that the rule should be changed to a matter of discretion rather than a performance standard as the wording proposed by the submitter wouldn't be enforceable as a rule.	Reject	
662.12	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.16 Subdivision of land containing an Environmental Protection Area, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.4.16 CI (a) Subdivision of land containing an Environmental Protection Area as follows: (a) Subdivision of land containing an Environmental Protection Area must comply with all of the following <u>as conditions of consent</u> :	Supports the rule as development within close proximity to delineated EPAs needs appropriate recognition to facilitate natural process and mitigate any potential adverse effects of development on such areas. Considers that, from a developer's perspective, a planting and management plan may be prepared and submitted to Council as a condition of consent. Once the developer has the confidence of consent being issues for any particular project, detailed design plans can include the provision of landscape plans and planting specifications.	Accept	31
662.40	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.1 Residential Character as notified	Supports this objective as an appropriate unambiguous high-level statement in the Proposed Waikato District Plan regarding	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development within residential areas and provides a suitable policy context.		
<b>662.41</b>	<b>Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.2 Character.	Notes that this policy does not align with several other policies proposed by Council as they relate to structure plans e.g. Policy 4.1.15 and 4.1.14. Acknowledges that urban growth needs to be considered in the context of a strategic plan, however an appropriate level of flexibility is needed in structure plans to allow for on-site variables that may not be provided for in the structure plan.	Accept	4
FS1387.118	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1107.10	Simon Upton	Support	The submitter accurately notes that the Structure Plan proposal for Ngaruawahia is not aligned with proposed Policy 4.2.2. The Structure Plan provides for blanket residential extension of the town's southern boundary without regard for 'the natural contour of the landform' or 'views and vistas from public spaces of the hinterland beyond'		Accept	
<b>662.42</b>	<b>Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.2.5 Setback: Side boundaries, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 4.2.5(b) Setback: Side boundaries as follows: (b) Reduced side boundary setbacks occur <del>only generally</del> where it: (i)... (ii) Retains trees on the site; or (iii) <del>Written approval for the encroachment has been provided by the abutting landowner.</del>	Support in part as the policy provides a degree of flexibility in regard to side yard performance standards in the Residential Zone. A further clause should be included to recognise the written approvals from affected parties, such as neighbouring landowners.	Reject	5
<b>662.43</b>	<b>Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.12 Outdoor living court - Multi-unit development, as notified.	It provides for flexibility in development through urban design.	Accept	9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
662.44	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.14 Earthworks, as notified.	Supports the objective in that subdivision development and assessment by Council is undertaken concurrently under the consents process, and that this process is inclusive of earthworks.	Accept	11
662.45	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 4.2.16 Housing options, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 4.2.16(a) Housing options as follows: (a) A wide range of housing options occurs in the Residential Zones of Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Pokeno, Raglan, Te Kauwhata, Taupiri and Tuakau...	Supports the objective in part as it is important for high-level recognition in the district plan for housing diversity. Taupiri should be explicitly included in the objective. The inclusion of Taupiri is due to the increased residential density and growth in the village post the Waikato Expressway.	Reject	12
FS1387.119	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
679.10	Greenways Orchards Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.3 Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area, with the exception of Rules RD1 (a)(ii) and RD1(a)(iv) which are addressed elsewhere in the submission.	Enables the subdivision of land in Te Kauwhata to provide for growth within the district.	Accept	34
FS1387.156	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
679.11	Greenways Orchards Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.3(a)(iv) Subdivision -Te Kauwhata West Residential Area and make it a matter of discretion.	The establishment of grid patterns may not be appropriate to all sites due to topographical or other physical constraints. There is no section 32 analysis to justify the requirement for a grid layout. The appropriateness of a grid layout should therefore be listed as a matter of discretion rather than a rule.	Accept	34
679.12	Greenways Orchards Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13(a) Subdivision creating reserves and make it a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and this rule will therefore result in unjustified costs to developers and purchasers. The rule is arbitrary and may not be appropriate for all types of reserves and developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage as indicated with the subdivision concept plan provided with the submission. There is no section 32 analysis to justify the 50% threshold. The extent of road frontage for a proposed reserve should therefore be a matter of discretion rather than a rule.	Reject	33
FS1377.188	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	The 50% threshold is better addressed as a matter of discretion rather than a standard.	Reject	
684.10	Janet Elaine McRobbie	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General, except for the points raised and amendments sought elsewhere in the submission.	Provides for the efficient use of the land resources. Enables the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district.	Accept	33.2
FS1387.254	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>684.11</b>	<b>Janet Elaine McRobbie</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(iii) Subdivision - General, and make it a matter of discretion.	The establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate for all sites, such as those that have natural or physical constraints. The submitter's properties are examples. A grid pattern does not reflect the existing character of Pokeno where there is a "loose looping grid formation with cul-de-sacs." A similar road formation should be carried over to the submitter's properties to maintain this character. There is no analysis in the section 32 report to justify this rule and grid patterns should be a principle rather than enforced as a rule.	Accept	33
<i>FS1387.255</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>684.12</b>	<b>Janet Elaine McRobbie</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(iv) Subdivision - General and make it a matter of discretion; OR Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(iv) Subdivision - General, as follows: (iv) Where 4 or more proposed lots are proposed to be created, the number of rear lots do not exceed <u>15% 25%</u> of the total number of lots being created;	It is not possible for a subdivision of the submitter's properties to comply with this rule due to their configuration and topographical constraints. The adjoining land contains a higher number of rear lots for this reasons. The pattern of subdivision needs to be considered in terms of the existing neighbourhood character. The rule is arbitrary and the section 32 analysis does not justify the proposed 15% threshold.	Accept	33
<i>FS1387.256</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>687.10</b>	<b>Campbell Tyson</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.3 RDI (a)(iv) Subdivision - Te Kauwhata, and make it a matter of discretion.	Submitter accepts that grid layouts result in increased permeability, legibility and walkability of residential areas. However, the establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate to all sites. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a grid layout. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule. While grid layouts are an accepted urban design principle for good subdivision design, they are not an absolute response. Therefore, they should be used as a principle and not enforced through a rule.	Accept	34
FSI 387.275	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>689.10</b>	<b>Greig Developments No 2 Limited</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 PI (a) Building setbacks - All boundaries as follows: (a) A building must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) <u>1.2+5m</u> from every boundary other than a road boundary; and (iv) <u>1.2+5m</u> from every vehicle	The Plan requires excessive building setbacks for residential Lots that will restrict the ability to develop the urban land. The setbacks exceed the existing Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section	Reject	5



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			access to another site.	standards for minimum side and rear yards of one meter Reducing the side yard allows for variety in lifestyle and lower maintenance		
689.11	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 P1(a)(ii) Building setback - Waterbodies to match Rule 24.3.6.3 Building setback - waterbodies AND Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 P1 Building setbacks - Waterbodies as follows: (ii) 23m from the bank of any <u>named</u> river (other than the Waikato and Waipa Rivers); AND Add a new permitted rule P3 to Rule 16.3.9.3 Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: <u>P3 A building must be set back a minimum of 10m from the bank of a perennial or intermittent named or unnamed stream.</u>	These are not consistent with other zones or the existing Operative District Plan - Franklin Section provisions	Reject	
FS1387.285	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
689.12	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RDI(a)(iii) Subdivision - General	The submitter accepts that grid layouts result in increased permeability, legibility and walkability of residential areas. However, the establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate to all sites. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to implement a grid layout. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in Section 32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule While grid layouts are an accepted urban design principle for good subdivision design they are not	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				an absolute response		
FS1387.286	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
689.13	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.2 RDI (a)(iv) Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area	The submitter accepts that grid layouts result in increased permeability, legibility and walkability of residential areas. However, the establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate to all sites. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to implement a grid layout. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in Section 32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule While grid layouts are an accepted urban design principle for good subdivision design they are not an absolute response	Accept	34
FS1387.287	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
689.14	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13 (a) Subdivision creating reserves and make this a matter of discretion.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers, which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. The enforcement of the rule may increase the cost of development, which could pass onto purchasers. This is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types or developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. There is no analysis in Section 32 stating why the 50% rule has been applied.	Reject	33
689.15	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips to adopt the provisions in the Operative District Plan - Franklin Section Rule 11.5 - Esplanade Reserves and Strips	This needs to be assessed on a case-by-case basis and Council should allow a waiver or reduction in width in certain circumstances. Accepts that esplanade reserves and strips enable public access and recreation.	Reject	33.15
689.34	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RDI(a)(iv) Subdivision - General	This is not able to be achieved on some sites due to the configuration of the site and topographical constraints which mean creation of roads will be difficult. The standard is arbitrary and there is no assessment in the Section 32 analysis to support the 15% standard.	Reject	33
FS1387.295	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
689.35	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.3 RDI(a)(v) Te Kauwhata West Residential Area	This is not able to be achieved on some sites due to the configuration of the site and topographical constraints which mean creation of roads will be difficult. The standard is arbitrary and there is no assessment in the Section 32 analysis	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				to support the 15% standard		
FS1387.296	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1318.2	Viaduct Harbour Nominees Limited	Support	Support in part insofar as replacement rules be general residential rules.	Current PDP rules fail to allow for growth density. Topography is one factor that is relevant to achieving density.	Reject	
689.36	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.4 RD1(a)(iii) Multi-unit development AND Add the following to Rule 16.4.4 RD1 (a) Multi-unit development: <u>Prior to subdivision occurring around existing buildings and development, all development must meet one of the following: (a) have existing use rights; (b) comply with the relevant zone rules; or (c) Be in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.</u>	It is too restrictive. Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings as an activity will allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary Resource Consent costs and time delays where the effects could be managed through permitted activity standards. Lots for multi-unit development should be sized in relation to the proposed unit sizes. There is no assessment in the Section 32 analysis to support the 300m2 net site area. prior to subdivision occurring, all development must meet one of the following: (a) have existing use rights; (b) comply with the relevant zone rules; or (c) be in accordance with an approved land use resource consent.	Reject	13
FS1387.297	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
689.37	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.11 Subdivision - Road frontage to adopt the provisions in the Operative District Plan - Franklin Section 26.6.4 Frontage to Road (Vehicular Access Requirement)	There is no analysis in Section 32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule Opposes council prescribing a minimum frontage.	Reject	33
FS1134.65	Counties Power Limited	Oppose	Seek that the submission point not be allowed.	The road frontage should not be reduced from 15m as it may create adverse effects on existing infrastructure and may also limit proposed infrastructure that would be located within road reserves.	Accept	
689.38	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.12 Subdivision - Building platform to adopt the Shape Factor in the Operative District Plan - Franklin Section 26.6.1.	There is no analysis in Section 32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule Opposes the size of the shape factors	Reject	33
FS1387.298	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
695.15	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.7(b) Site Coverage and Permeable Surfaces to remove the words "lawns and gardens."	It is solely the right of a land owner to decide if they want lawns and gardens or not on their property and not be directed by Council Planners that they must have this. Council will not maintain the lawn and garden for owners. The key requirement of the permeable surface is that it is required to comply.	Accept	6
695.16	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.10(a) Daylight and outlook as follows: Maintain adequate daylight, and enable opportunities for passive solar gain by providing for the progressive reduction in the heights of buildings. AND Consider adding a link to a rule or a source for context for Policy 4.2.10(a) Daylight and outlook.	The phrase has no context and is meaningless. The reduction of the height of buildings on a flat site could lead to less exposure to sunlight. There are other means of providing solar access.	Accept	8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
695.17	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.10(b) Daylight and outlook as follows: Require the height, bulk and location of development to maintain sunlight access and privacy, and to minimise <u>non-compliant</u> visual dominance effects on adjoining sites <u>where they are demonstrated to the satisfaction of council that they cannot be reasonably avoided due to constraints such as steep topography in relation to effects of works and costs.</u>	Visual dominance can only occur through a non-compliance or an effect greater than a permitted activity equivalent comparison.	Reject	8
695.20	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.2.15(a)(iv) Earthworks. OR Amend Policy 4.2.15(a)(iv) Earthworks to refer to "unauthorised clean-fill" instead of "clean-fill".	It is ultra-vires. It lacks any comprehension of building and development requirements. If it meant to refer to unauthorised clean-fill, it should state so. The statement is objected to it (in its present form). The stated prohibition on importation of all clean-fill would make almost all development impossible. Building sand, crushed stone, shells or bark for gardens can all be regarded as clean-fill if received from an authorised source. Some sites need earth brought in to address drainage or where building of the soil level is required for stability and building platform integrity.	Reject	11
695.22	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.15(e) Earthworks to identify which sites this applies to as a planning overlay on the Proposed District Plan maps. OR Amend Policy 4.2.15(e) Earthworks to provide a reference document source for applicants to refer to determine to what extent they need to comply.	This clause has no context as to how it is intended to be applied. Subjective open-ended statements frustrate applicants.	Reject	11
695.23	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.18(a)(i) Multi-unit development to include reference to the document (Appendix 3.4 of the Proposed District Plan) at the start of this policy, rather than part way through or at the end of this section.	The reader will read the various open-ended requirements of (a) and wonder how that might be achieved. It is only later in clause (b) the reference document is stated. Dispersing key requirements of the District Plan in a prominent and consistent manner would better assist applicants.	Reject	12
695.24	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.2.23(a)(i) Non-residential activities. AND Delete Policy 4.2.23(a)(iv) Non-residential activities. OR Add to Policy 4.2.23(a)(iv) Non-residential activities a list	The intent to avoid dominance in residential areas is fully supported. Policy 4.2.23(a)(iv) is not well considered. Non-residential activities on front sites would be more prominent on	Reject	16

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			of the types of non-residential activities that can occur in residential areas, with restrictions on dominance.	front sites if the intent is to restrict a dominant presence in the residential zone. The location of restriction on cul-de-sacs, and to strategic roads, is equally bizarre. This would see a disproportionate amount of these activities occur on residential through streets.		
<b>695.25</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.26(a)(ii) Neighbourhood centres in structure plan areas to replace "provide" with "plan" and define the walkable catchment in relationship to the catchment.	The statement is not well considered. It needs to be revised. The walkable catchment requirement would potentially restrict the size of neighbourhood centres and could create an inefficient dispersal of resources and infrastructure where more than one would be needed when on that is larger could do the task efficiently provided that it does not overly tax the roading system. The work "provide" implies that such centres must wait for development to occur around them and be retrofitted.	Reject	17
<b>695.32</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.4.6 Signage to include restrictions on the number of signs on a premises.	Many signs are superfluous to advise traffic of safety, speed or directions. This avoids signage clutter.	Reject	21
<b>695.33</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs to include restrictions on the number of signs on a premises.	Many signs are superfluous to advise traffic of safety, speed or directions. This avoids signage clutter.	Reject	21
<b>695.82</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Visually permeable" in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: Means materials on a fence or wall that have <del>continuous vertical or horizontal gaps of at least 50mm width that result in</del> at least 50% visual permeability that include continuous vertical or horizontal gaps of at least 50mm width.	The definition cannot be applied as it reads. It suggests only the gaps have the visual permeability.	Reject	23
<b>695.83</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (h) Restricted Discretionary Activities so that an additional 10m <sup>2</sup> per bedroom be required for outdoor living space for 3 bedrooms or more, and that the 4m dimension be reduced to 3m.	The Council should be aiming for regional consistency. There is no obvious need for such wide variations to occur. The minimum dimensions in the Proposed District Plan are difficult to achieve, particularly on many narrow sites that occur in the District. This requirement is 60% greater than that for Hamilton City (included in the submission), with no logical explanation for such a great difference. The	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				area requirement is supported in principle, there seem to be more practical consideration that Hamilton has applied, however again there appears to be no reason for either Council, to vary as much as 300% in one example.		
FS1387.326	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
695.84	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P1 Earthworks - General so that earthworks are applied as a ratio to site area, i.e. a 1:1 ratio on a 450m2 site would provide 450m3 earthworks.	The Proposed District Plan penalises bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects. Earthworks totals should not cancel each other out, i.e. cut and fill add together.	Reject	11
695.85	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain a maximum area of earthworks in Rule 16.2.4.1 P1 Earthworks - General.	No reasons provided.	Accept	11
695.86	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P3 Earthworks - General so that the volume is applied as a ratio to site, i.e. a 1:5 ratio, so a 450m2 site would therefore provide a 90m3 fill.	The Proposed District Plan penalises bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects.	Reject	11
695.89	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.2 P1(a)(i) Minor dwelling to apply a 600m2 threshold instead of the current 900m2 requirement.	Hamilton City Council allows 600m2 in the Residential Zone on reticulated and serviced sites (but precludes later subdivision). The Proposed District Plan approach is a 150% difference to HCC for no logical planning reason. The Council should be moving toward regional consistency. It would better enable the region to meet its share of provision of affordable housing options in a more cost effective manner	Reject	13



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				by reducing building costs.		
FS1387.327	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1308.106	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	This is consistent with our submission. A net site area of 900m <sup>2</sup> is too large given the maximum gross floor area of 70m <sup>2</sup> for a minor dwelling.	Reject	
695.90	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 PI Height - Building general so the rule applies to that part of the building structure opposite the immediate ground level only. AND Amend Rule 16.3.5 Daylight admission as a consequential amendment.	The rule is suitable for flat sites. A development on a steeply sloped site is severely penalised. This would avoid giving neighbours perverse objection rights. Height in relation to boundary would need to account for the same. Subdivision design would need to ensure larger lots on steeper sites than the minimums to avoid solar access issues when development occurs.	Accept	27
697.87	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 (1) Permitted Activities as follows: (a) Activity-specific conditions; (a)(b) Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 16.2 (unless the activity rule and/or activity-specific conditions identify a condition(s) that does not apply); (b)(c) Land Use - Building rules in Rule 16.3 (unless the activity rule and/or activity-specific conditions identify a condition(s) that does not apply); (c) Activity-specific conditions."	The list of rules (a) - (c) should follow the order that they appear.	Accept	22
FS1387.431	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.90	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P3 (e)(i) Permitted Activities A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village as follows: Minimum service court is either: (i)Apartment - Communal outdoor space (ie no individual service courts required of at least 5m2 with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres for each apartment.	There is no minimum size for the communal service court which is required for a permitted activity standard. A 5m2 area for each apartment would be suitable for outdoor storage and washing lines.	Accept	22
697.96	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new condition to Rule 16.1.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary as follows: <u>A detailed site plan depicting the proposed record of title boundaries for each residential unit and any common areas (including access and services must be provided, ensuring that a freehold (fee simple or unit title subdivision complied with rule 16.4.4 (Subdivision - Multi-unit development);</u> AND Add a new rule to Rule 16.1.3 as follows: (d) where units or apartments are being proposed, the following minimum unit areas apply: Unit of Multi-Unit _____ Minimum Unit Area <u>Studio unit or 1 bedroom unit</u> 60m2 _____ 2 bedroom unit _____ _____ 80m2 3 or more bedroom unit _____ 100m2	To set a density standard that would determine the number of units that could be built on a site and to ensure that each residential unit is contained within an area that would enable subdivision.	Reject	13
FS1377.204	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities house types.	Accept	
FS1291.3	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities house types.	Accept	
FS1387.439	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
742.20	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.16(b) Housing options as notified, except for the amendments sought below. AND Add a High Density Residential Zone to the Proposed District Plan with supporting objectives, policies and rules. AND Amend planning maps to show the location of a High Density Residential Zone. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the development of accessible, liveable and resilient communities. The submitter supports the intent of Objective 4.1.16(b) as it supports a mode shift for trips in urban areas from private vehicles to a focus on a more accessible transport system with a variety of modes such as walking, cycling and public transport. The use of a higher density residential zone would provide a clearer and more robust (regulatory) signal to applicants of Council's expectations for the density of development in locations close to the Business Town Centre Zone and transport networks. This approach would also provide stronger support for Policy 4.2.18(a)(iv).	Accept in part	12
FS1387.850	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1313.24	Perry Group Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	Consider that a higher density Residential zone will be an efficient use of natural and physical resources and more density will facilitate more accessible transport and favourable urban design and living outcomes.	Accept	
FS1287.37	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Blue Wallace seek that Council allow the portion of the submission point that refers to higher density development.	The Submitter supports this submission point to the extent that it promotes higher density development. This will contribute to creating a compact urban form.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1269.59	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Support in part.	Housing New Zealand supports the proposed amendment, to the extent it is consistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
742.25	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 4.4.7 Managing the adverse effects of signs as follows: (a) The location, colour, content, and appearance of signs directed at or visible to road users traffic is controlled to ensure signs they do not distract, confuse or obstruct motorist, pedestrians and other road users adversely affect safety of road users... (b) Discourage signs that generate adverse effects from illumination, light spill, flashing, moving, or reflection are avoided. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the recognition in Policy 4.5.37 of the potential adverse effects of signs on people using the land transport system but seeks minor amendments.	Accept	21
746.28	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.2- Permitted Activities to include multi-unit development of up to three dwellings as follows: <u>P13 Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings is a Permitted Activity</u> AND Add similar activity specific standards to the new rule as Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (including the amendments sought)	Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings should be a Permitted Activity. This will allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary Resource Consent costs and time delays and effects could be managed through permitted standards. The construction of up to three dwellings on a residential site is unlikely to result in adverse effects provided the relevant controls can be met. The proposed addition to the permitted activity table will allow existing land to be developed more efficiently without the need to subdivide the land.	Reject	13
FS1387.919	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1202.75	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 746.28.	Increased density and mixed-use developments	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				support multi-modal transport options, help achieve a change in urban form, and support liveable communities. The Transport Agency supports the proposed change however notes that that the Transport Agency has requested amendments to 16.1.3 RD1 that requires consideration of the transport network and the requested new activity specific standards should also include these amendments.		
<b>746.29</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (c) Restricted Discretionary Activities for Multi-unit development as follows: The minimum net site area per residential unit is <del>300m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>250m<sup>2</sup></u> ; AND Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 condition (e) Restricted Discretionary Activities (Multi-unit development) as follows: Total Building coverage of the site does not exceed 50% <del>60%</del>	The submitter supports the provision for multi-unit housing as it gives effect to the strategic direction outlined in Section A and Chapter B 4.1. The provision supports variety in the future housing stock to help achieve policies 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.16 and 4.2.17. Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings should be a Permitted Activity. This will allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary Resource Consent costs and time delays where and effects can be managed through permitted standards. While the policy directive support variety in housing types the provisions of the Plan encourage typical suburban form rather than enabling medium density development.	Reject	13
FS1387.920	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1017.7	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
FS1017.2	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
<b>746.30</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities to provide for low rise apartments close to town centres as follows Where multi-unit apartments are proposed apply conditions in 17.1.3 RD1	This will enable the directive in Policy 4.2.17(a) Housing types. There are a number of larger (1000m <sup>2</sup> ) sections within the older existing residential areas in both Tuakau, Te	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Kauwhata, Ngaruawahia and Poke no. These areas are often close to the Town Centre. Intensification of these sites should be encouraged given their proximity to existing services. These sites could accommodate low-rise apartments and multi-unit development to achieve the policy directives of the Proposed Plan. While the policy directive support variety in housing types the provisions of the Proposed Plan encourage a typical suburban form rather than enabling medium density development.		
746.31	The Surveying Company	Support	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1- Earthworks- General P1(a)(ii) as follows: (ii) Not exceed a volume of <del>250m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>500m<sup>2</sup></u>	Where subdivision has been approved by Council and lots have been created there should be no requirements for land owners to apply for additional resource consents for earthworks to undertake permitted activities on the land. The earthworks thresholds need to be lenient enough to ensure the land can be developed without additional consents. Permitted land use standards should be able to control the adverse effects of any works.	Reject	11
746.32	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Rule 16.2.4.1 P2 Earthworks-General as notified.	The submitter supports this provision to enable the creation of stable building platforms.	Accept	11
746.33	The Surveying Company	Support	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P3(a)(i) Earthworks- General as follows: Not exceed a total volume of <del>20m<sup>3</sup></del> <u>100m<sup>3</sup></u> AND Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P3(a)(ii) Earthworks- General as follows: Not exceed a depth of <del>1m</del> <u>1.5m</u> .	Cleanfill may be required in residential zoned sites to enable greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes. The requirement to avoid filling in all circumstances may restrict the ability to development residential land where balanced cut to fill earthworks are inappropriate or cannot be achieved. The importation volume is too low to enable residential development.	Reject	11
746.34	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.2.4.1 NCI Earthworks General AND Add a new restricted discretionary activity (RD2) to Rule 16.2.4.1 as follows: <u>RD2 Earthworks including the importation of cleanfill to a site.</u>	The importation volume is too low to enable residential development Cleanfill may be required in residential zoned sites to enable greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes. The requirement to avoid filling in all circumstances may restrict the ability to development residential land where balanced cut	Reject	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				to fill earthworks are inappropriate or cannot be achieved. The Non-Complying status is too restrictive and needs to be more lenient to enable greenfield development within residential zones.		
<b>746.35</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Add a new permitted activity (P2) to Rule 16.3.1- Dwelling for a multi-unit development of up to three dwellings as follows: <u>P2 Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings added as a Permitted Activity</u> AND Add permitted activity conditions to the new Rule 16.3.1 P2 similar to Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (including proposed amendments) AND Amend Rule 16.3.1- Dwelling to state that Rule 16.3.1 does not apply to multi-unit development.	The submitter opposes the condition as it is too restrictive. Up to three dwellings permitted on a site where the multi-unit dwelling standards can be met. Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings should be a Permitted Activity. This will allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary Resource Consent costs and time delays where and effects could be managed through permitted standards. There are a number of larger (1000m <sup>2</sup> ) sections within the older existing residential areas in both Tuakau, Te Kauwhata, Ngaruawahia and Poke no. These areas are often close to the Town Centre. Intensification of these sites should be encouraged given their proximity to existing services. These sites could accommodate low-rise apartments and multi-unit development to achieve the policy directives of the Plan. Provision should be made within the rules for this. This will allow existing land to be developed more efficiently without the need to subdivide the land allowing land owners to build additional dwellings on existing lots. Permitted standards can control amenity effects to ensure that neighbouring sites are not affected. This approach has been taken by Auckland Council where additional dwelling can be constructed on properties without Resource Consent provided permitted standards can be achieved.	Reject	13
<i>FSI 387.921</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is</i>	<i>Accept</i>	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1377.246	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities, housing types and zones.	Accept	
<b>746.36</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Support	Amend Rule 16.3.2 PI(a)(i)- Minor dwelling as follows: The net site area is <del>900m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>600m<sup>2</sup></u> or more.	The submitter supports the provision as it will enable more diversity in the housing stock to achieve policies 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.16 and 4.2.17. Reduce the net site area to 600m <sup>2</sup> . The Plan should encourage intensification and housing options in the residential zones, especially in growth areas such as Tuakau and Pokeno. The permitted standards will control effects if the site is an appropriate size to accommodate a minor dwelling.	Reject	13
FS1387.922	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>746.37</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 PI-Building Height -General as follows: The maximum height of any building must not exceed <del>7.5m</del> <u>11m</u> . AND Amend Rule 16.3.5- Daylight admission as a consequential amendment.	The height limit does not enable the efficient use of urban land and fails to increase the development capacity of existing urban areas. The strategic direction outlined in Section A and Chapter B 4.1. of the Plan supports increase densities and housing choice throughout the district. The provision supports variety in the future housing stock to help achieve policies 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.16 and 4.2.17. This includes the provision of low rise apartments and multi-unit development. The 7.5m height limit restricts the potential to build medium density	Reject	27



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				housing. While the Plan seeks some intensification and increased density to accommodate future growth the land use provisions in the Plan create a suburban form which is at odds with the strategic direction and objectives and policies for the urban environment.		
<b>746.38</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.5 P1- Daylight admission as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>37</del> <sup>45</sup> degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	This is inconsistent with previous Planning documents, which are less restrictive. This is too restrictive for urban areas. Adequate amenity and daylight for adjoining sites can be achieved with a less restrictive control plane. The 37 degree angle is difficult to calculate.	Accept	8
FS1297.22	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provision so that the angle is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa, and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
FS1261.16	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provision so that the angle used to calculate daylight admission is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive. 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
<b>746.39</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.6 P1- Building Coverage as follows: The total building coverage must not exceed 40% <del>50</del> %.	The submitter opposes the 40% building coverage as it does not enable the efficient use of urban land and fails to increase the development capacity of existing urban areas. Increasing building coverage will allow greater utilisation of residential zoned land and support the strategic direction outlined in Section A and Chapter B 4.1 of the Plan, which supports increase densities and housing choice throughout the district.	Reject	6
<b>746.40</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.7 P1 Living Court, as follows: (a) A living court must be provided for each dwelling that meets all of the following conditions: (i) It is for the exclusive use of the occupants of the dwelling; (ii) It is readily accessible from a living area of the dwelling; (iii) When located on the	The Plan requires excessive outdoor living areas relative to 450m' lot size provision for residential Lots. While the Plan seeks some intensification and increased density to accommodate future growth the land use	Reject	29

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			ground floor it has a minimum area of <del>80m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>40m<sup>2</sup></u> and a minimum dimension of <del>4m</del> <u>3m</u> in any direction. (iv) When located on a balcony of an above ground apartment, it must have a minimum area of <del>15m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>10m<sup>2</sup></u> and a minimum dimension of <del>4m</del> <u>2m</u> in any direction. AND Amend Rule 16.3.7 P2 Living Court, as follows: (a) A living court must be provided for each minor dwelling that meets all of the following conditions: (i) It is for the exclusive use of the occupants of the minor dwelling; (ii) It is readily accessible from a living area of the minor dwelling; (iii) When located on the ground floor it has a minimum area of <del>40m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>10m<sup>2</sup></u> and a minimum dimension of <del>4m</del> <u>2m</u> in any direction. (iv) When located on a balcony of an above ground apartment, it must have a minimum area of <del>15m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>8m<sup>2</sup></u> and a minimum dimension of <del>2m</del> <u>1.6m</u> in any direction.	provisions in the Plan create a suburban form which is at odds with the strategic direction and objectives and policies for the urban environment. Excessive sized outdoor living areas will restrict the ability to develop the urban land. The size standards exceed the existing Franklin District Plan standard which requires 60m' of outdoor living area. The Perception of urban living is changing and people no longer need large outdoor areas. Smaller outdoor living courts have been adopted by Auckland Council to promote a more compact living approach and should be adopted by the Waikato District Council to achieve the strategic objectives. Reducing the minimum outdoor living court allows for variety in lifestyle and lower maintenance. In addition, 16.3.8 requires an additional service court which ensures adequate outdoor space for living and other domestic requirements.		
FS1297.26	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provisions of 16.3.7 P1 and P2 accordingly.	The 80m2 requirement exceeds that of the operative plan (Franklin Section) and makes no attempt to strike a balance between that section and the Waikato Section. The 80m2 requirement could restrict the ability to effectively develop in Residential-zoned areas.	Reject	
FS1261.20	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provisions of 16.3.7 P1 and P2 accordingly.	The 80m2 requirement exceeds that of the operative plan (Franklin Section) and makes no attempt to strike a balance between that section and the Waikato Section. The 80m2 requirement could restrict the ability to effectively develop in Residential-zoned areas.	Reject	
746.41	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.8 P1 Service Court as follows: (a) A service court must be provided for each dwelling and minor dwelling, each with all the following dimensions: (i) minimum area of <del>15m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>5m<sup>2</sup></u> ; and (ii) contains a circle of at least <del>3m</del> <u>2m</u> diameter.	The Proposed Plan requires excessive service court for modern urban living. Excessive service courts will restrict the ability to develop urban land efficiently. There is no assessment in the s32 analysis to support the size of the service court.	Accept	30
FS1377.247	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities, housing types and zones. Reducing the spatial requirement for service courts will allow for the more efficient development of urban land.	Accept	
FS1297.29	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission points and amend 16.3.8 accordingly.	Reducing the spatial requirement for service courts will allow for the more efficient development of urban land. The s32 analysis does not provide any	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				evidence supporting the size of the service court.		
FS1261.23	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend 16.3.8 accordingly.	Reducing the spatial requirement for service courts will allow for the more efficient development of urban land. The s32 analysis does not provide any evidence supporting the size of the service court.	Accept	
<b>746.42</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 P1 (a)- Building setbacks- All boundaries as follows: (a) A building must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) <del>1.5m</del> <u>1.2m</u> from every boundary other than a road boundary (iv) <del>1.5m</del> <u>1.2m</u> from every vehicle access to another site	The Plan requires excessive building setbacks for residential Lots that will restrict the ability to develop the urban land. The setbacks exceed the existing Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section standards for minimum side and rear yards of one metre. Reducing the side yard allows for variety in lifestyle and lower maintenance.	Reject	5
FS1377.248	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities, housing types and zones. The proposed amendments strike a middle ground between the operative rules of the Franklin and Waikato sections.	Reject	
FS1261.25	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend 16.3.9 accordingly.	The proposed amendments to the setback standards strike an appropriate balance between the current provisions of the Franklin and Waikato Sections of the operative Waikato District Plan.	Reject	
FS1297.31	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission points and amend 16.3.9 accordingly.	The proposed amendments strike an appropriate balance between the operative rules of the Franklin and Waikato sections.	Reject	
<b>746.43</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 P1 (a) (ii)-Building setback - Water bodies to match Rule 24.3.6.3- Building setback- Waterbodies, including the following: (ii) ...from the bank of any <u>named</u> river... AND Add a new permitted activity (P3) to Rule 16.3.9.3 Building setback- Water bodies as follows P3. A building must be set back a minimum of 10m from the bank of a perennial or intermittent <u>named or unnamed</u> stream.	These setbacks are not consistent with other zones in the Proposed District Plan or the existing Operative District Plan-Franklin Section provisions.	Reject	5
FS1387.923	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>746.44</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1- Subdivision-General as notified, except for amendments sought elsewhere in the submission.	Provides for the efficient use of the urban land resource. Enables the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district.	Accept	33.2
<i>FS1387.924</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>746.45</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Support	Retain the minimum net site area of 450m <sup>2</sup> in Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a)(i) Subdivision - General, for greenfield subdivision. AND Add a new clause to Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a) Subdivision - General requiring a minimum net site area of 350m <sup>2</sup> for infill development in accordance with the Operative District Plan: Franklin Section.	The submitter supports the minimum lot size of 450m <sup>2</sup> for greenfield development areas. There are many larger sites within the existing urban areas of Tuakau and Pokeno which are suitable for infill subdivision. Subdivision of larger sites within the existing urban area should be encouraged to ensure that intensification of the existing urban areas can be achieved in accordance with the Future Proof Strategy. This will ensure efficient use of the existing urban land resources allowing additional residential development close to services and amenities. The submitter proposed the subdivision of existing sites to 350m <sup>2</sup> in accordance with the Franklin District Plan. Lot sizes below this should be provided where an integrated land use and subdivision consent can show compliance with the land use standards.	Accept in part	33
<i>FS1387.925</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>746.46</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RD1(a)(iii)- Subdivision- General.	The submitter accepts that grid layouts result in increased permeability, legibility and walkability of residential areas. However, the establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate to all sites. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a grid layout. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative road design. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule. While grid layouts are an accepted urban design principle for good subdivision design they are not an absolute response. Therefore, they should be used as a principle and not enforced through a rule.	Reject	33
FS1377.249	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and zones. Grid layouts are recognised as a desired design but it should be recognised that achieving this layout is not always feasible given environmental constraints.	Reject	
FS1297.34	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission points and delete Rule 16.4.1 RD 1 (a)(iii)	Grid layouts are recognised as a desired design but it should be recognised that achieving this layout is not always feasible given environmental constraints.	Reject	
FS1387.926	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>746.47</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.2 RDI (a)(iv)- Subdivision- Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area.	The submitter accepts that grid layouts result in increased permeability, legibility and walkability of residential areas. However, the establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate to all sites. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a grid layout. There may also be sites where the lay of the land is best suited to an alternative road design. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding this relevance or practicality of this rule. While grid layouts are an accepted urban design principle for good subdivision design they are not an absolute response. Therefore, they should be used as a principle and not enforced through a rule.	Accept	34
<i>FS1387.927</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>746.48</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a)(iv) Subdivision - General (rear lot subdivision control) and make this a matter of discretion; OR Amend Rule 16.4.1 RDI (a) (iv) Subdivision - General (rear lot subdivision control) to increase the percentage of rear lots to no more than 25%.	The standard is not able to be achieved on some sites due to the configuration of the site and topographical constraints which mean the creation of roads will be difficult. The standard is arbitrary and there is no assessment in the s32 analysis to support the 15% standard.	Accept	33
<i>FS1387.928</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
746.49	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.3 RD1 (a)(v)- Subdivision- Te Kauwhata West Residential Area to increase the percentage of rear lots to no more than 25%.	15% is not able to be achieved on some sites due to the configuration of the site and topographical constraints which mean the creation of roads will be difficult. The standard is arbitrary and there is no assessment in the s32 analysis to support the 15% standard.	Accept	34
FS1387.929	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
746.50	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.3(a) (ii)-Subdivision- Te Kauwhata West Residential Area as follows: (ii) Have a minimum average net site area of 875m <sup>2</sup> 700m <sup>2</sup> .	An average residential lot size of 875m <sup>2</sup> is considered to be an inefficient use of the residential land resource. fails to take into account the anticipated growth for the area. It fails to give effect to the Future Proof Strategy identified in I.S.1 of the Plan that seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a more compact urban form based on concentrating growth in and around Hamilton (67%) and the larger settlements of the district (21%). This involves a reduction in the relative share of	Reject	34

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the population outside of the sub-region's existing major settlements through tighter control over rural-residential development and encouraging greater urban densities in existing settlements. It does not achieve the minimum density required by strategic Policy 4.1.5. This is an inconsistency between the rules and the Plans objectives. Therefore, for the rule should give effect to the Plan, this should be rectified.		
FS1387.930	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
746.51	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13 RD1(a)-Subdivision creating reserves and make this a matter of discretion	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers which may not be justifiable from an economic perspective. This is an arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types or developments. Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage. There is no analysis in the s32 stating why the 50% rule has been applied. This can be assessed through assessment criteria or a matter of discretion.	Reject	33
746.52	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips to adopt Operative Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section Rule 11.5 - Esplanade Reserves and Strips.	The submitter accepts that esplanade reserves and esplanade strips enable public access and recreation. However, this needs to be assessed on a case by case basis and Council should allow a waiver or reduction in width in certain circumstances.	Reject	33
746.91	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.17 Housing types.	Submitter supports this objective as it gives effect to the strategic direction outlined in	Accept	12



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>section 4.1 and promotes variety in the future housing stock to help achieve 4.1.2 and 4.1.5. Enabling denser housing options gives effect to the Future Proof Strategy identified in 1.5.1 of the Plan that seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a more compact urban form based on concentrating growth in and around Hamilton (67%) and the larger settlements of the district (21%). This involves a reduction in the relative share of the population outside of the subregion's existing major settlements through tighter control over rural-residential development and encouraging greater urban densities in existing settlements. The Plan needs to provide more direction through the objectives and policies on this issue. As the Plan has one residential zone it needs to identify through the objectives and policies locations where medium density development is appropriate and encourage higher densities in appropriate locations. The Plan should specify that multi-unit development and smaller lots are encouraged close to Town Centres, public amenities and public transport stations. This will ensure the Strategic objectives and met by encouraging higher densities within a walkable distance to existing amenities. Diversity and a range of housing choice should also be promoted within greenfield sites. The rural areas of Tuakau contain versatile soils that are used for rural production activities. These soils contribute significantly to both regional and national food supply. Intensification of urban land at higher densities should be encouraged within Tuakau residential areas to ensure that land supply requirements meet while preserving the soil resources. The maximisation of the lands residential development potential will future proof the capacity of land supply to avoid further encroachment into the rural area past the lifetime of this Plan. Intensification and higher densities should be encouraged in appropriate locations to avoid additional sprawl into the rural areas.</p>		
FS1387.962	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1377.250	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports provisions in the Plan that provide for a development potential and a wider variety of densities and zones.	Accept	
746.92	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.2.18 (b) (v) (D)- Multi-unit development.	Variation in roof design is a principle for good design and should be a directive with the design guidelines rather than a policy.	Reject	12
FS1387.963	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
749.44	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Duplex" in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: Means two attached residential units, including <del>two units</del> connected by a common wall and/or an accessory building, such as a garage or a carport. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally supports the proposed definition. However a duplex could be connected by a common wall and/or by an accessory building, such as a garage or a carport.	Accept	23
749.65	Housing New Zealand	Support	Retain the definition of "Visually permeable" in Chapter 13	The submitter supports the proposed definition.	Accept	23

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Corporation		as notified.			
749.79	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities by adding and activity and activity-specific condition as follows: <u>PI3. Boarding House Activity Specific condition: (a) No more than 10 people per site inclusive of staff and residents.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally supports the permitted activities listed in 16.1.2; however, notes that there is no activity for boarding houses / boarding establishments included in the table.	Accept	22
FS1387.1020	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
749.80	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: Activity A Multi-Unit development that meets all of the following conditions: The Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 16.2; The Land Use - Building rules in Rule 16.3, except the following rules do not apply: Rule 16.3.1, Dwelling; Rule 16.3.8 Building coverage; Rule 16.3.9 Living court; Rule 16.3.10 Service court; Rule 16.3.3 Height; and Rule 16.3.5 Daylight admission. <del>The minimum net site area per residential unit is 300m<sup>2</sup>;</del> The Multi-Unit development is connected to public wastewater and water reticulation; Total building coverage of the site does not exceed 50%; <del>Each residential unit is designed and constructed to achieve the internal design sound level specified in Appendix I (Acoustic Insulation) – Table 14;</del> Service court areas are provided to meet the following minimum requirements for each residential unit: At least 2.25m <sup>2</sup> with a	The submitter generally supports, and seeks amendments to Activity RDI, Multi-unit development. A minimum density requirement for multi-unit development is not required and seeks a deletion of such rule in the Proposed WDP. The bulk, location, site coverage and assessment criteria sufficiently address the likely impacts on amenity values while providing for a range of housing typologies. The submitter seeks a maximum height of 11m to enable multi-unit development up to 3 storeys in height. The submitter seeks the deletion of the multi-unit development urban design guidelines from the Proposed District Plan (reasons outlined later in this submission), including any reference to such guidelines in a rule or policy approach.	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed									
			<p>minimum dimension of 1.5 metres of outdoor or indoor space at ground floor level for the dedicated storage of waste and recycling bins; (ii) At least 3m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres of outdoor space at ground floor level for washing lines; and (iii) The required spaces in (g)(i) or (g)(ii) for each residential unit shall be provided individually, or as a dedicated communal service court. (h) <del>Living court</del> <u>Outdoor Living Space</u> areas are provided to meet the following minimum requirements for each residential unit:</p> <table border="0"> <tr> <td>Duplex dwelling</td> <td>Area</td> <td>Minimum dimension</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Studio unit or 1 bedroom</td> <td>30m<sup>2</sup></td> <td>1.6m</td> </tr> <tr> <td>2 or more bedrooms</td> <td>40m<sup>2</sup> 30m<sup>2</sup></td> <td>4m</td> </tr> </table> <p>Apartment Building Ground Level Residential Unit Area Minimum dimension Building Studio unit or bedroom 1 20m<sup>2</sup> 1.6m 4m 2 or more bedrooms 30m<sup>2</sup> 4m Apartment Building Upper Level Residential Unit Area Minimum dimension Building Studio unit or 1 bedroom 10m<sup>2</sup> 2m 1.5m 2 or more bedrooms 15m<sup>2</sup> 2m 1.5m</p> <p>(i) The maximum height of any building must not exceed 11m in height.  (j) Buildings must not project beyond a 45 degree recession plane measured from a point 3m vertically above ground level along side and rear boundaries. (a) Where the boundary forms part of a legal right of way, entrance strip or access site, the standard applies from the farthest boundary of that legal right of way, entrance strip or access site. (b) This standard does not apply to existing or proposed internal boundaries within a site. (k) Add Alternative Height in relation to Boundary controls as prescribed in the Auckland Unitary Plan, Rule H6.6.7 Alternative height in relation to boundary. Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: Density Intensity of the development; The manner in which the provisions of the Multi-Unit Design contained in Appendix 3.4 have been incorporated; Contribution of the development to and engagement with adjacent streets and public open space; The visual quality and interest created through design such as the separation of buildings, variety in built form and architectural detailing, glazing, materials and colour; The incorporation of energy efficiency measures such as passive solar principles; Amenity values for occupants and neighbours in respect of outlook, privacy, noise, light spill, access to sunlight, living court orientation,</p>	Duplex dwelling	Area	Minimum dimension	Studio unit or 1 bedroom	30m <sup>2</sup>	1.6m	2 or more bedrooms	40m <sup>2</sup> 30m <sup>2</sup>	4m			
Duplex dwelling	Area	Minimum dimension													
Studio unit or 1 bedroom	30m <sup>2</sup>	1.6m													
2 or more bedrooms	40m <sup>2</sup> 30m <sup>2</sup>	4m													

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>site design and layout; Staging needed to ensure that development is carried out in a coordinated and timely manner;</p> <p>Avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards</p> <p>Geotechnical suitability for building;</p> <p>Provision of infrastructure to individual units,</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.</p>			
FS1387.1021	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept	
FS1308.120	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<p>Agree that density standard is not required or should be reduced. Agree that bulk and location standards should be reduced and height increase to encourage more intensive development.</p>	Reject	
749.81	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	<p>Delete Rule 16.1.4 D2;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.3 RD and matters of discretion as follows: <u>RD2. Any permitted activity that does not comply with the Land Use - Effects Rule 16.2 or Land Use - Building Rule 16.3 unless the activity status is specified as controlled, restricted discretionary or non-complying.</u> Matters of discretion: (a) Intensity of the development; (b) Contribution of the development to and engagement with adjacent streets and public open space; (c) The incorporation of passive solar principles; (d) <u>Amenity values for occupants and neighbours in respect of outlook, privacy, noise, light spill, access to sunlight, living court orientation, site design and layout;</u> (e) <u>Avoidance or mitigation of natural hazards;</u> (f) <u>Geotechnical suitability for building;</u> and (g) <u>Provision of infrastructure.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or</p>	<p>The submitter opposes the activity (D2) and seeks it be a restricted discretionary activity with matters of discretion included.</p>	Accept in part	22 – ch.16

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.			
FS1387.1022	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1308.121	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	The default discretionary activity status is too restrictive for minor infringements to standards.	Accept	
749.82	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.1.5 NCI Non-complying Activities. AND Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.4 Discretionary Activities as follows: <u>D3 Any activity that is not listed as Prohibited, Permitted, Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the activity, NCI and seeks it is a discretionary activity.	Reject	22 – ch.16
FS1387.1023	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
749.83	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 PI(a) Earthworks - General as follows: (a)... (ii) Not exceed a volume of <del>250m<sup>3</sup></del> <u>1000m<sup>3</sup></u> (iii) Not exceed an area of <del>1000m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>1ha</u> ... (vi) <del>Earthworks</del>	The submitter generally opposes the maximum volume and area allowed in the permitted activities listed in 16.2.4.1. The submitter	Reject	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			are setback 1.5m from all boundaries: ... AND Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P3(a) Earthworks - General as follows: (i) Not exceed a total volume of 5020m <sup>3</sup> ; (ii) Not exceed a depth of 1.5m; (iv) Fill material is setback 1.5m from all boundaries; ... AND Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 RD1 Earthworks - General as follows: ... (b) The Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: ... (viii) Protection of the Hauraki Gulf Catchment Area; ... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	generally opposes the matters of discretion listed for RD1 in 16.2.4.1 and seeks the word 'any' is inserted into 16.2.4.1, RD1 (b) so the list is not seen as an inclusive list to which all matters need to be met. It could be that one or more matters may be relevant instead of all matters listed when the activity is triggered for a consent.		
FS1293.57	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Seek that the submission point is disallowed.	The Director-General opposes an increase to permitted activity standards for earthworks. Earthworks increase the amount of sediment entering waterways, impacting on waterways, estuaries and the coast.	Accept	
FS1308.122	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support the submission as the proposed earthwork standards are too restrictive and will result in unnecessary consenting requirements for small scale works.	Reject	
749.85	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.7.1 P2(a) Signs - general as follows: (a) ... (iii) The sign does not exceed 1.0m <sup>2</sup> 0.25m <sup>2</sup> ; (iv) The sign height does not exceed 2m in height; ... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the sign measurements allowed in the permitted activities listed in 16.2.7.1 and seeks the figures are amended.	Accept in part	21
749.86	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.7.2 D1 Signs - Effects on traffic to change the activity status to Restricted Discretionary and add matters of discretion as follows: <u>RD1-D1</u> Any sign that does not comply with Rule 16.2.7.2 P1 (a) Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Amenity values; (ii) Character of the locality; (iii) Effects on traffic safety; (iv) Glare and artificial light spill; (v) Content, colour and location of the sign; (vi) Effects on a notable tree; (vii) Effects on the heritage values of any heritage item due to the size, location, design and appearance of the sign; (viii) Effects on cultural values of any Maaori Site of Significance; and (ix) Effects on notable architectural features of a building. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the activity D1 and seeks it is a restricted discretionary activity with matters of discretion included.	Reject	21

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
749.87	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.1 PI Dwelling as follows: <del>PI. One dwelling within a site. Up to three dwellings per site.</del> AND Amend Rule 16.3.1 DI Dwelling to change the activity status to a Restricted Discretionary Activity and add matters of discretion as follows: <del>DI RD1 A dwelling that does not comply with Rule 15.3.1 PI (a) Four or more dwellings per site; (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Intensity of the development; (ii) Height of the building; (iii) Design and location of buildings; (iv) Extent of shading on adjacent sites; (v) Provision of infrastructure to individual units, and (vi) Privacy on adjoining sites.</del> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the activity status for a dwelling that does not comply with Rule 16.3.1 PI. Provisions for building a second dwelling on site or multi-unit developments are restrictive and discourage the desired urban uplift sought in the district. It is found that any type of in-fill housing development (i.e. build a second dwelling on an existing lot) or multi-unit development will trigger a consent requirement. The Proposed District Plan permits one dwelling per site. Subdivision consent will be required first in order to construct an in-fill dwelling. One dwelling per site is unnecessary and overly restrictive regulation and will act to discourage any new residential development including any in-fill type developments to occur. It also does not encourage sufficient housing choice and variety in residential built form to support changing demographics, lifestyles, rising housing costs, future housing demands and population growth in the Waikato District. Amendments are required to the Residential Zone as a means of better enabling and incentivising residential development in the district. In doing so, Housing New Zealand proposes changes are necessary to triggers for consent and matters of discretion.	Reject	13
FS1387.1024	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1377.259	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities, housing types and zones.		
FS1308.123	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support the submission to allow more than one primary dwelling per site. This is similar to our submission which seeks to allow up to three dwellings as a permitted activity through amendments to the multi-unit housing provisions.	Reject	
749.88	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.2 Minor dwelling as follows: PI (a) One minor dwelling contained within a site must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) <del>The net site area is 9000m2 or more</del> <u>There must be no more than one minor dwelling per site;</u> (ii) The site does not contain a Multi-unit development. (iii) The gross floor area shall not exceed 70m2 <del>excluding decks and garaging</del> . D1 A minor dwelling that does not comply with Rule 16.3.2 PI (a)(iii) <u>NCI More than one minor dwelling per site or does not comply with Rule 16.3.2 PI (a)(ii).</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	Housing New Zealand generally opposes the conditions attached to PI minor dwelling activity and activity status. Provisions for building a minor dwelling on site is restrictive and discourage the desired urban uplift sought in the district. Provisions do not encourage sufficient housing choice and variety in residential built form to support changing demographics, lifestyles, rising housing costs, future housing demands and population growth in the Waikato District. Amendments are required to the residential zone provisions to better enable residential intensification at different scales and typologies.	Reject	13
FS1387.1025	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
749.89	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 Height - Building general as follows: PI The maximum height of any building must not exceed 7.5m <del>8m</del> . <del>RD1D+</del> (a) Any building that does not comply with Rule 16.3.3.1 PI. (b) <u>Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Design and location of the building; (ii) Extent of shading on adjacent sites; (iii) Privacy on adjoining sites.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or	The provision does not encourage sufficient housing choice and variety in residential built form to support changing demographics, lifestyles, rising housing costs, housing demands and population growth. Amendments are required to the residential zone and urban subdivision provisions to better enable residential intensification at different scales and typologies. Housing New Zealand proposes	Accept	27

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	changes are necessary to triggers for consent and matters of discretion.		
FS1261.13	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend the maximum building height in the Residential Zone to 8m and amend the activity status for dwellings not complying with 16.3.3.1 to Restricted Discretionary.	The Operative Plan (Franklin Section) provides for a permitted building height of 8m. A dwelling not complying with the Permitted Activity requirements should not be assessed as a Discretionary Activity. There is no clear justification for a maximum building height of 7.5m in the s32 reports.	Accept	
FS1297.19	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the maximum building height in the Residential Zone to 8m.	The operative plan provides for a permitted building height of 8m. A dwelling not complying with the Permitted Activity requirements should not be assessed as a Discretionary Activity.	Accept	
FS1377.260	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential. The operative plan provides for a permitted building height of 8m.	Accept	
<b>749.90</b>	<b>Housing New Zealand Corporation</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.4 PI Fences or walls - Road boundaries and Reserve Zone boundaries as follows: 16.3.4 Fences or walls - Road boundaries and Reserve Zone boundaries-PI (a) Fences and walls between the applicable building setbacks under Rule 16.3.9 on a site and any road and reserve zone boundaries must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Be no higher than <del>1.5m</del> <del>1.2m</del> if solid; (ii) Be no higher than 1.8m if: A. visually permeable for the full 1.8m height of the fence or wall; or B. solid up to <del>1.5m</del> <del>1.2m</del> and visually permeable between <del>1.5m</del> <del>1.2m</del> and 1.8m. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes this rule.	Reject	28
<b>751.10</b>	<b>Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.3.2 Minor Dwelling, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 16.3.2 PI(a)(i) Minor dwelling as follows: (i) The net site area is <del>900</del> <del>500</del> m <sup>2</sup> or more;	The Proposed District Plan should encourage intensification and housing options in the Residential Zone, especially in growth areas such as Tuakau and Pokeno. The permitted standards will control if the site is an appropriate size to accommodate a minor dwelling.	Reject	13
FS1387.1072	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1281.45	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Support	Support.	The operative District Plan provides for a permitted building height of 8m. There is no compelling basis for reducing the permitted building height by 0.5m. In this regard, PVHL has been unable to find any section 32 analysis that provides justification for this approach.	Reject	
751.11	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 PI Height - Building general as follows: The maximum height of any building must not exceed <del>7.5</del> 11m. AND Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight Admission as a consequential amendment.	The height limit does not enable the efficient use of urban land and fails to increase the development capacity of existing urban areas. The strategic direction outlined in the Proposed District Plan supports an increase in densities and housing choice. This includes the provision of low rise apartments and multi-unit development. The 7.5m height limit restricts the potential to build medium density housing. Opposes the 7.5m permitted height limit and request it be increased within the residential area surrounding Pokeno and Tuakau	Reject	27
751.12	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight admission as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>37</del> 45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	Inconsistent with previous planning documents, which are less restrictive. Too restrictive for urban areas. Adequate amenity and daylight for adjoining sites can be achieved with less restrictive control plane. The 37 degree angle is difficult to calculate.	Accept	8
FS1297.24	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provision so that the angle is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa, and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	
FS1261.18	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission points and amend the provision so that the angle used to calculate daylight admission is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive. 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa and Thames-Coromandel).	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
751.13	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.6 P1 Building Coverage as follows: The total building coverage must not exceed <del>40</del> <u>60</u> %.	The 40% building coverage does not enable the efficient use of urban land and fails to increase the development capacity of the urban areas. Increasing building coverage to allow greater utilisation of residential zoned land to support the strategic direction outlined in the Proposed District Plan to increase densities and housing choice.	Reject	6
751.14	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.7 Living Court as follows: P1 (a) A living court must be provided for each dwelling that meets all of the following conditions: ... (iii) When located on the ground floor it has a minimum area of <del>80</del> <u>40</u> m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of <del>4</del> <u>3</u> m in any direction. (iv) When located on a balcony of an above ground apartment, it must have a minimum area of <del>15</del> <u>10</u> m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of 2m in any direction. P2 (a) A living court must be provided for each minor dwelling that meets all of the following conditions: ... (iii) When located on the ground floor it has a minimum area of <del>40</del> <u>10</u> m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of <del>4</del> <u>2</u> m in any direction. (iv) When located on a balcony of an above ground apartment, it must have a minimum area of <del>15</del> <u>8</u> m <sup>2</sup> and a minimum dimension of <del>2</del> <u>1.6</u> m in any direction....	The Proposed District Plan required excessive outdoor living areas relative to 450m <sup>2</sup> lot size provision for residential lots. The Proposed District Plan will create a suburban form which is at odds with the strategic direction, objectives and policies for the urban environment. Excessive sized outdoor living areas will restrict the ability to develop urban land. The size standards exceed the existing Franklin District Plan standard which requires 60m <sup>2</sup> of outdoor living area. The perception of urban living is changing. Smaller outdoor living courts have been adopted by Auckland Council to promote a more compact living approach and this should be adopted by Waikato District Council. Reducing the minimum outdoor living court allows for a variety in lifestyle and lower maintenance. Rule 16.3.8 requires additional service court which ensures adequate outdoor spare space for living.	Reject	29
FS1377.269	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential. An outdoor living area of 80m <sup>2</sup> is excessive for the Residential Zone and the minimum lot size of 450m <sup>2</sup> .	Reject	
FS1261.21	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provisions of 16.3.7 P1 and P2 accordingly.	The 80m <sup>2</sup> requirement exceeds that of the operative plan (Franklin Section) and makes no attempt to strike a balance between that section and the Waikato Section. The 80m <sup>2</sup> requirement could restrict the ability to effectively develop in Residential-zoned areas.	Reject	
FS1297.27	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provisions of 16.3.7 P1 and P2 accordingly.	The 80m <sup>2</sup> requirement exceeds that of the operative plan (Franklin Section) and makes no attempt to strike a balance between that section and the Waikato Section. The 80m <sup>2</sup> requirement could restrict the ability to effectively develop in Residential-zoned areas.	Reject	
751.15	Chanel Hargrave and Travis	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.8 Service Court as follows: P1 (a) A	The Proposed Waikato District Plan required	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>Miller</b>		service court must be provided for each dwelling and minor dwelling, each with the following dimensions: (i) minimum area of 45m <sup>2</sup> ; and (ii) contains a circle of at least 3m diameter.	excessive service courts that will restrict the ability to develop urban land efficiently. There is no assessment in the s32 analysis to support the size of the service court.		
FS1261.24	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend 16.3.8 accordingly.	Reducing the spatial requirement for service courts will allow for the more efficient development of urban land. The s32 analysis does not provide any evidence supporting the size of the service court.	Accept	
FS1297.30	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission points and amend 16.3.8 accordingly.	Reducing the spatial requirement for service courts will allow for the more efficient development of urban land. The s32 analysis does not provide any evidence supporting the size of the service court.	Accept	
FS1377.270	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential. Reducing the spatial requirement for service courts will allow for the more efficient development of urban land.	Accept	
<b>751.16</b>	<b>Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 P1 Building setbacks - All boundaries as follows: (a) A building must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) 4.5m from every boundary other than a road boundary; and (iv) 4.5m from every vehicle access to another site.	The Proposed Waikato District Plan requires excessive building setbacks for residential lots that will restrict the ability to develop the urban land. The setbacks exceed the existing Operative District Plan requirements. Reducing the side yard allows for a variety in lifestyle and lower maintenance.	Reject	5
FS1261.26	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend 16.3.9 accordingly.	The proposed amendments to the setback standards strike an appropriate balance between the current provisions of the Franklin and Waikato Sections of the operative Waikato District Plan.	Reject	
FS1297.32	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend 16.3.9 accordingly.	The proposed amendments strike an appropriate balance between the operative rules of the Franklin and Waikato sections.	Reject	
<b>751.17</b>	<b>Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 Building setback - Waterbodies to adopt the provision of Rule 24.3.6.3 Building setbacks-water bodies, including the following amendments: P1 (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: ... (ii) ...from the bank if any named river... ... P3 A building must be set back a minimum of 10m from the bank of a perennial or intermittent named or unnamed stream.	These are not consistent with other zones or the Operative Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section provisions.	Reject	5
FS1387.1073	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1281.47	Pokeno Village Holdings Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	PVHL opposes this submission point and sought in their original submission that 152 Hitchen Road, 201 Hitchen Road and Munro Road be deleted from Map 7.5 (which is the implementation method). It was not clear from the provisions on how these would be implemented.	Accept	
<b>751.18</b>	<b>Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General other than the specific points in other submission points.	Provides for the efficient use of the urban land resource. Enables the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district.	Accept	33.2
FS1387.1074	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1297.35	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission points and delete Rule 16.4.1 RD 1 (a)(iii)	Grid layouts are recognised as a desired design but it should be recognised that achieving this layout is not always feasible given environmental constraints.	Accept	
<b>751.19</b>	<b>Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain the 450m2 minimum net site area for greenfield subdivision in Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision - General AND Add a provision for infill subdivision requiring a minimum net site area of 350m2 in Rule 16.4.1(a) Subdivision - General.	Support the minimum lot size of 450m2 for greenfield development areas. Many larger sites within Tuakau and Pokeno which are suitable for infill subdivision. Subdivision of larger sites within the existing urban area should be encouraged to ensure that intensification of the existing urban areas can be achieved in accordance with Future Proof. This will ensure efficient use of the existing urban land resources allowing additional residential development close to services and amenities. The submitter proposes the	Accept in part	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				subdivision of existing sites to 350m2 in accordance with the Franklin section of the Operative District Plan.		
FS1387.1075	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
751.20	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1RDI (a)(iii) Subdivision-General.	The establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate to all sites. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to be practically implemented. There may also be sites where the lay of land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding the relevance or practicality of this rule.	Accept	33.6
FS1387.1076	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
751.21	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.1(a)(iv) Subdivision - General AND Add the number of rear lots as a matter of discretion to	This is not able to be achieved on some sites due to the configuration of the site and topographical constraints which mean the creation of roads	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Rule 16.4.1 (b) Subdivision-General OR Amend Rule 16.4.1(a)(v) Subdivision - General to increase the percentage of rear lots to no more than 25%. AND Amend Rule 16.4.3 RD1 (a)(v) Subdivision Te Kauwhata West Residential Area to increase the percentage of rear lots to no more than 25%.	will be difficult. The standard is arbitrary and there is no assessment in the section 32 analysis.		
FS1387.1077	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
751.22	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.3(a)(ii) Subdivision Te Kauwhata West Residential Area as follows: Have a minimum average net site area of <u>875700</u> m <sup>2</sup> .	Minimum average net site area of 875m <sup>2</sup> is an inefficient use of land that fails to take into account the anticipated growth for the area. Fails to give effect to the Future Proof Strategy that seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a more compact urban form based on concentrating growth in and around Hamilton and larger settlements of the district. This involves a reduction in the relative share of the population outside of the subregion's existing major settlements through tighter control over rural-residential development. Does not achieve the minimum density required by Strategic Policy 4.1.5 and this is an inconsistency between the rules and objectives.	Accept	34
FS1318.3	Viaduct Harbour Nominees Limited	Support	Full rule deletion is preferred- rule supported in part as a backstop to increased density where full deletion is not supported by WDC.	Inefficient to meet growth.	Accept	
FS1387.1078	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
751.23	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.13 RDI (a) Subdivision creating reserves AND Add the road frontage of reserves as a matter of discretion for subdivision creating reserves.	Roading infrastructure is expensive and the rule will result in additional costs for developers which may not be economically justifiable. Arbitrary standard which may not be relevant for all reserve types Safety and surveillance of reserves may be achieved with less road frontage No analysis within the s32 report This can be assessed through assessment criteria or a matter of discretion.	Reject	33.14
751.24	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips to adopt the Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section Rule 11.5 - Esplanade Reserves and Strips.	Accept that esplanade reserves and esplanade strips enable public access and recreation, however this needs to be assessed on a case by case basis. Council should allow a waiver or reduction in width in certain circumstances.	Reject	33
751.43	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.2.15(a)(iv) Earthworks OR Amend Policy 4.2.15(a)(iv) Earthworks to ensure fill can be imported where required to enable land to be developed for residential activities as follows: <u>The importation of cleanfill is avoided in the Residential Zone, except where it is required to enable land to be developed for residential purposes.</u> OR Amend Policy 4.2.15(a)(iv) Earthworks to ensure fill can be imported where required to enable land to be developed for residential activities follows: <u>The importation of cleanfill is avoided in the Residential Zone The inappropriate importation of cleanfill is avoided in the Residential Zone where it is not required to enable greenfield land to be developed.</u>	Cleanfill may be required in Residential Zoned sites to enable greenfield development and to avoid filling in all circumstances may restrict the ability to develop residential land. The policy contradicts Objective 4.2.14(a) which states that earthworks facilitate subdivision, use and development. Policy 4.2.15 (iv) should be amended to avoid this contradiction.	Reject	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
751.44	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.16 Housing options, except for the amendments below. AND Add to Objective 4.2.16 Housing Objectives the following: <u>Multi-unit development including low rise apartments is promoted within walking distance to existing Town Centres, public amenities and public transport. Smaller lots size and multi-unit development promoted within new greenfield sites where the land is within walking distance to amenities and reserves.</u>	<p>Gives effect to the strategic direction outlined in section 4.1 and promotes the variety in the future housing stock to help achieve 4.1.2 and 4.1.5. Enabling densified housing options give effect to the Future Proof Strategy identified in 1.5.1 of the Plan that seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a compact urban form. Involves a reduction in the relative share of the population outside of the subregion's existing major settlements through tighter control over rural-residential development and encouraging greater urban densities in existing settlements. The Plan should specify that multi-unit development and smaller lots are encouraged close to the Town Centres, public amenities and public transport stations. Diversity and a range of housing choice should also be promoted within greenfield sites. The rural areas of Tuakau contain versatile soils that are used for rural production activities. These soils contribute significantly to both regional and national food supply. The maximisation of the lands residential development potential will future proof the capacity of land supply to avoid further encroachment into the rural area. Intensification and higher densities should be encouraged to avoid additional sprawl into rural areas.</p>	Accept	12
FS1387.1091	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p><i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i></p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1377.271	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities, housing types and zones.	Accept	
751.45	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.17 Housing types.	Gives effect to the strategic direction outlined in section 4.1 and promote the variety in the future housing stock to help achieve 4.1.2 and 4.1.5. Enabling densified housing options give effect to the Future Proof Strategy identified in 1.5.1 of the Plan that seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a compact urban form. Involves a reduction in the relative share of the population outside of the subregion's existing major settlements through tighter control over rural-residential development and encouraging greater urban densities in existing settlements. Diversity and a range of housing choice should also be promoted within greenfield sites.	Accept	
FS1387.1092	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
751.46	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.2.18(b)(v) (D) Multi-unit development	This is a principle for good design and should be a directive with the design guidelines rather than a policy.	Reject	12
FS1387.1093	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>751.57</b>	<b>Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller</b>	Support	Amend Appendix 3.4 Multi-Unit Development to recognise alternative options may be more suitable.	The design guidance preferring consistent front setbacks and separation between buildings as well as consistent fencing and boundary treatment is encouraged by the design guide to create a repetitive form. There may be good design outcomes created by variations in setbacks and treatments.	Reject	13
<i>FS1387.1098</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
<b>751.59</b>	<b>Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.2 RDI(a)(iv) Subdivision - General	The establishment of formal and informal grid patterns may not be appropriate to all sites. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to be practically implemented. There may also be sites where the lay of land is best suited to an alternative roading design. There is no analysis in the s32 regarding the relevance or practicality of this rule.	Accept	34
<i>FS1387.1099</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
757.11	Karen White	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, to include the following: <u>The developer of lots 4ha shall be required to provide esplanade facilities that will include as a minimum a 1.8m wide timber edge gravel path walkway and 10% of area landscape planting.</u>	Promotes the development and linkages of esplanade areas to increase the areas walking and cycling facilities.	Reject	33
FS1308.125	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	The purpose of esplanade reserves and strips is defined in S229 of the RMA. These include: Protection of conservation values; Public access; Public recreation use Therefore public access is not a requirement for all esplanade purposes. The rule proposed by the submitter is therefore too onerous. We support a requirement for the provision of a gravel path, where the esplanade reserve forms part of a public access reserve network or identified trail.	Accept	
780.11	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose	Add rules to support Policy 4.2.7 - Site Coverage and Permeable Surfaces.	The submitter supports the policies of having sufficient open space to provide for landscaping, on-site stormwater disposal in the Residential Zone, but objects that they do not appear to have any corresponding rules, except for Te Kowhai Airpark Zone Rule 27.3.3.	Reject	6
FS1385.49	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury B	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
780.22	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P9 Permitted Activities to provide for the registration of Homestay or Visitor accommodation.	Raglan needs a plan similar to that of Queenstown to avoid more residential	Reject	22 ch.16

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>Incorporation on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>			accommodation becoming available only to visitors. As residents tend to move to and from the surrounding country areas, the same policy needs to apply there. Queenstown has rules requiring registration as a Homestay, or a Holiday Home and, for larger properties, resource consent for change of use. Raglan needs similar rules.		
FS1093.7	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Support	<i>Motels and hotels are subjected to strict rules which set maximum number of guests, safety and standard of the building in which guests are accommodated, monthly fire checks, annual building WOF certification etc. As the buildings are on commercially zoned land the rates are also substantially higher, adding further costs. Goods and Services Tax (GST) is also paid by the accommodation provider on all income received. Whereas when home owners open their homes to accommodate travellers, many illegally convert garages and sheds to provide short term accommodation. This puts guests in potential danger and therefore needs to be regulated and monitored. It also put genuine accommodation providers at an unfair advantage due to the lower costs associated with AIR B &amp; B's and homestays .</i>	<i>There should be a level playing field for all accommodation providers. There are significant safety issues by allowing the haphazard use of residential homes for tourism. When homes are rented regularly to holiday makers there is often disregard for the peace and harmony of the neighbourhood as the parties 'renting' the homes feel they are entitled to do as they please. When guests misbehave or create a nuisance in a motel or hotel the management is usually on-site so can monitor guest behaviour easily before it gets out of hand. The use of holiday homes for Air B &amp; B has seriously compromised residential areas throughout NZ, particularly in areas with high tourism numbers, which Raglan has.</i>	Reject	
FS1387.1198	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
<b>780.25</b>	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society)</b>	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.2.22 Bankart Street and Wainui AND Add provision for Wi Neera Street.	The area behind the corrugated iron on Wi Neera St is still be developed and residents will be forced out of their homes by rate rises, overlooking, noise, etc. Raglan needs housing for locals far more than extra holiday apartments.	Reject	15
FS1142.11	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	<i>The commercial area was established under Plan Change 14 in response to a lack of business zoned land in the Raglan Town Centre.</i>		Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
780.45	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose	Add a rule to Section 16.3 Land Use - Building to the effect that: (a) Construction of a building or other structure within sight of SH23 at Raglan is a permitted activity if it will be screened from SH23 by planting with indigenous species that will achieve an average height of 3m after 5 years, mature to over 9m in the residential zone and 12m in the Business Zone and be of sufficient density to visually screen the activity from SH23. (b) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity is a discretionary activity.	The zone extensions have increased the extent of urban development along the main approach to Raglan. That could be mitigated by screening further development.	Reject	26
FS1387.1207	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1093.2	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Oppose	We oppose the visual screen planting of all buildings and structures within site of SH23, Raglan. When land is zoned for residential or business zoning the existing natural features of the land are taken into consideration by the developer and council. In order to gain consent land used for residential or business developments must be 'offset' by additional native plantings and 'corridors' are also provided for wildlife to move through the newly developed areas. Screening any new development by high screen plantings would give a feeling of 'isolation' from the rest of the community, not integration. For a feeling of 'community' to development people must feel connected and like to be part of the wider area, not shut off from it. There is an area of business zoned land adjacent to SH23 which is yet to be developed. If this area was blocked off by high plant screening it would have no visibility from SH23 at all so would not succeed if the passing public were unaware it was located there. Business zoned land needs to be visible and easily accessed.	Not practical and does not align with 'good' design for new housing areas. This is implying that new development is unsightly and undesirable for Raglan. New housing and business developments can be well designed aesthetically and provide interest and character to an area so do not need to be screened from public view.	Accept	
FS1269.73	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Null	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
781.10	Ministry of Education	Oppose	Add a new activity for Education Facilities in Rule 16.1.3	Education facilities are not listed in the	Accept	22 ch.16

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: <u>Activity RD2 Education Facilities Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: _____ The extent to which the location, bulk, scale and built form of building(s) impacts on natural, ecological, landscape and/or historic heritage values. _____ The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network. Ability to soften the visual impact of buildings from adjoining residential properties. _____ The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</u>	Residential Zone and are therefore a non-complying activity in terms of Rule 16.1.5. However, the majority of education facilities including community education, early childhood education, tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres, outdoor education centres and sports training establishments located within residential areas are essential social infrastructure that supports these areas.		
FS1387.1216	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
781.11	Ministry of Education	Oppose	Add new noise standards for education facilities to Rule 16.2.1 Noise as follows: <u>16.2.1.2 Noise - Education facilities The operation of any education facilities shall comply with the following noise limits at the boundary of any site within the residential zone, at a point 20m from the façade of any dwelling, or the site boundary, whichever is closest to the dwelling: - Mon-Sun, 7.00am-10.00pm (0700-2200) 55dBA (Leq) -Mon-Sun, 10.00pm-7.00am (2200-0700) 45 dBA (Leq) - LMAX= 75dBA These noise levels shall not apply to noise from outdoor school activities occurring between 0800 and 1800 hours Monday to Saturday. Noise levels shall be measured and assessed in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 "Measurement of Environmental Sound" and NZS 6802:2008 "Environmental Noise".</u>	Noise standards for education facilities in the Residential Zone are needed to enable them to operate without hindrance while recognising the surrounding residential environment.	Reject	
782.10	Jack Macdonald	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision - General, as follows: RD1 (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed lots must have a	The proposed minimum net site area of 450m2 is too large and restrictive. Smaller lots are generally more popular for easy maintenance and	REject	18



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			minimum net site area of <del>450m<sup>2</sup></del> 400m <sup>2</sup> , except where the proposed lot is an access allotment or utility allotment or reserve to vest;	the request for 400m <sup>2</sup> will still be large enough to fit a decent sized dwelling.		
FS1387.1230	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1093.3	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Support	We support the reduction in the minimum size lot from 450M2 to 400M2.	As the cost of land increases worldwide and also the cost of consent, compliance and development in order for people to afford to buy land it is necessary to provide a variety of options for purchasers. Lowering minimum lot sizes will help address this need and will also cost less to develop so therefore cheaper to purchase. Many dwellings are now occupied by one person only so there is demand for even smaller lots. Elderly people do not want to mow lawns and tend large gardens so the option should be there for small dwellings and lots to meet this demand. We feel the minimum lot size could be lowered to 350M2 from 450M2.	Reject	
782.11	Jack Macdonald	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(iv) Subdivision - General, to include an area requirement before triggering a "rear lot" rule, e.g. 1 hectare.	The proposed rule is not fully workable for smaller infill subdivisions and should only apply to larger sites. The submitter suggests that a threshold of over 1 ha is appropriate.	Reject	33
FS1387.1231	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
798.29	Ngati Te Ata	Neutral/Amend	Add the following text to Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips: <u>must be bordered by Park edge roading for safety, environment, amenity and urban design purposes.</u> AND Add " <u>must be bordered by park edge roading for safety, environment, amenity and urban design purposes</u> " into all sections, i.e. Business, Industrial, Village, Town Centre etc.	This is recommended as an esplanade strip can be a stream, river or coastal. If sections "back onto" a waterbody, they are often treated as a dumping ground. If the esplanade has a road frontage, and walkway, it tends to provide passive surveillance and a healthy environment for both the waterbody and the people using it.	Reject	33.15
FS1308.79	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	While we agree that safety, environmental, amenity and urban design issues are relevant concerns for esplanade reserves the requirement for these reserves to be bordered by park edge roading would be onerous, economically unfeasible, given the cost of roading, and in some circumstances impractical given topographical and other constraints along river, stream and coastal margins. These issues would better be addressed through matters of discretion or design standards so they can be included where practical and feasible.	Accept	
81.124	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend rules in 22: Residential Zone to capture the intended location specific character and density sought.	There are no rules or other methods in Chapters 16 that are clearly targeted to achieve the outcomes sought for particular towns and villages identified in Policies 4.10-4.1.18. The submission notes the relevant sections of the WRPS.	Reject	39
FS1377.30	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports amendments to the plan provisions to provide for the rezoning of land it controls, a greater range of housing densities and the implementation of the Havelock Village Masterplan. Plan provisions should not however be overly prescriptive.	Reject	
FS1386.64	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
81.126	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.16 Housing options.	The submitter supports this objective as it assists with giving effect to the WRPS' direction relating to the integration of land use with public transport: WRPS Policies 6.1; Policy 6.3 and Section 6A.	Accept	12
FS1223.20	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
81.127	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.17 Housing types.	The submitter supports this Policy as it assists with giving effect to the WRPS' direction relating to the integration of land use with public transport: WRPS Policies 6.1; Policy 6.3 and Section 6A.	Accept	12
FS1223.21	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1223.164	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that the submission point is allowed.	Mercury supports land use intensification and development, where relevant matters, including	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>natural hazard risk, have been well considered, prior to establishing feasible housing targets, as required by the NPS-UDC. Mercury considers that the PWDP has not been prepared in accordance with the NPS-UDC, as required by section 74 of the RMA.</i>		
<b>81.128</b>	<b>Waikato Regional Council</b>	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.18 Multi-unit development.	The submitter supports this Policy as it assists with giving effect to the WRPS' direction relating to the integration of land use with public transport: WRPS Policies 6.1; Policy 6.3 and Section 6A.	Accept	12
FS1223.22	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FS1223.165	Mercury NZ Limited	Support	Mercury seeks that the submission point is allowed.	<i>Mercury supports land use intensification and development, where relevant matters, including natural hazard risk, have been well considered, prior to establishing feasible housing targets, as required by the NPS-UDC. Mercury considers that the PWDP has not been prepared in accordance with the NPS-UDC, as required by section 74 of the RMA.</i>	Accept	
<b>81.148</b>	<b>Waikato Regional Council</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.1.2 P3 Permitted Activities.	The submitter supports the rule's encouragement for location of retirement villages within 400 metres walking distance of public transport, as this assists with giving effect to the WRPS Policies 6.1 and 6.3, and Section 6A Development Principles. It also assists with giving effect to the Proposed Plan's Objective 4.2.16 Housing options and Policy 4.2.17 Housing types.	Accept	22 ch.16
FS1386.65	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>81.149</b>	<b>Waikato Regional Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 16.1.3 RD 1 A Multi-Unit development a new condition as follows: <u>The development is either serviced by or within 400m walking distance of public transport.</u>	The submitter supports the provision and considers that it will assist to some degree with the achievement of Objective 4.2.16 Staging options and Policies 2.2.17 Housing types and 4.2.18 Multi-unit development, however considers that there should be an incentive in the rule, similar to Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities - P3 to encourage this type of development to locate within 400 metres walking distance of public transport. This would assist with giving effect to the WRPS' direction in Policies 6.1, 6.3 and Section 6A Development Principles.	Reject	13
FS1223.159	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Mercury seeks that the submission point is allowed.	It opposes the principle of increasing the density of any sensitive activity within any land use zoned until natural hazard risk is assessed. Mercury supports the provision of well-planned urban development and intensification in appropriate locations. The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires Waikato District Council to evaluate natural hazard risk in its section 32 assessment and to have regard to the evaluation report when preparing the PWDP. Mercury does not consider that such an adequate assessment has been undertaken for the PWDP.	Accept	
FS1308.144	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	Multi-unit development may be suitable in other residential areas other than just 400m walking distance from public transport. For example around schools and park and also encourage throughout the residential zone to provide variety and a choice of living options to the residential zones.	Accept	
FS1202.76	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 81.149.	The Transport Agency supports provisions that promote alternative transport options to the private motor vehicle.	Reject	
FS1187.1	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Not Stated	We support the intent of this submission to encourage multi-unit development close to existing town centres with public transport links. However, we oppose the implication that towns without		Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>public transport links cannot have multi-unit developments for their residents. Many of the Waikato District Towns have no public transport and even if a train line passes through the town, there is no service and/station for the residents to use public transport.</i>			
<b>81.151</b>	<b>Waikato Regional Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 Subdivision - General to allow for more intensive subdivision in Residential areas directly adjacent to the Business Town Centre zones at Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Pokeno, Raglan, Te Kauwhata and Tuakau.	The submitter is concerned that applying this minimum lot size to areas directly adjacent to the Business Town Centre zones for the towns of Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Pokeno, Raglan, Te Kauwhata and Tuakau will not enable the achievement of a range of the plan's objectives and policies for the urban environment, including those relating to housing choice; density aligned with the Future Proof Strategy; and promotion of subdivision, land use and development that encourages thriving, sustainable town centres, and integrates with and is supportive of provision of public transport and other infrastructure. Submission refers to WRPS Policies 6.1 Planned and co-ordinated subdivision, use and development; Policy 6.3 Co-ordinating growth and infrastructure; Policy 6.16 Commercial development in the Future Proof area; and Section 6A Development principles.	Reject	33
FS1223.160	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	<i>Mercury seeks that the submission point is allowed.</i>	<i>It opposes the principle of increasing the density of any sensitive activity within any land use zoned until natural hazard risk is assessed. Mercury supports the provision of well-planned urban development and intensification in appropriate locations. The Resource Management Act 1991 (RMA) requires Waikato District Council to evaluate natural hazard risk in its section 32 assessment and to have regard to the evaluation report when preparing the PWDP. Mercury does not consider that such an adequate assessment has been undertaken for the PWDP.</i>	Accept	
FS1202.78	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	<i>Support submission point 81.151.</i>	<i>Increased density and mixed-use development support multi-modal transport options, help achieve a change in urban form, and support liveable communities. The Transport Agency supports the proposed changes subject to adequate consideration of impacts on the transport network.</i>	Reject	
<b>81.209</b>	<b>Waikato Regional Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.7.13 (a)(i) Residential Zone - Te Kauwhata Ecological and West Residential Areas as follows: <del>Promote</del> <b>Protect</b> the natural features and landscapes of the Whangamarino Wetland and Lake Waikare;	To promote consistency with the WRPS, Policy 4.7.13 (a)(i) should read 'protect' rather than promote the natural features and landscapes of Whangamarino Wetland and Lake Waikare.	Accept	34

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
825.11	John Lawson	Oppose	Add rules to support Policy 4.2.7 - Site Coverage and Permeable Surfaces.	The submitter supports the policies of having sufficient open space to provide for landscaping, on-site stormwater disposal in the Residential Zone, but objects that they do not appear to have any corresponding rules, except for Te Kowhai Airpark Zone Rule 27.3.3.	Reject	6
FS1385.69	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury B	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
825.22	John Lawson	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P9 Permitted Activities to provide for the registration of Homestay or Visitor accommodation.	Raglan needs a plan similar to that of Queenstown to avoid more residential accommodation becoming available only to visitors. As residents tend to move to and from the surrounding country areas, the same policy needs to apply there. Queenstown has rules requiring registration as a Homestay, or a Holiday Home and, for larger properties, resource consent for change of use. Raglan needs similar rules.	Reject	12 ch.16
FS1387.1321	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				appropriate.		
825.25	John Lawson	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.2.22 Bankart Street and Wainui Street AND Add provision for Wi Neera Street	The area behind the corrugated iron on Wi Neera St is still be developed and residents will be forced out of their homes by rate rises, overlooking, noise, etc. Raglan needs housing for locals far more than extra holiday apartments.	Reject	15
FS1276.200	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	The submission highlights the need for the new District Plan to avoid the planning failures, which approved apartments on the corner of Stuart Street and Wainui Road, Raglan. The failures include devolution of power by council, resulting in the lack of any political or public involvement in making the decision, lack of adequate treatment of storm water from a site immediately adjacent to the coastal management area and a shellfish bed, infringement of daylight protections, parking and setback requirements, location of a road junction with poor sightlines and failure to protect views of a heritage building. It also highlights the need for the District Plan to consider the social and economic value of a development. This development for holiday apartments removes much needed permanent accommodation and will exacerbate seasonal parking, traffic and employment problems. Furthermore, WED supports the 'Raglan Naturally' ethos and notes that the Waikato Blueprint, adopted by council in June 2019, aims to "Provide a high-level 'spatial picture' of how the district could progress over the next 30 years, address the community's social, economic and environmental needs, and respond to its regional context. The Blueprint will provide the Waikato District Council with an effective and legible tool to move from vision to strategy, and from strategy to action by setting out specific, prioritised initiatives at the district and social level." And includes these statements: "WDC should work with the Community Board and Raglan Naturally and Tangata Whenua to define, strengthen and communicate Raglan's special identity." The top priority initiatives for Raglan include: -Building a strong identity for the town, -Supporting Raglan Naturally in their prioritised local initiatives such as local food production, energy self sufficiency, alternatives to weed spraying, GE free approaches and education regarding climate change, - Partnering with Raglan Naturally in respect to planning	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				processes.		
FS1142.9	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	The commercial area was established under Plan Change 14 in response to a lack of business zoned land in the Raglan Town Centre.		Accept	
825.45	John Lawson	Oppose	Add a rule to Section 16.3 Land Use - Building to the effect that: (a) Construction of a building or other structure within sight of SH23 at Raglan is a permitted activity if it will be screened from SH23 by planting with indigenous species that will achieve an average height of 3m after 5 years, mature to over 9m in the residential zone and 12m in the Business Zone and be of sufficient density to visually screen the activity from SH23. (b) Any activity that does not comply with a condition for a permitted activity is a discretionary activity.	The zone extensions have increased the extent of urban development along the main approach to Raglan. That could be mitigated by screening further development.	Reject	26
FS1387.1329	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1325.7	Avondale Trust	Oppose	I seek that the whole of the submission be disallowed. Very impractical.	Suggestion to screen plant off the Lorenzen Bay Structure Plan Business area is ridiculous. A business area needs to be clearly visible to be successful. No rule needed.	Accept	
831.13	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Add rules that support Policy 4.2.7 Site Coverage and Permeable Surfaces.	Supports having sufficient open space to provide for landscaping, on-site stormwater disposal in the Residential Zone, but objects that they do not appear to have any corresponding rules, except for Te Kowhai Airpark Zone Rule 27.3.3.	Reject	6
831.31	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Amend P9 in Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities, to require registration of homestay or visitor accommodation.	Airbnb does not contribute a fair share to seasonal infrastructure costs. Raglan needs a plan similar to that of Queenstown to avoid more residential accommodation becoming available only to visitors. As residents tend to	Reject	12 ch.16

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				move to and from the surrounding country areas, the same policy needs to apply there. Queenstown has rules requiring registration as a homestay, or a holiday home and, for larger properties, resource consent for a change of use. Raglan needs similar rules.		
FS1276.252	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Properties are being built or converted for holiday accommodation and this is forcing out those who add to Raglan's character and do many of its essential jobs.	Reject	
831.51	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.2.7.1 Signs - general, to enable information on history and places to be shared in both English and Te Reo Maori.	The rule seems to be aimed at functional signage and therefore unreasonably limits the size and placing of interpretation and Heritage Trail signs. The submitter encourages the use of more bilingual signs.	Reject	21
831.68	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Oppose	Add rules to 22 Residential Zone to provide for the protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops and to include at least the following defined areas: From SH3 (north of Maungatawhiri Road) to Kaitoke Creek All existing views of the bard from Main Road, Bow St and Norrie Avenue All existing views of Karioi from Raglan CBD From Wainui Road to the coast between the Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp From SH23 summit to Karioi Aro Aro salt marsh from Wallis St AND Consequently amend the planning maps as necessary to satisfy the relief sought in this submission.	Views are an inherent part of Raglan's seaside character and retaining these is a priority action. Policy 3.3.3 needs to be achieved. The protection of views that affect the wellbeing of residents is a matter that needs to be considered in accordance with section 5 of the RMA.	Reject	37
FS1276.158	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole submission point be allowed.	This supports WED's submission that views should be protected by the Plan.	Reject	
FS1258.56	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not provide sufficient detail to determine the precise spatial extent of the view protection areas and does not define what 'protection' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.	Accept	
FS1329.26	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose. Disallow the introduction of protected viewshafts.	The submission seeks to introduce rules that protect defined views. It is unclear in the submission what is to be protected and the extent of the viewshafts sought to be protected. The consequences of introducing protected views without specific landscape and visual assessment are unclear.	Accept	
871.15	Brendon John & Denise Louise	Support	Retain 22 Residential zone, with the exception of Rule	Provides for the efficient use of land resources,	Accept	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>Strong</b>		16.2.4.1 Earthworks General; Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight admission, Rule 16.3.6 PI Building Coverage; Rule 16.3.9.3 Building setback - waterbodies; Rule 16.4.13 (a) Subdivision creating reserves and Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips (which are addressed in other submission points).	Enables the subdivision of land to provide for the growth of the district.		
FS1387.1422	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
922.10	John Rowe	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision - General, as follows: RD1 (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed lots must have a minimum net site area of 450m2 400m2, except where the proposed lot is an access allotment or utility allotment or reserve to vest;	The proposed minimum net site area of 450m2 is too large and restrictive. Smaller lots are generally more popular for easy maintenance and the request for 400m2 will still be large enough to fit a decent sized dwelling.	Reject	33
922.11	John Rowe	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(iv) Subdivision - General, to include an area requirement before triggering a "rear lot" rule, e.g. 1 hectare.	The proposed rule is not fully workable for smaller infill subdivisions and should only apply to larger sites. The submitter suggests that a threshold of over 1 ha is appropriate.	Reject	33
FS1387.1474	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
923.45	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.2.3 (a)-Residential built form and amenity as follows: (a) Maintain neighbourhood residential amenity values, promote urban design protocols (Appendix 3.3), and facilitate safety in the Residential Zone.	The submitter supports Objective 4.2.3 in principle but requests that it include promotion of the urban design protocols and guidelines as reference in Appendix 3.3- Town Centre Guidelines, to optimize health and wellbeing outcomes for all residents. The purpose of the principles is to guide the design of environments, products and communications and describe the concepts of designing all products and the built environment to be aesthetic and usable to the greatest extent possible by everyone, regardless of age, disability or status.	Reject	4
FS1387.1498	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
923.48	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Objective 4.2.16- Housing Options as notified.	The submitter this objective as it assists with giving effect to the Future Proof Strategy and the Waikato Regional Policy Statements' directions relating to the integration of land use with public transport and walking and cycling. Directions in these documents linked to housing typology and multiple unit dwellings should enable increased levels of physical activity if accompanied by parallel improvements in access to accessible public transport services and infrastructure, and safe and accessible walking and cycling infrastructure.	Accept in part	12
FS1387.1500	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
923.49	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.17- Housing types as notified.	The submitter supports this objective as it assists with giving effect to the Future Proof Strategy and the Waikato Regional Policy Statements' directions relating to the integration of land use with public transport and walking and cycling. Directions in these documents linked to housing typology and multiple unit dwellings should enable increased levels of physical activity if accompanied by parallel improvements in access to accessible public transport services and infrastructure, and safe and accessible walking and cycling infrastructure.	Accept	12
FS1387.1501	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
923.50	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.18- Multi-unit development as notified.	The submitter supports this objective as it assists with giving effect to the Future Proof Strategy and the Waikato Regional Policy Statements' directions relating to the integration of land use with public transport and walking and cycling. Directions in these documents linked to housing typology and multiple unit dwellings should	Accept in part	12

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				enable increased levels of physical activity if accompanied by parallel improvements in access to accessible public transport services and infrastructure, and safe and accessible walking and cycling infrastructure.		
FS1387.1502	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
923.51	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 4.2.26- Neighborhood centres in structure plans as notified.	Neighborhood centres provide a really important function to support local communities to have access to commercial and community facilities.	Accept	17
FS1387.1503	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
923.57	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.4.1 (a)- Adverse effects of land use and development as follows: The health, safety and wellbeing of people communities and the environment are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development.	The submitter supports Objective 4.4.1- Adverse effects of land use and development to the extent that recognition is given to the health and wellbeing of communities and communities are protected from the adverse effects of land use and development, however recommends that	Accept	18

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				the wording better reflects section 5 of the RMA which also refers to the safety of the community.		
FS1114.33	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Null	FENZ supports the amendment of Objective 4.4.1 as it recognises the importance of protecting the health, safety and wellbeing of communities from the adverse effects of land use and development and better reflects section 5 of the RMA, which also refers to the safety of the community. This submission supports the intention sought in FENZ's submission point number 378.73.	Accept	
923.95	Waikato District Health Board	Oppose	Amend 22: Residential Zone by establishing a stronger objective, policy and rule framework than is proposed for un-serviced urban residential areas where there is uncertainty about the funding, staging and timing for infrastructure provision.	The amendments are requested to ensure activities of an urban nature, including subdivision, are not provided for prior to structure planning processes being undertaken and without certainty about the funding, timing and staging of infrastructure provision and so subdivision, use and development is not compromised in these areas for future development. The submitter is concerned provisions do not adequately address how subdivision and development activities will be managed where a 'live' residential zoning is proposed for un-serviced land within urban towns and villages. No obvious strategy as to how Council intends to manage these areas, how long the transition to urban use will be for particular areas, how Council is achieving its Future Proof land allocations obligations, or any framework evaluating other non-identified 'live zoning' areas. Proposed Plan creates a highly uncertain development environment for communities as to where and how future urban growth will be provided for, and how health and wellbeing outcomes will be managed in parallel to managing growth.	Reject	39
FS1387.1525	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1308.171	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	We support a stronger objective and policy framework for un-serviced urban residential areas where there is uncertainty about the funding, staging and timing for infrastructure provision. We do not support the deferral of live zoning for residential areas. Infrastructure provision and development of infrastructure can sit alongside the District Plan. There is no need to identify this staging within the District Plan as properties can be live zoned and developed where infrastructure is available..	Accept	
FS1377.296	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports integrated development and amendments to the proposed plan that better achieve that outcome. However, there are a number of different mechanisms that can be included in the PWDP to achieve that outcome including development standards and triggers for release of live zoned residential land or the creation of a future urban zone/deferred zone.	Reject	
942.21	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 4.2.16 Housing options to ensure the character of Raglan is not compromised.	While policies 4.2.17 and 4.2.18 enable a variety or housing types, there is a need to ensure that the character of Raglan is not compromised.	Reject	12
942.75	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P3(b) Permitted Activities to clarify if a village cannot be built if there is not public transport available.	Clarification is required.	Reject	22
942.76	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Not Stated	Clarify Rule 16.1.2 P9 Permitted Activities by identifying how many homes are occupied by residents and how many are reserved for homestay accommodation. AND No specific decision sought, but the submitter supports priority being given to building homes in Residential Zones for residents with respect to Rule 16.1.2 P9 Permitted Activities.	Many long term residents have moved to Hamilton as land and homes that are available for renting have become scarce at realistic and affordable prices.	Reject	22
942.77	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 16.1.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: (k) Enhancement of the character of the town.	No reasons provided.	Reject	13



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
943.10	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.12 RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision - Building platform, to be inclusive of yards or be reduced to 15m, AND Any consequential amendments to other residential zones throughout the Proposed Waikato District Plan.	The requirement (as notified) would be difficult to achieve on many sites typically being 20m in length. No obvious planning support for 18m.	Reject	33
943.34	McCracken Surveys Limited	Support	Retain A new retirement village as a permitted activity in Rule 16.1.2 P3 Permitted Activities.	No specific reason provided.	Accept	22
FS1387.1581	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1325.3	Avondale Trust	Support	I seek that the whole of the submission be allowed.	A New Retirement Development in the Lorenzen Bay Structure Plan area as a permitted activity.	Accept	
943.35	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Add an explicit exception to Rule 16.1.2 P3(a) - A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village, (a), to add an explicit exception to allow smaller development without a minimum area to support development in Raglan.	The 3 Ha minimum site area is not appropriate for Raglan contour. No apparent reason to apply a minimum in the Residential Zone in Raglan. Lack of existing near level land may require two storey structures in Raglan.	Reject	22
FS1387.1582	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1276.30	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be disallowed.	A retirement village already existed at the foot of Stewart Street. Planning controls failed to protect it. Until such controls are in place it seems pointless to build new villages, later susceptible to conversion to other forms of housing.	Accept	
FS1325.1	Avondale Trust	Support	I support reduction in the minimum area of 3H required for a retirement development in the LBSP (Lorenzen Bay Structure Plan) Area.	The Lorenzen Bay Structure Plan area is an ideal situation for a Retirement home but does not meet the 3H minimum area due to the terrain of the land.	Reject	
FS1218.2	Stewart Webster	Support	I seek the submission to be allowed.	Reduction in minimum area of three hectares for a retirement facility in the Lorenzen Bay Structure Plan Area 3ha seems restrictive.	Reject	
943.42	McCracken Surveys Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 3 - Design Guidelines - 3.1: Residential Subdivision Guidelines, to bold the following statement and for it to be implemented in the intent that the words portray as follows: Every application will be different (and not all the outcomes sought and design guidelines will be relevant to the assessment) of the proposed subdivision application. Each subdivision will be assessed on its merits taking into account its context and specific attributes. A degree of flexibility in relation to how the proposals respond to the guidelines is reasonable and to be expected. What is important is that the outcomes sought are clearly achieved and that this able to be demonstrated in the proposal.	The bracketed part of the sentence in the relief sought is potential cause for concern. It states that not all design guidelines will be relevant. Yet the boxes throughout the guideline are ticked or not ticked. Are the ticks in each box to be interpreted as being relevant no matter or can the applicant disagree with Beca and invoke the above statement? Reasonableness must play a part and to ensure that the statements must be given primacy for processing planners. Potential conflicts will arise if the above statement is not held in high regard and consistently implemented by processing planners.	Reject	33
FS1387.1585	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
943.44	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (c) - Multi-Unit development, to apply the 'Average Net Site Area' rather than the minimum net site area.	Apartments are likely to be two storeys and terraced rather than vertical. Net site area minimum is problematic for apartment design. Average Net Site Area for apartments will	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				provide a greater degree of design flexibility in terms of for example placement, separation and outlook, privacy, daylighting and access.		
FS1387.1586	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
943.45	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.1.4 Discretionary Activities to reflect where a permitted or restricted discretionary performance standard is failed it should remain restricted discretionary to the failed performance standard. AND No specific relief sought, but submission considers the approach of the Proposed District Plan cascading to a discretionary activity upon non-compliance with a permitted standard has negative and unnecessary implication for increased application cost.	The widening to full discretionary is not warranted.	Reject	22
FS1017.10	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
FS1308.177	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	The default discretionary activity status is too restrictive for minor infringements to standards.	Reject	
FS1017.15	Gulab Bilimoria	Support	Null		Reject	
FS1387.1587	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
943.46	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P1 (a) (ii) - Earthworks General, as follows: (ii) Not exceed a volume of 250-500m <sup>3</sup> ; AND Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P3 (a)(i) - Earthworks General, as follows: (i) Not exceed a total volume of 20 500m <sup>3</sup> ;	500m <sup>3</sup> allows for variation in topography or ground conditions where 250m <sup>3</sup> can easily be exceeded, especially in Raglan. Will avoid penalising steeper sites. Effects of earthworks are well understood and 500m <sup>3</sup> can be managed as 250m <sup>2</sup> area by way of the performance standards. Sites are subject to engineering at building consent.	Reject	11
FS1276.162	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.	Even the 250m <sup>3</sup> limit can result in damage to RMA objectives, so it should not be increased.	Accept	
943.47	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.2 (a) (i) Minor dwelling, as follows: (i) The net site area is 900 600m <sup>2</sup> or more;	Other jurisdictions have 600m <sup>2</sup> where a maximum of 70m <sup>2</sup> is imposed. 600m <sup>2</sup> still provides a reasonable degree of living space and functionality. Reduction in Net Site Area provides opportunities that has significant benefits for people and communities, young and old living close to families; additional income.	Reject	13
FS1387.1588	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1308.178	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	This is consistent with our submission. A net site area of 900m <sup>2</sup> is too large given the maximum gross floor area of 70m <sup>2</sup> for a minor dwelling.	Reject	
943.48	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.3.1 PI - Building general, so that 'Height' is taken at the building edge from the highest foundation height, projected out and over any slope.	Rule works for near level residential dwelling sites only. Experience in Raglan shows that there is nearly always a land use infringement due to topography. Will reduce annoying minor infringements on many sloping sites. Noting that daylight omission rules on more steeper sites from dominating structures.	Accept	27

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1276.163	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.	A 7.5m limit allows considerable scope. Its like the speed limit; 7.5 should be a limit, not a target.	Reject	
943.49	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.5 P1 - Daylight admission, to increase daylighting to 45 degrees north and 37 degrees south measured 3.0m above the ground level at all boundaries.	The rule is unnecessarily restrictive for all sites and lacks consistency with other councils.	Accept in part	8
946.10	Dee Bond	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission states that Rule 16.1.2 P5 hours of Temporary Events, precludes multi-day wedding functions that are normal in some cultures, after 8:30pm at night.	No reasons provided.	Reject	22
946.11	Dee Bond	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission considers Rule 16.1.2 P9 Homestay limits to 4 temporary residents should be driven by the size of the property for carparking and number of bedrooms.	No reasons provided.	Accept	22
FS1387.1597	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
986.21	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.15(b) as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): Earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that ensures the stability and safety of surrounding land, buildings, <u>infrastructure</u> and structures. AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	Policy 4.2.15(b) seeks to ensure that earthworks do not undermine surrounding land, buildings and structures. KiwiRail seeks to add the word infrastructure to the policy to recognise the need to protect it from adjacent earthworks activity.	Accept	11
FS1176.288	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports this submission as it protects infrastructure from adjacent earthwork activity.	Accept	
FS1345.140	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons set out in the KiwiRail submission.	Accept	
986.53	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.2 Building setback - Sensitive land use as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the	• KiwiRail seeks that a 5metre setback apply to all new building development adjacent to	Reject	5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	(KiwiRail)		<p>requested relief): Building setback - Sensitive land use P1 Sensitive land use (a)Any new building or alteration to an existing building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: <del>(i)5m from the designated boundary of the railway corridor ...</del> <u>P2 Railway corridor any new buildings or alterations to an existing building must be setback 5 metres from any designated railway corridor boundary</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Retain Rule 16.3.9.2 P1(a)(i) Building setback -sensitive land use if the primary relief above is not accepted</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.</p>	<p>operational railway corridor boundaries (i.e. not just sensitive land uses). Ensuring all new structures in all zones are set back from the rail corridor allows access and maintenance to occur without the landowner or occupier needing to gain access to the rail corridor- potentially compromising their own safety. • Setting back buildings from the rail corridor boundary is a means of ensuring people's health and wellbeing through good design. • Construction of buildings in close proximity to the rail corridor has significant safety risk if it is not managed appropriately in accordance with relevant standards. • A 5m setback is not an acoustic setback. It allows for vehicular access to the backs of buildings (e.g. a cherry picker) and would also allow scaffolding to be erected safely. This in turn fosters visual amenity as lineside properties can then be regularly maintained. • A setback is the most efficient method of ensuring intensification does not result in additional safety issues for activities adjacent to the rail corridor, whilst not restricting the ongoing operation and growth of activity within the rail corridor. • The proposed provisions would require any development within the setback to obtain consent with matters of discretion relating to: (i)location, design and use of the proposed building or structure as it relates to the rail network (ii)impacts on the safe operation, maintenance and development of the rail network (iii)construction and maintenance management. • The relief provides for the rejection of the primary relief. This setback applies only to sensitive land use buildings which does not achieve the safety and amenity benefits sought throughout the district.</p>		
FS1269.88	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
FS1031.6	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with Kiwi Rail to reach an agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Accept	
FS1032.6	Vodafone New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with KiwiRail to reach an agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				telecommunications equipment.		
FS1033.6	Spark New Zealand Trading Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with KiwiRail to reach an agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Accept	
986.62	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add new matters of discretion relating to non-compliance with the 5m Building setback - railway corridor (sought elsewhere in other submission points) in Rule 16.1 Land Use Activities as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>1. The size, nature and location of the buildings on the site.</u> <u>2. The extent to which the safety and efficiency of rail and road operations will be adversely affected.</u> <u>3. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u> <u>4. Any characteristics of the proposed use that will make compliance unnecessary.</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• KiwiRail accepts that there will be at times situations where the proposed 5 metre Building setback - railway corridor rule cannot be met, or it is inappropriate to require compliance.</li> <li>• It is noted that some zones have restricted discretionary activity categories and some don't. It's been KiwiRail's policy to seek restricted discretionary activity status for non-compliance with its noise and vibration performance standards. The criteria allow for a bespoke consideration of site specific effects.</li> <li>• Application for resource consent under this rule can be decided without public notification. KiwiRail are likely to be the only affected person determined in accordance with section 95B of the Resource Management Act 1991.</li> </ul>	Reject	5
FS1269.89	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Null	Housing New Zealand opposes the relief sought.	Accept	
986.71	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.5 - Setback: Side boundaries as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): 4.2.5 Policy - Setback: Side-bBoundaries (a) Require development to have sufficient side boundary setbacks to provide for: ... (c) <u>Manage Reverse sensitivity by providing sufficient setbacks buildings to provide for residents' safety and amenity</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The policies applying to each zone requiring setbacks from the railway corridor should include reference to the purpose of the setback.</li> <li>• Existing and sought changes to the Plans objectives lend sufficient support the need for setbacks for amenity and safety, and the efficient integration of development and infrastructure.</li> <li>• Adding an additional item to these plan sections will also facilitate assessment of situations where the proposed 5 metre Building setback - railway corridor rule cannot be met, or it is inappropriate to require compliance.</li> </ul>	Reject	5
FS1269.91	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
FS1193.33	Van Den Brink Group	Oppose	The submission is disallowed.	Setbacks from the NIMT (greater than a normal yard control) imposes unnecessary development restrictions on the use of land.	Accept	
986.88	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 16.4.1 RDI General Subdivision as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>Reverse sensitivity effects, including on land transport networks</u>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design, location and service arrangements for new development carried out in the subdivision process cannot be separated from the future use of the subdivided sites. New</li> </ul>	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	buildings, including those containing sensitive or noise sensitive activities, their location and the design and location of access ways may all have an influence on the ultimate impact development has on existing and planned infrastructure. The potential for reverse sensitivity effects is therefore a relevant consideration at this point in the development process. • KiwiRail seeks the addition of matters of discretion relating to reverse sensitivity effects on land transport networks to the subdivision consent criteria in the listed zones.		
<b>986.96</b>	<b>Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 PI(a) Earthworks-General as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (i) Be located more than 1.5 m horizontally from any <u>infrastructure, including a waterway</u> , open drain or overland flow path; AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	KiwiRail supports that earthworks are required to be setback from services and network systems. The rail track itself is most susceptible from adverse effects if adjacent earthworks are not adequately set back. KiwiRail seeks that rule relating to setbacks in certain zones should be amended to reflect that there should be an earthworks setback of 1.5m from infrastructure, to ensure that the efficient and effective operation of the existing network is maintained.	Accept	11
<i>FS1176.309</i>	<i>Watercare Services Ltd</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to protect existing infrastructure.</i>	Accept	
<b>559.251</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.4.10 RDI Subdivision - land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 16.4.10 RDI Subdivision - land containing heritage items as follows: (a) Subdivision of land containing a heritage item listed in Schedule 30.1 (Historic Heritage Items) (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Effects on heritage values; (ii) Context and setting of the heritage item; (iii) The extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained <u>within one lot.</u> AND Amend Rule 16.4.10 RDI Subdivision - land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters, including heritage items being retained in one lot.	The submitter supports in part the restricted discretionary activity status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items and the associated matters of discretion, as these assessment criteria will assist to give effect to the related policy. An amendment is required to the assessment criteria to recognise that the retention of a heritage item and its setting is best achieved when they are located within the same lot. The inclusion of threshold creates a clear distinction for those administering the Plan as to when the activity becomes a non-complying activity.	Accept	33
<b>559.258</b>	<b>Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.10 NCI Subdivision - land containing heritage items, except for the amendments sought below. AND	The submitter supports the non-complying status of the rule relating to the subdivision of land containing heritage items, when the	Accept	33



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Amend Rule 16.4.10 NCI Subdivision - land containing heritage items to be consistent with the equivalent rules in other zone chapters.	restricted discretionary activity status of the rule is not achieved. This stringent assessment will assist to ensure that the heritage values of the heritage item with its setting are maintained.		
559.260	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.9 RDI Title boundaries - Maaori sites and Maaori areas of significance.	The submitter supports Rule 16.4.9 RDI Subdivision - land containing heritage items. This rule will give effect to Part 2 section 6 Matters of National Importance, in particular s6(e).	Accept	33
559.261	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.9 NCI Title boundaries - Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance.	The submitter supports Rule 16.4.9 NCI Title boundaries - Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance. This rule applies a more stringent activity status therefore giving effect to Part 2 section 6 Matters of National Importance.	Accept	33
695.168	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.4 Fences or walls - Road boundaries and Reserve Zone boundaries so that no fences or walls occur ahead of the front building line or within the 3m front yard setback to a road.	In the interest of good urban design and road safety.	Reject	28
695.169	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.4 Fences or walls - Road boundaries and Reserve Zone boundaries for fences to be at least 50% permeable for that part of the fence over 1.2m height facing a reserve, with permeability to be spaced evenly along the fence.	Active road corridors slow drivers subconsciously as they see more activity in a residential street. This assists security through observation. Privacy can still be achieved with solid 1.8m side and rear fences.	Reject	28
695.170	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.5 PI Daylight admission as follows: Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 37.45 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.53m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	It should be consistent with other Councils, unless scientific evidence demonstrates that the sun angle differ in the Waikato district compared to other districts.	Accept in part	8
FS1287.32	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Blue Wallace seeks that the submission point be accepted in full.	The Submitter supports this submission point to the extent that it creates consistency between other Councils and will allow for greater housing choice.	Accept	
695.171	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.7 Living Court so that an additional 10m <sup>2</sup> per bedroom be required for outdoor living space for 3 bedrooms or more, and that the 4m dimension be reduced to 3m.	The council should be aiming for regional consistency. There is no obvious need for such wide variations to occur. The minimum dimensions in the Proposed district Plan are difficult to achieve, particularly on narrow sites that occur in the District. This requirement is	Reject	39

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				60% greater than that for Hamilton City with no logical explanation for such a great difference.		
<b>695.172</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(i) Subdivision - General so that flat sites have a minimum of 400m2, instead of 450m2.	This would be consistent with Hamilton City Council Residential Zone requirements. Concurrent land use consent and subdivision consent can approve smaller lots around approved building. Care needs to be taken on steeper sites in terms of lot sizes when Council approves these to evidence later building viability as slope affects the viable building platform and height to boundary relationships.	Reject	33
FS1387.344	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>695.173</b>	<b>Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(iv) Subdivision - General to state that rear lots are to be avoided except where there is no realistic alternative.	The rule does not appear to consider topographical and existing existing infrastructure constraints. There appears to be no reason for a lesser constraint in the number of lots to which the rule applies. This will lead to inconsistent decision-making.	Reject	33
FS1387.345	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
695.174	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.2 RD1(a)(v) Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area to state that rear lots are to be avoided except where there is no realistic alternative.	The rule does not appear to consider topographical and existing infrastructure constraints. There appears to be no reason for a lesser constraint in the number of lots to which the rule applies. This will lead to inconsistent decision-making.	Accept	34
FS1387.346	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
695.175	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.3 RD1 to state that rear lots are to be avoided except where there is no realistic alternative.	The rule does not appear to consider topographical and existing infrastructure constraints. There appears to be no reason for a lesser constraint in the number of lots to which the rule applies. This will lead to inconsistent decision-making.	Accept	34
FS1387.347	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				appropriate.		
695.176	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.5 C1(b) Subdivision - Boundary adjustments to change the term "boundary relocation" to "boundary adjustment".	The term "boundary relocation" is used in this clause whereas the heading refers to a boundary adjustment, and relocation refers to the whole boundary and adjustment is part of the boundary.	Accept	33
FS1387.348	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
695.177	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.12 RD1(a)(i) Subdivision - Building platform as follows: (i) a circle with a diameter of at least <del>18</del> 15m exclusive of yards; or...	Sub-regional consistency of subdivision design should be a key focus for Council. The proposed rule is inconsistent. The Proposed District Plan requirement would be difficult to achieve on many sites as they are typically 20m across. There is no logical planning explanation, why urban residential sites require a 20% greater sized shape factor than an equivalent Residential Zone lot in Hamilton City. There is no planning outcome to be achieved by requiring excess size shape factors.	Reject	33
FS1387.349	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.100	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.2.1.1 P3 Permitted Activities Noise-General AND Amend Rule 16.2.1.1 P2 Permitted Activities Noise-General to read as follows: (a) Noise measured within any other site in the Residential Zone must not exceed: (i) 50dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm, every day; (ii) 45dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm, every day; and (iii) 40dB (LAeq) and 65dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. (b) Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound"; and (c) Noise levels shall be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic- Environmental noise". Amend Rule 16.2.1.1 P3 DI to read as follows: Rule 16.2.1.1 P1 or P2 or P3.	P3 needs to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept	18
697.105	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P1(a) Permitted Activities to read as follows: (a) Earthworks (excluding the importation of fill material) within a site must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Be located more than 1.5 m horizontally from any waterway, open drain or overland flow path; (ii) Not exceed a volume of 250m <sup>3</sup> and an area of more than 1000m <sup>2</sup> over any consecutive 12 month period; (iii) Not exceed an area of 1000m <sup>2</sup> over any consecutive 12 month period; (iv) The total depth of any excavation or filling does not exceed 1.5m above or below ground level; (v) The slope of the resulting cut, filled areas or fill batter face in stable ground, does not exceed a maximum of 1:2 (1 vertical to 2 horizontal); (vi) Earthworks are set back at least 1.5m from all boundaries; (vii) Areas exposed by earthworks are re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover within 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks; (viii) Sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; (ix) Do not divert or change the nature of natural water flows, water bodies or established drainage paths.	The rule needs to apply over a single consecutive 12 month period for both volume and area thresholds. The words "at least" provide clarity to the rule. This is also consistent with other zone chapters.	Accept	11
697.106	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P3(a)(iv) Permitted Activities to read as follows: (iv) Fill material is setback at least 1.5m from all boundaries;	The wording "at least" provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.120	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.2.7.1 P2 (a) (viii) Signs-general.	This is not a condition as the Residential Zone provisions do not apply to the road reserve.	Accept	21
697.121	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.2.7.1 P3 (a)(iv).	This is not an appropriate condition as the Residential Zone provisions do not apply to the road reserve.	Accept	21
697.122	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.2.7.2 P1(a)(iv) Signs-Effects.	The condition is unnecessary and in many instances will not be able to be complied with.	Accept	21
697.128	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend 16.3.1 P1 Dwelling to read as follows: One dwelling within-site a record of title.	Words' "a record of title" has been included for correction.	Accept	13
FS1387.447	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.129	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.2 P1 Minor dwelling to read as follows: (a) One minor dwelling contained within a site-a record of title must comply with all of the following conditions:	Words' "a record of title"been included for correction.	Accept	13
FS1387.448	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
697.130	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend 16.3.3(2) Height as follows: Rule 16.3.3.1 Height - Building general provides permitted height limits across the entire Residential Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rules 16.3.3.2 or 16.3.3.3</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that the rules in 16.3.3.2 or 16.3.3.3 apply instead of the Building general rule.	Accept	27
697.133	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.5 RD1 (b) Daylight admission to read as follows: (a) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) Height of the building; (ii) Design and location of the building; (iii) <del>Extent of shading on adjacent sites</del> <u>Level of shading on any other sites;</u> (iv) Privacy on <del>another</del> <u>any other</u> sites; and (v) <del>Effects on amenity values and residential character of the locality.</del>	Additional words in this rule provide clarity and consistency with other zones.	Accept in part	8
697.134	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.6 D1 Building coverage as follows: <del>Total</del> Building coverage that does not comply with Rule 16.3.6 P1, P2 or P3.	Consistency of wording across the zone chapters.	Reject	6
697.135	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add in after Rule 16.3.6 as follows: <u>Rule 16.3.6A</u> Impervious surfaces P1 - The impervious surface of a site must not exceed 70%. RD1 (a) Impervious surface that does not comply with Rule 16.3.6A P1 (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Site design, layout and amenity; (ii) The risk of flooding, nuisance or damage to the site or other buildings and sites.	To include the impervious surfaces rule from Rule 14.11.1(P2) and 14.11.2(RD2) to make it easier to find.	Accept	6
697.137	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 P1 (a)(ii) Building setbacks - All boundaries as follows: (ii) 13m from <del>the edge of an</del> indicative road.	As the indicative road is just a line, there is no 'edge' to be set back from.	Reject	5
697.139	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 P2 (a) Building setback - Water bodies as follows: (a) A public amenity of up to 25m <sup>2</sup> , or a pump shed ( <u>public or private</u> ), within any building setback identified in Rule 16.3.9.3 P1.	Clarify that the pump shed is both private and public.	Accept	5
FS1387.449	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
697.146	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Delete Rule 16.4 Subdivision (1)-(5) AND Add to replace as follows: (1) <u>Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General provides for subdivision density and apply across within the Residential Zone subject to compliance with the following:</u> (a) <u>Rule 16.4.7 Subdivision - Title boundaries - contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas;</u> (b) <u>Rule 16.4.8 Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas;</u> (c) <u>Rule 16.4.9 Title boundaries - Maaori sites and Maaori areas of Significance;</u> (d) <u>Rule 16.4.10 Subdivision of land containing heritage items;</u> (e) <u>Rule 16.4.11 Subdivision - Road Frontage;</u> (f) <u>Rule 16.4.12 Subdivision - Building Platform;</u> (g) <u>Rule 16.4.13 Subdivision creating reserves;</u> (h) <u>Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips;</u> (i) <u>Rule 16.4.15 Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways;</u> and (j) <u>Rule 16.4.16 Subdivision of land containing an Environmental Protection Area.</u> (2) <u>Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General does not apply where the following specific areas and/or activities rules apply:</u> (a) <u>Rule 16.4.2 Subdivision - Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area;</u> (b) <u>Rule 16.4.3 Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area;</u> (c) <u>Rule 16.4.4 Subdivision - Multi-unit development;</u> (d) <u>Rule 16.4.5 Subdivision - Boundary adjustments;</u> and (e) <u>Rule 16.4.6 Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans and conversion to freehold.</u> (3) <u>The following rules apply to specific areas and/or activities:</u> (a) <u>Rule 16.4.2 - Subdivision - Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area (refer to Rule (4));</u> (b) <u>Rule 16.4.3 - Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area (refer to Rule (4));</u> and (c) <u>Rule 16.4.4 - (Subdivision - Multi-Unit development).</u> (d) <u>Rule 16.4.5 - subdivision boundary adjustments;</u> (e) <u>Rule 16.4.6 - subdivision amendments and updates to cross lease flats plan and conversion to freehold;</u> (f) <u>Rule 16.4.7 - subdivision title boundaries natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas;</u> (g)</p>	<p>The rule contains an unclear mixture of subdivision conditions that apply to the general subdivision, as well as subdivisions that apply only in specific areas or circumstances.</p>	Accept	33



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Rule 16.4.8 - subdivision title boundaries Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori; (h) Rule 16.4.9 - Title boundaries - Maaori site and Maaori areas of significance (i) Rule 16.4.10 - subdivision of land containing heritage items; (j) Rule 16.4.13 - subdivision reserves; and (k) Rule 16.4.14 - subdivision esplanade reserves and esplanade strips. (l) Rule 16.4.15 - subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways; and (m) Rule 16.4.16 - subdivision of land containing Environmental Protection Area. (4) Rule 16.4.4 Subdivision - Multi-unit development does not apply in the following areas: (a) Rule 16.4.2 - Subdivision - Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area; and (b) Rule 16.4.3 - Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area.</p>			
FS1291.8	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments that provide greater clarity for plan users but opposes any amendments that reduce development potential and flexibility in residential zones.	Accept	
FS1387.450	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1377.209	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments that provide greater clarity for plan users but opposes any amendments that reduce development potential and flexibility in residential zones.	Accept	
697.147	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add to 16.4 Subdivision Rule 16.4 as follows: (6) Rule 16.4.10A - subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor AND Consequential renumbering 16.4.10A Subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor RDI (a) The subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) All allotments intended to contain a sensitive land use must</p>	Replicate the rules regarding subdivision in the National Grid Corridor from Chapter 14 to 22 to increase the ease of use of the District Plan.	Accept	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>provide a building platform for the likely principal building(s) and any building(s) for a sensitive land use located outside of the National Grid Yard, other than where the allotments are for roads, access ways or infrastructure; and (ii) The layout of allotments and any enabling earthworks must ensure that physical access is maintained to any National Grid support structures located on the allotments, including any balance area. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) The subdivision layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid; (ii) The ability to provide a complying building platform outside of the National Grid Yard; (iii) The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage; (iv) The nature and location of any vegetation to be planted in the vicinity of National Grid transmission lines. NCI Any subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor that does not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 16.4.10A RDI.</p>			
FS1350.123	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<p>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</p>	<p>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A standalone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. If council wish to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to provisions as sought in its original submission.		
FSI387.451	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.148	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1(a)(iv) Subdivision - General, as follows: (iv) Where 4 or more proposed lots are proposed to be created, the number of rear <u>records of title</u> <del>lots</del> do not exceed...	The rule should link to the definition of "Rear Record of Title".	Reject	33.7
FSI387.452	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
697.149	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.2 RD1 (a) Subdivision - Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area, as follows: Proposed lots, <u>except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve to vest</u> in the Te Kauwhata Ecological Residential Area...	The rule needs to clarify that it does not apply to access lots (as these are part of the subdivision), utilities (which are exempt from subdivision standards) or to reserves (which have their own subdivision rule).	Accept	34

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.453	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.150	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.3 RD1 (a) Subdivision - Te Kauwhata West Residential Area, as follows: Proposed lots, <u>except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve to vest</u> within the Te Kauwhata West Residential Area...	The rule needs to clarify that it does not apply to access lots (as these are part of the subdivision), utilities (which are exempt from subdivision standards) or to reserves (which have their own subdivision rule).	Accept	34
FS1387.454	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.151	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.4. RD1 (a)(iii) Subdivision - Multi-unit development, as follows: The minimum existing <u>exclusive area for each residential unit lot-size</u> where a new freehold (fee simple) lot is being created must be 300m2 net site area.	The intent of the condition was to set a density (number of units) that could be subdivided that matched the land use condition in Rule 16.1.3 RD1(c). The current wording does not achieve this intent.	Reject	13
FS1387.455	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective,	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1377.210	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and housing types.	Accept	
FS1291.9	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for greater development potential and a wider variety of densities and housing types.	Accept	
697.152	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.5 C1 Subdivision - Boundary adjustments, as follows: (b) Proposed lots must not generate any additional building infringements to those which legally existing prior to the boundary <del>relocation</del> <u>adjustment</u> .	Incorrect reference to 'relocation' rather than 'adjustment'.	Accept	33
FS1387.456	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.153	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete from Rule 16.4.6 C2 Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans and conversion to freehold C2(b)(i) the line.	Matter of control (i) is not relevant to this rule.	Accept	33
697.154	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.4.6 D1 Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans and conversion to freehold.	There are no conditions for the controlled activities, hence no need for D1.	Accept	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.155	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.7 Title boundaries - contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas heading, as follows: Title boundaries - <del>Existing Buildings contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas</del>	This rule heading needs amending to reflect the changes being made to RDI.	Reject	33
FS1387.457	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
697.156	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.7 RDI Title boundaries - contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas (the same as set out in the Village Zone in Rule 24.4.5 RDI) retaining only the rules relating to existing buildings and make consequential changes, as follows: <del>(a) Subdivision of land containing contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and Aggregate Extraction Areas must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) The boundaries of every proposed lot containing existing buildings must demonstrate compliance with the following building rules (other than where any non-compliance existed lawfully prior to the subdivision) relating to: A. daylight admission (Rule 16.3.5); B. building coverage (Rule 16.3.6); C. building setbacks (Rule 16.3.9). (ii) The boundaries of every proposed lot must not divide the following: A. a natural hazard area; B. contaminated land; C. Significant Amenity Landscape; or D. notable tree. (iii) The boundaries of every proposed lot must provide the following setbacks: A. 300m from any intensive farming activity; B. 500m from the boundary of an Aggregate Extraction Area for rock extraction; and C. 200m from the boundary of an Aggregate Extraction Area for sand excavation. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following</del>	The rule can be read to mean that all the features need to be on a lot, which is incorrect and is consistent with Village Zone.	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			matters: (i) Landscape values; (ii) Amenity values and character; (iii) Reverse sensitivity effects; (iv) Effects on existing buildings; (v) Effects on natural hazard areas; (vi) Effects on contaminated land; (vii) Effects on any notable trees; and Effects on an intensive farming activity.			
FS1377.211	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports amendments that provide greater clarity for plan users but opposes any amendments that reduce development potential and flexibility in residential zones.	Reject	
FS1387.458	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1291.10	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports amendments that provide greater clarity for plan users but opposes any amendments that reduce development potential and flexibility in residential zones.	Reject	
FS1316.45	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 697.156 and amend Rule 16.4.7 RD1 as per submission point 693.7.	The proposed rule (along with the omission of a specific setback in Rule 16.3.9.2 as per submission point 693.7) seeks to remove the need for subdivision to ensure adequate setbacks from intensive farming. This fails to protect Alstra Poultry's existing activities from reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept	
697.157	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.7 NCI Title boundaries - contaminated land, notable trees, intensive farming and aggregate extraction areas, to be a discretionary activity rather than a non-complying activity as follows: <del>NCI</del> DI	The activity status should be Discretionary as not complying with a distance should not require that level of assessment.	Accept	33
FS1387.459	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.158	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.12 RDI (a) Subdivision - Building platform, as follows: Every proposed lot, other than one designed specifically for access, <u>or is a</u> utility allotment...	Grammar.	Accept	33
FSI387.460	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.159	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.14 RDI (a) (ii) Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, as follows: (ii) The proposed lot is more than 4ha, or more than 20m <del>from</del> of mean high water springs, or is a water body identified in Appendix 4 (Esplanade Priority Areas).	Clarity of wording.	Accept	33
697.160	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.15 Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways, as follows: Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways, <del>cycleways or</del> <u>bridleways</u> . (a) Subdivision where walkways, <del>cycleways or</del> <u>bridleways</u> . (i) The walkway, <del>cycleway or</del> <u>bridleway</u> is...shared pedestrian, <del>and</del> <u>and</u> cycle <del>or</del> <u>riding</u> use as per Rule 14.12.1 P8 (Transportation); (ii) The walkway, <del>cycleway or</del> <u>bridleway</u> is generally in accordance with the walkway, <del>cycleway or</del> <u>bridleway</u> route shown on the planning maps: (iii) The walkway, <del>cycleway or</del> <u>bridleway</u> is... (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: (i) Alignment of the walkway, <del>cycleway or</del> <u>bridleway</u> ; (ii) Drainage in relation to the walkway, <del>cycleway or</del> <u>bridleway</u>	The rule is meant to apply to walkways, cycleways and bridleways.	Accept	33



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			bridleway; (iii) Standard of design and construction of the walkway, cycleway or bridleway;			
<b>697.325</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 Building setback - Waterbodies, to be consistent in terms of the terminology of structures across all zone chapters.	Consistency with the equivalent rule in other chapters.	Reject	5
FS1387.527	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>697.328</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, to clarify the number of units that can be built based on the 300m2 net site area per residential unit.	To provide additional clarification to the multi-unit development rules where it applies to duplexes, Unit Titles developments and town house developments (standard 1 dwelling per site).	Reject	13
FS1387.529	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>697.329</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend for consistency of reading, the following rule: Rule 16.4.6 Subdivision - Amendments and updates to cross lease flats plans and conversion to freehold.	Rules 16.4.6, 17.4.1.3 and 18.4.4 are worded differently from each other and should be worded the same for consistency given that it	Accept	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				relates to the same subdivision process.		
FS1387.530	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.380	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Duplex" as follows: Means two attached residential units, <del>including</del> includes two units connected by an accessory building, such as a garage or a carport. This does not apply to minor dwellings.	Improves clarity of the definition, and clarifies that this definition does not apply to minor dwellings.	Accept	23
697.542	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.23 (b) Non-residential activities as follows: <del>Enabling</del> Enable existing...	The grammar is incorrect.	Accept	16
FS1387.598	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
742.120	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Delete conditions (g) and (i) in Rule 16.1.2 P3 A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	Signage and traffic generation matters should not be excluded from the conditions that apply to this activity.	Reject	22

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
742.121	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.1.2 P4 Home occupation, except for the amendments sought below AND Add to Rule 16.1.2 P4 Home occupation a new condition as follows: <u>(f) There are no heavy vehicle movements associated with the activity.</u> AND Add a new Restricted Discretionary rule for home occupations not complying with 16.1.2 P4(f), with discretion restricted to the effects of heavy vehicle traffic on the safety and efficiency of the transport network. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	Within the Residential Zone, home occupations should not involve heavy vehicles.	Reject	22
FS1387.881	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
742.122	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 16.1.2 P5 Temporary event as notified.	The submitter supports no direct access from a national route or regional arterial road. Temporary events are subject to Rule 14.12.1.4 which would ensure that for events exceeding a certain size any effects on the transport network could be addressed.	Accept	22
FS1387.882	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
742.123	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Add to Rule 16.1.3 RDI A multi-unit development that meets all of the following conditions new matters of discretion as follows. (k) <u>On-site parking and manoeuvring</u> ; (l) <u>Safety and efficiency of the land transport network</u> . (m) <u>Provision for multi-modal transport</u> . AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The potential adverse effects on the transport network from multi-unit developments should be considered.	Accept	13
FS1387.883	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
742.124	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 16.1.4 DI Discretionary Activities, as notified.	The submitter supports Council having full discretion over activities that do not comply with permitted activity standards.	Accept in part	22
FS1387.884	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
742.125	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 16.2.3 PI Glare and artificial lighting as notified. AND Retain Rule 16.2.3 RD1 Glare and artificial lighting as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept in part	19
742.126	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain P1 in Rule 16.2.7.1 as notified; AND Retain P2 in Rule 16.2.7.1 as notified; AND Retain P3 in Rule 16.2.7.1 as notified; AND Retain RD1 in Rule 16.2.7.1 as notified.	The submitter supports the rules in this section.	Accept in part	21
742.127	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.2.7.2 PI Effects on traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.2.7.2 PI (v) Effects on traffic as follows: Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 words, symbols or graphics. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 16.2.7.2 PI but seeks amendment to provide clarification on the maximum amount of words permitted. This will ensure that signage erected does not cause unnecessary visual clutter or affect the efficient, safe and effective functioning of the transport network.	Accept	21
742.128	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 16.2.7.2 DI Effects on traffic as notified.	The submitter supports Council having full discretion over signs that do not comply with permitted activity standards.	Accept	21
742.129	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 PI (a) Building setback - all boundaries, as follows: A building must be set back a minimum of: (i) 3 m from the road boundary (excluding state highways); (ii) 7.5 m from the boundary of a state highway; AND Add to Rule 16.3.9.1 P2(a) Building setback - all boundaries a new clause as follows: (iii) it is not a state highway road boundary. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	Rules 16.3.9.1 PI and P2 do not differentiate between different road types as described in the road hierarchy.	Reject	5
742.130	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.3.9.1 Building setback- All boundaries, except for the amendments sought below	The submitter supports the matters of discretion under Rule 16.3.9.1 RD 1, particularly (b)(i) and	Accept	5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 RD1 matter of discretion (b)(i) Building setbacks- All boundaries as follows: Road Transport network safety and efficiency; AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	(ii) with minor amendment.		
<b>742.131</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.3.9.2 PI Building setback- Sensitive land use, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.3.9.2 P1(a)(iii) Building setback - Sensitive land use as follows (iii) <del>25m</del> <u>35m</u> from the designated boundary of the Waikato Expressway; AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 16.3.9.2 but considers that the proposed setback of 25m from the Waikato Expressway has the potential to result in adverse effects on health and wellbeing and reverse sensitivity effects. A setback of 35m (as per the Operative District Plan) will better avoid reverse sensitivity matters consistent with the policy direction in the Proposed District Plan. The proposed setbacks will not be sufficient to avoid adverse effects on occupiers on their own and buildings will also require acoustic treatment. Relief sought in this respect assumes submission points regarding acoustic treatment are accepted.	Reject	5
<b>742.132</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.3.9.2 DI Building setback sensitive land use as notified.	The submitter supports Council having full discretion over sensitive land use activities that do not comply with permitted activity standards.	Accept in part	5
FS1316.43	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 742.132 in part with amendment to Rule 16.3.9.2 P1 as per submission point 693.7.	Support the retention of this rule and (subject to the relief outlined in submission point 693.7) in particular full discretion over sensitive land uses being located close to established intensive farming activities.	Accept	
<b>742.133</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.11 RD1 Subdivision Road Frontage as notified.	The submitter supports a minimum 15m width for lots with road frontages as it will assist in avoiding adverse effects on network safety and efficiency.	Accept	
FS1134.68	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	A minimum road frontage of 15m will assist in avoiding adverse effects on network safety and efficiency as well as support existing infrastructure and allow for future infrastructure.	Accept	
<b>742.191</b>	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Not Stated	Retain Rule 16.3.9.2 DI Building setback- Sensitive land use as notified.		Accept in part	5
<b>746.107</b>	<b>The Surveying Company</b>	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.2.15 (a) (iv)- Earthworks	Clean fill may be required in residential zoned	Reject	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			OR Amend Policy 4.2.15 (a) (iv)- Earthworks to enable land to be developed for residential activities as follows: The importation of cleanfill is avoided in the Residential Zone <u>except where it is required to enable land to be developed for residential purposes.</u> OR Amend Policy 4.2.15 (a) (iv)- Earthworks to enable land to be developed for residential activities as follows: The <u>inappropriate</u> importation of clean fill is avoided in the Residential Zone <u>where it is not required to enable greenfield land to be developed.</u>	sites to enable greenfield land to be developed for residential purposes. The requirement to avoid filling in all circumstances may restrict the ability to develop residential land where balanced cut to fill earthworks are inappropriate or cannot be achieved. This policy is contradictory to the Objective 4.2.14(a)-Earthworks which states that earthworks facilitate subdivision, use and development. Policy 4.2.15(iv) should be amended to avoid this contradiction.		
FS1377.254	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	Residential development may require the importation of clean fill as part of efficient and effective land development. The amendment should extend to all permitted activities in the residential zone.	Reject	
746.108	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 4.2.16 Housing options, except for the amendments sought below AND Add to Objective 4.2.16- Housing options as follows: <u>Multi-unit development including low rise apartments is promoted within walking distance to existing Town Centres, public amenities and public transport. Smaller lots size and multi-unit development promoted within new greenfield sites where the land is within walking distance to amenities and reserves.</u>	The submitter supports Objectives 4.2.16 and 4.2.17 as they give effect to the strategic direction outlined in Section 4.1 and promote variety in the future housing stock to help achieve Objectives 4.1.2 and 4.1.5. Enabling denser housing options gives effect to the Future Proof Strategy identified in 1.5.1 of the Plan that seeks a shift in the existing pattern of land use towards accommodating growth through a more compact urban form based on concentrating growth in and around Hamilton (67%) and the larger settlements of the district (21%). This involves a reduction in the relative share of the population outside of the subregion's existing major settlements through tighter control over rural-residential development and encouraging greater urban densities in existing settlements. The Plan needs to provide more direction through the objectives and policies on this issue. As the Plan has one residential zone it needs to identify through the objectives and policies locations where medium density development is appropriate and encourage higher densities in appropriate locations. The Plan should specify that multi-unit development and smaller lots are encouraged close to Town Centres, public amenities and public transport stations. This will ensure the Strategic objectives and met by encouraging higher densities within a walkable distance to existing amenities. Diversity	Accept in part	12

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and a range of housing choice should also be promoted within greenfield sites. The rural areas of Tuakau contain versatile soils that are used for rural production activities. These soils contribute significantly to both regional and national food supply. Intensification of urban land at higher densities should be encouraged within Tuakau residential areas to ensure that land supply requirements meet while preserving the soil resources. The maximisation of the lands residential development potential will future proof the capacity of land supply to avoid further encroachment into the rural area past the lifetime of this Plan. Intensification and higher densities should be encouraged in appropriate locations to avoid additional sprawl into the rural areas.		
FS1377.255	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities, housing types and zones.	Accept	
FS1387.972	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
FS1287.40	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Blue Wallace seek that Council accept the submission point to the extent that it refers to higher density development.	The Submitter supports this submission point to the extent that it promotes higher development in appropriate locations. This will contribute to creating a compact urban form.	Accept	
746.136	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Amend Appendix 3.4-Multi-unit Development to recognise alternative good design outcomes created by variations in setbacks and boundary treatment.	The submitter supports the principles and outcomes sought in the design guide. However, the design guidance preferring consistent front setbacks and separation between buildings as well as consistent fencing and boundary treatment (i.e. through fencing heights/materials, landscaping, the configuration	Reject	13



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				of pedestrian entrances) encouraged by the design guide could create a repetitive built form. There may be good design outcomes created by variations by in setbacks and boundary treatments.		
FS1387.983	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
749.107	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Add a new chapter with Objectives and Policies for a "Medium Density Residential Zone" into the Proposed District Plan, as outlined in Attachment 2 to the submission. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide for consequential changes or further amendments required to give effect, and reference, the new residential zone. The submitter provides the example that wherever the Residential and Village Zones are referenced or compact urban form or medium to higher density residential living, the new residential zone 'Medium Density Residential Zone' will need to be referenced and included (where applicable and appropriate). AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The amalgamation of former residential zones under the Waikato and Franklin sections of the Operative Waikato District Plan into one 'Residential Zone' does not alone enable residential intensification and housing options close to and within existing town centres and urban settlements. The provisions of the residential zones do not sufficiently encourage housing choices that are necessary to support the social and economic demands of the Waikato District. The two proposed residential zones - Residential Zone and Village Zone - do not encourage sufficient housing choice and variety in residential built form to support changing demographics, lifestyles, rising housing costs, future housing demands and population growth in the Waikato District. There is no differentiation in height, bulk and density controls for residential activities in the Residential and Village zones. To this end, Housing New Zealand proposes an additional new Residential Zone 'Medium Density Residential Zone' is introduced into the District Plan around key centres and urban settlements. The proposed new zone will enable apartment, terrace housing and multi-unit	Reject	36

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				developments close to and around centres. This will support economic and residential growth in and close to town centres and settlements, and will provide certainty to landowners, developers and service providers for long-term investment decisions. All of which will improve the health and well-being of the wider community.		
FS1387.1036	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1297.13	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point to create the proposed "Medium Density Residential Zone" subject to changes to the minimum lot size and the application of the zoning to include the subject sites as per master plan provided in the original submission.	The "Medium Density Residential Zone" would allow for increase residential intensification and provide for a greater variety in housing typologies and lifestyle options. It is noted that 200m2 is not considered a large enough minimum lot size for this proposed zone and that instead the minimum should be 300m2. The application of the zone should also be extended to allow for zoning around neighbourhood centres rather than just town centres.	Reject	
FS1377.264	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities, housing types and zones.	Reject	
FS1202.53	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 749.107.	Density guidance can help achieve a change in urban form and support the viability of a range of transport options.	Reject	
749.108	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend the Objectives and Policies in Section 4.2 - Residential Zone to clearly state the outcome sought. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the objectives and policies of the 'Residential Zone' as notified. A lot of the objectives and policies read as an assessment criterion. Objectives and policies need to clearly state the outcome sought	Reject	39
FS1387.1037	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1377.265	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to improve workability and clarity.	Reject	
749.109	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.5 Daylight admission as follows: PI Buildings must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>37-45</del> degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary. RDI (a) A building that does not comply with Rule 16.3.5 PI. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: ... (iv) Privacy on another adjoining sites; and (f) <del>Effects on amenity values and residential character.</del> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the daylight admission and seeks a change to the height control plane.	Reject	8
FS1297.23	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provision so that the angle is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa, and Thames-Coromandel).	Reject	
FS1261.17	Annie Chen	Support	Accept submission point and amend the provision so that the angle used to calculate daylight admission is changed to 45 degrees.	37 degrees is more difficult to calculate and is unnecessarily restrictive. 45 degrees is a more commonly used figure for managing daylight admission. This is evidenced by the development controls in some of the residential zones of the surrounding areas (Auckland, Waipa and Thames-Coromandel).	Reject	
749.110	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Add a restricted discretionary activity provision to Rule 16.3.6 Building coverage that reads as follows: <u>RDI (a) Total building coverage that does not comply with Rule 16.3.6 PI. (b) Council's discretion shall be rested to any of the following matters: (i) Design and location of the</u>	The submitter generally opposes the trigger for consent on infringements to building coverage. Amendments are required to the residential zone provisions to better enable residential intensification at different scales and	Accept	6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			building; (ii) Provision for outdoor living space; (iii) Privacy on adjoining sites. AND Amend Rule 16.3.6 D1 Building coverage as follows: Total building coverage that does not comply with Rule 16.3.6 P1, P2 or P3. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	typologies. The submitter proposes changes are necessary to triggers for consent and matter of discretion.		
FS1387.1038	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
749.111	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.7 Living Court as follows: P1 (a) A living court must be provided for each dwelling that meets all of the following conditions: ... (iii) When located on the ground floor, it has a minimum areas of <del>80m<sup>2</sup></del> <u>30m<sup>2</sup></u> and a minimum dimension of 4m in any direction; and (iv) When located on a balcony of an above ground apartment, it must have a minimum area of <u>5m<sup>2</sup> for studio and one-bedroom dwellings, or 8m<sup>2</sup> for two or more bedroom dwellings</u> <del>15m<sup>2</sup></del> and a minimum dimension of <u>1.5m</u> <del>2m</del> in any direction. P2 (a) A living court must be provided for each minor dwelling that meets all of the following conditions: ... (iii) When located on the ground floor it has a minimum area of <u>5m<sup>2</sup> for studio and one-bedroom dwellings, or 8m<sup>2</sup> for two or more bedroom dwellings</u> <del>40m<sup>2</sup></del> and a minimum dimension of <u>1.5m</u> <del>4m</del> in any direction; (iv) When located on a balcony of an above ground apartment, it must have a minimum area of <u>5m<sup>2</sup> for studio and one-bedroom dwellings, or 8m<sup>2</sup> for two or more bedroom dwellings</u> <del>15m<sup>2</sup></del> and a minimum dimension of <u>1.5m</u> <del>2m</del> in any direction. D1 RD1 (a) A living court that does not comply with Rule 16.3.7 P1 or P2. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following	The submitter generally opposes the proposed living court provisions. The submitter seeks the minimum living court is reduced. This will enable better utilisation of the site for residential development. The submitter proposes changes are necessary to triggers for consent and matters of discretion.	Accept in part	29

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>matters: (i) Design and location of the building; (ii) Provision for outdoor living space including access to sunlight and open space and the usability and accessibility of the outdoor living space proposed; (iii) Privacy on adjoining sites; and (iv) The proximity of the site to communal or public open space that has the potential to mitigate any lack of private outdoor living space.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.</p>			
749.112	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 16.3.8 Service Court to read: P1 (a) A service court must be provided for each dwelling and minor dwelling, each with all of the following dimensions: (i) minimum area of <del>15m<sup>2</sup></del> 8m<sup>2</sup>; and (ii) contains a circle of at least 3m diameter. <del>RD1 D1</del> (a) A service court that does not comply with Rule 16.3.8 P1. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Design and location of the building; (ii) Provision for service court space.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.</p>	The submitter generally opposes the proposed service court provisions. The submitter seeks the minimum service court is reduced. This will enable better utilisation of the site for residential development. The submitter proposed changes are necessary triggers for consent and matters of discretion.	Accept	30
749.113	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 16.3.9 Building setbacks-All boundaries as follows: P1 (a) A building must be setback a minimum of: (i) 3m from the road boundary; (ii) <del>4.3m</del> 3m from the edge of an indicative road; (iii) <del>1.5m</del> 1m from every boundary other than a road boundary; (iv) <del>and 1.5m from every vehicle access to another site.</del> P2 (a) non-habitable building can be set back less than 1.5m from a boundary, where: (i) the total length of all buildings within 1.5m of the boundary does not exceed 6m; and (ii) the building does not have any windows or doors on the side of the building facing the boundary. <del>P3</del> P2 A garage must be setback behind the front <del>street facing</del> facade of the dwelling. RD1 (a) A building that does not comply with Rule 16A.3.9.1 P1 or P2 or P3. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Road network safety and efficiency; (ii) Reverse sensitivity effects; ...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.</p>	The submitter generally opposes the building setbacks and seeks a change to the building setback from every boundary other than a road boundary and from every vehicle access to another site.	Reject	5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
749.114	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.3.9.2 Building setback for sensitive land use AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes any rule for building setback for sensitive land use and seeks the deletion of all such rules in the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	5
FS1316.44	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 749.114 and amend Rule 16.3.9.2 PI as per submission point 693.7.	Rule 16.3.9.2 seeks to provide protection from reverse sensitivity to activities such as railway lines and or wastewater treatment facilities. Therefore we oppose the deletion of this rule and seek inclusion of a specific setback with regard to intensive farming activities as per submission point 693.7.	Accept	
FS1110.36	Synlait Milk Limited	Oppose	Deleting the setback for sensitive land uses has the potential to create reverse sensitivity effects on legitimate and lawfully established activities, many of which provide essential services to the community and are regionally significant infrastructure. This will have potentially significant consequences for the future efficiency of these activities, the effective functioning of settlements, communities and business. In addition, sensitive land uses may experience a lower standard of environmental quality.	The whole submission point.	Accept	
FS1322.15	Synlait Milk	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	Deleting the setback for sensitive land uses has the potential to create reverse sensitivity effects on legitimate and lawfully established activities, many of which provide essential services to the community and are regionally significant infrastructure. This will have potentially significant consequences for the future efficiency of these activities, the effective functioning of settlements, communities and business. In addition, sensitive land uses may experience a lower standard of environmental quality.	Accept	
749.116	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.9.3 PI (a)(i) Building setback - Water bodies as follows: (a) Any building must be setback a minimum of: (i) <del>20m</del> <del>23m</del> from the margin of any: ... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the distance setback from margin of any lake and wetland and seeks the distance is amended from 23m to 20m.	Reject	5
FS1387.1039	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
749.118	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision - General as follows: RD1 (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Proposed <u>vacant</u> lots must have a minimum site area of <u>200m<sup>2</sup> 450m<sup>2</sup></u> , except where the proposed <u>vacant</u> lot is an access allotment or utility allotment or reserve to vest. (ii) Proposed <u>vacant</u> lots must be able to connect to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater; (iii) Where roads are to be vested in Council, they <del>must</del> <u>should generally</u> follow a grid layout; ... (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to <u>any of</u> the following matters: ... (vii) <del>Consistency with the matters contained within Appendix 3.1 (Residential Subdivision Guidelines)...</del> AND Add a new controlled activity to Rule 16.4.1 Subdivision as follows: <u>C1 (a) Any subdivision in accordance with an approved land use resource consent must comply with that resource consent. (b) Council's control shall be reserved to any of the following matters: (i) The effect of the design and layout of the proposed sites created; (ii) Compliance with the approved land use consent; and (iii) Provision of infrastructure. ...</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the subdivision provisions. These provisions are restrictive and discourage the desired urban uplift sought in the district. Any type of in-fill housing development (i.e. build a second dwelling on an existing lot) or multi-unit development will trigger a consent requirement. The Proposed District Plan permits one dwelling per site. Subdivision consent will be required first in order to construct an in-fill dwelling. The submitter considers the minimum net size area for subdivision to be high and will discourage any new residential development including any in-fill type developments to occur. It does not encourage sufficient housing choice and variety in residential built form to support changing demographics, lifestyles, rising housing costs, future housing demands and population growth in the Waikato District. Amendments are required to the subdivision provisions as a means of better enabling and incentivising residential development in the district. Additionally the submitter seeks the decision of the residential subdivision design guideline from the plan.	Reject	33
FS1387.1040	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS114.31	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Not Stated	Support in part.	FENZ support in part the amendment sought but consider for that sake of clarity that the wording be amended as follows, to avoid lots containing existing buildings being excluded from the effect of the rule: (ii) Proposed lots (including vacant lots) must be connected to public-reticulated water supply and wastewater.	Reject	
749.119	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.4 Subdivision - Multi-unit development as follows: <del>RD+C1</del> (a) Multi-Unit development must comply with all of the following conditions: (i)An application for land use consent under Rule 16.1.3 (Multi-Unit Development) must accompany the subdivision or have been granted land use consent by Council; (ii) <u>Any subdivision relating to an approved land use consent must comply with that resource consent;</u> (iii)The minimum existing lot size where a new freehold (fee simple) lot is being created must be 300m <sup>2</sup> net site area <del>(iv)The minimum existing lot size where a new freehold (fee simple) lot is being created must be 300m<sup>2</sup> net site area.</del> (v) Where a residential unit is being created in accordance with the Unit Title Act 2010 it must meet the following minimum residential unit size: ... Studio unit or 1 bedroom unit 60m <sup>2</sup> <del>30m<sup>2</sup></del> 2 bedroom or more residential unit 2 bedroom unit 80m <sup>2</sup> <del>45m<sup>2</sup></del> 3 or more bedroom units 100m <sup>2</sup> (b)Council's <u>control</u> discretion shall be <u>reserved</u> restricted to <u>any</u> of the following matters: ... (ii) <del>Provision of common areas for shared spaces, access and services; ...</del> (vi) <u>Compliance with the approved land use consent.</u> Amenity values and streetscape; (vii) <del>Consistency with the matters contained, and outcomes sought, in Appendix 3.4 (Multi-Unit Development Guideline)</del> (viii) <del>Consistency with any relevant structure plan or master plan, including the provision of neighbourhood parks, reserves and neighbourhood centres;</del> (ix) <del>Vehicle, pedestrian and cycle networks;</del> (x) <del>Safety, function and efficiency of road network and any internal roads or accessways.</del> D1 Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 16.4.4 <del>C1</del> <del>RD+</del> . AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter opposes the minimum residential unit size in Multi-unit development. The provisions for residential subdivision are restrictive and discourage the desired urban uplift sought in the district. Subdivision consent will be required first in order to construct an infill dwelling or multi-unit dwelling. The submitter considers that the minimum residential unit size to be high and will discourage any new residential development to occur. The provisions do not encourage sufficient housing choice and variety in residential built form to support changing demographics, lifestyles, rising housing costs, future housing demands and population growth in the district. Amendments are required the subdivision provisions to enable and incentivise residential development. Reducing the minimum residential unit size will enable more units to be accommodate in a development and better utilisation of the site. The submitter seeks the deletion of the multi-unit development urban design guidelines from the Proposed District Plan, including any reference to such guidelines in a rule or policy approach.	Reject	13
FS1387.1041	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	v	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective,	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
749.120	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.5 D1 Subdivision - Boundary adjustments as follows: <del>RD1</del> (a) Boundary adjustments that does not comply with Rule 16.4.5 C1. (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Subdivision layout; (ii) Shape of titles and variation in lot sizes. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the activity status for this rule and seeks that the discretionary activity is changed to a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept	33
749.121	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.11 RD1 Subdivision - Road frontage as follows: RD1 (a) Every proposed <u>vacant</u> lot with a road boundary, other than an access allotment, utility allotment, or a proposed <u>vacant</u> lot containing a ROW or access leg must have a width along the road boundary of at least <u>10m ±5m</u> . (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to any of the following matters: (i) Safety and efficiency of vehicle access and road network; and <del>(ii) Amenity values and rural character.</del> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the proposed subdivision - road frontage provisions. The submitter seeks the minimum width is reduced. This will enable better utilisation of the site for residential development and create mores lots.	Reject	33
FS1371.39	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seeks that the amendment of Rule 16.4.11 RD1 Subdivision - Road frontage (a) and (b) contained within the submission point be allowed.	Will allow for increased residential intensity through amendments to the subdivision standards relating to residential development within Business zones to promote the development of compact urban forms. Will encourage design innovation in providing a variety of housing typologies within areas marked for intensification. Will enable consistency and clarity across the plan. Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will meet the	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.		
FS1134.66	Counties Power Limited	Oppose	Seeks that the submission point not be allowed.	The road frontage should not be reduced from 15m as it may create adverse effects on existing infrastructure and may also limit proposed infrastructure that would be located within road reserves.	Accept	
749.122	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.12 RD1 (a) Subdivision - Building platform as follows: RD1 (a) Every proposed <u>vacant</u> lot, other than one designed specifically for access, utility allotment must be capable of containing a building platform upon which a dwelling and living court could be sited as a permitted activity, with the building platform being contained within either of the following dimensions: (i) <del>a circle with a diameter of at least 18m exclusive of yards;</del> or (i)(ii) a rectangle of at least 100m <sup>2</sup> 200m <sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 6m <del>12m</del> exclusive of yards. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter generally opposes the provisions and seeks the minimum area and distance is reduced. The sought amendments will enable better utilisation of the site for residential development and potentially create more lots.	Reject	33
FS1387.1042	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
749.123	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Retain Rule 16.4.14 Subdivision of esplanade reserves and esplanade strips as notified.	The submitter generally supports this rule.	Accept	33
FS1371.40	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	Lakeside Development Limited seek that the amendment of Rule 16.4.14 RD1 (a)- Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips contained within the submission point be allowed.	Will allow for increased residential intensity through amendments to the subdivision standards relating to residential development within Business zones to	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>promote the development of compact urban forms. Will encourage design innovation in providing a variety of housing typologies within areas marked for intensification. Will enable consistency and clarity across the plan. Will promote the sustainable management of resources and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.</p>		
749.125	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend 22 Residential Zone to align with the activities and rules in the new "Medium Density Residential Zone" chapter sought. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.</p>	Certain rules and activities in the Residential Zone will need to be amended to align with the proposed Medium Density Residential Zone provisions.	Reject	36
FS1377.266	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support in part.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities, housing types and zones.	Reject	
FS1387.1044	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept	
FS1297.14	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Support	Accept submission point and amend 22 to align with the new "Medium Density residential Zone"	Consistency across the District Plan will be necessary to account for the proposed "Medium Density Residential Zone" so this submission point is logical.	Reject	
749.151	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	<p>Delete Appendix 3 Design Guidelines AND Delete all references to Appendix 3 in the Proposed District Plan as a consequential amendment.</p>	The submitter generally supports design guidelines for residential subdivision, multi-unit development and town centre in principle being utilised by Council to provide further detail and	Reject	32

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	guidance regarding best practice design outcomes, however, opposes any policy or rule approach which would require development proposes to comply with the design guidelines in the Proposed District Plan. Any requirements prescribed in a design guideline should be a specific rule or matter of discretion, not hidden in a design guideline. The design guidelines should be treated as non-statutory documents to inform design and development.		
FS1385.43	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury B	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure perspective. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1377.267	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	Design guidelines should not be used in all circumstances or treated as rules but may have some value for certain sites such as Havelock Village and should be retained.	Accept	
923.144	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Rule 16.1.2 P3- A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village as notified.	Submitter supports the rule's encouragement for location of retirement villages within 400m walking distance of public transport. Retirement villages are becoming an increasingly strong element of urban areas and are critical for providing aged care of the community.	Accept	22
FS1387.1541	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
923.145	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Rule 16.1.3 RDI- A Multi-Unit Development as notified.	Submitter supports the encouragement as drafter for multi-unit development in the residential zone to be located within 400m walking distance of public transport. Compact urban forms that are well connected to community and commercial facilities are to be encouraged, given the public health and well-being benefits that accrue.	Reject	13
FS1387.1542	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
923.146	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RDI- Subdivision- General to allow for more intensive subdivision in residential areas directly adjacent to the Business Town Centre zones at Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Pokeno, Raglan, Te Kauwhata and Tuakau. OR Amend the Proposed District Plan to apply a new alternative residential or mixed use zone or an overlay to the residential zone, or any other method, that includes objective(s) and policy(ies) that provide for a more intensive residential pattern around the Business Town Centre zones at Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Pokeno, Raglan, Te Kauwhata and Tuakau.	Submitter is concerned that applying the minimum lot size specified in Rule 16.4.1 RDI to areas directly adjacent to the Business Town Centre Zones for Huntly, Ngaruawahia, Pokeno, Raglan, Te Kauwhata and Tuakau will not enable the achievement of a range of the Plan's objectives and policies for the urban environment, including those related to housing choice; density aligned with the Future Proof Strategy; and promotion of subdivision, land use and development that encourages thriving, sustainable town centres, and integrates with and is supportive of provision of public transport and other infrastructure. This is considered inconsistent with WRPS Policies 6.1, 6.3 and 6.16 and Section 6A.	Reject	33
FS1387.1543	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1276.168	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed subject to restricting to suitable areas where amenities and the environment won't suffer.	Affordable housing is needed, but that such changes won't necessarily create it.	Reject	
FS1377.297	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential and a wider variety of densities, housing types and zones.	Reject	
923.147	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.1.1 P2, P3 and D1 as follows: P2 <u>Sound measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008 must not exceed:</u> (a) <u>Noise measured the following noise limits at any point within any other site in the Residential Zone must not exceed:</u> (i) 50dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq); 7am to 7pm every day; (ii) 45dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq); 7pm to 10pm, every day; and (iii) 40dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq) and 65dB (LAmax); 10pm to 7am the following day; (iv) 65dB LAFmax, 10pm to 7am the following day; (b) <u>The permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any other site where sound is received.</u> P3 (a) <u>Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801: 2008 "Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound"; and (b) Noise levels shall be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic Environmental noise."</u> D1 (a) <u>Sound that is outside the scope of NZS 6802: 2008 or a permitted activity standard; and (b) Sound Noise that does not comply with Rule 16.2.1.1 P1 or P2 or P3.</u>	It is preferable for noise limits to be district-wide provisions as they should be based on receiver locations/zones rather than based on source locations/zones. The proposed noise limits are generally in accordance with guideline values and use current measurement and assessment standards, acoustical metrics, numerical values, assessment location and time-frames. However, the following issues have been identified: - Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with the standards specified, - No provision has been made for sound sources outside the scope of NZS 6802, - The measurement and assessment standards are an integral part of the noise limits and cannot be a separate permitted activity standard, - No noise limits are specified for sound received in adjoining zones.	Accept	18
986.106	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P1(vii) Earthworks general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (vii) Areas exposed by the earthworks <u>are stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover 6 months of the</u>	KiwiRail also seeks that the rule relating to revegetation in certain zones be amended to include other available methods to stabilise the ground to prevent runoff, including building or hard cover development. As notified, these rules	Accept	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			commencement of the earthworks AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	are ambiguous.		
<b>81.3</b>	<b>Waikato Regional Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Permitted Activity standards for all zones for earthworks to provide for a minimum 5 metre distance from any waterbody or overland flow path, example of which is as follows: P16.2.4.1 (a)(i) Be located more than <del>1.5m</del> <u>5.0 m</u> horizontally from any waterway, open drain or overland flow path.	The Te Ture Whaimana o Te Awa o Waikato, Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River contains a number of objectives regarding the restoration and protection of the Waikato River, including but not limited to a) The restoration and protection of the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River, e) The integrated, holistic and coordinated approach to management of the natural, physical, cultural and historic resources of the Waikato River and (f). The adoption of a precautionary approach towards decisions that may result in significant adverse effects on the Waikato River, and in particular those effects that threaten serious or irreversible damage to the Waikato River. These provisions are supported by related provisions of the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (VRPS), notably Implementation Method 8.3.10. The provisions as written do not take a sufficiently precautionary approach to managing sediment loadings entering stormwater networks and waterbodies, such as: Managing earthworks in close proximity to water bodies, managing earthworks in a flood plain or flood hazard area and managing the revegetation of earthworked sites in a timely fashion. Amending (or adding) the conditions to provide for a more precautionary approach that minimises the risk of sediment entering waterbodies or stormwater providing a minimum 5 metre setback and 2 month revegetation period aligning with better practice earthworks management.	Reject	11
FS1293.7	Department of Conservation	Support	Support in part. Seek that the setback distances are increased to 10m.	The Director-General considers that an increased setback would support better practice earthworks management; however, notes a 10m would be more appropriate.	Reject	
FS1110.25	Synlait Milk Limited	Oppose	The increase in setback has not been sufficiently justified and within the context of a Heavy Industrial Zone may impact flexibility in the efficient use of the site.	The whole submission point.	Accept	
FS1139.97	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support		Amend permitted activity standards for earthworks to be located more than 1.5m 5.0m horizontally	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a waterway.		
FS1198.56	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full.	The relief sought is overly restrictive and unnecessary for many activities including prospecting and exploration.	Accept	
FS1322.34	Synlait Milk	Oppose	Disallow the whole submission point.	The increase in setback has not been sufficiently justified and within the context of a Heavy Industrial Zone may impact flexibility in the efficient use of the site.	Accept	
FS1342.38	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 81.3.	FFNZ understands the intent of the submission however, planning mechanisms such as buffer zones and setbacks should not be an automatic planning response. Setbacks should only be proposed for a specific purpose and to manage specific effects. The District Council has a specific function with regards to managing the effects of earthworks.	Accept	
FS1108.110	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support		Amend permitted activity standards for earthworks to be located more than 1.5m 5.0m horizontally from a waterway.	Reject	
FS1168.191	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Reject submission.	The submitter seeks a standard for earthworks in all zones for a minimum 5m setback from any waterbody or overland flow paths. Such an approach is arbitrary and is not effects based.	Accept	
<b>367.1</b>	<b>Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee</b>	Support	Retain Section 4.2 Residential Zone.	No reasons provided.	Accept	39
FS1386.544	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
<b>419.1</b>	<b>Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand</b>	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.1.2 P10 Agricultural, horticultural and viticultural activities, except for the amendments sought below AND Add the following activity specific condition to Rule 16.1.2	The submitter supports the provision of horticultural activities within the Te Kauwhata Area. The provision of horticultural activities as permitted activities should be extended to include all existing horticultural activities.	Reject	22



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>PI0 Agricultural, horticultural and viticultural activities:            (a) Must be within the Residential West Te Kauwhata Area; or (b) Must be in the area around Tuakau being north of the Waikato River, west of State Highway One and east of the Tutaenui Stream.            AND            Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission</p>	<p>There is a significant amount of land in the Tuakau area that has been rezoned from Rural to Residential Zone and which is actively being cultivated. As outlined in Schedule One, these horticultural areas play a significant role in New Zealand's domestic food supply and it is critical they be protected and that cultivation they be protected and allowed to continue. The submitter strongly opposes the rezoning of these areas.</p>		
FS1171.5	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	<p>This submission provides for the horticultural activities within the Te Kauwhata Area and Tuakau Area and seeks to address the rezoning of those areas for residential use. This submission is supported in so far as it acknowledges the critical role the existing horticultural activities in these areas has for New Zealand's domestic food supply and the potential adverse effects arising from enabling residential development that could remove these areas from farming or compromise the ability of the land is these areas to be used for farming.</p>	Reject	
419.2	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 16.2.1.1 PI Noise - General, as notified.	<p>There are a number of residential zones immediately adjoining Rural Zones, particularly around Tuakau and Pokeno. The submitter supports recognising, and providing for, the legitimate farming noises that will impact on these new and existing residential zones.</p>	Accept	18
FS1171.6	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	<p>This submission acknowledges the level of noise that may be anticipated within the rural environment. This submission is supported.</p>	Accept	
FS1316.42	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 419.2 in part with amendment as per submission point 693.8.	<p>Support retention of rule but with amendment to PI to make specific reference to intensive farming noting that Alstra Poultry have two existing activities located in the Residential Zone of the proposed plan.</p>	Accept	
FS1342.100	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.2.	<p>For reasons stated by the submitter.</p>	Accept	
419.3	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new permitted activity rule in Rule 16.2.4.1 Earthworks, as follows: Ancillary rural earthworks AND            Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	<p>Ancillary rural earthworks should be a permitted activity to allow for existing operations to continue where land is rezoned from rural to residential.</p>	Reject	11
FS1171.7	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission extent consistent with this further submission	<p>This submission proposes a provision for earthworks ancillary to rural activities as a permitted activity. This submission is supported in so far as it seeks to permit earthworks ancillary to horticultural activities.</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1308.34	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	The General Subdivision provisions and the associated title do limit the number of these lots that can be created within the Rural Zone.	Accept	
FS1342.74	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.3.	FFNZ supports the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Reject	
FS1388.174	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
419.4	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 16.2.4.1 RDI (b) Earthworks - General, as follows: <u>(xii) Measures to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on any adjoining Rural zoned land.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The potential impacts of earthworks on adjoining rural production activities is relevant given the expansion of the rural-urban boundary. Recognition of this as a matter to which discretion is restricted will assist in managing the new urban-rural interface.	Reject	11
FS1171.8	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. Reverse sensitivity effects should be avoided in relation to activities within the rural environment undertaken for rural production uses.	Reject	
FS1342.75	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.4.	FFNZ supports the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Reject	
419.5	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (v) to Rule 16.3.9.1 PI (a) Building setbacks - All boundaries , as follows: (a) A building must be set back a minimum of: ... <u>(v) 5m from every boundary adjoining the Rural Zone.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	An additional standard is sought to ensure adequate management of any new rural-urban interface. A 1.5m setback from all boundaries as proposed is not sufficient to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects that will arise a a result of the extended residential areas, particularly around Tuakau. The Rural Zone permits farming activities which includes spraying of agrichemicals for horticultural operations. Greater setbacks for those buildings in Residential Zones which adjoining Rural Zones will assist in mitigating reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1171.9	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes a 5m setback for buildings in residential zones, where 1.5m was proposed under the Proposed Waikato District Plan. The increased set back is supported to address reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	
FS1342.76	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.5.	FFNZ supports the relief sought for the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Reject	
FS1377.84	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL opposes amendments to the Plan that reduce development potential and impose greater restrictions.	Accept	
419.6	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (vi) to Rule 16.3.9.2 P1 (a) Building setback - Sensitive land use, as follows: (a) Any new building or alteration to an existing building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: ... (vi) <u>100m from any boundary adjoining a Rural Zone.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter seeks that additional clauses be provided to better manage the new rural-urban interface. There are many sensitive land uses that are incompatible with horticulture, such as schools/childcare facilities, health facilities and hospitals, retirement villages and rest homes. Greater setbacks should be provided to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	5
FS1330.25	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject Submission.	This proposed rule would compromise adjoining land owners rights to quiet enjoyment of their land and is too larger distance and does not take into account site characteristics.	Accept	
FS1342.77	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.6.	FFNZ supports the relief sought for the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Reject	
FS1388.175	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
419.7	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (vi) to Rule 16.4.1RD1 (a) Subdivision - General, as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: ... (vi) <u>Where the subdivision adjoins a Rural Zone, a buffer strip no less than 10m wide is to be provided along the boundary adjoining the Rural Zone.</u> AND	Given the significant rezoning of prominent horticultural land from Rural to Residential Zone, it is appropriate to include provisions which will assist in managing reverse sensitivity on high class soils and adjoining Rural zones. This could include requiring provision of buffer strips on Residential zoned land at the time of	Reject	33

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 16.4.1 RDI (b) as follows: (b) Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: ... (xi) <u>measures to minimise and avoid reverse sensitivity effects on high class soils and any adjoining Rural Zone.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	subdivision as an activity condition, and including reverse sensitivity as a matter to which discretion is restricted. This aligns with the proposed objectives and policies which seek to protect high class soils.		
FS1171.10	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. The provision of a 10m buffer between a new subdivision and adjoining rural land would assist in mitigating issues of reverse sensitivity and any effects on high class soils.	Reject	
FS1297.33	CSL Trust & Top End Properties Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point	This submission is supported. The provision of a 10m buffer between a new subdivision and adjoining rural land would assist in mitigating issues of reverse sensitivity and any effects on high class soils.	Accept	
FS1342.78	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.7.	FFNZ supports the relief sought for the reasoning outlined by the submitter.	Reject	
FS1377.85	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	HVL opposes amendments to the Plan that reduce development potential and impose greater restrictions.	Accept	
FS1388.176	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
466.5	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Oppose	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 16.2.4.1 Earthworks – General for Ancillary Rural Earthworks where existing commercial vegetable production operations have been rezoned residential.	Ancillary rural earthworks should be provided for as a permitted activity to enable the continued operation of existing commercial vegetable production operations.	Reject	11
466.6	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 RDI Earthworks to avoid reverse sensitivity effects on any adjoining Rural Zoned land.	The submitter supports this rule however considers that reverse sensitivity issues should	Reject	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				be addressed.		
FS1308.60	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We agree that this minimum setback is impractical, particularly as section sizes get smaller. It is often necessary to undertake earthworks to create the footings etc. for the foundation which would be within this 1.5m area and trigger resource consent.	Reject	
FS1388.401	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
662.5	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.2.4.1 P2 Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 16.2.4.1 P2 Earthworks - General as follows (or words to similar effect): Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform and accessway for residential purposes within a site, using imported fill material must meet the following condition:	Seeks to amend the permitted activity rule by expanding the coverage to accessway formation too. Supports the permitted activity status for earthworks associated with building platforms.	Accept	11
FS1387.98	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
689.2	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Oppose	Delete 16.1.2 P3 (a) and (b) Permitted Activities, relating to a new retirement village or alterations to an existing one.	There are many examples of retirement villages/facilities located on sites of less than 3 hectares. Retirement villages can range in their design including individual detached units, townhouses and apartment-style units in a multi-story building. A minimum site size of 3 hectares will add to urban sprawl rather than provide housing intensification close to existing town centers. Finding an area of land over 3 hectares in size in the Residential zone will be challenging, particularly within 400 meters of public transport (which does not exist in Waikato).	Reject	22
FS1387.282	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
689.3	Greig Developments No 2 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities as follows: <u>P13 Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings is a Permitted Activity</u> AND Add similar standards to Rule 16.1.3 RD1 (including proposed amendments) as permitted activity standards to new Rule 16.1.2 P13 AND Delete Rule 16.1.3(1)(RD1(c) Restricted Discretionary, which requires the minimum net site area per residential unit to be 300m2.	Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings should be a Permitted Activity. This will allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary Resource Consent costs and time delays where the effects could be managed through permitted standards. The construction of up to three dwellings on a residential site is unlikely to result in adverse effects provided the relevant controls can be met. The proposed addition to the permitted activity table will allow existing land to be developed more efficiently without the need to subdivide the land. The rule does not promote higher densities or compact development and will add to urban sprawl rather than housing intensification. Density should be appropriate to the physical attributes of the proposal. There is no analysis in Section 32 regarding this relevance or	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				practicality of this rule.		
FS1129.21	Auckland Council	Support	Support in part submission on 16.1.3(1).	Allow in part submission on 16.1.3(1)	Reject	
FS1387.283	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
695.13	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (iv) to Policy 4.2.5(a) Setback: Side boundaries as follows: <u>(iv) For property and building maintenance.</u>	No reasons provided.	Reject	5
695.14	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Oppose	Delete Policy 4.2.5(b)(i) and (ii) Setback - Side boundaries.	It is too restrictive. There are other reasons for reduced side yard setback, such as the presence of infrastructure.	Reject	5
695.18	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.10(c) Daylight and outlook as follows: Maintain and enhance attractive open space character of residential areas by ensuring that development is compatible in scale to surrounding activities and structures and has <u>generous compliant</u> on-site landscaping, screening and street planting, <u>as set out in design guide xyz as stated as being applicable to the proposal in that design guide</u>	The term "generous" is too open ended and has no context or reference. Council would have to develop a design guide to source will assist applicants with a specific requirements they are to achieve. Open-ended uncertainty frustrates applicants and leads to delays ad costs from arguments with Council Planners as to what represents a satisfactory outcome.	Reject	8
695.21	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Delete Policy 4.2.15(d) Earthworks. OR Amend Policy 4.2.15(d) Earthworks to refer to minimising earthworks to maintain the fundamental shape, contour and landscape characteristics where otherwise possible.	It is ultra-vires It lacks any comprehension of building and development requirements. Altering fundamental shape, contour and landscape cannot be avoided in some scenarios to achieve a suitable and safe building development outcome. If the intended outcome is to minimise earthworks then this is what the clause should state.	Reject	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1377.200	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support	HVL supports amendments that recognise that it may not always be practicable to maintain such landscape characteristics during urban development and there may be other ways to mitigate that effect.	Reject	
<b>697.84</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend 22: Residential Zone heading as follows: 22: Residential Zone – Rules	To assist in clarifying that all of the provisions within the chapter are rules.	Accept	22
FS1387.428	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>697.85</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend 22: Residential Zone Rule 16(2) as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Residential Zone are contained in Rule 16.4 <u>and the relevant rules in: 14 Infrastructure and Energy; and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).</u>	To clarify that the rules in Chapter 14: Infrastructure and Energy and Chapter 15: Natural Hazards and Climate Change apply to subdivision as well as to land use activities	Accept	22
FS1387.429	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
<b>697.86</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend 22: Residential Zone Rule 16(5) as follows: The Residential Zone contains a Specific Area that is Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct ...to the rest of the Residential Zone.	Grammar	Accept	22



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1371.15	Lakeside Development Limited	Support	That the submission made by Waikato District Council in relation to correcting minor grammatical errors to improve the clarity and accuracy of rules be allowed.	Lakeside Development Limited supports the proposed amendments to the Plan to help improve the clarity and accuracy of rules within the Lakeside Te Kauwhata Precinct. Will promote the sustainable management of resource and will achieve the purpose of the RMA 1991. Will enable the wellbeing of the community. Will meet the reasonably foreseeable need of future generations. Will enable the efficient use and development of the district's assets. Will represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.	Accept	
FS1387.430	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
697.91	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P3 (e)(ii) Permitted Activity A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village as follows: (ii)All other units – 10m2 with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres for each unit.	There is no minimum dimension for the service court.	Accept	22
FS1387.434	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>697.92</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.2 P4 (f) Permitted Activities Home occupation to read as follows: (f) For up to 4 people.	A maximum number of people is required for clarity.	Reject	22
FS1387.435	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>697.93</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.1.2 P9 Activity Specific Condition (b) Permitted Activity Home stay activity specific condition (b).	The condition is not relevant to the activity.	Accept	22
FS1387.436	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
<b>697.94</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activity a new rule as follows: P13 Childcare Facility For up to 4 children that are not permanent residents at the home.	Childcare facilities for up to 4 children should be provided for in the residential zone.	Accept	13
FS1387.437	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Neutral/Amend	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
697.95	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities table heading into read as follows: <del>The Council's discretion shall be limited to the following matters:</del> <u>Matters of Discretion</u>	Alignment with other zone chapters.	Accept	
FS1387.438	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
697.97	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.1.4 D1 Discretionary Activities to read as follows: Any permitted activity that does not comply with <u>one or more of the</u> a 'Activity-Specific Conditions' in Rule 16.1.2.	Consistency with other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.	Accept	22
FS1387.440	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>697.98</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.1.4 D2 Discretionary Activities.	This rule is not needed as it refers to Land Use Effects and Land Use Building rules which are in subsequent parts of the chapters.	Accept	22
<i>FS1387.441</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>697.99</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 16.2.1 (1) Noise.	Reduces duplication – this noise rule is adequately covered by points (2) and (3).	Accept	18.3
<i>FS1387.442</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>697.102</b>	<b>Waikato District Council</b>	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.3 PI Permitted Activities Glare and artificial light spill to read as follows: <u>Illumination from</u> Gglare and artificial light spill must not exceed 10 lux measured horizontally and vertically within any other site.	Consistency of wording with other zone chapters.	Accept	19
<i>FS1387.443</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>		
697.103	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4 Earthworks as follows: (1) Rule 16.2.4.1 – General, provides the permitted rules for earthworks activities for the Residential Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rule 16.2.4.2, 16.2.4.3 and 16.2.4.4</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that the rules in 16.2.4(2) apply instead of the general earthworks rule.	Accept	11
FS1350.91	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.	<p>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid earthworks provisions (submission point 697.6), Transpower's further submission point in response to Submission point 697.6 apply to the earthwork provisions listed. Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions relating to earthworks within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to earthwork provisions as sought in its original submission point 576.55. Note: It is not evident from the summary if there is a submission point applicable for Chapter 17. If so, this further submission covers that point.</p>		
742.19	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Policy 4.2.15 Earthworks, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 4.2.15(b) Earthworks as follows: Earthworks are designed and undertaken in a manner that ensures the stability and safety of surrounding land, buildings, <u>infrastructure</u> and structures.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.</p>	Policy 4.2.15(b) seeks to ensure that earthworks do not undermine surrounding land, buildings and structures. For the avoidance of doubt, add infrastructure to this list.	Accept	5
FS1345.42	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the NZTA submission.	Accept	
FS1387.849	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
742.21	Mike Wood for New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 4.2.18 Multi-unit development, except for the	The submitter supports the intent of policy	Accept in part	12

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	<b>Transport Agency</b>		<p>amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 4.2.18 Multi-unit development as follows: (a) Ensure multi-unit residential subdivision and development is designed <u>and located</u> in a way that: ..... (ii) <u>Addresses and integrates</u> with adjacent residential development, town centres and public open space; .... (iv) <u>Supports an integrated</u> Integrates with the transport network, including <u>access to</u> walking and cycling connections <u>to and the</u> public open space network; and .... (b)(iii) Promoting the safe movement of pedestrians and vehicles on site, <u>and between the site and the wider transport network</u>;</p> <p>AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.</p>	4.2.18(a)(iv) but suggests it is unclear exactly what is sought. For example, it is unclear how subdivision and development would 'support' an integrated transport network. Policy 4.2.18(b)(iii) refers to safe movement of pedestrians and vehicles on site but is silent about movement between the site and wider network.		
FS1387.851	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
742.22	<b>Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency</b>	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Policy 4.2.23 Non-residential activities, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 4.2.23 (a) (iv) Non-residential activities by replacing 'strategic roads' with the appropriate terminology consistent with the road categories described in Table 14.12.5.5.</p> <p>AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission</p>	The submitter supports the intent of Policy 4.2.23 and in particular the recognition that different roads perform different functions (4.2.23(a)(iv)); and that adverse effects on the surrounding transport network should be minimised (4.2.23(a)(v)B). The submitter notes that the term 'strategic road' is not defined in the Proposed District Plan.	Accept	16
FS1387.852	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
742.23	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.2 Noise as notified.	The submitter supports the intent of this policy, in particular clauses (iii)-(v). These clauses are consistent with the Transport Agency's approach to managing the reverse sensitivity effects from activities sensitive to noise on the state highway network.	Accept	18
742.24	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Policy 4.4.3 Artificial outdoor lighting as notified.	The submitter supports Policy 4.4.3(c).	Accept in part	19
749.1	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.8 Excessive building scale by changing the heading as follows: Policy - Excessive Building Scale AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.	The submitter supports the intent of the policy, however, does not agree the word 'excessive' needs to be included. The policy should focus on building scale and should not be qualified in terms of scale and size.	Accept	7
FS/387.988	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
749.3	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 4.2.18(b) Multi unit development as follows: Encourage the design of multi-unit residential developments to that promote the outcomes of the	The submitter supports the intent of the 4.2.18 Policy – Multi-unit development. The submitter seeks deletion of the multi-unit	Reject	12



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Waikato District Council's multi-unit development urban design guidelines (Appendix 3.4), in particular section 3 (site and context analysis), section 4 (movement, access and parking), section 5 (neighbourhood character), section 6 (street and public realm interface), and section 8 (communal open spaces and landscape treatment), in particular by: i. Responding to the immediate urban and built form; ii. Designing and locating Locate development to support connection to the surrounding context and local amenities; iii. Promoteing the safe movement of pedestrians and vehicles on-site; iv. Ensuring design is Be contextually appropriate and promotes promoting of local characteristics to that contribute to community identity; v. Designs that rRespond to and promote the public interface by the provision of: A. Streets and public places; B. Pedestrian safety and amenity; C. Side setbacks; and D. Variation in roof form. vi. Ensuring Provide a communal outdoor living court is provided where private individual outdoor living courts are limited.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan as consequential or additional relief as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission as necessary.</p>	development urban design guidelines from the Proposed District Plan.		
FS1387.990	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept	
749.5	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Support	Retain the Objectives and Policies in Section 4.4 Residential and Village Zones - Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour, as notified.	The submitter supports the objectives and policies of 4.4 Residential and Village Zones – Noise, lighting, outdoor storage, signs and odour.	Accept	18
751.3	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Support	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 16.1.2 Permitted Activities as follows: P13 Multi-unit development of up to	Multi-unit development of up to three dwellings should be a permitted activity and will enable	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			three dwellings is a Permitted Activity." with similar standards as Rule 16.1.3 RDI (including proposed amendments as permitted applied as permitted activity standards).	infill development and avoid unnecessary resource consent costs and time delays where effects could be managed through permitted standards. Construction of up to three dwellings is unlikely to result in adverse effects provided the relevant controls can be met. Will allow existing land to be developed more efficiently without the need to subdivide the land.		
FS1017.19	Gulab Bilimoria	Support			Reject	
FS1387.1067	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
751.4	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 16.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 16.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: A Multi-Unit development that meets all of the following conditions: .... (c) The minimum net site area per residential unit is 300250m2; ... (e) Total building coverage of the site does not exceed 5060%; ... Where multi-unit apartments are proposed apply conditions in 17.1.3 RDI.	Supports the provision for multi-unit housing as it gives effect to the strategic direction outlined in Section A and Chapter B.4.1. Achieves policies 4.1.2, 4.1.5, 4.2.16 and 4.2.17 Will allow for infill development and avoid unnecessary resource consent costs and delays where effects can be managed by standards. Provision should also be made for low rise apartments close to the centre and support Policy 4.2.17(a). There are a number of large sections within the older existing residential areas in Tuakau, Te Kauwhata, Ngaruawahia and Pokeno. These sites are close to the Town Centre and could accommodate low-rise apartments and multi-unit developments. The provisions of the Plan encourage a typical suburban form rather than medium density development. The minimum net site area does not support diversity in building types. The building coverage should be increased.	Reject	13

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1017.1	Gulab Bilimoria	Support			Reject	
FS1017.8	Gulab Bilimoria	Support			Reject	
FS1387.1068	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
751.5	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.4.1P1 (a)(ii) Earthworks - General as follows: Not exceed a volume of 250500m <sup>3</sup> ;	Where subdivision has been approved by Council and lots have been created there should be no requirements for land owners to apply for additional resource consents for earthworks to undertake permitted activities on the land. The earthworks thresholds need to be lenient enough to ensure the land can be developed without additional consents. Permitted land use standards should be able to control the adverse effects of any works.	Reject	11
FS1387.1069	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
751.6	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Support	Retain Rule 16.2.4.1P2 Earthworks – General.	Enables the creation of stable building platforms.	Accept	11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.1070	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
780.2	<b>John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society</b>	Oppose	Add rules to 22 Residential Zone to provide for protection of defined views from public places to the harbour, coast and natural backdrops and to include at least the following defined views: (a) from SH23 (north of Maungatawhiri Rd) to Kaitoke Creek (b) all existing views of the bar from Main Road, Bow St and Norrie Avenue (c) all existing views of Karioi from Raglan CBD (d) from Wainui Rd to the coast between the Bryant Reserve and the Bible Crusade Camp (e) from SH23 summit to Karioi (f) AroAro salt marsh from Wallis St. AND Amend the planning maps for any consequential relief required to give effect to this submission.	Rules in each zone are required to give effect to Policies 3.3.3 (a) and 4.5.14 (a) (iii). Views are a part of Raglan's character. Raglan Naturally makes various references to 'view'. The original submission notes these references in detail. RMA (Section 5) includes "well being" which was included in Raglan Naturally and this clearly includes protection of views. Raglan Naturally needs to be considered as a part of the district plan review. Other district plans protect views (Auckland and Hastings).	Reject	37
FS1329.9	Koning Family Trust and Martin Koning	Oppose	Oppose	The submission seeks to introduce rules that protect defined views. It is unclear in the submission what is to be protected and the extent of the viewshafts sought to be protected. The consequences of introducing protected views without specific landscape and visual assessment are unclear.	Accept	
FS1258.48	Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Disallow	The submission point does not provide sufficient detail to determine the precise spatial extent of the view protection areas and does not define what 'protection' means in terms of rules and policy framework. It is not possible to determine what the potential effect would be for structures, including infrastructure installations. In the absence of this detail, Meridian opposes the submission point.	Accept	
FS1269.63	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment; to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
838.1	Madsen Lawrie Consultants	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.3.2(a)(i) Minor dwelling to reduce the net site area required for a minor dwelling to 600m2.	Having a requirement for a 900m2 net site area to establish a minor dwelling seems redundant given that subdivision to allow two primary dwellings on site has the same net site area requirement. As a result, there should be a smaller net site area requirement for a minor dwelling. Multi-unit development in the residential zone allows 1 residential unit per 300m3. Such multi-unit development allows greater dwelling capacity. The net site area requirement for a minor dwelling would be more appropriate at 600m2 in line with a multi-unit development and the allowable subdivision lot size of 450m2.	Reject	13
FS1308.157	The Surveying Company	Support		This is consistent with our submission. A net site area of 900m2 is too large given the maximum gross floor area of 70m2 for a minor dwelling.	Reject	
FS1387.1365	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
838.2	Madsen Lawrie Consultants	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.4.1(a)(i) Subdivision - General to reduce the net site area requirement from 450m2 to 300-350m2 for subdivisions in the Residential Zone.	A minimum net site of 450m2 is too large to adequately reduce urban sprawl and provide concentrated areas of urban development. Higher density development in residential zoned areas should be promoted to preserve and maintain the regions land resources especially as land outside of residential areas is largely used for activities that produce economic gain for the district.	Reject	33
FS1387.1366	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
943.2	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.3.9.1 PI (a)(ii) – Buildings setbacks – All boundaries, as follows; (ii) 13m from the edge <u>centreline</u> of an indicative road;	Indicative roads have no legal boundaries resulting in planning location only. District Plan maps are not of scale that is useful in accurately determining a boundary. The centre of the indicative road provides a useful degree of variance.	Reject	5
943.3	McCracken Surveys Limited	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed Waikato District Plan to clarify what and where the Environmental Protection Areas are as referred to in Rule 16.3.9.4 - Building setback - Environment Protection Area.	Not obvious on map.	Reject	31
FS1387.1561	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
943.4	McCracken Surveys Limited	Support	Retain Rule 16.3.9.1 (a)(i) Buildings setbacks – All boundaries, as notified.	No reason provided.	Accept in part	5
FS1387.1562	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>943.5</b>	<b>McCracken Surveys Limited</b>	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.1 RD1 (a)(ii) – Subdivision – General, as follows; (iii)Where roads are to be vested in Council, they <del>must</del> <u>should</u> follow a grid layout; AND Any consequential amendments as required. Rule is far too restrictive.	Grid layout may not always be possible given topography that may require curvilinear layout. The word 'must' will result in a forced performance failure and fall to full discretionary.	Reject	33
<i>FS1387.1563</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
<b>943.6</b>	<b>McCracken Surveys Limited</b>	Oppose	Delete Rule 16.4.4 (a)(iv)(Table) – Subdivision – Multi-unit development. AND Add the Table from Rule 16.4.4 (a)(iv) - Subdivision Multi-Unit Development to Rule 16.1.3 RD1 – Multi-Unit development.	Table is not suited for subdivision rule. Areas are subject to land use provisions and not a result of subdivision.	Reject	13
<i>FS1387.1564</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
943.7	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 16.4.5 C1 (b) Subdivision – Boundary adjustments, to correct the inconsistency in terminology between boundary adjustment and boundary relocation.	Decision is required.	Accept	33
FS1387.1565	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
945.5	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add new activities to Rule 16.1.3: RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: <u>Establishment of a residential activity or use within 20m of a gas transmission pipeline. Establishment of a residential activity or use within 60m of the gas network (other than a gas transmission pipeline). Establishment of a sensitive land use (excluding residential activities) within 60m of the gas network.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	In order to protect the gas network inclusive of delivery points the submitter seeks to include a minimum setback between a delivery point and sensitive land use. The submitter seeks minimum setbacks between the gas network (excluding distribution pipelines) and sensitive activities to ensure the safety of the gas transmission network and the people living and working near this network.	Reject	22
986.116	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 16.2.7.2 PI Signs – Effects on traffic as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Any sign directed at <del>road-land transport</del> users must: ... (iii)Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections or at a level crossing; AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested- changes.	• Signs erected in the City should not have an adverse effect on the safe and efficient functioning of the land transport network, including railways, and the health and safety of road users. Traffic on the railway network will grow, and with more trains the issue of minimizing driver distraction is important to ensure the efficient running of the land transport network. • Further, signs should be restricted	Accept	21



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>where they breach the level crossing sightline areas developed from the NZTA Traffic Control Devices Manual 2008, Part 9 Level Crossings as sought in KiwiRail submission 67. • It is appropriate to restrict and prevent the placement of signs within required sight lines for vehicles access and intersections, and within the sight lines required for rail crossings.</p>		