

Appendix I: Recommendations for each submission

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
7.1	Jason Howarth for Howarth Consulting	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.2 (a) (ii) and (iii) General Subdivision, in relation to a 1.1ha lot size.	There is no rationale for 1.1ha. The shape of the Airport Noise Subdivision Control Boundary does not reflect the operational nature of larger aircraft using Hamilton Airport. The Air Noise Subdivision Control Boundary has no ground reference; the shape combined with different subdivision limits creates unusual and perverse outcomes. Plan Change 19 cited that Hamilton International Airport proposed schedules wide body jet operations on more than three occasions per week. This no longer occurs. There are no provisions relating to noise within the zone that address reverse sensitivity issues. There is a lack of operational knowledge of the airport when the boundaries were set. Current regional Air New Zealand aircraft conduct their visual approach west of the boundaries that have been set and the aircraft are conducting approaches in areas not inside the Air Noise Subdivision Control Boundary and over areas that have subdivided down to 5000m2. Current noise control boundaries do not allow for the visual approach of aircraft arriving from the south. The boundaries do not account for instrument approaches made on other navigational aids. Light aircraft operations are operating under visual flight conditions and account for 75% of all Hamilton airports aircraft movements between the airport and the river (See attachment to submission for full details). Traffic	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				management systems implemented by Airways Corporations have limited circuit training traffic to no more than 4 at any one time. Similar limitations on other training has also been limited to 4 by Airways Corporation. The noise restriction boundaries lack operational understanding. Air New Zealand operated on average 12 flights a day with last arrivals scheduled before 9pm. Aircraft noise is minimal as the aircraft are turbo prop and not jet or turbo fan. Other practical measures include landing and take off on the opposing runway.		
FS1253.27	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The Airport Subdivision Control boundary (ASCB) takes into account the airport operations occurring today in addition to the likely future operations and the noise effects that those operations will have on surrounding properties. The intention of this rule is to limit/maintain the number of dwellings that can be built inside an area where now or in the future reverse sensitivity effects may arise. Retention of the rule framework will ensure that properties within the ASCB are maintained at the current level and additional development opportunities/additional dwellings are not provided for. These rules are considered to be essential in managing the reverse sensitivity effects associated with the airport on the properties within the ASCB and should therefore remain in the District Plan.	Accept	9.1
FS1386.5	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	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1002.1	Tony Dickson	Support	There is no longer any need, nor rationale for the rule or the 1.1 ha section sizes Waikato Regional Airport have stated the original issue was potential reverse sensitivity effects of aircraft noise. Modern double glazing and insulation requirements remove these effects. This rule has been made redundant by modern building practices, and whilst good intentioned, no longer serves any useful purpose. The larger section sizes are irrelevant, as are the boundary lines which do not reflect actual flight paths.	The rule is redundant and the 1.1 ha section size irrelevant. If concerns remain over potential reverse sensitivity effects of aircraft noise, these can be addressed more meaningfully with double glazing and insulation requirements.	Reject	9.1
50.1	Gary McMahon	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RDI (a)(i) General subdivision to reduce the net site area from 5000m ² to 3000m ² .	3000m ² is appropriate for Tamahere because in future it will become a dormintary suburb of Hamilton and greater density of development will help to meet the demand. Waste water disposal is still possible with 3000m ² lots. This lot size will also be adequate to preserve the green open nature of Tamahere.	Reject	8.5
FS1287.2	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Blue Wallace seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.	The submitter agrees with his point as it is consistent with the Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd (BWS) submission and provides necessary flexibility for appropriate development within the Country Living Zone.	Reject	8.5
FS1308.73	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	A reduced minimum lot size will provide more efficient use of the urban land resource and will provide greater flexibility for countryside living developments. The reduced minimum lot size will also provide for a greater range of rural lifestyle living choices.	Reject	8.5
FS1386.38	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	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FSI365.1	Rosita Dianne-Lynn Darnes	Support	Support submission point 50.1 in part. Reduce the net site area from 5000m2 to 2500m2 instead of 3000m2.	I support the reduction in the minimum lot size for Restricted Discretionary Subdivision in the Country Living zone. The minimum lot size should be reduced to 2500m2 rather than 3000m2 to maintain consistency with the minimum sized section for Waikato Regional council effluent field requirements.	Reject	8.5
FSI379.6	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 water and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
50.2	Gary McMahon	Oppose	Delete the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary from Map 27.2.	The Airport Subdivision Control Boundary unnecessarily restricts subdivision and development potential of land within the area. The Airport Subdivision Control Boundary is unnecessary to protect in airport as reverse sensitivity issues are sufficiently addressed by building insulation requirements in the plan.	Reject	9.1
FSI253.43	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The Airport Subdivision Control Boundary (ASCB) takes into account the airport operations occurring today in addition to the likely future operations and the noise effects that those operations will have on surrounding properties. The intention of this rule is to limit/maintain the number of dwellings that can be built inside an area where now or in the future they could be annoyed by the aircraft noise by maintaining the density of the properties within the ASCB at its current level. The inclusion of the ASCB in Planning Map 27.2 is essential in managing the reverse sensitivity effects associated with the airport on the properties located within the ASCB and should therefore remain in the District Plan.	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
147.1	Haley Bicknell-McMahon	Oppose	Delete the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary from Planning Map 27.2.	The Airport Subdivision Control Boundary unnecessarily restricts subdivision and development potential in this area. The Airport subdivision Control Boundary is unnecessary to protect the airport as reverse sensitivity issues are sufficiently addressed by building insulation requirements in the District Plan.	Reject	9.1
FS1253.44	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The Airport Subdivision Control boundary (ASCB) takes into account the airport operations occurring today in addition to the likely future operations and the noise effects that those operations will have on surrounding properties. The intention of this rule is to limit/maintain the number of dwellings that can be built inside an area where now or in the future reverse sensitivity effects may arise. Retention of the rule framework will ensure that properties within the ASCB are maintained at the current level and additional development opportunities/additional dwellings are not provided for. These rules are considered to be essential in managing the reverse sensitivity effects associated with the airport on the properties within the ASCB and should therefore remain in the District Plan.	Accept	9.1
147.2	Haley Bicknell-McMahon	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a) (i) General subdivision by reducing the minimum net site area from 5000m2 to 3000m2.	A minimum net lot size of 3000m2 is appropriate for Tamahere because this area will become a future dormitory suburb of Hamilton and a greater density of development will help to meet the demand. Wastewater disposal is still feasible within 3000m2 lots. The open nature of Tamahere will be preserved.	Reject	8.5
FS1253.28	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The Airport Subdivision Control boundary (ASCB) takes into account the airport operations occurring today in addition to the likely future operations and the noise effects that those operations will have on surrounding properties. The intention of this rule is to limit/maintain the number of dwellings that can be built inside an area where now or in the future reverse sensitivity effects may arise. Retention of the rule framework will ensure that properties within the ACSB are maintained	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				at the current level and additional development opportunities/additional dwellings are not provided for. These rules are considered to be essential in managing the reverse sensitivity effects associated with the airport on the properties within the ACSB and should therefore remain in the District Plan.		
FS1386.127	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	8.5
FS1379.35	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 water and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
161.2	Martin Lynch	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.1 (Prohibited subdivision) to remove a blanket ban on subdivision of properties in the Country Living Zone within the Hamilton Urban Expansion Policy Area.	The submitter opposes the blanket ban of subdividing properties inside the Hamilton Urban Expansion Area as this is a blunt instrument which locks up value for the property owners for a significant period of time when there is the ability to design subdivisions to cater for future intensification at a later date. Prohibiting subdivision would have a material adverse economic and social outcome which goes against Objective 5.6.1 which calls for a balanced policy approach. Prohibiting	Accept	8.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				subdivision in this areas does not take into account the ability to future proof for residential intensification. A blanket ban would be a blunt tool which does not take into account the existing layout of Country Living Zones and whether future development would materially impact upon the long term strategy of protecting Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area. The proposed change does not reflect public consultation phases and is contrary to ratepayers' expectations and the submitter's.		
FS1386.137	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	8.4
FS1287.8	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	The Council accepts the submission and provides a mechanism to be able to subdivide Country Living contained within the UEPA.	The Submitter supports this point as prohibiting subdivision in the Country Living Zone UEPA is unreasonable given that provision for future urbanisation can still be provided at the subdivision stage of development. The submitter seeks that provision for Subdivision in UEPA is provided for, albeit with an expectation that a higher density concept plan is approved as part of the assessment process.	Accept	8.4
FS1379.40	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to delete the prohibited activity status of subdivision in the CLZ within the Hamilton UEA. The prohibited activity status is imperative in the UEA to ensure the objectives and policies for this overlay are achieved. Further fragmentation	Reject	8.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				through subdivision within the UEA will compromise the ability for the area to be fully urbanised in a comprehensive manner in the 8.4 future, as is anticipated for land within this overlay.		
FS1277.128	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Retain Rule 23.4.1 as notified.	As this land has been identified as future urban expansion, amending the rule to allow rural residential subdivision has the potential for inefficient use of land. This would not give effect to Policy 6.17 and Implementation Method 6.17.1 of the WRPS.	Reject	8.4
161.3	Martin Lynch	Not Stated	Delete the requirement for a 23m building setback apply to artificial water bodies in Rule 23.3.7 (Building Setbacks).	It is inappropriate for a setback to apply to artificial water bodies which have been developed for the purpose of adding character and amenity value on private property. The rule does not take into account elevation, screening and other material items. The rule prevents the provision of a small hut or bird viewing shelter which would be a great attribute for children and adults interested in conservation.	Reject	7.9
196.1	Derek and Colleen Hartley	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.2 RD 1(a) (i) and (ii) so that net site areas are not prescribed.	Rule should allow for discretion and subdivision to net site areas which do not materially/significantly affect the amenity values. Rule that creates the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary unnecessarily constrains subdivision potential of land within that boundary. Many sites in surrounding area are considerably less than 5000 m ² and do not materially or significantly affect amenity values of the country living zone. Councils section 32 report dated July 2018 acknowledges a balanced approach is most beneficial to achieve country living zone objectives. Report further states there must be recognition of having land too small for farming but too large to maintain as gardens.	Reject	8.5
FS1253.29	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The Airport Subdivision Control boundary (ASCB) takes into account the airport operations occurring today in addition to the	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				likely future operations and the noise effects that those operations will have on surrounding properties. The intention of this rule is to limit/maintain the number of dwellings that can be built inside an area where now or in the future reverse sensitivity effects may arise. Retention of the rule framework will ensure that properties within the ACSB are maintained at the current level and additional development opportunities/additional dwellings are not provided for. These rules are considered to be essential in managing the reverse sensitivity effects associated with the airport on the properties within the ACSB and should therefore remain in the District Plan.		
FS1386.191	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	8.5
FS1379.48	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
196.2	Derek and Colleen Hartley	Oppose	Delete the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary from the Proposed District Plan.	The Designation unnecessarily constrains subdivision of land within the airport subdivision control boundary. Designation does not significantly/materially	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				enhance the principles of the Country Living Zone. Enquiries with WDC cannot identify documents/evidence to support Zoning or Designation. The Noise from airport operations can be adequately protected by noise insulation techniques and rules for new dwellings. Existing lots less than 5000m2 have no impact on principles of the Country Living Zone.		
FS1253.45	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The Airport Subdivision Control boundary (ASCB) takes into account the airport operations occurring today in addition to the likely future operations and the noise effects that those operations will have on surrounding properties. The intention of this rule is to limit/maintain the number of dwellings that can be built inside an area where now or in the future reverse sensitivity effects may arise. Retention of the rule framework will ensure that properties within the ASCB are maintained at the current level and additional development opportunities/additional dwellings are not provided for. These rules are considered to be essential in managing the reverse sensitivity effects associated with the airport on the properties within the ASCB and should therefore remain in the District Plan.	Accept	9.1
249.1	Anton Marais	Neutral/Amend	Amend the title for the "Country Living Zone" for a more commonly used term such as "Rural Residential", "Low Density Residential", or "Rural Settlement Zone".	The Council should be seeking opportunities to align the Proposed Plan to the developing Draft National Planning Standards. The Council should use terminology that is more commonly used across the country. Country Living Zone is a legacy name and this is an opportunity to align with the future.	Accept in part	4.2
269.1	Catherine Wright	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.2 Minor Dwelling, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 23.3.2 Minor Dwelling to have a flexible location (in metres) between a minor dwelling and the existing dwelling.	Support in principle a minor dwelling of no more than 70m2 be allowed. Wish to provide accommodation that can be utilized for extended family when required. Submitter suggests negotiation on the siting of the minor dwelling with regards to the proximity of the existing dwelling. Otua and the surrounding area is very undulating	Reject	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and the 20m rule would be impractical in some cases. In the submitters case, there is a suitable flat area suitable to a minor dwelling however it is approximately 45m from the main dwelling and can be serviced by the existing driveway. The alternative site, which falls under 20m rule, requires some adjustment to the land contour and felling of some trees. Wish to provide accommodation that can be utilized for extended family when required.		
FS1386.273	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	7.3
280.2	Peter Nation for New Zealand National Fieldays Society Inc	Not Stated	Amend Rule 23.2.1 Noise to align with the Waipa District Council operative District Plan and implement the Environment Court Consent Order (see submission for copy of Consent Order). AND Amend the zoning to align with Waipa District Councils Operative District Plan to manage the Mystery Creek Events Centre and noise generation.	Implement provisions outlined in Environment Court Consent Order issued 28 July 1997 between PM & WR Lang, Waipa District Council, Waikato District Council and the NZ National Fieldays Society. Refer to Appendix C in the submission for Court Order. Court Order contemplated noise provisions in the Waikato District Plan. Provisions contemplated decibel levels between 40dBA and 50dBA and 55dBA during scheduled times. Rules incorporated in Waipa District Plan. Rules not incorporated in Waikato District Plan, believe to be an omission. Society considers WDC's agreement to introduce noise provisions set out in the	Reject	6.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Memorandum and Consent Order should be incorporated in provisions within the proposed Waikato District Plan.		
328.5	Paula Dudley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RDI (a) (i) General Subdivision, to be 3000m2 minimum site area rather than 5000m2.	As the submitter's property must also adhere to the various subdivision constraints imposed from the south boundary (historical reserve), west boundary (highway) and east boundary (SNA), it is more difficult for the submitter to meet the complex subdivision criteria. The complexity of the submitter's boundaries seeks flexibility on the net site area to 3000m2 to ensure a fair solution in optimising subdivision potential. Optimise division of land into smaller sized lots.	Reject	8.5
FS1386.386	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	8.5
FS1379.70	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
328.6	Paula Dudley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.1 P3 (c) Permitted Activities for	Safety concerns with public entry and	Reject	5.9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Operating hours of temporary events to be shortened with some flexibility during daylight savings.	activity(s) on neighboring historical reserve to property owners and residents. Safety concerns for neighbouring residents near public reserves.		
FS1386.387	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	5.9
328.7	Paula Dudley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.7 RDI (a) Road frontage to include more specific details on rules about what/how the number(s) of dwellings/lots/activities can determine the width(s) of a right of way and the 15m width is excessive.	An excessive width from the modest 7-9m width required for a property wishing to explore subdivision potential. Not enough information is provided in the Proposed Plan (or various public mediums) to property owners and residents on what/how the width of a right of way can influence and/or affect the number of dwellings permitted. A land acquisition involving the submitter's original privately owned right of way (approx. 9m) to be replaced with only a 7m, reducing their chances for any future subdivision potential.	Reject	12.1
328.8	Paula Dudley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.9 RDI (b) Subdivision creating Reserves to require consultation with neighbouring property owners directly affected by planning and implementation of public owned reserves.	The sharing of information between parties (council and owner(s)) can only improve the effectiveness on the operation of any public reserves. To be amended to also consult with affected property owners. To build relationships.	Reject	12.3
348.1	Julie Perry	Support	Amend to allow subdivision of the property at 55A Rosebanks Drive Tamahere into two titles of	Allow the submitters to purchase the land and build a family home. Allowing the	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			5000m2 and 3000m2.	subdivision of the land will accommodate a growing population and economic growth in my region. Minimal impact on the environment. The current site does not infringe on any other resident and is of limited use to the current owner. The proposed site has shared access. Accommodate the growing population and the demands of people wanting to raise a family in a semi-rural environment. Enables family to live close together. The site would maintain its rural character Economic benefits for the surrounding areas and businesses.		
FS1386.494	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	8.5
FS1379.91	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought, which would result in additional subdivision in the CLZ, for the reasons set out in its original submission.	Accept	8.5
FS1044.1	Julie Ann Perry	Support	Support submission point 348.1.		Reject	8.5
367.9	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Section 5.6 Country Living Zone.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	4.2
FS1386.549	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,</i>	Accept in part	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
376.3	Jolene Francis	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4 Subdivision provisions to permit additional allotments where appropriate for larger lifestyle properties.	In the next 10 years, at the current growth we are seeing, it is likely there will be increasing pressure from urban expansion out into the Waikato district, particularly in the northern part of the district. Provisions within the proposed plan should permit additional allotments where appropriate for larger lifestyle properties to allow fill in of current housing areas and ease the requirements for entirely new subdivisions to address a housing shortage.	Reject	8.5
FS1388.13	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	8.5
FS1379.101	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	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>and areas identified for growth.</i>		
378.1	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.6.9 Existing non-residential activities.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the policy as a number of existing fire stations in the Waikato region are within the Rural environment therefore provision to enable fire service facilities to continue to function, re-development, or if necessary, expand, they can do so grounded on an effects based approach.	Accept	4.7
FS1388.14	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	4.7
FS1035.106	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	<i>Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.</i>	<i>Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.</i>	Accept	4.7
389.3	Jonathan Quigley for J and T Quigley Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.6.2 Country Living Character, to include early childcare activities OR Amend related Objectives and Policies to refer to early childhood activities. OR Amend the definition of "Rural Activity" in Chapter 13 Definitions, to include early childhood activities. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to include all necessary, consequential or further relief required to give effect to the submission.	It is considered that the policy for Country Living character at it is currently written, would not clearly include JTQL activities that occur on the site. Day-care facility with spaces for up to 114 Children It is considered that the definition of "Rural Activity" as it is currently written, would not clearly include JTQL activities that occur on the site. Accordingly, it is requested that either the definition of "rural activities" is amended to clearly include JTQL's activities or the related objectives or policies need to refer to early childhood activities.	Reject	4.3
FS1379.104	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>HCC opposes the inclusion of 'childhood</i>	Accept	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				activities (daycare)' in the definition of 'rural activity.' One of the key purposes of the Rural Zone is to protect the productive nature of the land and to ensure non-rural activities are more appropriately directed to towns and other areas identified for growth. Non-rural activities within the Rural Zone can undermine the intent of the zone.		
389.4	Jonathan Quigley for J and T Quigley Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a clause to Policy 5.6.3 Subdivision within the Country Living Zone, as follows: (vi) where sites are in close to a village Zone, subdivision can be between 5,000m2 and 3000m2 unreticulated. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to include all necessary, consequential or further relief required to give effect to the submission.	Some activities are appropriate in the rural environment and the effects are to be accepted. To specifically include urban activities in the list of features in the rural environment where a site is in close proximity to an urban village is appropriate. It is important to ensure consistent direction in the objectives and policies in the Proposed Waikato District Plan relating to reverse sensitivity. Whilst JTQL is located in the Rural Zone, it is surrounded by the Country Living Zone, Residential Zone and adjacent to the Waikato Expressway. The Tamahere Village Zone is within 800m of the site and is therefore no longer appropriately zoned as Rural. It is important to also provide a policy basis to ensure that when considering applications to subdivide and develop in the Rural Zone and Country Side Living Zone, that the location of the subdivision itself needs to be considered in terms of reverse sensitivity mitigation. This will assist in reducing the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity instead of only mitigating them.	Reject	8.2
FSI 388.92	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	Accept	8.2

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.		
FS1379.105	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the subdivision of rural land near Village Zones/CLZ within HCC's Area of Interest. Fragmentation of rural land undermines the intent of the Rural Zone, regardless of its proximity to other zones.	Accept	8.2
389.5	Jonathan Quigley for J and T Quigley Ltd	Support	No specific decision sought, but the submission supports in part Rule 23.1.3 Non-Complying Activities.	Notes that in the Countryside Living Zone a Retirement Village is a non-complying activity yet the JTQL site has a consented retirement village (zoned Residential) across the road at 650 Airport Road. Therefore, the current zoning of Rural does not suit the JTQL site anymore.	Reject	5.15
FS1388.93	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	5.15
389.7	Jonathan Quigley for J and T Quigley Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (iii) to Policy 5.6.8 Non-residential activities, as follows: (iii) <u>Are in close proximity (within 1 km) to a Village Living Zone and include early childhood education.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to include all necessary, consequential or further relief required to give effect to the submission.	Childcare facilities should be considered as providing for the health and well being of the community.	Reject	4.6
FS1379.106	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the inclusion of 'childhood activities (daycare)' within close proximity to a	Accept	4.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				village of CLZ. HCC seeks objectives and policies ensuring land use within HCC's Area of Interest aligns with the key purpose of the Rural Zone, to protect the productive nature of the land and to ensure non-rural activities are more appropriately directed into towns and other areas identified for growth. Non-rural activities within the Rural Zone can undermine the intent of the zone.		
389.8	Jonathan Quigley for J and T Quigley Ltd	Not Stated	Add a new activity for childcare facility to Rule 23.1.1 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>P5 Child Care Facility A child care facility established prior to notification of the District Plan and within 1km of a Village Zone</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to include all necessary, consequential or further relief required to give effect to the submission.	JTQL is concerned that JTQLs activities may not fit within the definition of Rural Activity. There is no confirmation in the plan that a child care facility fits within activity. Therefore, the child care facility that has been legally established potentially is not considered as a permitted activity in the Rural Zone or Country Side Living. Village Living Zone appears to be the best zone for the JTQL site (25 Tamahere Drive).	Reject	5.5
FS1388.95	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	5.5
389.9	Jonathan Quigley for J and T Quigley Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.2(1) and D5 Discretionary Activities, as follows: (1) The activities listed below are discretionary activities, <u>unless in close proximity 1km to a Village Zone</u> D5 An education facility, excluding a child care facility for up to 10 children and P5 above AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to include all	Consideration for some of these activities given the proximity to the Tamahere Village Green, specifically D3, D4, D5, D7 and D9.	Reject	5.11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			necessary, consequential or further relief required to give effect to the submission.			
FS1388.96	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	5.11
401.1	Robert Hugh Maclennan	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7 Building Setbacks, to reduce the required boundary setback from 12m to 1.5m.	The current required boundary setback is now too restrictive on the current and proposed site sizes.	Reject	7.7
408.1	Godfrey Bridger	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 General subdivision, by reducing the minimum lot size from 5000m ² to 4000m ² .	The operative minimum lot size requirement of 5000m ² has existed for quite a while and needs to take account of change. Changing this to 4000m ² would enable the supply of sections in the Country Living Zone to transition to a slightly higher density housing. Reduces the likelihood of a pressure point.	Reject	8.5
FS1388.153	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	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1379.123	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
409.1	Riki Manarangi	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a) (i) General Subdivision, as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) All proposed lots must have a net site area of at least 5000m ² 30002m.	No reasons provided.	Reject	8.5
FS1388.154	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	8.5
FS1379.124	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
433.9	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game	Neutral/Amend	Delete Policy 5.6.7 (a) (iii) Earthworks. AND/OR	Assessing changes to natural water flows and established drainage paths is a function	Reject	4.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Council		Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	of Waikato Regional Council. Therefore, retaining clause (a) (iii) is considered a duplicate function.		
FS1083.6	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Support	Policy 5.6.7 (a)(iii) Earthworks should be deleted because is unnecessarily duplicates a function of the Waikato Regional Council	Allow the submission point in full	Reject	4.5
551.2	Dinah Robcke	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2(a)(i) General Subdivision requiring a 5000m2 minimum net site area to enable greater flexibility in subdivision development standards as they relate to the Country Living Zone in Glen Massey e.g. minimum net site area of 2500m2 with an average of 5000m2; OR Amend the zoning of the land on 859 and 889 Waingaro Road, Glen Massey that was zoned Country Living Zone in the Operative District Plan to Village Zone; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential changes.	Introduce greater flexibility in subdivision development standards in Glen Massey. 5000m2 development in the Country Living Zone is marginal/uneconomic. 2500m2 lots are able to be serviced onsite. Careful design will ensure character and amenity values can be maintained and enhanced. Land in and around Glen Massey is poor quality in terms of productive capacity. 5000m2 net site area is inappropriate for available land resource and creates pressure for 'infill' subdivision. Opportunity to develop subdivision standards for the Country Living Zone to enable innovative development designs to be explored (e.g. averaging, reduced minimum lot sizes).	Reject	8.5
FS1388.780	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	8.5
FS1127.3	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	In part. Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan. However, average lot size is opposed because it distorts the	in part	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			subdivision outcome.			
FS1278.26	Stuart Quigley and Quigley Family Trust	Support	Allow in part. 859 Waingaro Road operative plan zoning to be kept and extended to 233 Wilton Collieries Rd. Section is retained as notified or changed as per submission. Disallow in part. If property sizes are reduced to under 5,000m ² then this part of the submission should be disallowed.	A 5,000m ² lot size should be a minimum or you will lose the rural aspect, amenity and outlook.	Reject	8.5
551.3	Dinah Robcke	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.8(a)(i) Subdivision - Building Platform requiring 1000m ² minimum building platform sizes to enable greater flexibility in subdivision development standards e.g. building platform of 500m ² as they relate to the Country Living Zone in Glen Massey.	Careful design will ensure character and amenity values can be maintained and enhanced.	Reject	12.2
FS1388.781	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	12.2
FS1278.27	Stuart Quigley and Quigley Family Trust	Support	Allow in part. 859 and 889 Waingaro Road operative plan zoning to be kept and extended to and to include 233 Wilton Collieries Rd. Section is retained as notified or changed as per submission.	No reasons provided.	Reject	12.2
551.4	Dinah Robcke	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.8(a)(ii) Subdivision - Building Platform requiring average gradients to be no steeper than 1:8, to enable greater flexibility in building development standards as they relate to the Country Living Zone in Glen Massey; OR Amend the zoning of the land on 859 and 889 Waingaro Road, Glen Massey that was previously zoned Country Living Zone in the Operative District	Opportunity to develop subdivision standards for the Country Living Zone to enable innovative development designs to be explored (e.g. averaging, reduced minimum lot sizes). Potential for steeper areas to be set aside from development.	Reject	12.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Plan to Village Zone; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential changes.			
FS1388.782	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	12.2
FS1278.28	Stuart Quigley and Quigley Family Trust	Oppose	Oppose 551.4.	The flat and rolling land is best for farming land if land is over 700 acres and the steeper land is better for housing and lifestyle. Small farm units hold small number of stock units per area and this is what lifestyles are generally seeking. To enable a large enough section for a 3 to 4 bedroom home and enough land to be self-sustainable. This would keep the rural outlook and keep the village rural sections should be no smaller than 5,000 square metres.	Accept	12.2
564.1	Mark Chrisp	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.2(a) (i) - General Subdivision, as follows: (i) All proposed lots must have a net site area of at least 5000 3000m ² .	The 5000m ² minimum net site area results in a very inefficient use of land. It is contrary to the purpose and principals of the Resource Management Act 1991 and cannot be justified in relation to section 32 of the Resource Management Act. All of the objectives of the Proposed Waikato District Plan can easily be achieved with a minimum net area of 3,000m ² . A reduction in the minimum net site area to 3,000m ² will not result in the further subdivision of the vast majority of existing lots within the Country Living Zone that have already been subdivided for 'large lot'	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				residential purposes. This is because most of the existing lots that have already been subdivided are less than 6,000m ² and would therefore be ineligible for further subdivision. Many properties that are over 6,000m ² have a substantial dwelling located in the middle of the property whereby it would be impossible to further subdivide without demolishing the existing dwelling and it would be uneconomic to do so. The relief sought provides for a more efficient use of land in relation to any 'greenfield' subdivision. The relief sought provides for a reconfiguration of existing lots where the boundaries of two or more existing lots could be reconfigured to create one or more additional lots.		
FS1379.198	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
FS1308.77	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	A reduced minimum lot size will provide more efficient use of the urban land resource and will provide greater flexibility for countryside living developments. The reduced minimum lot size will also provide for a greater range of rural lifestyle living choices.	Reject	8.5
FS1127.4	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.		Reject	8.5
FS1388.814	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	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
590.3	Jenny Kelly	Support	Retain Policy 5.6.2(a) (i) Country Living character, and ensure it is not contradicted.	The Resource Management Act's liberal provision for resource consents have enabled this policy to be contradicted in Te Kauwhata. The Resource Management Act is a flawed system that required significant resources and expenditure under the guide of a democratic process. As for elected Council Representatives not being able to hear community concerns, relating to the planning process, because they are commissioners is farcical. This is not democracy.	Accept	4.3
590.4	Jenny Kelly	Support	Retain Policy 5.6.3(a) (i) and (ii) Subdivision within the Country Living Zone, and ensure it is not contradicted.	The Resource Management Act's liberal provision for resource consents have enabled this policy to be contradicted in Te Kauwhata. The Resource Management Act is a flawed system that required significant resources and expenditure under the guide of a democratic process. As for elected Council Representatives not being able to hear community concerns, relating to the planning process, because they are commissioners is farcical. This is not democracy.	Accept	8.2
FSI388.995	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</i>	Reject	8.2

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.		
626.3	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Retain the restricted discretionary activity status for general subdivision in the Country Living Zone and the matters of discretion for those.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	8.5
FS1144.3	Mark Glover for Kiwitykes Ltd on behalf of Glover Family Trust	Oppose	Null	8.1) The current district plan does provide an appropriate and efficient opportunity for rural residential lifestyle development. To provide for more appropriate and efficient land use there is significant other land areas available. 8.2) CLZ is not about efficient use of land for productivity in the opinion of Vineyard Rd residents. Lots were not purchased to be used for production or grazing. In fact, covenants were placed on the land specifically restricting what can and cannot be done. The comment "too big to be managed" is not relevant to the application for land zone change, this is the responsibility of owners to be managed as they see fit. Again, specific covenants require the land to be kept to certain standards. 3 8.3) The residents on Vineyard rd. do not wish to see a more intensive rural- residential lifestyle opportunity. The sections were sold, purchased and built in accordance with the current CLZ. a) A more intensive subdivision is not required to make the land more efficient, there is ample land available in Te Kauwhata for higher density living, see failed sub division on eastern side of Wayside Ave, specifically 24 Wayside Ave. b) A smaller site of 2000m2 would not provide an opportunity in Vineyard rd. it would severely fragment the current outlook in the form of sections having both singular rural houses next to over capitalized and developed 2000m2 sections. c) It would disadvantage those that have already built in accordance with current	Accept in part	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>covenants while advantaging those that have blank sections. d) In looking at District plan submissions for Te Kauwhata there are a number of submissions for higher density housing. 8.4) The comments of 'relaxation' pose serious concern for residents on Vineyard Rd. It has already been the subject to relaxations around telecommunications which has proved problematic and further intensive housing will increase the problem. 8.5) Kiwitykes ltd. Opposes that 2000m2 for on-site services is achievable for wastewater and water. There have already been numerous issues with drainage on Vineyard Rd with a number of properties struggling to drain themselves and other sections. A higher density would place further strain on the systems and would be to the detriment of those with 5000m2. It should not be the job of the large sections to provide drainage areas for the smaller sections which could happen. It is our understanding that the original subdivision size was a requirement in part due to stormwater management. 8.6) The properties on Vineyard Rd do not exhibit a compromised and fragmented character, this is the opinion of Vineyard Rd Properties Ltd. The current look is not relevant. The current look is because the sub division is still in its infancy and was only signed off for development in 2015. It would be unfair to consider the area mature after only 4 years. The submitter also wishes the WAIDC to understand that the sections were sold by Vineyard Rd ltd originally as 5000m2 sections to have 'a rural lifestyle' and that this submission is clearly around capital greed rather efficient land use. It should also be noted that Vineyard Rd Ltd. Is still advertising sections at 5000m2 somewhat misleading prospective purchasers. 8.7) There is no reason to treat Te Kauwhata the same as Tuakau or Te Kowhai, there as much dissimilar as they are similar. This is not about being fair and consistent across towns but fair and consistent to those people affected. 8.8) It could be argued that</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Te Kauwhata does not have the required infrastructure to absorb the increased density. Whilst the motorway may afford the current rd. on Vineyard rd. is not suitable for higher density traffic. Education facilities are currently at maximum, there is only 1 playground in Te Kauwhata and shopping somewhat limited. Most residents in Te Kauwhata do not do their main shopping here but travel some distance to either Pukekohe, Huntly or Hamilton. Vineyard Rd also does not have telecommunication provisions as it was signed off as a wireless telecommunication resource consent. Even with current density of houses the service is basically unusable and placing more houses at a higher density will only negatively impact further. 8.9) Te Kauwhata may be a 'spill over' area for Auckland, however with the Winton group placing high density housing at Lakeside and land available on Wayside Ave. for development, high density 4 housing is not needed on Vineyard rd. as other land is available. It is also noted how many other areas have submissions currently for increased density housing in Te Kauwhata. 8.10) A greater mass of rate payers to contribute is available in other land. This is clearly a grab at the Council 'carrot' to tempt the council into higher density land zone which is not needed here. Lakeside will provide the critical mass required should it be successful. See point 8.3 (c) There are enough submissions by other parties in Te Kauwhata to provide for higher density houses. 8.11) Kivitykes Ltd is not convinced that on site servicing can be achieved in this area on 2000m2 sections due to the local effects of drainage. It is also not convinced that open space, rural views and landscaped areas can be achieved due to restriction of views by higher density of housing. 8.12) Kivitykes ltd. Also asserts that it is unclear what the effects of property values would be by mixing the sections, however its likely to devalue the property in the opinion of the submitter due to the mismatch of housing. Vineyard Rd property</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Ltd asserts that there is a fragmented look on Vineyard Rd which Kiwitykes Ltd disagrees with. It is more likely that if the area was rezoned that a fragmented look would ensue mixing high density and lifestyle look. 9.0) That overall this will have a negative impact on our amenity value compromising our property values. 9.1) The sections were purchased on the understanding of 5000m2, a change to this will negatively impact on our space character 9.2) Land for higher density housing is available in a number of locations in Te Kauwhata, such as Wayside Ave, The Lakeside development and east of Te Kauwhata in the Swan Rd development. See point 8.3 (c) Again there are a number of applications for higher density housing in Te Kauwhata. 9.3) It seems unfair that this needs to be retrospectively opposed. There has been no notification to Vineyard rd residents. 9.4) This will have a negative impact on the current covenants on the land, and in most cases will not be able to comply with. 9.5) Increased traffic and safety concerns such as no lighting, no footpaths and no parking areas. 9.6) Increased noise from housing and also traffic. 9.7) Increased storm water run-off due to impermeable surfaces. A significant part of the original subdivision sign-off for 5000m2 was the ability for each section to independently manage its own stormwater. Increased density will increase catchment and runoff whilst also reducing the size of sections to be able to manage. The Waikato Regional Council should be consulted with respect to stormwater issues. There are considerations around catchment as well as discharge and in particular the quality of water being discharged to the Whangamarino Wetlands. Kiwitykes Ltd. Formally requests that the WAIDC request the Waikato Regional Council to do due diligence on the existing subdivision to ensure that we do not create any unforeseen issues. 9.8) Increased and additional expenses to existing properties to manage storm water run off 9.9) Current poor connectivity to telecommunication</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				services and a higher demand on rural (wireless) broadband services make render an already poor service virtually unusable. 5 9.10) Overshadowing and loss of privacy for current residents. 10) Overall it appears to Kivitykes Ltd. That this is a retrospective grab from the developer. The sections were sold at 5000m2 and a change to 2000m2 can only be seen as a cash grab to sell more sections at a similar price while packaging up the submission to the WAIDC as increased efficient use of land and an increase of rate retrieval. It should also be noted that the developer is still selling sections at 5000m2 telling prospective buyers that this is what they are buying into. This is clearly deceitful and misleading. The overall net effects of the decision would be negative to all properties and owners on Vineyard Rd. That this area has already been re-zoned once and given a formal status for sub-division and should not be done again.		
FS1387.22	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 in part	8.5
FS1133.2	Dave Roebeck	Oppose	same points as 626.3	same points as 626.3	Accept in part	8.5
662.3	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.3 Subdivision within the Country Living Zone, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.6.3(a)(i) Subdivision within the	The word "avoid" is absolute and will restrict flexibility in subdivision design. The submitter supports in part Policy 5.6.3 to the extent that Country Living Zones may intensify (residentially)	Reject	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Country Living Zone as follows: (i) The creation of undersized lots is avoided <u>discouraged</u> where character and amenity are compromised;	thus providing an element of future proofing into the zone. Amendments are needed to create undersize allotments in appropriate instances.		
FS1387.96	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	8.2
FS1379.226	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to amend Policy 5.6.3 Subdivision within the CLZ. It is not appropriate to allow more flexible subdivision provisions within the CLZ (i.e. more subdivision). Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton.	Accept	8.2
696.2	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.1 Permitted Activities, to include a small-scale childcare as a permitted activity.	Small-scale childcare offers a vital social service to the community. Small-scale childcare has no effects greater than a large family. The activity is appropriate in the Country Living Zone. Inclusion of small-scale childcare as a separate activity will clarify the distinction between home occupations (which are permitted) and education facility (which currently requires consent as a Discretionary activity).	Reject	5.5
FS1387.379	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,	Accept	5.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
696.5	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.3.6 PI Building coverage, as follows: The total building coverage must not exceed 10% or 300-m ² 400m ² , whichever is the larger.	This is a consequential amendment to enabling a smaller minimum site size. It will still enable a useable gross floor area of principal dwelling, minor dwelling and accessory buildings. It will still ensure an open and spacious character is in accordance with the large lot residential form of the Country Living Zone.	Reject	7.6
FS1387.382	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	7.6
696.6	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.2 Minor dwelling, including the following aspects: (a) A single minor dwelling is a permitted activity; (b) 70m ² as the maximum gross floor area (c) The absence of limitations on the type of person occupying the minor dwelling (e.g. dependent family member); (d) Absence of provisions requiring the minor dwelling to be temporary.	Minor dwellings provide housing choice, particularly when families are changing in their makeup. Minor dwellings provide an affordable option for housing. The limit on the size ensures they will be secondary to the primary dwelling. For the elderly, minor dwellings enable independent living, while still being close enough to family to have supported living. In terms of effects,	Accept	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				particularly with the size limit, they are no different to a sleepout. The effects and their occupancy rate are no different to a large primary dwelling.		
FS1387.383	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	7.3
696.9	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.7.2 P1 (a) (ii) Building setback - sensitive land use.	15m setback from a national route or regional arterial boundary is an appropriate minimum setback to mitigate against noise and vibration effects generated from the State Highway.	Accept	7.8
724.3	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.1 P4 Permitted Activities - home occupations, by replacing the notified conditions with the conditions for home occupations in this zone as set out in the Waikato Section of the Operative Waikato District Plan.	The notified conditions will result in the amenity of the Countryside Living Zone being degraded. This is because these conditions: - defer to the infrastructure requirements in Chapter 14 Infrastructure; - allow home occupations to operate up to 9pm; - set no limit on daily vehicle movements or heavy vehicle movements; and - do not manage interference with neighbours' televisions, radios, telephones or electronic equipment. The aspects of Rule 23.1.1 P4 that are supported: - The removal of the 40m ² gross floor area limit. - The requirement for the activity to be wholly contained in the dwelling or ancillary building.	Reject	5.10
FS1387.801	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission,	Accept	5.10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	D			neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
724.4	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.6 Building coverage, which permits up to 10% building coverage or 300m ² , whichever is the larger.	The alternative limit of 300m ² provides flexibility for development on smaller land holdings (eg: 2500m ²), rather than the previous 10%. Recognises that building coverage is subject also to the impervious surface rules and building setback rules.	Accept	7.6
FS1387.802	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	7.6
724.6	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Support	Retain Rule 23.4.2 RDI (a) (i) General Subdivision, which specifies a minimum net site area of 5000m ² .	No reasons provided.	Accept	8.5
FS1387.803	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	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>therefore not clear from a land use management 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>		
FS1379.280	Hamilton City Council	Support	Null	HCC supports the submission to retain the general subdivision rule 23.4.3 RD1 in the CLZ which specifies a minimum lot size of 5000 sq.m. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton.	Accept	8.5
724.7	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.2 (a)(ii) General Subdivision, which is the requirement for an average site area of 1.1ha where the land to be subdivided is located within the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary.	This requirement seems redundant given the amount of intensification that has occurred in the Countryside Living Zone. It only affects a very small area within this zone, there has been no opposition from the many landowners who already reside on existing 5000m2 sites within the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary, a lot size of 1.1ha is difficult to maintain and consistency is required with the 5000m2 lot size required outside of this restricted area.	Reject	9.1
FS1253.31	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The Airport Subdivision Control boundary (ASCB) takes into account the airport operations occurring today in addition to the likely future operations and the noise effects that those operations will have on surrounding properties. The intention of this rule is to limit/maintain the number of dwellings that can be built inside an area where now or in the future reverse sensitivity effects may arise. Retention of the rule framework will ensure that properties within the ACSB are maintained at the current level and additional development opportunities/additional dwellings are not	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>provided for. These rules are considered to be essential in managing the reverse sensitivity effects associated with the airport on the properties within the ACSB and should therefore remain in the District Plan.</i>		
FS1387.804	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	9.1
735.2	Cindy and Tony Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a) (i) General Subdivision, to read as follows: All proposed lots must have a net site area of at least 5000 <u>3000</u> m ² .	There is no need or justification for a 5000m ² minimum lot size. The residents living in these areas have urban expectations and struggle maintaining 5000m ² . The Country Living Zone is actually a large lot residential and is not a rural zone, and a smaller site size is more in accordance with this housing and living choice. Reducing the minimum lot size will enable more efficient use of the land. Aligns more clearly with the 2500m ² minimum site size required for on-site wastewater management. Still enables an open and spacious character, in accordance with the large lot residential form of the Country Living Zone.	Reject	8.5
FS1387.817	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</i>	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1379.281	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth	Accept	8.5
735.3	Cindy and Tony Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.3.6 P1 Building coverage, to read as follows: The total building coverage must not exceed 10% or 300m² <u>500m²</u> , whichever is the larger.	This is a consequential amendment to enabling a smaller minimum site size. It will still enable a useable gross floor area of principal dwelling, minor dwelling and accessory buildings. It will still ensure an open and spacious character in accordance with the large lot residential form of the Country Living Zone.	Reject	7.6
FS1387.818	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	7.6
735.4	Cindy and Tony Young	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.2 Minor dwelling.	Support the rule, particularly the retention	Accept	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				of a new single minor dwelling as a permitted activity on each site, 70m2 as the maximum size gross floor area, that there is no limitation on the type of person occupying the dwelling, and enabling minor dwellings to be permanent. Minor dwellings provide housing choice, particularly when families are changing in their makeup. Minor dwellings provide an affordable option for housing. The limit on the size ensures they will be secondary to the primary dwelling. For the elderly, minor dwellings enable independent living, while still being close enough to family to have supported living. In terms of effects, particularly with the size limit, they are no different to a sleepout. The effects and their occupancy rate are no different to a large primary dwelling.		
FS1387.819	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	7.3
735.7	Cindy and Tony Young	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.3.6 PI Building Coverage, to increase the permitted building coverage limits.	For genuine rural enterprises, accessory buildings such as hay sheds, stables, garages, tractor sheds are necessary. The proposed limit of 2% or 500m2 (whichever is the larger) is too constraining to enable the level of buildings required to support rural production activities.	Reject	7.6
FS1387.822	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor</i>	Accept	7.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
741.2	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Neutral/Amend	<p>Delete Rule 23.4.2 General subdivision RDI (a)(ii), (a)(iii), (b) and NCI; AND Add a new prohibited subdivision rule in Rule 23.4.1 Prohibited subdivision as follows: PR2 (a) <u>Any subdivision inside the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary or inside the SEL95 Boundary identified on the planning maps where the average net site area is less than 1.1ha. (b) Where the land is being subdivided straddles the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary any subdivision that creates more lots than the number calculated by the following formula. Number of new lots = (area(ha) outside the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary / 0.5) + (area (ha) inside the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary / 1.1).</u> AND Any further relief and/or amendments to the Proposed Plan as may be necessary.</p>	<p>This prohibited subdivision rule for subdivision inside the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary or inside the SEL95 Boundary is in the Operative District Plan. There is no change to resource management issues to suggest that the Proposed Plan should be any different. The issue is the potential reverse sensitivity effects of aircraft noise on residential development. The prohibited subdivision rules have been in the Waikato District Plan since about 2001 when they were developed by Waikato Regional Airport Ltd in consultation with Waikato District Council and a group of Tamahere landowners. The rules are designed to maintain the density of development within the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary generally at its current level. To relax this subdivision rule and allow a higher density could lead to additional houses being built in an area where they are subject to adverse noise effects from aircraft and could exacerbate reverse sensitivity conflicts. The prohibited activity subdivision rule was the subject of scrutiny and decision making in 2001 and again in 2011 as part of Variation 14 to the Waikato District Plan. The inclusion of the prohibited subdivision rule will: i) be</p>	Reject	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				consistent with the purpose and principles of the RMA ii) promote the sustainable management of natural and physical resources iii) enable people to provide for their social and economic well-being iv) meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations v) be consistent with sound resource management practices.		
FS1387.832	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	9.1
754.2	Pieter Van Leeuwen	Neutral/Amend	Amend 23.4.2 RD1 (a) (i)-General Subdivision to read as follows: All proposed lots must have a net site area of at least 5000 3000m2.	There is no need or justification for a 5000m2 minimum lot size. Residents living in these areas have urban expectations and struggle maintaining 5000m2. Country Living Zone is actually a large lot residential and not a rural zone. Smaller site size is more in accordance with such housing and living choice. Reducing minimum lot size will enable more efficient use of land. Aligns more clearly with the 2500m2 minimum site size required for on-site wastewater management. Enables an open and spacious character, in accordance with large lot residential form of Country Living Zone.	Reject	8.5
FS1379.301	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.		
FS1387.1102	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	8.5
754.3	Pieter Van Leeuwen	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.3.6 P1- Building Coverage to read as follows: The total building coverage must not exceed 10% or 300 400m ² , whichever is the larger.	This is a consequential amendment to enabling a smaller minimum site size. Still enable a useable gross floor area of principal dwelling, minor dwelling and accessory buildings. Will still ensure an open and spacious character is accordance with the large lot residential form of the Country Living Zone.	Reject	7.6
FS1387.1103	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	Accept	7.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
754.4	Pieter Van Leeuwen	Support	Retain the following aspects of Rule 23.3.2 Minor dwelling: Permitted activity status; 70m2 maximum gross floor area; Conditions for the minor dwelling; Absence of limitations on the type of person occupying the minor dwelling; and Enabling the minor dwellings to be permanent buildings.	Minor dwellings provide housing choice, particularly when the families are changing their makeup. Minor dwellings provide an affordable option for housing. Minor dwellings provide the elderly with independent living whilst maintaining a close distance to family for supported living. The effects are not different from that of a sleep out. In terms of additional occupancy, the effects and their occupancy rate are no different to a large primary dwelling. The limits of size ensure they are secondary to the primary household.	Accept	7.3
FS1387.1104	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	7.3
754.7	Pieter Van Leeuwen	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.7.2 P1 (a) (ii) Building setback sensitive land use, as notified.	15m setback from a national route or regional arterial boundary is an appropriate minimum setback to mitigate against noise and vibration effects generated from the State Highway.	Accept	7.8
FS1387.1107	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</i>	Reject	7.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
754.8	Pieter Van Leeuwen	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.3.6 PI Building coverage to increase the permitted building coverage limits.	For genuine rural enterprises, accessory buildings (e.g. hay shed, stables, garages, tractor sheds) are necessary. The proposed limit of 2% or 500m ² (whichever is the larger) is too constraining to enable the level of buildings required to support rural production activities.	Reject	7.6
FS1387.1108	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	7.6
820.1	Leo Koppens	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a) (ii) and (iii) General subdivision, so the minimum lot area defaults to 5,000m ² .	The rule is now redundant. Only a limited number of lots that can be subdivided if this rule were to change as per the relief sought. Lots of 1.1 or in many cases 2.0 are difficult to manage. What are owners meant to do with grass paddocks.	Reject	9.1
FS1253.32	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The Airport Subdivision Control boundary (ASCB) takes into account the airport operations occurring today in addition to the likely future operations and the noise effects	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				that those operations will have on surrounding properties. The intention of this rule is to limit/maintain the number of dwellings that can be built inside an area where now or in the future reverse sensitivity effects may arise. Retention of the rule framework will ensure that properties within the ACSB are maintained at the current level and additional development opportunities/additional dwellings are not provided for. These rules are considered to be essential in managing the reverse sensitivity effects associated with the airport on the properties within the ACSB and should therefore remain in the District Plan.		
FS1387.1303	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	9.1
845.6	Grace M Wilcock	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 23.4 Subdivision similar to Policy 3.2.8 (Natural Environment - Incentivise subdivision); AND Amend Policy 3.2.8 Incentivise subdivision, to apply to the Country Living Zone.	Property owners in the Country Living Zone are equally affected by this new environmental policy.	Reject	12.7
FS1387.1385	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	Accept	12.7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
875.2	DPI 2014 Limited	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission recognises that the importation of fill to enable residential development is appropriate in Rule 23.2.3.1 Earthworks - General, and questions whether this would be a permitted activity (P2) or a non-complying activity (NC1).	These provisions seem workable but the submitter is interested in the thoughts of other submitters. Clean-fill may be required in residential zones to enable green-field land to be developed for residential purposes. It is unclear to the submitter whether it is P2 permitted activity or NC1 non-complying activity. NC1 would be too restrictive and needs to be more lenient to enable green-field development within residential zones.	Reject	6.6
875.3	DPI 2014 Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RDI(a)(i) General Subdivision, as follows: (i) All proposed lots must have a <u>minimum net site area of at least 3000m2 and average net size area of 5000m2.</u>	A blanket minimum lot size can present challenges when designing a subdivision where there are different parent lot shapes, sizes and topographical/vegetative/other constraints. Incorporating a minimum net size area and average net size area for subdivision will provide for greater flexibility in the instances where physical constraints exist. 5000m2 is an awkward size to maintain for some people, being too large to maintain the large curtilage area but too small to have stock grazing. An average net size area of 5000m2 would maintain the amenity values of the Country Living Zone, whilst a minimum net site area of 3000m2 would provide a variety of housing living styles and greater flexibility in the instances where physical constraints exist.	Reject	8.5
FS1387.1445	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	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1379.357	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
876.2	Turtle Nut Farm Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RD1(a)(i) General Subdivision, as follows: (i) All proposed lots must have a <u>minimum net site area of at least 3000m2 and average net size area of 5000m2.</u>	A blanket minimum lot size can present challenges when designing a subdivision where there are different parent lot shapes sizes and topographical/vegetative/other constraints. Incorporating a minimum net size area and average net size area for subdivision will provide for greater flexibility in the instances where physical constraints exist. 5000m2 is an awkward size to maintain for some people, being too large to maintain the large curtilage area but too small to have stock grazing. An average net size area of 5000m2 would maintain the amenity values of the Country Living Zone, whilst a minimum net site area of 3000m2 would provide a variety of housing living styles and greater flexibility in the instances where physical constraints exist. The submitters have obtained subdivision consent (SUB0130/18) to create six lots of at least 5000m2 including around their existing dwelling. The submitters only need an area to contain the existing	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				dwelling, new effluent disposal area and orchard. The additional area comprises of pasture and a pond that is surplus to their needs and ability to maintain and has only been included with their dwelling to comply with an arbitrary rule.		
FS1387.1447	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	8.5
FS1379.358	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
939.5	David Totman on behalf of Waipa District Council	Oppose	Add provisions to Rule 23.2.1.1 Noise - General for the Mystery Creek Event Centre, to mirror that contained in the Operative Waipa District Plan Rule 9.4.2.16 (c).	The Noise Rule should mirror the Noise Rule provided in the Waipa Operative District Plan for the Mystery Creek Events Centre on activity days under Rule 9.4.2.16 which states that noise levels "between 12.30am and 7.30am, noise levels must not exceed LAeq 45dB within the notional boundary of any dwelling within the Waipa District territorial boundary, and LAeq 40dB within the notional boundary of any dwelling within the Waikato District territorial boundary".	Reject	6.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
947.3	Stuart Quigley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.6.2 Country Living Character (specific amendments are not provided); AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary including provisions, consequential additions and cross references.	Submitter considers that the policy would include a 16 lot subdivision to occur on the property at 233 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey. Submitter states that "with the definition of 'Country Living Character', then this site should be considered necessary, particularly due to the proposed rezoning of QFT site from Rural to Country Side Living."	Reject	4.3
FS1278.3	Stuart Quigley and Quigley Family Trust	Support	General support of submission.	Submitter considers that the policy would include a 16-lot subdivision to occur on the property at 233 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey. Submitter states that 'with the definition of 'Country Living Character', then this site should be considered necessary, particularly due to the proposed rezoning of QFT site from Rural to Countryside Living'.	Reject	4.3
947.4	Stuart Quigley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.6.3 Subdivision within the Country Living Zone, as follows (or with words to similar effect): (a) Subdivision, building and development within the Country Living Zone ensures that:... (vi) <u>where sites are in close to a village Zone, subdivision can be up wards of 5,000m2 unreticulated.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary including provisions, consequential additions and cross references.	Some activities are appropriate in the rural environment and the effects are to be accepted. Including urban activities in the list of features for the rural environment where a site is in close proximity to an urban village is appropriate. It is important to ensure a consistent direction with objectives and policies relating to reverse sensitivity and to provide a policy basis so that the reduction and mitigation of reverse sensitivity issues are considered with subdivision applications in the Rural and Countryside Living Zones. The property at is bounded by the Country Living Zone and Residential Zone, is within 1500m of the Glen Massey Village Zone and is therefore no longer appropriate to be zoned Rural. 233 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey.	Reject	8.2
FS1387.1599	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	Accept	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1278.4	Stuart Quigley and Quigley Family Trust	Support	General support of submission.	Some activities are appropriate in the rural environment and the effects are to be accepted. Including urban activities in the list of features for the rural environment where a site is in close proximity to an urban village is appropriate. It is important to ensure a consistent direction with objectives and policies relating to reverse sensitivity and to provide a policy basis so that the reduction and mitigation of reverse sensitivity issues are considered with subdivision applications in the Rural and Countryside Living Zones. The property is bounded by the Country Living Zone and Residential Zone, and is therefore no longer appropriate to be zoned Rural, 233 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey.	Accept	8.2
FS1379.371	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the subdivision of rural land near Village Zones/CLZ within HCC's Area of Interest. Fragmentation of rural land undermines the intent of the Rural Zone, regardless of its proximity to other zones.	Accept	8.2
947.5	Stuart Quigley	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 23.1.1 Permitted Activities, as follows (or with words to similar effect): P5 - child care facility - A child care facility established prior to notification of the District Plan and within 1km of a Village Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary including provisions, consequential additions and cross references.	The submitter is concerned that their activities "may not fit within the definition of Rural Activity on the basis that 16 large country living lots have been developed", but states that they are "confident they would fit within the definition of rural activity, under permitted activities". A Village Living Zone would be the best for the property at 233 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey.	Reject	5.5
FS1092.3	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Support	We support the submitter requesting that a new 'activity' be added to Rule 23.1.1 - Permitted Activities as follows:- Childcare Facility within a 1K distance of a living zone.	Allow childcare facilities to be located in rural areas close to residential areas. Due to increasing demand for childcare facilities there is a need for non-residential land to be used for	Reject	5.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>this purpose. The trend is moving away from small childcare facilities located within residential areas to larger facilities set in a semi rural environment. This provides a healthier environment for children who often spend 1-5 years living at such facilities so need ample room for play, sport and all weather activities. This need has developed from the need for many parents to both have full time employment so are not available to ensure their children have adequate time outdoors in a natural and healthy environment.</p>		
FS1278.5	Stuart Quigley and Quigley Family Trust	Support	General support of submission.	<p>The submitter is concerned that their activities 'may not fit within the definition of Rural Activity on the basis that 16 large country living lots have been developed', but states that they are 'confident they would fit within the definition of rural activity, under permitted activities'. A Village Zone would be the best for the property at 233 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey. This section is in reference to both Tamahere and Glen Massey noted stated in Council's input on submitter's information. A Village Living Zone would be the best for the property at 233 Wilton Collieries Road, Glen Massey; and 15 and 25 Tamahere Drive.</p>	Reject	5.5
FS1387.1600	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	5.5
947.6	Stuart Quigley	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.2 Discretionary Activities, as follows (or with words to similar effect): (1) The	<p>Consideration is needed for some of the discretionary activities given proximity to</p>	Reject	5.11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			activities listed below are discretionary activities., <u>unless in close proximity 1km to a Village Zone.</u> ... D5 An education facility, excluding a child care facility for up to 10 children <u>and P5 above.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary including provisions, consequential additions and cross references.	Tamahere Village Green, specifically D3, D4, D5, D7 and D9.		
FS1278.6	Stuart Quigley and Quigley Family Trust	Support	General support of submission.	Consideration is needed for some of the discretionary activities given proximity to Tamahere Village Green, specifically D3, D4, D5, D7 and D9.	Reject	5.11
FS1387.1601	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	5.11
276.11	Ted and Kathryn Letford	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a) (i) General Subdivision, to reduce the minimum lot size to allow lots below 5000m2.	WDC needs to think about productivity of land and the use of it as most Waikato District towns are surrounded by very fertile land. Council should concentrate on developing smaller blocks as they have the inability to be used for productive purposes. More intensive subdivision in Tamahere should be catered for as a priority due to its proximity to Hamilton, which would require reducing the lot sizes to 2500m2 for all of the Country Living zone. it is important for Waikato farmland to be maintained to a viable size. Enabling the Country Living Zone to be more intensively developed leaves the Rural	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>Zone available for productive purposes. Leaving the minimum lot size at 5000m2 seems like a very inefficient way of conserving large lots for farming purposes. Better to intensify the land that is already zoned for Country Living. Other councils in the Waikato Region manage to successfully have 2500m2 and the residents still enjoy a 'large lot' feel.</p> <p>Submission questions where the 5000m2 requirement came from. Reducing lot size to 2500m2 reduces the amount of land being taken out of productivity. Minimum lot size of 5000m2 encourages the loss of landscaped/garden areas as they are harder to maintain the lawn, reflecting a changing society which places less priority on gardening and more on family and recreation. Tamahere is in a location where development should be encouraged and catered for options, retaining some larger blocks, and allowing smaller country living blocks. Tamahere is also close to places of work, shopping areas and services, close to entertainment, the Waikato expressway and Airport.</p>		
FS1379.55	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
FS1197.9	Bowrock Properties Limited	Support	That the submission point is accepted.	Support general intent of submission point, particularly around allowing smaller lot sizes for Country Living zone and concentrating on developing smaller blocks as they have the inability to be used for productive purposes.	Reject	8.5
FS1311.7	Ethan & Rachael Findlay	Support	Support submission point 276.11.	To provide provisions for lot sizes below 5000m2. To support general intent of submission point.	Reject	8.5
FS1386.287	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FSI 127.1	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.	in part.	Reject	8.5
297.18	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to 5.6.7 (Rural Environment - Country Living Zone - Policies - 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 reduced victimisations, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	4.5
297.25	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.15 Artificial outdoor lighting, except for the amendments sought below. AND Add to Policy 5.6.15 Artificial outdoor lighting a new line as follows: <u>(d) 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	4.9
297.28	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Support	Retain Policy 5.6.14 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 in part	4.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
297.35	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 5.6.2 Country Living character a new point as follows: (f) conforms to the national guidelines for CPTED	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	4.3
297.36	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 5.6.3(a) (Subdivision within the Country Living Zone a new point as follows: (vi) <u>conforms to the national guidelines for CPTED</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe.	Reject	8.2
FS1386.315	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	8.2
297.37	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 5.6.8 Non-residential activities a new point as follows: (b) <u>ensure any non-residential activities and associated buildings, structures and facilities conform to the national guidelines for CPTED</u>	To ensure that there is an obligation to consider CPTED, reducing victimisation, making people safe and feel safe	Reject	4.6
330.61	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Policy 5.6.16 Noise.	No reasons provided.	Reject	4.10
330.68	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.1 - Land Use- Activities and/or all rules sitting under Rule 23.1 Land Use-Activities.	No reasons provided.	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1386.445	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	5.2
330.69	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2 Land Use - Effects and/or all the rules sitting under Rule 23.2 Land Use - Effects.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.2
FS1386.446	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	6.2
330.71	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.6 - Signs-General.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.7
330.72	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3 Land Use - Building and/or all	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			rules sitting under Rule 23.3 Land Use - Building.			
FS1386.447	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	7.2
330.73	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4 Subdivision and/or all rules sitting under Rule 23.4 Subdivision.	No reasons provided.	Reject	8.3
FS1386.448	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	8.3
330.92	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Chapter 23 Country Living Zone.	No reasons provided.	Reject	4.4
FS1386.452	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Accept	4.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
330.93	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.1 Land Use - Activities, and all rules sitting under Rule 23.1.	No reasons provided.	Reject	5.2
FS1386.453	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	5.2
330.94	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2 Land Use - Effects.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.2
FS1386.454	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,	Accept	6.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
330.95	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.1 - Noise, and/or all rules under Rule 23.2.1.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.3
330.96	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.2 Glare and Artificial Light Spill.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.5
330.97	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.3 Earthworks, and/or all rules sitting under Rule 23.2.3.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.6
345.18	Brent Trail	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4 Subdivision.	It is an extraordinary measure. It will undoubtedly cause future significant hurdles for interim management of land resources. There will be cases where, with appropriate planning, subdivision could take place considering future development and thus there will undoubtedly be requirements for subdivision in relation to infrastructure.	Reject	8.3
FSI 386.488	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</i>	Accept	8.3

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.		
345.19	Brent Trail	Neutral/Amend	Amend Subdivision Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a) (i) General Subdivision, to reduce the minimum lot size from 5000m2 to 2500m2.	This will match requirements for on-site treatment and disposal of wastewater. This will allow for much better use of resource. This will assist in making housing land more affordable. So much land is being wasted with this rule. People do not necessarily want to have to maintain 5000m2.	Reject	8.5
FS1386.489	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	8.5
FS1127.11	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.	in part	Reject	8.5
345.21	Brent Trail	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.5 Site boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori.	The rule concerns submitter and oppose it along with the same rule appearing anywhere else. Significant natural areas and Maaori sites can be very large, and often to create access, viable building sites and practical boundaries, and such sites may be required to have boundaries go through parts of them. Submitter agrees parts of significant Maaori sites should not be	Accept in part	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				severed, however some sites, by their nature, can be spread out.		
FS1323.29	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendment sought is declined.	<i>HNZPT has concerns that the deletions/inclusions sought in the rule will cause adverse effects to historic heritage.</i>	Accept in part	
345.22	Brent Trail	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.8 Building platform.	Rule concerns submitter and opposite, along with the same rule appearing anywhere else, particularly in Country Living and Village Zones. It is unrealistic. A building site of 300m ² is more realistic. Given earthworks take place, a grade of 1:5 would be acceptable. Given that evidence is required from a geotechnical engineer, even steeper may be acceptable. With a proposed size of 1000m ² it is clearly not meant to cater for wastewater treatment and disposal as well as building. It is inappropriate for a flat site. A soils engineer should be able to certify such a site up to 1:5. Council should seek independent advice on the matter and to not over specify the level of engineer required on straight forward sites. Sites can be readily constructed on sloping ground subject to the recommendation and supervision from soils engineers without particular geotechnical qualifications, if they consider it out of their field they are expected to engage an expert.	Reject	12.2
FS1386.490	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</i>	Accept	12.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
378.38	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 23.1.1 Permitted Activities as a permitted activity as follows: (x) <u>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 Rule 23.1.1 to the extent that no provision is explicitly made for emergency services training and management activities. The rules should 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.	Accept	5.3
FS1388.38	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	5.3
FS1035.144	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	5.3
378.39	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add a new discretionary activity to Rule 23.1.2 Discretionary Activities, as follows: (x) <u>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 opposes Rule 23.1.2 as no provision is made for emergency service facilities. As no provision is made under this rule, emergency service facilities would instead default to non-complying activities under Rule 23.1.2. The default non-complying activity is overly restrictive and inappropriate. Fire and Emergency New Zealand therefore seeks the inclusion of emergency facilities as a discretionary activity in the Country Living	Accept in part	5.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Zone for the following reasons: Fire stations must be strategically located within and throughout communities to maximise their coverage and response times so that they can efficiently and effectively provide for the health and safety of people and communities by being able respond to emergency call outs in a timely way, thus avoiding or mitigating the potential for adverse effects associated 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 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 Fire and Emergency New Zealand to meet its statutory obligations.		
FS1388.39	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	5.3
FS1035.145	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 in part	5.3
378.42	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.3.4.1 Height, to include the following: This Standard does not apply to emergency service	Inclusion of a specific exemption for emergency service facilities and hose drying	Accept in part	7.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			facilities and hose drying towers up to 15m associated with 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.	towers will appropriately provide for the operational requirements of Fire and Emergency New Zealand. Fire stations are single storied buildings of approximately 8-9m in height and are typically able to achieve the height standards in a District Plan. Some fire stations also include a hose drying tower of between 12-15m in height. Fire and Emergency New Zealand considers that the inclusion of an exemption for associated structures better provides for the health and safety of the community by enabling the efficient functioning of Fire and Emergency New Zealand.		
FS1035.148	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 in part	7.4
378.43	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.7.5 Building setback - Waterbodies.	The Rule will safeguard the wellbeing of communities in accordance with the purpose of the RMA and purpose of Fire and Emergency New Zealand in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.	Accept in part	7.9
FS1035.149	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 in part	7.9
378.44	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 General Subdivision, as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions:... (x) <u>Proposed lots must be connected to water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes.</u> (b) Council's discretion is limited to the following matters:... (i) <u>Provision of infrastructure, 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 support Rule 23.4.2 as subdivision of land in the Country Living Zone is a Restricted Discretionary activity, however, Fire and Emergency New Zealand requires proposed lots to be connected to public-reticulated water supply or water supply sufficient for firefighting purposes. Subdivision that does not comply is a Non-complying activity. The changes sought promote consistency across all zones in the District Plan.	Accept in part	8.5
FS1035.150	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 in part	8.5
FS1134.89	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	The provision of existing infrastructure should be considered.	Accept in part	8.5
FS1388.41	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Accept in part	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
378.63	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Objective to Section 5.6 Country Living Zone, as follows: <u>Objective 5.6.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 Country Living areas.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	To better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.	Accept in part	4.3
FS1388.51	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 in part	4.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1035.170	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 in part	4.3
378.64	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.2 Country living character, as it requires activities to be self-sufficient for water supply, unless a reticulated system is available AND Amend Policy 5.6.2(e) Country Living character, as follows: (e) Requires activities within the Country Living Zone to be self-sufficient in the provision of water supply (including for firefighting purposes), wastewater and stormwater disposal, unless a reticulated supply is available. 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 supports in part Policy 5.6.2. However, Fire and Emergency New Zealand requests that it is made explicit that water supply in the Country Living Zone is sufficient for firefighting purposes and not just for drinking supply.	Reject	4.3
FS1035.171	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	4.3
378.65	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.8 Non-residential activities, to the extent that it anticipates non-residential activities in the Country Living Zone AND Amend Policy 5.6.8 Non-residential activities, as follows: (a) Limit the establishment of commercial or industrial non-residential activities within the Country Living Zone unless they: (ii) 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 supports in part Policy 5.6.8 to the extent that these provisions anticipate non-residential activities in the Country Living 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 Country Living 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	4.6
FS1035.172	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	4.6
405.72	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a clause to Rule 23.3.1 PI (b) Dwelling so that where there are existing overhead lines, the location	Works must comply with NZECP34:2001.	Reject	7.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			of the dwelling must comply with the requirements of NZECP34:2001.			
405.73	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a clause to Rule 23.3.2 PI (b) Minor Dwelling so that where there are existing overhead lines, the location of the dwelling must comply with the requirements of NZECP34:2001.	Works must comply with NZECP34:2001.	Reject	7.3
405.75	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 23.4.2 RDI (a) General Subdivision 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;</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Accept in part	8.5
405.76	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add the following to Rule 23.4.3 DI (a) (i-viii) Subdivision within identified areas 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;</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Accept in part	10.1
405.77	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 23.4.9 RDI (b) Subdivision creating Reserves 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;</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Reject	12.3
FS1211.54	First Gas Limited on behalf of First Gas	Support	Amend Rule 23.4.9 as requested under submission point 405.77	First Gas supports the proposed amendment to Rule 23.4.9 to add the following matter of discretion for Subdivision to create an esplanade reserve: <u>The subdivision, layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure</u>	Reject	12.3
405.78	Counties Power Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 23.4.12 RDI (b) Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips as follows: <u>The subdivision layout and design in regard to how</u>	To prevent assets becoming landlocked. Similar to Transpower rules.	Reject	12.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<u>this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure assets;</u>			
FS1211.55	First Gas Limited on behalf of First Gas	Support	Amend Rule 23.4.1.2 as requested under submission point 405.78	First Gas supports the proposed amendment to Rule 23.4.12 to add the following matter of discretion for Subdivision to create an esplanade reserve: The subdivision, layout and design in regard to how this may impact on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of existing infrastructure assets.	Reject	12.6
418.16	Ethan Findlay	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Chapter 23 Country Living Zone.	No reasons provided.	Reject	4.2
FS1388.171	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	4.2
419.42	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 23.1 Land use - Activities, that provides for rural production that is existing at the time the Proposed Plan is made operative. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter considers that existing rural production activities should be provided for as a permitted activity, although no reasons have been provided.	Accept in part	5.4
FS1171.30	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes that existing rural production activities should be provided for as a permitted activity. This submission is supported as it records within the Plan, the existing use rights of those rural production activities existing at the time that the provision	Accept in part	5.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>of the Proposed Plan has legal effect.</i>		
FS1388.196	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	5.4
419.43	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new discretionary activity to Rule 23.1 Land use - Activities, that provides for rural production activities within the Country Living Zone. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	Under the proposed planning framework, farming would be a non-complying activity. This is inconsistent with Policy 5.6.9 Existing non-residential activities, which supports expansion and operation of existing non-residential activities within the Country Living Zone.	Reject	5.4
FS1388.197	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.	Support	5.4
419.44	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.7 PI Building setbacks - All boundaries, as notified.	The submitter supports the 12m setback from boundaries, other than a road	Accept	7.7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				boundary. Requiring an adequate buffer between new urban/residential development from existing, legitimate rural production activities will assist in avoiding or mitigating the potential for reverse sensitivity to arise. Although farming noise is permitted within the zone, there are a number of other effects associated with legitimate farming activities which are part of rural character and amenity. Rural character and amenity is often not clearly understood by new residents and providing adequate buffers can assist in minimising complaints.		
419.45	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (iv) to Rule 23.3.7.1 P2 (a) Building setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: (a) Any building located on a lot containing 1000m2 or less must be set back a minimum of: ... (iv) 10m from every <u>boundary adjoining a Rural Zone.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	A 1.5m setback from all boundaries as proposed is not sufficient to avoid or mitigate potential reverse sensitivity effects that arise between residential activities and rural activities. When compared with the 12m setback proposed in Rule 23.3.7 for lots greater than 1000m2, the 1.5m setback incentives creation of smaller lots which results in a high density of residential development in close proximity to the rural environment. This has the potential for greater reverse sensitivity issues.	Reject	7.7
FS1171.31	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission proposes a 10m setback for all boundaries adjoining rural zones. This submission is supported to the extent that the boundary setbacks on a boundary for residential activities on a residential/rural zone boundary will act to mitigate reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	7.7
419.46	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (v) to Rule 23.3.7.1 RD1 (b) Building setbacks - All boundaries as follows: (v) <u>reverse sensitivity effects.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	An additional matter is sought to enable the potential for reverse sensitivity effects to be included as a matter to which discretion is restricted in determining the location of buildings within the relevant setbacks from Rural zoned land. This is a matter of restricted discretion in Rule 26.3.6.1 of the Village Zone and is also relevant to the Country Living Zone.	Accept	7.7
FS1171.32	Phoebe Watson for Barker &	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes a new clause to Rule	Accept	7.7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Associates on behalf of T&G Global			23.3.7 Building setbacks. This submission is supported. Reverse sensitivity issues are relevant to the consideration of building setbacks on the boundary of rural and residential zones.		
419.47	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (vii) to Rule 23.3.7.2 PI (a) Building setbacks - 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: ... (vii) 100m from any boundary adjoining a Rural Zone where the sensitive activity is not a residential activity. 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 the rural-urban interface and to avoid and mitigate the potential for reverse sensitivity effects between sensitive land uses and legitimate farming activities. Greater setbacks should be provided to avoid or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	7.8
FS1388.198	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	7.8
FS1330.32	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject submission.	Unreasonable constraint on use of land as above.	Accept	7.8
419.48	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.7.2 DI Building setback - Sensitive land use, as notified.	The discretionary activity status is supported.	Accept	7.8
419.49	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 23.4.2 RDI (b) General Subdivision as follows: (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: ... (iii) Measures to mitigate and minimise reverse sensitivity effects on adjoining Rural Zone land.	The submitter seeks that an additional clause to the matters to which discretion is restricted. Measure taken to minimise potential reverse sensitivity effects is appropriate to consider given the	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	significance of horticultural land in the Waikato District. This aligns with the objectives and policies which seek to protect high class soil and support ongoing operation and development of existing farming activities.		
FS1388.199	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	8.5
FS1171.33	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes a new matter of discretion to Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (b) General Subdivision. This submission is supported. Reverse sensitivity effects can arise where subdivision adjoin s rural production land uses.	Accept	8.5
FS1134.90	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	Measures should be taken to minimise potential reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept	8.5
419.66	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Amend Objective 5.6.1 Country Living Zone, as follows: (a) Subdivision, use and development in the Country Living Zone maintains or enhances the character and amenity values of the zone <u>and avoids compromising rural production land or activities.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The objective is inward focused. It fails to address the rural interface that is apparent with all Countryside Living Zones and often an area of rural production.	Accept in part	4.2
FS1388.208	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	Accept in part	4.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1171.41	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission seeks to amend Objective 5.6.1 Country Living Zone. This submission is supported as it recognises the need for subdivision and development within the Country Living Zone to avoid effects on rural production activities.	Accept in part	4.2
FS1342.80	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.66.	FFNZ supports the amendment, which provides important policy direction.	Accept in part	4.2
419.67	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.6.3 Subdivision within the Country Living Zone, as notified.	The policy requires that subdivision, building and development within the Country Living Zone ensures existing lawfully-established activities are protected from reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	8.2
FS1388.209	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 in part	8.2
FS1333.13	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	For the reasons stated in the submission.	Accept in part	8.2
433.25	Mischa Davis for Auckland	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.6.1 PI Signs - General, as follows:	Fish and Game erects important public	Reject	6.7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
	Waikato Fish and Game Council		A public information sign erected by a government agency <u>and Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council.</u> AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	information signs but it is not a recognised government agency.		
433.26	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.2.6.1 P2 (a) (i) and (vii) Signs - General, relating to a single sign AND Delete Rule 23.2.6.1 P2 (a) (viii) Signs-General relating to the Waikato Expressway AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	These conditions are too restrictive for signs required by Auckland Waikato Fish and Game as there may be occasions when they need to be breached in order to main and enhance access to sports fisheries and game bird hunting areas and maintain public safety. Resource consent should not be required in these instances as Fish and Game signs are permitted around much of New Zealand.	Reject	6.7
<i>FS1323.187</i>	<i>Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>That the amendments sought are declined.</i>	<i>The permitted activity signs rules are applicable to heritage items and Maaori Sites and Areas of significance. The additions proposed have the potential to cause adverse effects to these items.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	<i>6.7</i>
433.28	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7.5 PI Building setback - Waterbodies, as follows: (a) Any building <u>that is not a maimai</u> must be set back a minimum of: ... AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Supports an appropriate buffer between any development freshwater bodies. Maimai should be exempt from this rule as they are controlled by the Building Act 2004. Consistency is required with the Waikato Regional Plan which permits maimai subject to them not exceeding an area of 10m2 and a height of 2.5m measured from floor level.	Reject	7.9
433.29	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7.6 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.	Supports and appropriate buffer between any development and a Environmental Protection Area. Maimai should be exempt from this rule as they are controlled by the Building Act 2004. Consistency is required with the Waikato Regional Plan which permits maimai subject to them not exceeding an area of 10m2 and a height of 2.5m measured from floor level.	Reject	7.11
435.15	Jade Hyslop	Oppose	Amend Home stay provisions in Rule 23.1.1	Raglan needs a plan similar to Queenstown	Reject	5.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Permitted Activities, to provide for registration of Homestay or Visitor accommodation.	to avoid more residential accommodation becoming available only to visitors. Residents tend to move to and from surrounding country areas, the same policy needs to apply there also.		
FS1388.260	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	5.8
466.28	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1 Land Use - Activities to include farming as a specified activity within the Country Living Zone.	Lot sizes within the Country Living Zone area must have a net site area of 5000m ² . Many people will buy these as lifestyle lots. Farming however, has not been listed as PA, RDA or DA within this zone and by default is therefore considered to be noncomplying in accordance with NC12.	Accept	5.4
FS1388.414	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	Reject	5.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
466.29	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.7 PI Building setbacks as notified.	The submitter supports this. An adequate buffer is essential in managing reverse sensitivity matters.	Accept	7.7
466.31	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RDI General Subdivision to include consideration of reverse sensitivity as a matter of discretion.	An additional provision is sought to enable the potential for reverse sensitivity effects to be included as a matter to which discretion is restricted, particularly about the siting of buildings adjoining land used for commercial vegetable production.	Accept	8.5
FS1388.415	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	8.5
FS1134.91	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seeks that the submission point be allowed.	<i>Measures should be taken to minimise potential reverse sensitivity effects.</i>	Accept	8.5
466.47	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.3 Subdivision within the Country Living Zone as notified, except for the amendments outlined below AND Amend Policy 5.6.3 (v) Subdivision within the Country Living Zone as follows: existing lawfully-established activities, and new development and activities, are protected from reverse sensitivity effects	The submitter supports this objective; however consider that the provision should ensure that both new development and existing lawfully established development and activities are protected from reverse sensitivity effects. This is of particular importance where this zone abuts the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	8.2
FS1388.423	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</i>	Accept in part	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1272.5	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Null	New development or activities cannot be the subject of reverse sensitivity effects. Reverse sensitivity refers to the susceptibility of established, effects-generating activities to complaints or objectives arising from the location of new incompatible (e.g. sensitive) activities nearby. New activities do not need to be protected from such effects, and it would be inconsistent with the widely accepted meaning of, and approach to, reverse sensitivity effects throughout New Zealand if the Proposed Plan sought do so.	Accept in part	8.2
489.18	Ann-Maree Gladding	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.4.2 RDI (a) General subdivision; AND Amend the zoning of Country Living Zoned properties to the Village Zone; AND Amend Rule 24.4.1 RDI (a) Subdivision-General as follows: (a) Proposed lots must have a minimum net site area of 3,000m² 2000m ² , except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve to vest.	The Countryside Living Zone provides for an inefficient rural -residential living opportunity. At a minimum lot size of 5000m ² , the lots created are too small to be productive or grazed, yet they are too big to be easily managed as lifestyle properties. A smaller lot size of 2000m ² still creates a rural-residential character, of open space, but at the same time can be planted, fenced, mowed and maintained easily. New houses are generally no larger than 300m ² and an effluent disposal field is generally 600m ² in size, this still leaves over 1000m ² for additional curtilage area and will maintain consistency with the draft objectives and policies of this zone whilst making more efficient use of the land. An appropriate level of amenity is still achieved, yet at the same time there is a	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				lower intensity of development, and a rural outlook and character.		
FS1311.16	Ethan & Rachael Findlay	Support	Support submission point 489.18.	To provide provisions to allow most efficient use of land. To support general intent of submission point.	Reject	8.5
FS1127.2	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.	in part	Reject	8.5
FS1197.21	Bowrock Properties Limited	Support	That the submission point is accepted.	Support general intent of submission point, particularly around allowing smaller lot size for Country Living zone.	Reject	8.5
FS1379.192	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other locations identified for growth.	Accept	8.5
FS1388.485	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	8.5
535.55	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.6.8 Non-residential activities.	The submitter supports the intent of this policy which is to limit the establishment of non-residential activities in the Country Living Zone and therefore ensure that existing commercial centres are maintained.	Accept	4.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
535.75	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.1.3 Discretionary Activities, to ensure existing commercial centres are maintained (currently listed as D3) in the Country Living Zone; AND Add objectives and policies as a consequential amendment. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Almost all of the Country Living zone is located near Hamilton or main towns. It is therefore important to maintain the primacy of existing commercial centres in Hamilton and the main towns by restricting commercial activities in this zone or add objectives and policies that better direct commercial activities to zones that are more appropriate than the Country Living Zone.	Reject	5.12
FS1388.713	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	5.12
535.77	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain the Prohibited Activity status of Rule 23.4.1 Prohibited subdivision, as notified.	A prohibited activity status for subdivision is imperative in the Urban Expansion Area to ensure that the objectives and policies for this area are achieved.	Reject	8.4
FS1388.714	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	Accept	8.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1287.21	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Blue Wallace seek that the point is rejected based on a more considered planning solution that will rationalise both parties' interests	BWS does not consider the Hamilton City Council submission point is accurate when stating that a prohibited activity status is imperative in the UEPA to ensure that the objectives and policies are achieved. Similar to urban expansion areas within Hamilton City (i.e., Peacocks Stage 2) the provision of a concept plan addressing future integration with impending urbanised land use can, and should be considered as a sensible approach to development in the PDP urban expansion areas opposed to a catch-all prohibited 'space saving' approach. A more appropriate and equitable planning solution for development in the UEPA is that of collaboration between landowners and affected parties (i.e. HCC) to achieve mutually beneficial outcomes.	Accept	8.4
FS1333.19	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	The provision provides appropriate protection for the continued operation of the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site and associated industrial land.	Reject	8.4
559.55	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.7 Earthworks, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Policy 5.6.7(e) Earthworks as follows: (d) Subdivision and development occurs in a manner that maintains shape, contour, and landscape characteristics <u>and avoids adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values.</u>	The submitter supports Policy 5.6.7 Earthworks activities 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 Resource Management Act.	Reject	4.5
559.86	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.2.6.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance. AND Amend Rule 23.2.6.1 RD1 Signs - general to include signage on Heritage items and Maaori Sites of Significance. AND Add an advice note under this new rule to advise of	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 Maori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on	Reject	6.7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			the other heritage building related rules within the Chapter. AND Provide for any consequential amendments as required.	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 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).		
602.53	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.2.6.1. P3 (a) Signs - 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; (iv) The sign is not illuminated; (v) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (vi) The sign does not project into or over road reserve. 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).	Accept in part	6.7
FS1323.87	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	The permitted activity signs rules are applicable to heritage items and Maaori Sites and Areas of significance. The additions proposed have the potential to cause adverse effects to these items.	Reject	6.7
662.24	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 23.2.3.1 PI Earthworks - General, except	Support the permitted activity rule for	Reject	6.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 P1 (a) (iii) Earthworks - General as follows: (iii) A building platform <u>and accessway</u> for a residential activity including an accessory building.	earthworks in part. Seeks that the permitted activity rule be amended to include earthworks associated with the construction of accessways. This currently gets overlooked by many developers and often triggers an unexpected land use consent. Earthworks for accessways is inherent in subdivision consent and subsequently already been considered by Council on the basis of effects. Earthworks restrictions will still comply in regard to NZS 4431:1989		
662.25	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 P2 Earthworks - General as follows: (a) Earthworks within a site for purposes other those contained in P1 (excluding the importation of fill material) must meet all of the following conditions: (i) Do not exceed a volume of more than 250 <u>500</u> m ³ and an area of more than 1000m ² within a site over any single 12 month period; ... (iii) Earthworks are set back 4 <u>0.5</u> m from any boundary; ...	Notes that a 250m ³ limit is the same as for the Residential Zone. Given the different activities undertaken for rural residential purposes, an increase in the limit to 500m ³ is appropriate. It is noted that a soil disturbing quantum would be better to align with the provisions of the Waikato Regional Plan. Seeks a 0.5m setback within the rural environment.	Accept in part	6.6
662.26	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.3.7.5 P1 Building setback - Waterbodies as follows: (a) Any building must be set back a minimum of: (i) 23m from the margin of any: A. Lake <u>over 4ha</u> ; and B. Wetland; ... (v) <u>10m from a managed wetland</u> .	Opposes the use of the generic term "wetland" as this all-encompassing terminology is inappropriate for use within the Proposed District Plan as it will a significant impact on land development in Country Living Zone that may not carry any reasonable environmental benefit. The setbacks for man-made stormwater infrastructure and/or modified waterbodies be identified under all applicable waterbody setback rules be 10m. As a 'lake' can constitute a large array of waterbodies., the submitter contends that a starting point of 4ha be used in the Proposed District Plan before the setback applies.	Accept in part	7.9
662.27	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.1 P1 Prohibited Subdivision AND Add a cascading objective, policy and rule set	Recognises that land within the Urban Expansion area is being preserved so as to enable future urban growth that is aligned	Accept in part	8.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			whereby subdivision of Country Living Zone land within the Urban Expansion Area is a Non-Complying Activity and will be subject to an approved Concept Plan of development.	with strategic agreements between Hamilton City Council and Waikato District Council; however prohibiting the future use of the area is too heavy handed. Urban expansion boundary across the country are subject to a higher level of land use management, whereby a well-considered and strategic concept land development plan can precede subdivision scheme plans. Market conditions and the rights of landowners should not be unreasonably withheld through limited district plan provisions. Rather a collaborative approach between all parties should be supported whilst aligning with their primary objectives in serving the local communities in a fair and reasonable manner.		
FS1379.224	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>HCC opposes the relief sought to delete the prohibited activity status of subdivision in the CLZ within the Hamilton UEA. The prohibited activity status is imperative in the UEA to ensure the objectives and policies for this overlay are achieved. Further fragmentation through subdivision within the UEA will compromise the ability for the area to be fully urbanised in a comprehensive manner in the future, as is anticipated for land within this overlay.</i>	Accept in part	8.4
FS1387.109	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 in part	8.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
662.28	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a)(i) General Subdivision as follows: (i) All proposed lots must have a net site area of at least 53,000m2.	Contends that a rural residential allotment should provide flexibility for the different kinds of activities in the Country Living Zone. Allotments down to an area of 3,000m2 should be provided for to allow such flexibility.	Reject	8.5
FS1387.110	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	8.5
FS1379.225	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
FS1127.5	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.	in part	Reject	8.5
662.29	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.4.3 D1 (a) (vi) Subdivision within identified areas relating to Coal Mining Area.	Seeks that the discretionary activity trigger "Coal Mining Area" be removed given that such an overlay applies to a large area of land, with the degree of influence being inconsistent across large land holdings across the district. Consideration for the Coal Mining Policy Area to be assessed by Council as a matter of limited discretion would be more appropriate.	Reject	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.111	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	10.1
695.54	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	No specific decision sought with respect to Policy 5.6.3(a) (i) Subdivision within the Country Living Zone, but submission considers greater intensification of Country Living Zoned land is to be encouraged not discouraged.	It currently presents a significant cumulative waste of rural land resources. Council should focus on developing land in and around villages and towns and not adhoc sprawling Country Living Zones. Smaller lot sizes should be encouraged where infrastructure can be supplied.	Reject	8.2
FS1379.266	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes greater intensification of the CLZ, particularly within HCC's Area of Interest. This would result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to impact upon infrastructure within Hamilton.	Accept	8.2
FS1197.30	Bowrock Properties Limited	Support	That the submission point is accepted.	As stated in the submission point.	Reject	8.2
FS1387.314	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	Accept	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
696.12	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a) (i) General Subdivision, as follows: All proposed lots must have a net site area of at least-5000 3000m2.	There is no need or justification for a 5000m2 minimum lot size. The residents living in these areas have urban expectations and struggle to maintain 5000m2. The Country Living Zone is actually a large lot residential and is not a rural zone. A smaller site size is more in accordance with this housing and living choice. Reducing the minimum lot size will enable more efficient use of the land. Aligns more clearly with the 2500m2 minimum site size required for on-site wastewater management. Still enables an open and spacious character, in accordance with the large lot residential form of the Country Living Zone.	Reject	8.5
FS1387.386	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	8.5
FS1379.268	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.</i>	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
742.41	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.3 Subdivision within the Country Living Zone, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.6.3(a)(iv) Subdivision within the Country Living Zone, as follows: existing and planned infrastructure is not compromised adversely affected; AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Policy 5.6.3 but requests an amendment to include existing and planned infrastructure and align with the Regional Policy Statement and RMA effects principles.	Accept in part	8.2
FS1387.860	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 in part	8.2
742.42	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.14 Managing the adverse effects of signs, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.6.14 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 motorists, pedestrians and other road users adversely affect safety of road users..." AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Policy 5.6.14 and requests that it is amended to clarify that it relates to all signage visible or directed at traffic. The submitter also seeks the wording of Policy 5.6.14 to be aligned with Policy 5.3.14(b) (and the submitter's proposed amendments to Policy 5.3.14(b)).	Accept in part	4.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
742.43	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.15 Artificial outdoor lighting as notified.	Submitter supports Policy 5.6.15(c).	Accept	4.9
FS1062.96	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 742.43.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important more robust policy is in place to encourage dark skies in rural areas, to mitigate for night flying fauna. • Stronger policy around lighting to protect the environment. 	Reject	4.9
742.44	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.16 Noise, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.6.16(a) (v) Noise, as follows: Requiring acoustic insulation where sensitive <u>land use</u> activities are located within high noise environments, <u>including near existing and designated State Highways.</u> AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Policy 5.6.16. Vehicles state highways can produce adverse effects that extend beyond the state highway boundary, such as: noise and vibration, emissions, lighting/glare, and dust. Development that establishes near highways needs to take into account the potential for these effects to be experienced and should be designed to avoid/mitigate them. In particular, noise sensitive activities such as dwellings can be affected by road-traffic noise and vibration, which can lead to annoyance and sleep disturbance potentially resulting in adverse health effects. The submitter therefore seeks recognition of state highways as high noise environments within this policy.	Reject	4.10
780.24	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorpora on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.1.1 P2 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	5.8
FS1387.1200	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	Accept	5.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
781.15	Ministry of Education	Oppose	<p>Delete Rule 23.1.2 D5 Discretionary Activities for an education facility AND Add a Restricted Discretionary activity rule that provides for education facilities in Rule 23.1.2 as follows: <u>23.1.2 Restricted Discretionary Activities (1)</u> <u>The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities</u> Activity RD1 <u>Education facilities</u> Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: <u>The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity in the Country Living Zone.</u> <u>Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape.</u> <u>The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</u></p>	<p>Opposes the activity status of education facilities in this zone. Education facilities such as schools, community education, tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres, outdoor education centres and sports training establishments within rural areas are essential social infrastructure. The submitter requests consistency with their requested definition of 'Education facilities'.</p>	Accept in part	5.11
FS1387.1219	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</p>	Reject	5.11

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1202.89	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 781.15.	The Transport Agency supports the inclusion of c. the extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.	Accept	5.11
782.18	Jack Macdonald	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a)(i) General Subdivision AND Amend the zoning of properties from Country Living Zone to Village Zone AND Amend Rule 24.4.1 RD1 (a) General Subdivision, as follows: (a) Proposed lots must have a minimum net site area of 3,000m ² 2000m ² , except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve to vest.	The submitter states that all Village zoned lots must have a minimum net site area of 2000m ² . The Country Living Zone which requires a minimum lot size of 5000m ² creates lots too small to be productive or grazed and too big to be easily managed for lifestyle purposes. A smaller lot of 2000m ² is efficient and it still retains an open rural residential character which can be planted, fenced, mowed and easily maintained. New houses are generally no larger than 3000m ² and with an effluent disposal field of approximately 600m ² , this would leave more than 1000m ² for additional curtilage. This outcome would remain consistent with the objectives and policies for the Country Living Zone.	Reject	8.5
FS1127.8	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.	<i>in part</i>	Reject	8.5
FS1379.323	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought. As included in its original submission, HCC opposes the objectives, policies and rules of the Village Zone. Accordingly, HCC opposes requests to include additional areas (that are within Hamilton's Area of Interest) within the Village Zone. Given the significant cross-boundary impacts that further subdivision within the area are likely to have on the infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure, HCC opposes more lenient subdivision provisions as provided by the Village Zone.	Accept	8.5
FS1387.1235	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,	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
788.11	Susan Hall	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.1 P2 Permitted Activities for homestays, to be more regulated in Raglan, all homestays and holiday house accommodation to be registered with Council, 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, and a maximum of 4 temporary residents.	<p>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. 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</p>	Reject	5.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
FS1276.250	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	5.8
797.36	Fonterra Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new activity to Rule 23.1.3 Non Complying activities as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>NC13 (a) Within the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site Noise Control Boundary: (i) a child care facility; (ii) a hospital or hospice; (iii) an education facility; (iv) travellers accommodation.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	Supports the identified activities as non-complying activities. Seeks amendment to include additional activities as non-complying activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects in respect to the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing site.	Reject	5.15
FS1387.1275	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	5.15
81.177	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.1 Dwelling.	The submitter supports the discretionary activity status assigned to dwellings, buildings and structures within an Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape or natural character area.	Accept	7.2
FS1223.41	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	Reject	7.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
81.179	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.2 Minor dwelling to provide for minor dwellings in a landscape or natural character area as a discretionary activity.	Submitter requires clarification as to what is the activity status for a minor dwelling.	Reject	7.3
825.24	John Lawson	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.1.1 P2 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	5.8
FS1387.1323	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	Accept	5.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
838.16	Madsen Lawrie Consultants	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.6(P1) Building coverage to increase the percentage of permitted building coverage.	Total building coverage of 10% or 300m2 is too small, rural sized dwellings with accessory buildings could easily exceed this whilst still being entirely appropriate for areas of country living.	Reject	7.6
FSI387.1373	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	7.6
838.17	Madsen Lawrie Consultants	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2(RD1) (a) (i) General subdivision to decrease the minimum net site area from 5,000m2 to 2,500m2-3,500m2.	A minimum lot size of 5,000m2 is too large for an area designated as a country living zone. A lot size closer to 2,500m2 would be more appropriate whilst maintaining a country atmosphere and density development. Would be consistent with the Auckland Unitary Plan. A minimum lot size of 5,000m2 is very generous and has a high probability of resulting in fragmentation of rural land and will potentially designate productive land for inappropriate use in large residential lots. 5,000m2 is not a manageable sized lot and rural usage of the land will not be maximised. Regional Council has a 2,500m2 minimum in the rural zone to minimise urban sprawl and best maintain and enable efficient usage of rural land.	Reject	8.5
FSI127.9	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as	in part.	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<i>a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.</i>			
FS1387.1374	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	8.5
FS1287.44	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Blue Wallace seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.	Blue Wallace agrees with this point as it is consistent with the BWS submission and provides necessary flexibility for appropriate development in the Country Living Zone.	Reject	8.5
FS1379.352	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
922.19	John Rowe	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.4.2 RD1 (a)(i) General Subdivision AND Amend the zoning of properties from Country Living Zone to Village Zone AND Amend Rule 24.4.1 RD1 (a) General Subdivision, as follows: (a) Proposed lots must have a minimum net site area of 3,000m² 2000m ² , except where the proposed lot is an access allotment, utility allotment or reserve to vest.	The submitter states that all Village zoned lots must have a minimum net site area of 2000m ² . The Country Living Zone which requires a minimum lot size of 5000m ² creates lots too small to be productive or grazed and too big to be easily managed for lifestyle purposes. A smaller lot of 2000m ² is efficient and it still retains an open rural residential character which can be planted, fenced, mowed and easily maintained. New houses are generally no larger than 3000m ² and with	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				an effluent disposal field of approximately 600m ² , this would leave more than 1000m ² for additional curtilage. This outcome would remain consistent with the objectives and policies for the Country Living Zone.		
FS1387.1479	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	8.5
FS1379.362	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought. As included in its original submission, HCC opposes the objectives, policies and rules of the Village Zone. Accordingly, HCC opposes requests to include additional areas (that are within Hamilton's Area of Interest), within the Village Zone. Given the significant cross-boundary impacts that further subdivision within the area are likely to have on the infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure, HCC opposes more lenient subdivision provisions as provided by the Village Zone.	Accept	8.5
FS1127.10	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.	in part.	Reject	8.5
942.25	Angeline Greensill for Tainui o Tainui	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause to Policy 5.6.3 Artificially outdoor lighting as follows: <u>In remote coastal and rural areas ensure artificial outdoor lighting is directed downward.</u>	Observation of the stars to predict future trends, or times to undertake particular activities has been practiced for centuries around the world. As residential areas grow, night lighting is making it difficult to easily observe the stars. Whangaroa has	Reject	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				a number of places where views of the night sky are not compromised and can still be studied, enjoyed and photographed.		
FS1340.192	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 942.25 as the amended policy will assist in the management of light spill within the rural environment. This will contribute to the pleasantness of the rural environment at night and result in neighbouring landowners not being adversely affected by light spill.	Reject	8.2
943.64	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 PI (a)(iii) Earthworks - General, to include access/driveway.	Earthworks for access/driveway is a part of the residential earthworks to establish a dwelling.	Reject	6.6
943.65	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.3.7.5 PI (a) - Building setback - Waterbodies, to carry over existing rule from the Operative District Plan.	The setbacks in the Notified version need to be workable and known parameters as to when the rule applies.	Reject	7.9
943.66	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Add clause (v) to Rule 23.4.12 RDI (b) - Subdivision - Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, as follows; (vi) costs and benefits of acquiring the land	To allow Council to consider the costs and benefits of land purchase.	Accept	12.6
943.67	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission states: The rule is too restrictive and has not prevented the significant development Zone Subdivision of dwellings within the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary or inside the SEL 95 Boundary. The rule has created an anomaly of larger lots over 1.1 ha whereas the majority of surrounding lots are closer to 5000m2. There is no longer a valid reason to retain the average.	No reasons provided.	Reject	9.1
FS1253.33	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	The Airport Subdivision Control boundary (ASCB) takes into account the airport operations occurring today in addition to the likely future operations and the noise effects that those operations will have on surrounding properties. The intention of this rule is to limit/maintain the number of dwellings that can be built inside an area where now or in the future reverse sensitivity effects may arise.	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				Retention of the rule framework will ensure that properties within the ACSB are maintained at the current level and additional development opportunities/additional dwellings are not provided for. These rules are considered to be essential in managing the reverse sensitivity effects associated with the airport on the properties within the ACSB and should therefore remain in the District Plan.		
FS1387.1593	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	9.1
943.72	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.12 RDI (b) e - Subdivision - Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, to include as a matter of discretion, RMA s230 (3).	RMA s230(3) provides for the requirement for esplanade reserves to be waived through the resource consent process and hence provide the full gambit of possibilities allowed by the RMA notwithstanding identified high priority areas. Too often a presumption in plans is that reserves must be taken in all cases. This presumption is further negatively amplified by Council refusals to help the cost of fencing esplanade reserves (there is no legislation that precludes payments) or reluctance to take responsibility to manage and maintain esplanade reserves.	Reject	12.6
945.22	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new Restricted Discretionary Activity to Rule 23.1 Land Use Activities as follows: <u>Establishment of a residential activity or use within 20m of a gas</u>	In order to protect the gas network inclusive of delivery points the submitter seeks to include a minimum setback	Reject	5.7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>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></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add the following matter of discretion to Rule 23.1 Land Use Activities: (a) The extent to which the development will avoid or mitigate conflict with the gas network.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>between a delivery point and sensitive land use. The submitter seeks to include an additional matter over which Council's discretion shall be limited under RDI (b) to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on the gas network inclusive of delivery points.</p>		
FS1289.7	Mowbray Group	Oppose	<p>Seeks that the sections referenced be disallowed.</p>	<p>In original submission #404, it was proposed to use the 2 acre site adjacent to the gas plant be re-zoned for mixed use. The land was to have small historic cottages placed on it facing the railway line. They would be restored to preserve this part on NZ's history and link back into the history of the factory the First Gas proposal essentially steals this land and the associated opportunity associated with this project. The Loss is to the Matangi Community who support Mowbray Groups plan. It is also a loss to NZ's Heritage that is being lost. Further to this the 60m encroaches on the factory site to land where we hope to place the Pukekohe railway station. This is another major restoration project to save an historic building that is being undertaken by Mowbray group (see attached drawing).</p>	Accept	5.7
FS1305.20	Andrew Mowbray	Oppose	<p>Seek that the whole of the submission point be rejected.</p>	<p>We understand what First Gas are proposing however Mowbray Group land at 464 and 492 Tauwhare Road will be directly adversely affected by the secondment of land available to develop by creating 60m exclusion zones around First Gas distribution plant.</p>	Accept	5.7
945.23	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new condition to Rule 23.2.3.1.P2 (a)(vii) Earthworks-General: <u>(vii) Earthworks to a depth of greater than 200mm are to be located a minimum of 12m from the centerline of a gas pipeline.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>To address reverse sensitivity effects, the submitter seeks the inclusion of a new earthworks rule requiring a 12m setback from gas transmission pipelines where earthworks are proposed to a depth of greater than 200mm.</p>	Reject	6.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FSI 305.23	Andrew Mowbray	Oppose	Seek that the whole of the submission be rejected.	We understand the First Gas proposal however this would greatly restrict any work on the Mowbray Group property at 464 Tauwhare Road. The gas pipeline is 1m on the other side of the boundary fence and is a narrow piece of land, restricting any earthworks on 11m of this strip would significantly reduce the value of the land and future potential development of the land.	Accept	6.6
FSI 289.3	Mowbray Group	Oppose	I seek that the sections referenced be maintained at 6 metres.	In my original submission (#404) I proposed to use the narrow ribbon of land owned by Mowbray Group for siting historic NZ cottages. As per the attached drawing. This is supported by the Matangi Community Council and has been widely notified in the community with no dissenting voices this proposal by First Gas completely destroys Mowbray Groups proposal in submission #404 for these cottages. Mowbray Group agrees with the present 6 metre setback and would like a mixed use zone for this strip of land similar to the mixed use zone they have for on the other 3 titles on the opposite side of the railway line. This mixed use zone will allow the site to transition from Industrial to retail, commercial, residential, and tourism activities in line with the aspirations of the local community. In this mixed use zone Mowbray Group would like a 5 metre set back from the boundaries. In my original submission (#404) I proposed to use the narrow ribbon of land owned by Mowbray Group for siting historic NZ cottages. As per the attached drawing. This is supported by the Matangi Community Council and has been widely notified in the community with no dissenting voices this proposal by First Gas completely destroys Mowbray Groups proposal in submission #404 for these cottages. Mowbray Group agrees with the present 6 metre setback and would like a mixed use zone for this strip of land similar to the mixed use zone they have for on the other 3 titles on the opposite side of the railway line. This mixed use zone will allow the site to transition from	Accept	6.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>Industrial to retail, commercial, residential, and tourism activities in line with the aspirations of the local community. In this mixed use zone Mowbray Group would like a 5 metre set back from the boundaries.</i>		
945.24	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a matter of discretion to Rule 23.2.3.1 RD1 (b) Earthworks-General as follows: <u>(xii) Effects on the safe, effective and efficient operation, maintenance and upgrade of infrastructure, including access.</u> AND Any consequential amendments and other relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter seeks to include an additional matter over which Council's discretion shall be limited under RD1 (b) to address potential effects of earthworks on gas transmission lines.	Accept	6.6
FS1134.88	Counties Power Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	Discretion should be limited to address potential reverse sensitivity effects on existing infrastructure.	Accept	6.6
945.25	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 23.4 - Subdivision as follows: Subdivision-Site containing a gas transmission pipeline: <u>(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 Rural Zone. The addition of a new rule would make subdivision of a site containing a gas transmission pipeline a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept in part	8.5
FS1342.258	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow, in part submission point 945.25. Disallow submission relief seeking any activity status other than controlled activity, for boundary adjustment or boundary relocation subdivision where a gas transmission pipeline is within the subject property. The matters of concern can be dealt with by appropriate controlled activity standards and matters of control.	FFNZ seeks controlled activity subdivision for boundary relocation and boundary adjustment in the Rural Zone and Country Living Zone. These are types of subdivision where no additional lots are being created and therefore there is no overall intensification of land use, and effects on the environment are less than minor in the context of the wide-open spaces of the Rural and Country Living zones. It is appropriate to provide for such subdivision as a controlled activity in order to enable efficient	Accept in part	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>organisation of land ownership and farm management. The submitter's concerns can be addressed with appropriate controlled activity standards and matters of control.</i>		
986.28	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Support	Retain Policy 5.6.3 Subdivision within the Country Living Zone as notified.	KiwiRail supports the policy's direction that existing infrastructure is not to be compromised by inappropriate subdivision, building and development, and that lawfully established activities are to be protected from reverse sensitivity effects in the zone.	Accept in part	8.2
FSI176.291	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports this submission as it protects existing infrastructure from inappropriate development and reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	8.2
986.29	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.6.16 Noise, particularly clauses (iii)-(v) as amended below AND Amend Policy 5.6.16 Noise as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (iii) Maintaining appropriate setback distances between high noise environments and sensitive land <u>uses and noise-sensitive activities</u> ; (iv) Managing the location of sensitive land uses <u>and noise-sensitive activities</u> , particularly in relation to lawfully-established high noise-generating activities; (v) Requiring acoustic insulation where noise sensitive activities are located within high noise environments. AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	KiwiRail supports the policy, in particular clauses (iii)-(v). These clauses support noise sensitive activities managing reverse sensitivity effects on the railway corridor, including through both setbacks and acoustic design. The terminology used in the policy is 'sensitive land uses'. The policy should be expanded to include 'noise' sensitive activities (as this is also defined in the Plan). A separate KiwiRail submission seeks that the definitions of 'noise sensitive' and 'sensitive' land uses be clarified or combined.	Accept	4.10
FSI304.15	Gary Bogaart / Meremere Dragway Inc.	Support	Meremere Dragway seeks that the submission point be allowed.	Meremere Dragway supports the retention of Policy 5.6.16 and the suggested amendments to clauses (iii) to (v). The Policy and amendments support sensitive activities managing reverse sensitivity effects on Meremere Dragway.	Reject	4.10
FSI345.142	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons set out in the KiwiRail submission.	Reject	4.10
FSI118.2	Gary Bogaart / Meremere Dragway Inc for Brookfields Lawyers	Support	Meremere Dragway supports the retention of Policy 5.6.16 and the suggested amendments to clauses (iii) to (v). The Policy and amendments support sensitive activities managing reverse sensitivity effects on Meremere Dragway.	Meremere Dragway seeks that the submission point be allowed.	Reject	4.10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1258.90	Meridian Energy Limited	Support	Allow	Meridian agrees that the suggested wording is a useful addition to the policy.	Reject	4.10
986.55	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Not Stated	<p>Amend Rule 23.3.7.2 Building setback sensitive land use as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the 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: (i)5m from the designated boundary of the railway corridor ... <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 23.3.7.2 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>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • KiwiRail seeks that a 5metre setback apply to all new building development adjacent to 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 	Accept in part	7.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				district.		
FS1033.8	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 in part	7.8
FS1032.8	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 telecommunications equipment.	Awaiting recommendation	7.8
FS1031.8	Chorus New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Oppose in part.	These further submissions provide standing for us to work with Kiwi Rail to reach and agreed position regarding appropriate exclusions for telecommunications equipment.	Awaiting recommendation	7.8
986.68	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 23.1 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. 2. The extent to which the safety and efficiency of rail and road operations will be adversely affected. 3. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail. 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"> • 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. • 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. • 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. 	Accept	7.8
986.74	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (b) to Policy 5.6.4 Building setbacks as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Maintain the existing spaciousness between buildings with adjoining sites. <u>(b) 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"> • The policies applying to each zone requiring setbacks from the railway corridor should include reference to the purpose of the setback. • 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. • Adding an additional item to these plan sections will also facilitate assessment of situations where the proposed 5 metre Building setback - railway 	Reject	4.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				corridor rule cannot be met, or it is inappropriate to require compliance.		
330.101	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.6 Signs - effects on traffic.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.8
330.102	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.7 Outdoor Storage.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.9
FS1386.390	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	6.9
405.	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3 Land Use - Building.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.2
FS1386.391	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	Accept	7.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>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>		
330.106	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3.1 Dwelling.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.2
FSI386.392	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	7.2
330.107	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3.2 Minor dwelling.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.3
FSI386.393	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	7.3
330.109	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3.4 Height, and/or all rules sitting	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			under Rule 23.3.4.			
330.111	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3.6 Building coverage.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.6
FS1386.394	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	7.6
330.112	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3.7 Building setbacks and all other rules sitting under Rule 23.3.7.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.7
330.113	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3.8 Horotiu Noise Acoustic Area.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.10
FS1386.395	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	Accept	7.10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
330.115	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4 Subdivision.	No reasons provided.	Reject	8.3
FS1386.396	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	8.3
330.116	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4.1 Prohibited subdivision.	No reasons provided.	Reject	8.4
FS1386.397	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	8.4
330.117	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission	No reasons provided.	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			refers to Rule 23.4.2 General Subdivision.			
FS1386.398	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	8.5
330.118	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4.3 Subdivision within identified areas.	No reasons provided.	Reject	9.1
FS1386.399	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	10.1
330.119	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4.4 Title boundaries - natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable trees, intensive farming activities, aggregate extractions areas.	No reasons provided.	Reject	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FSI386.400	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	11.1
330.122	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4.7 Subdivision - Road frontage.	No reasons provided.	Reject	12.1
330.123	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4.8 Subdivision- Building platform.	No reasons provided.	Reject	12.2
FSI386.401	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	12.2
330.124	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission	No reasons provided.	Reject	12.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			refers to Rule 23.4.9 Subdivision creating Reserves.			
330.125	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4.10 Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways.	No reasons provided.	Reject	12.4
330.126	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4.11 Subdivision of land containing all or part of an Environmental Protection Area.	No reasons provided.	Reject	12.5
330.127	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4.12 Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips.	No reasons provided.	Reject	12.6
330.136	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.6.15 Artificial outdoor lighting to control adverse effects of large project lighting and any other lighting in an ecological management area with low light emission tolerance.	This policy does not go far enough An ecological management area should be managing for environmentally sensitive lower light spill tolerance. Dark sky area should be promoted Specific mitigation policy should be in place for road lighting spill. Permissible Lux light level should be lower. If this is an ecological area then a dark sky area should be promoted. It is noted that there is no significant dark sky area in this central area of the north island. It is also noted that light spill is being experienced currently in the proposed ecological area that is unacceptable for an ecological management area. The light spill should be strictly controlled. Lighting should be subject to tighter environmental control.	Reject	4.9
559.272	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Rule 23.4.5 RDI Site boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maori.	The submitter supports Rule 23.4.5 RDI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maori. This rule	Accept in part	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).		
559.273	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain Rule 23.4.5 NCI Site boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maori.	The submitter supports Rule 23.4.5 NCI Title boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maori. This rule and the more stringent activity status will give effect to Part 2, section 6 Matters of national Importance, in particular s6(e) and 6(f).	Accept in part	12.1
FS1388.811	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	12.1
695.105	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain the maximum area of earthworks in Rule 23.2.3.1 P2 Earthworks - General.	No reasons provided.	Accept	6.6
695.106	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 P2 Earthworks - General, so that earthworks limits be applied as a ratio of the site area i.e. 1:1 so that a 450m2 site would provide 450m3 of earthworks.	The Proposed District Plan penalises bigger sites for no apparent planning outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be able to absorb and diffuse effects. Earthworks totals should be counted as not cancelling each other out i.e. cut and fill are added together.	Reject	6.6
695.107	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 P4 (i) Earthworks - General, to increase the infill volume from 20m3 to 50m3.	The imported infill volume is too low and should be 50m3 to be realistic for works	Accept	6.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				outside of a building form.		
695.108	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 P4 (ii) Earthworks - General, to increase the maximum depth from 1m to 1.5m.	A depth of 1.5m is not realistic.	Accept	6.6
695.112	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.6.1 P2 (a) (iii) Signs - General, to increase the maximum sign size to 3m ² (total per site).	The sign size is too small as Country Living Lots tend to be fairly large. It is considered that relief sought will be in keeping with the balance of rural and residential qualities. The relief sought is more appropriate.	Reject	6.7
FS1323.88	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	The permitted activity signs rules are applicable to heritage items and Maaori Sites and Areas of significance. The additions proposed have the potential to cause adverse effects to these items.	Accept	6.7
695.113	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	No specific relief sought for Rule 23.2.6.1 P2 (a) (vii), however the submission notes that Council has no jurisdiction over State Highways and the Waikato Expressway when these are under NZTA jurisdiction.	While NZTA regulations have not been considered due to time constraints, it is noted that Council has no jurisdiction over State Highways and the Waikato Expressway when these are under NZTA jurisdiction.	Reject	6.7
695.114	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.6.2 P1(a)(ii) Signs - Effects on traffic, to delete the words "and any other sign"; OR Amend Rule 23.2.6.2 P1(a)(ii) Signs - Effects on Traffic, as follows: Be located at least 60m from controlled intersections, pedestrian crossings and any other sign on the same site. OR Amend Rule 23.2.6.2 P1(a)(ii) Signs - Effects on Traffic, as follows: Be located at least 60m from controlled intersections, pedestrian crossings and any other sign railway crossings (or roads under Council jurisdiction).	This is unrealistic. The cost of the consent would usually be more than the cost of the sign.	Accept in part	6.8
695.115	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.4.1 P1 Height, so the rule should apply to that part of the building structure opposite the immediate ground level only;	This would avoid giving neighbours perverse objection rights. Height in relation to boundary would need to	Reject	7.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend Rule 23.3.5 Daylight admission as a consequential amendment.	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.		
695.116	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.5 P1 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.	There is no logical planning reason for this differentiation. All daylight control planed should be consistent with each other and that are used by adjoining Councils.	Accept in part	7.5
695.117	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.6 P1 Building coverage, as follows: The total building coverage must not exceed 10% of the site area or 300m2, whichever is the larger.	The submitter considers re-phrasing is required.	Accept	7.6
FS1387.335	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	7.6
695.118	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7.1 P2 (a) (ii) Building setbacks - All boundaries, to include an exemption where an indicative road has been constructed and is open to the public but the indicative road has not been removed from the Planning Maps.	Difficulties have been encountered with inflexible Council Planner's interpretations in Raglan and Tamahere that insisted on proposals being a prohibited activity in one instance, and in the other, on considering the effects of future development on an indicative road where the road had been constructed just 50m away and was open to the public.	Accept	7.7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
695.119	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7.1 P2 (a) (iii) Building setbacks - All boundaries to reduce the minimum setback to 6m for all sites.	This rule to be changes to a reduced setback to be realistic. The minimum setback at 23.3.7.1 P2(a)(ii) is just 1.5m, yet for the an allotment over 1,000m2 is 12m. The 24m distance requirement from a dwelling on an adjoining lot is completely impractical. If a dwelling is placed 1.5m from the existing boundary, adjoining site of 1,000m2 application site loses 22.5m x 31.623m equals a loss of 711m2, which cannot be used for the building platform. It is impractical.	Reject	7.7
695.121	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RD1(a)(i) General subdivision, to allow provision for 1000m2 sized serviced (reticulated service) lots on the outskirts of towns and villages.	This is a waste of soil resources which typically occurs on high class rural land.	Reject	8.5
FS1387.336	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	8.5
FS1379.255	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to change the general subdivision rules to allow for 1000 sq.m sized sections on the outskirts of towns and villages. This relief is likely to result in ad hoc, unchecked growth in a large number of locations, contrary to the principles of the Future Proof Strategy and WRPS, which seek to manage growth and infrastructure provision,	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				and to concentrate growth to identified towns. HCC seeks urban development to locate within existing towns and other areas identified for growth, avoiding urban sprawl and the inefficient use of land and infrastructure.		
FSI11.25	Ethan & Rachael Findlay	Support	Support submission point 695.121.	To provide provisions to allow most efficient use of land. To support general intent of submission.	Reject	8.5
FSI127.6	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	In part. Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan. Not necessary that potable water be reticulated.	In part.	Reject	8.5
FSI197.31	Bowrock Properties Limited	Support	That the submission point is accepted.	Support general intent of submission.	Reject	8.5
695.122	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.8 RD1 (a) (i) Subdivision - Building platform, to decrease the area from 1000m2 to 600m2 (exclusive of boundary setbacks).	A building platform area of 600m2 would suffice for most Country Living Zone dwellings, access and servicing curtilage.	Reject	12.2
FSI387.337	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	12.2
695.123	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	No specific relief sought for Rule 23.4.8 RD1(a)(v) Subdivision - Building platform, but submission notes that a 1% AEP requirement normally applies although the submitter is not opposed to a lesser requirement provided this is a consistent with regulatory practice elsewhere.	The submitter is not opposed to a lesser requirement provided this is consistent with regulatory practice elsewhere.	Reject	12.2
FSI387.338	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Reject	12.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.468	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7.5 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.	Accept	7.9
FSI139.16	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Reject	7.9
FSI108.17	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Reject	7.9
697.844	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Chapter 23 Country Living Zone heading, as follows: Chapter 23: Country Living Zone - <u>Rules</u>	This is to assist in clarifying that all of the provisions within the chapter are rules.	Accept	5.2
FSI387.707	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	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.845	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23(2) Country Living Zone, as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Country Living Zone are contained in Rule 23.4 and the relevant rules in 14 Infrastructure and Energy; and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).	This is 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.	Reject	8.3
FS1387.708	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	8.3
697.846	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.1 PI Permitted Activities, as follows: (a)Activity-specific conditions; (a)(b)Land Use - Effects rules in Rule 22.2 (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 22.3 (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	5.2
FS1387.709	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	Reject	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
697.847	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.1 P2 Permitted Activities, as follows: Home stay for up to 4 people	This amendment makes it clear that the activity is permitted for up to 4 people.	Accept	5.8
FS1387.710	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	5.8
697.848	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.1 P4 (d) and (e) Permitted Activities, as follows: (d) Unloading and loading of vehicles and/or the receiving of customers or and deliveries <u>can</u> only occur after 7:30am and before 7:00pm on any day; (e) Machinery may only be operated after 7:30am and up to 9pm on any day.	To align the hours for the activity with the noise rule (23.2.1) for this zone.	Accept	5.10
FS1387.711	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	Reject	5.10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.849	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity (P5) to Rule 23.1.1 P5 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>P5 Travellers' Accommodation (a) For up to 5 people</u> .	Travellers' accommodation has been provided for as a Discretionary Activity, but not a permitted activity. This needs to be consistent with other zone chapters.	Accept	5.6
FS1387.712	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	5.6
697.851	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.2 D1 Discretionary Activities, as follows: Any permitted activity that does not comply with <u>one or more of the an 'Activity Specific Conditions'</u> in Rule 23.1.1	This is to provide consistency with other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.	Accept	5.2
FS1387.713	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	Reject	5,2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.852	Waikato District Council	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.1.2 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 chapter.	Accept	5.2
FS1387.714	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	5.2
697.853	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.2 D9 Discretionary Activities, as follows: Travellers' accommodation for more than 5 people	This amendment makes it clear that the activity is for more than 5 people, which is consistent with other zone chapters.	Accept	5.13
FS1387.715	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	5.2
697.854	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new discretionary activity (D12) to Rule 23.1.2	A homestay activity has been provided for	Accept	5.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Discretionary Activities, as follows: <u>A home stay for more than 4 people.</u>	as a permitted activity (Rule 23.1.1 P2), which has also been proposed to be amended to include provision for up to 4 people. However for clarity; homestay for more than 4 people needs to be provided as a Discretionary activity.		
FS1387.716	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	5.8
697.855	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new non-complying activity (NC13) to Rule 23.1.3 Non-Complying Activities, as follows: <u>(a) The following activities located within the Urban Expansion Area: (i) intensive farming; (ii) storage, processing or disposal of hazardous waste; (iii) correctional facility; (iv) extractive industry; (v) industrial activity; (vi) motorised recreation activity; (vii) transport depot; (viii) rural industry.</u>	A new rule is required to provide consistency with the rural zone for activities situated within the Urban Expansion Area.	Accept	5.14
FS1387.717	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	Reject	5.14

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
697.856	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.2.1.1 P3 Noise - General; AND Amend Rule 23.2.1.1 P2 Noise - General, as follows: (a) Noise measured at the notional boundary within any site in the Rural Zone and within any other site in the Country Living Zone must not exceed: (i) 50dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm every day; (ii) 45dB (LAeq), 7pm to 10pm every day; (iii) 40dB (LAeq) and 65dB (LAm _{ax}), 10pm to 7am the following day. (b) <u>Noise measured within any site in any other zone, other than the Rural Zone, must meet the permitted noise levels for that other zone. (i) Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound". (ii) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic-Environmental noise".</u> AND Amend Rule 23.2.1.1 D1, as follows: Noise that does not comply with Rule 23.2.1.1 P1, P2, P3, P4 or P5.	Including the standards referred to in P5 ensure that they are complied with in conjunction with the rule.	Accept	6.3
FS1051.17	Colette Shona Hanrahan	Oppose	<i>If my understanding is correct, then it needs a proper consultation process with all affected landowners. If WDC wants any further subdivision in their area, then this Rule is blatantly going to put any landowner off it. There is no justice or fairness to any part of it. WDC would be blatant robbers.</i>	Rule 23.4.10 is still unclear. The understanding is that WDC proposes that any landowner who wishes to subdivide their land, which has an SNA designation on it, will have to pay for the subdivision, pay for the 3m wide walkway/cycle way/bridleway, and then vest their land in the WDC, all the while getting no reimbursement back from Council from their loss of land, security or privacy. Have an SNA and a walkway/cycle way/bridleway currently over the property, which is definitely not an SNA, as it is covered in pest species. It would also cost an absolutely astronomical amount as the terrain is not suitable for a walkway/cycle way/bridleway. It is very steep, prone to	Reject	6.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>erosion easily, and extremely boggy- completely off the scale for even contemplating to build a walkway/cycle way/bridleway.</i>		
697.857	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.2.1.1 P5 Noise - General; AND Add to Rule 23.2.1.1 P4(a) Noise - General, as follows: (c) <u>Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with the requirements of Standard NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound".</u> (d) <u>Noise levels shall be assessed in accordance with the requirements of Standard NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic- Environmental noise".</u> AND Amend Rule 23.2.1.1 D1, as follows: Noise that does not comply with Rule 23.2.1.1 P1, P2, P3, <u>or</u> P4 or P5	The word "noise" provides clarity to this rule. Including the standards referred to in P5 ensure that they are complied with in conjunction with the rule. As a consequential amendments.	Accept	6.3
697.858	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.1.2 P1(a) Noise - Construction, as follows: Noise generated from the construction site must not exceed meet the limits in NZS 6803:1999 (Acoustics - Construction Noise);	Additional clarity to the rule. Construction noise should not exceed the limits, rather than meet the limits in the New Zealand Standards.	Accept	6.4
697.861	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.2.3.1 P1 (a) (ii) Earthworks - General.	The content of this rule is already contained within the definition of ancillary rural earthworks.	Reject	6.6
697.863	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 P2(a) Earthworks - General, as follows: (i) Do not exceed a volume of more than 250m3 and an area of more than 1000m2 within a site over any single <u>consecutive</u> 12 month period; ... (iii) Earthworks are setback <u>at least</u> 1.5m from any boundary;	The words "consecutive" and "at least" provide clarity to this rule.	Accept	6.6
697.864	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.2.3.1 P3 Earthworks - General; AND Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 RD1 (a) as follows: (a) Earthworks that do not comply with Rule 23.2.3.1 P1, P2, P3 or P4.	P3 has been included in Rule 23.2.3.1 P1 (a) (iii) for efficiency and clarity. As a consequential amendment.	Accept	6.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.865	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 P4(a)(iv) Earthworks - General, as follows: (iv) Fill material is setback at <u>least</u> 1.5m from all boundaries;	The words "at least" provide clarity to this rule.	Accept	6.6
697.878	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.2.6.1 P2(a)(viii) Signs - General; AND Amend Rule 23.2.6.1 P2(a)(xi) Signs - General, as follows: (xi) The sign is <u>for the purpose of identification and interpretation not attached to</u> of a Maaori site of significance listed in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori Sites of Significance) <u>except for the purpose of identification and interpretation</u> ;	Re-wording this rule provides clarity. P2 (a)(viii) is not required because the Country Living Zone provisions do not apply within the road reserve.	Accept in part	6.7
697.879	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.6.1 P3 Signs - General as follows: (a) A real estate 'for sale' or 'for rent' sign relating to the site on which it is located must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) There is no more than <u>1.3</u> signs per site agency; (ii) The sign is not illuminated; (iii) The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (iv) The sign does not project into or over road reserve.	This rule excluded signs for rental properties and provided for only 1 sign per agency, as opposed to the site. This proposed wording provides clarification. P3 (a)(iv) is not required as the Country Living zone provisions do not apply within the road reserve.	Accept in part	6.7
697.881	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.2.7 Outdoor Storage.	This rule needs to be deleted, as this is difficult to enforce in the Country Living Zone. There are no rules included in the plan for Residential, Village or Rural zones.	Accept	6.9
FS1387.721	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</i>	Reject	6.9

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.		
697.891	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.2 PI Minor dwelling as follows: (a) One minor dwelling within a site <u>record of title</u> must <u>comply with all of the following conditions: not exceed 70m² gfa.</u> (i) Where there is an existing dwelling located within a site not exceed 70m² gross floor area (ii) The minor dwelling must be located within 20m of the principal residential unit dwelling; (iii) The minor dwelling must share a single driveway access with the existing principal residential unit dwelling.	These amendments provide clarity of rule and alignment with the definition for minor dwelling.	Accept in part	7.3
FS1387.723	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 in part	7.3
697.893	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.4(2) Height, as follows: (2) Rule 23.3.4.1 - Height - Building general provides permitted height levels across the entire Rural Zone for buildings, structures or vegetation. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rule 23.3.4.2.</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that Rule 23.3.4.2 applies to the areas specified in that rule instead of the height building general rule.	Reject	7.4
FS1253.23	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Seek that the whole part of this submission be disallowed.	With the proposed wording, if a building were to be erected within the AOLS overlay, the height of that building could be as high as that	Accept	7.4

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				overlay allows in that particular location. This proposed submission would work in instances where the allowable height of the building within the AOLS overlay was below 7.5m. However, in many locations the height limit within the AOLS overlay well exceeds 7.5m meaning that buildings within those areas could be built higher than 7.5m as a permitted activity within the AOLS in some cases. If buildings in these areas can be built above 7.5m this would have a detrimental effect on the amenity and character values of the Country Living Zone. Both rules should apply to prevent the above scenario from occurring.		
697.896	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 23.3 Land Use - Building after Rule 23.3.6 Building coverage, as follows: <u>Rule 23.3.6A Impervious surfaces</u> PI The impervious surface of a site must not exceed 70%. RDI (a) Impervious surfaces that does not comply with Rule 23.3.4A PI (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.	This is to include the impervious surfaces rule from Rule 14.11.1(P2) and 14.11.2(RD2) into Chapter 23 to make it easier to find.	Accept	7.6
FS1387.725	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	7.6
697.897	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.5 RDI (b) Daylight admission, as follows: (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Height of the building; (ii)	This additional wording provides clarity to the rule in respect to shading and other sites. This provides consistency with	Accept	7.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Design and location of the building; (iii) Admission of daylight and sunlight to the site and other site; (iv) Privacy on <u>any</u> other site; (v) Effects on amenity values <u>of the locality</u> .	other zone chapters.		
697.898	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.6 P1 Building coverage, as follows: The total building coverage must not exceed 10% or 300m2, whichever is the larger.	The word "total" is not required. This is to provide consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	7.6
FS1387.726	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	7.6
697.899	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.6 D1 Building coverage, as follows: Total Building coverage that does not comply with Rule 23.3.6 P1.	This is to provide consistency across zone chapters.	Accept	7.6
FS1387.727	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	Reject	7.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
697.901	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7.1 P1 (a) Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: (b) A building located on a site <u>Record of Title</u> containing more than 1000m2 must be set back a minimum of:	The reference to "record of title" has been included for correction.	Reject	7.7
697.902	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (v) to Rule 23.3.7.1 RDI (b) Building setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: (v) <u>reverse sensitivity</u> .	This additional matter of discretion is required to be included in the planner's assessment of effects of this activity.	Accept	7.7
697.904	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend location of Rule 23.3.7.4 Building - Airport Noise Outer Control Boundary to follow rule 23.3.8 Building - Horotiu Noise Acoustic Area.	This rule is a noise rule, not a setback requirement and needs to be relocated.	Accept	7.12
FS1387.728	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	7.12
697.905	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 23.3.7.5 P1 (b) Building setback - waterbodies; AND Add a new permitted activity P2 to Rule 23.3.7 Building setbacks as follows: <u>P2 - A public amenity of up to 25m2, or a pump shed (public or private) within any building setback identified in rule 23.3.7.5 P1.</u>	This is to provide consistency with other zone chapters. As a consequential amendment.	Accept	7.9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			AND Amend Rule 23.3.7.5 D1 Building setbacks, as follows: Any building that does not comply with Rule 23.3.7.5 P1 or P2			
697.906	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7.5 Building setback - waterbodies, as follows: P1 (a) Any building must be set back a minimum of: (i) 23 32m from the margin of any; A. lake; and B. wetland; (ii) 23 32m from the bank of any river (other than the Waikato River and Waipa River); (iii) 37m from the banks of the Waikato River and the Waipa River; and (iv) 27.5 32m from mean high water springs.	This is so that the setback represents 25m esplanade reserve plus the yard setback for the Waikato and Waipa Rivers, and 20m esplanade plus the yard setback for all other waterbodies.	Accept	7.9
FS1387.729	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	7.9
697.917	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4 Subdivision heading, as follows: 23.4 Subdivision <u>Rules</u>	These additional words in this rule provide clarity.	Accept	8.3
FS1387.731	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	Reject	8.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
697.918	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new clause (xi) to Rule 23.4(2) Subdivision, as follows: <u>(xi) Rule 23.4.6B - subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend consequential renumbering;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new rule to Rule 23.4 Subdivision after Rule 23.4.6, as follows: <u>23.4.6B Subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor</u> RDI (a) <u>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 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.</u></p> <p>NCI Any subdivision of land within the National Grid Corridor that does not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rule 23.4.6B RDI.</p>	This is to replicate the subdivision rule within the National Grid Corridor from Chapter 14 into Chapter 23 for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Accept	8.5
FS1350.129	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions,	Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p>Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</p>	<p>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 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.</p>		
FS1387.732	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</p>	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
697.919	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.1 PRI Prohibited Activities, as follows: Any subdivision within Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area <u>as identified on the planning maps</u> involving the creation of any additional let <u>record of title</u> .	This provides additional clarity.	Accept	8.4
FS1387.733	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	8.4
FS1379.276	Hamilton City Council	Support	Null	HCC supports the amendments within this submission as they provide further clarification to the prohibited activity status rule for subdivision within the CLZ in the UEA.	Accept	8.4
697.921	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new rule (ix) to Rule 23.4.3 D1 Subdivision within identified areas, as follows: <u>(ix) A natural hazard area.</u>	This is to accommodate the consequential changes as a result of changes to 23.4.4 Title boundaries rule.	Accept	10.1
FS1387.734	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	Reject	10.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
697.922	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.4 Title boundaries - natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable trees, intensive farming activities, aggregate extraction areas heading, as follows: Title boundaries - Existing Buildings-natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable trees, intensive farming activities, aggregate extraction areas	This rule heading needs amending to reflect the changes being made to RDI.	Accept	11.1
FS1387.735	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	11.1
697.923	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.4 RDI Title boundaries - natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable trees, intensive farming activities, aggregate extraction areas, as follows: (a) Subdivision of land containing any natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable tree, intensive farming activity or Aggregate Extraction Area must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) (a) The boundaries of every proposed lot containing an existing building must demonstrate compliance with the Land Use - Building rules in Rule 23.3 relating to: (i) Rule 23.3.5	Rule needs amending to provide clarity as to its purpose. Consequential changes to be made in other rules.	Accept	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			(Daylight admission); (ii) Rule 23.3.6 (Building coverage); (iii) Rule 23.3.7 (Building Setbacks); (iii) (b) Rule 23.4.4 RDI (a)(i) does not apply to any non-compliance with the Land Use - Building rules in Rule 23.3 that existed lawfully prior to the subdivision. (iii) (c) Any boundary of a proposed lot must not divide the following: A. a natural hazard area; B. contaminated land; C. Significant Amenity Landscape; D. Notable tree. (iv) Any boundary of a proposed lot must provide the following setbacks: A. 300m from any intensive farming activity; B. 200m from an Aggregate Extraction Area for sand extraction; C. 500m from an Aggregate Extraction Area for rock extraction. (c) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Landscape values; (ii) Amenity values and character; (iii) Reverse sensitivity effects; (iv) Effects on any existing building; (v) Effects on a natural hazard area; (vi) Effects on contaminated land; (vii) Effects on a notable tree; (viii) Effects on an intensive farming activity; E. Effects on an Aggregate Extraction Area.			
FS1387.736	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	11.1
697.924	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.4 NCI Title boundaries - natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable trees, intensive farming activities, aggregate extraction areas to change to D1 a discretionary activity rather than a non complying activity, as follows; NCI-D1 Discretionary activities	This activity status is too onerous for this rule.	Accept	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			Title boundaries - natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable trees, intensive farming activities, aggregate extraction areas			
FS1223.130	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 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	11.1
FS1387.737	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	11.1
FS1308.113	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	The proposed activity status is too onerous for this rule.	Accept	11.1
697.925	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.5 Site boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori heading, as follows: Site boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage	This rule needs to apply only to significant natural areas and notable trees, as Rule 23.4.6 (heritage items) and new Rule 23.4.6A for archaeological sites and sites	Accept	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, <u>notable trees</u>	and areas of significance to Maaori will accommodate these rules.		
697.926	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.5 RDI (a) Site boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, as follows: (a) Any boundary of a proposed lot must not divide any of the following: (i) A Significant Natural Area; (ii) A heritage item as identified in Schedule 30.1 (Heritage Items); (iii) A Maaori site of significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maaori Sites of Significance); or (iv) A Maaori area of significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori Areas of Significance). (iii) notable tree	The removal of clause (ii) is because it is already covered in Rule 23.4.6. The removal of clauses (iii) and (iv) are to set these rules apart and create a new rule entirely (proposed Rule 23.4.6A).	Accept in part	12.1
697.928	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add new rule to Rule 23.4 Subdivision after Rule 23.4.5 Site boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maaori, as follows: <u>23.4.6A Subdivision of land containing archaeological sites, Maaori sites of significance and Maaori areas of significance RDI</u> (a) The boundaries of every proposed lot must not divide any of the following: (i) Maaori sites of significance as identified in Schedule 30.3 (Maori sites of significance); (ii) Maori areas of significance as identified in Schedule 30.4 (Maaori areas of significance). (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) effects on heritage values; (ii) context and setting of the heritage item; and (iii) the extent to which the relationship of the heritage item with its setting is maintained. <u>DI Subdivision that does not comply with Rule 23.4.6A RDI.</u>	Amendment arising from splitting out archaeological sites and Maaori sites and areas of significance in Rule 23.4.5.	Accept in part	12.1
FS1323.30	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendment sought is declined.	HNZPT has concerns that the deletions/inclusions sought in the rule will cause adverse effects to historic heritage. HNZPT has concerns that the proposed new rule, where non-compliance with the restricted discretionary activity will be a discretionary activity, rather than non-complying activity, could cause adverse effects to historic heritage	Reject	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.929	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.7 RDI (a) Subdivision - Road frontage, as follows: (a) Every proposed lot as part of the subdivision having with a road boundary, other than one designed as any access allotment or utility allotment or lot accessed via an access leg containing a road access leg , must have a width along the road boundary of at least 15m.	This is to provide clarity to this rule.	Accept in part	12.1
697.931	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.10 Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways heading, as follows: Subdivision of land containing mapped off-road walkways, <u>cycleways, bridleways</u>	Heading to include cycleways and bridleways.	Accept	12.4
697.932	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.10 RDI Subdivision on land containing mapped off-road walkways, as follows: (a) Subdivision of land where containing walkways shown on the planning maps <u>must provide those walkways, cycleways and bridleways and are to be provided as part of the subdivision</u> must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) <u>The walkway, cycleway or bridleway</u> is at least 3 metres wide and (ii) the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> is designed and constructed for shared pedestrian and cycle use, as per Rule 14.12.1 P8 (Access and road performance standards); (iii) the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> is generally in accordance with the walkway route shown on the planning maps; (iv) the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> is shown on the plan of subdivision and vested in the Council. (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) alignment of the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> ; (ii) drainage in relation to the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> ; (iii) standard of design and construction of the walkway, <u>cycleway or bridleway</u> ; (iv) land stability; (v) amenity matters including batter slopes; (vi) connection to reserves.	Wording to provide clarity to this rule.	Accept	12.4
697.933	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 23.4.11 CI (b) Subdivision of land containing all or part of an Environmental Protection Area, a new clause (iii) as follows: (iii) <u>Legal protection if appropriate.</u>	Adding legal protection as a matter of discretion enables Council to protect areas of planting in perpetuity.	Accept	12.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.934	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.12 RDI (a) Esplanade reserves and esplanade strips, as follows: (a) Subdivision of an esplanade reserve or strip 20m wide (or other width stated in Appendix 54 Esplanade Priority Areas) is required to be created from every proposed lot and shall vest in Council where the following situations apply:	This is to correct a referencing error.	Accept	12.6
742.144	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.7 RDI (a) Subdivision - Road frontage as follows: (a) Every proposed lot as part of the subdivision having a road boundary, other than one designed as an access allotment or utility allotment containing a road access leg, must have a width along the road boundary of at least 15m <u>50m</u> .	The submitter considers there is no justification as to why the road frontage rule within the Country Living Zone has been changed from 50m (under the Operative Plan) to 15m. 50m is appropriate to ensure the safe and efficient operation of the transport network.	Accept in part	12.4
FS1283.2	Parkmere Farms	Oppose	Oppose.	An increased 50m frontage of a Country Living site is not justified in terms of amenity, character, road safety or access. This will result in sites with a very wide frontage and very short depth to the site. On a 5000m2 site, this will result in a site that is 100m deep, as opposed to a site 333m (assuming 15m road frontage as notified). It will result in considerably more roads to provide the frontage requirements.	Reject	12.4
FS1221.2	Cindy and Tony Young	Oppose	Null	An increased 50m frontage of a Country Living site is not justified in terms of amenity, character, road safety or access. This will result in sites with a very wide frontage and very short depth to the site. On a 5000m2 site, this will result in a site that is 100m deep, as opposed to a site 333m (assuming 15m road frontage as notified). It will result in considerably more roads to provide the frontage requirements.	Reject	12.1
742.232	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 23.1.1 P3 Permitted Activity - 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	5.9

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1387.897	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	5.9
742.233	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 23.1.1 P4 Home occupation, except for the amendments sought below AND Add a new condition to Rule 23.1.1 P4 Permitted Activity - Home occupation as follows: f) <u>There are no heavy vehicle movements associated with the activity.</u> AND Add a new Restricted Discretionary rule for home occupations not complying with 23.1.1 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 Country Living Zone, home occupations should not involve heavy vehicles without an assessment of effects.	Reject	5.10
FS1387.898	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	Accept	5.10

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
742.234	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 23.2.2 P1 Glare and Artificial Light Spill as notified. AND Retain Rule 23.2.2 RD1 Glare and Artificial Light Spill as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept	6.5
742.235	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 23.2.6.1 P1 Signs - General as notified. AND Retain Rule 23.2.6.1 P2 Signs - General as notified. AND Retain Rule 23.2.6.1 RD1 Signs - General as notified.	The submitter supports Rules 23.2.6.1 P1 and P2 and the matters of discretion under RD1, particularly (b)(iii), (b) (iv) and (b)(v).	Accept in part	6.7
742.236	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 23.2.6.2 P1 Signs- effects on traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 23.2.6.2 P1v) Signs - effects on traffic as follows Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 <u>words</u> , symbols <u>or</u> <u>graphics</u> . AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 23.2.6.2 P1 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.	Reject	6.8
742.237	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 23.2.6.2 DI Signs - effects on traffic as notified.	The submitter supports Council having full discretion over signs that do not comply with permitted activity standards.	Accept	6.8
742.238	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rules 23.3.7.1 P1 and P2 Building Setbacks - All boundaries to require 35m setbacks from the Waikato Expressway designation boundary, and 15m setbacks from all other state highways.	Rules 23.3.7.1 P1 and P2 do not differentiate between different road types as described in the road hierarchy.	Reject	7.7
FS1283.6	Parkmere Farms	Oppose	Oppose.	<i>15m setback from all state highways or 35m from the Waikato expressway for all buildings (including those that are not habitable) does</i>	Accept	7.7

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>not constitute an efficient use of the land resource. There are no resource management reasons (particularly acoustic reasons) why an uninhabited building, or building that is otherwise not used for sensitive activities should be subject to an increased setback from a state highway in comparison to a district road.</i>		
FS1221.6	<i>Cindy and Tony Young</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>1.5m setback from all state highways or 3.5m from the Waikato expressway for all buildings (including those that are not habitable) does not constitute an efficient use of land resource. There are no resource management reasons (particularly acoustic reasons) why an uninhabitable building, or building that is otherwise not used for sensitive activities should be subject to an increased setback from a state highway in comparison to a district road.</i>	Accept	7.7
742.241	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.7.2 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	7.8
746.116	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 P2 (a) (i)- Earthworks - General to increase the earthworks volume to 500m ³ .	Where subdivision has been approved by Council there should be no requirements for land owners to apply for additional 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 earthworks works.	Accept	6.6
FS1287.43	<i>Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd</i>	Support	<i>Blue Wallace seeks that the submission point be allowed in full.</i>	<i>The Submitter supports this submission point as it acknowledges that rural activities need a larger permitted earthworks volume. 500m² is a more suitable volume.</i>	Accept	6.6
746.117	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Rule 23.3.2 PI-Minor Dwelling as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept	7.3
FS1387.975	<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</i>	Reject	7.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<p>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>		
746.118	The Surveying Company	Support	Amend Rule 23.3.5 PI-Daylight Admission as follows: A building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 45 37 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.	An angle of 37 degrees to be harder to follow than the general standard of 45 degrees that is presented across many other Plans in New Zealand. 45 degrees is clear cut and easy to measure.	Accept in part	7.5
746.119	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 23.3.7.5 PI-Building Setbacks - Waterbodies as follows: <u>a building must be set back a minimum of 10 metres from the bank of a perennial or intermittent stream (named or unnamed).</u>	Rule 22.3.7.5 has not included minimum setbacks from the bank of a perennial or intermittent stream.	Accept in part	7.9
746.121	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.7 RDI (a)-Subdivision - Road Frontage. AND Amend Rule 23.4.7-Subdivision-Road Frontage as per Rule 26.6.4-Vehicular Access Requirement of the Operative Waikato District Plan- Franklin Section.	The layout of a development is dependent on the size and shape of the site as well as its topography (amongst other constraints). While a 15m minimum width along a road boundary can generally work in many developments that have the ability to follow a grid design, not every site is flat with no size/shape constraints. Sites with topographical natural or physical constraints may be unable to practically implement a layout that achieves 15m road frontage for all lots with the road. 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.	Reject	12.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
746.122	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.9 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. 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. There is no analysis in the s32 stating why the 50% road frontage rule has been applied. While this may be a principle to follow it should not be enforced through a rule.	Accept	12.3
746.144	The Surveying Company	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission supports with amendments Rule 23.2.3.I PI Earthworks - General and considers that where subdivision has been approved, 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	6.6
746.145	The Surveying Company	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, but submission supports with amendments Rule 23.2.3.I P3 Earthworks - General and considers that where subdivision has been approved, 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	6.6
923.159	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.1.I P2, P3, P4, P5 and D1 - Noise-General as follows: P2 Sound measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008 must not exceed: (a) Noise measured at the following noise limits at any point within a notional boundary on within any site in the Rural Zone and within any other site in the Country Living Zone must not exceed: (i) 50dB	The proposed noise limits are generally in accordance with guideline values and use current measurement and assessment standards, acoustical metrics, numerical values, time-frames and assessment location. However, the following issues have been identified: - Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with	Deferred until expert advice received prior to Hearing	6.3

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			<p><u>LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq), 7am to 7pm, every day;</u> (ii) <u>45dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq); 7pm to 10pm every day;</u> (iii) <u>40dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq) and 65 dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day;</u> (iv) <u>65dB LAfmax, 10pm to 7am the following day;</u> (b) <u>The permitted activity noise limits for the zone of any other site where sound is received. P3 (a) Noise measured within any site in any zone, other than the Country Living Zone and Rural Zone, must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone. P4 (a) Noise generated by any activity in Tamahere Commercial Area A and Tamahere Commercial Area B, as identified on the planning maps, must not exceed the following levels: (a) In Tamahere Commercial Areas A and B does not exceed: (i) 65dB (LAeq), 7am to 10pm; (ii) 50dB (LAeq) and 75 dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day, (b) Outside Tamahere Commercial Areas A and B, does not exceed: (i) 55dB (LAeq), 7am to 10pm; (ii) 40dB (LAeq) and 70Db (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. P5 (a) Noise levels shall be measured in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound." (b) Noise levels shall be assessed in accordance with the requirements of NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic Environmental Noise." D1 (a) 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 23.2.1.1 P1 or P2, P3, P4 or P5.</u></p>	<p>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, - There is an inconsistent approach for sound received in another zone, - Tamahere Commercial Areas A and B have been treated inconsistently with other areas in that a noise limit is based on the source location and not the receiver location. This should be moved onto a separate rule, as for Huntly Power Station in the Rural Zone</p>		
986.105	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new clause (vii) to Rule 23.2.3.1 P2(a) Earthworks - General as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (vii) <u>Be located more than 1.5 m horizontally from any infrastructure, including a waterway, open drain or overland flow path;</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.</p>	<p>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 setback. 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.</p>	Reject	6.6
FS1176.318	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	<p>Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to</p>	Reject	6.6

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>protect existing infrastructure.</i>		
986.113	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3.1 P2 (a)(iv) Earthworks general as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (iv) Areas exposed by the earthworks are <u>stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation re-vegetated to achieve 80% ground cover 6 months of the commencement of the earthworks</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	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 are ambiguous.	Accept	6.6
276.10	Ted and Kathryn Letford	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7.1 (a) (iii) Building Setbacks (All Boundaries), from 12m to a 6m setback.	12m setback seems like an inefficient use of land. Difference between 6m and 12m in terms of noise and privacy is not something that would be noticed in terms of effects on the residents, compared to the effects of the waste of space that it results in.	Reject	7.7
330.60	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Policy 5.6.15 Artificial outdoor lighting.	No reasons provided.	Reject	4.9
330.70	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.1.2 Noise - Construction.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.4
330.100	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.2.6.1 Signs - General.	No reasons provided.	Reject	6.7
330.110	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.3.5 Daylight admission.	No reasons provided.	Reject	7.5
330.120	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 23.4.5 Site boundaries - Significant Natural Areas, heritage items, archaeological sites, sites of significance to Maori.	No reasons provided.	Reject	12.1
345.20	Brent Trail	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.4 RDI (a) (iii) Title boundaries - natural hazard area, contaminated land, Significant Amenity Landscape, notable trees, intensive farming	Submitter is concerned by rule. Submitter agrees a boundary should ideally not go through a notable tree; there will be	Accept in part	11.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			activities, aggregate extraction areas. AND Delete from every zone the subdivision rule which requires the boundary of every proposed lot to not divide any of the following: A natural hazard area; Contaminated land; Significant Amenity Landscape; Notable tree.	instances where a boundary could go through a contaminated area, natural hazard or significant landscape. Much of Waikato rural land is contaminated due to high levels of cadmium, therefore any rural boundary line would not be allowed. Vast lengths of the coast may become natural hazards; therefore any coastal subdivision where lots require to intersect the coastal reserve will likely be affected by this rule.		
378.40	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 23.2.1.1 Noise - General.	The rule permits noise generated by emergency sirens and 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 in part	6.3
<i>FS1035.146</i>	<i>Pareoranga Te Kata</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.</i>	<i>Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	6.3
433.8	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.6.3 (a) (v) Subdivision within the Country Living Zone, as notified.	Existing game bird hunting activities are often constrained by surrounding land use, and generally becomes untenable when this land use changes; for example, when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites. Recreational game bird hunting is a very popular activity in the rural environment. The game bird season involves the discharge of shotgun noise. This is not like other constant noises rather it is very brief in duration. Game bird hunting begins at 6:30am in the morning and concludes at 6:30pm at night for the length of the season. Introducing new dwelling areas near areas of recreational significance to hunters can have implications on the future of hunting in these areas. For example, complaints can be made under the Arms Act 1983 which makes clear that anyone discharging a firearm in a public	Accept in part	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				place so as to deliberately endanger, frighten or annoy any other person is guilty of a serious offence. Shotgun noise may also be a particular issue for public places such as any equestrian arena in the vicinity of maimais used during the game bird hunting season. Method 6.1.2 'Reverse sensitivity' of the RPS requires local authorities to have particular regard to the potential for reverse sensitivity when assessing resource consent applications, preparing, reviewing or changing district plans. It states that particular consideration should be given to discouraging new sensitive activities near existing and planned land uses or activities that could be subject to effects including the discharge of noise, which could lower the amenity values of the surrounding area.		
FS1223.69	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 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.</i>	Accept in part	8.2
433.10	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.6.13 Enabling signage, as notified.	Fish and Game has a statutory role to main and enhance access to sports fisheries and game bird hunting areas. Signage is therefore a fundamental aspect of managing game bird shooting and sports fish angling activities and is accepted as a permitted activity throughout much of New Zealand.	Accept	4.8
FS1330.39	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Oppose in current form. Reject subject to further amendments	<i>The proposal does not sufficiently acknowledge design constraints, and security and health and</i>	Reject	4.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				safety risks, of unfettered public access.		
464.10	Perry Group Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.4.2 RDI (a) (i) General Subdivision. AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to address the concerns raised in the submission.	Council should be concerned with amenity values, not with minimum lot sizes in the Country Living Zone.	Reject	8.5
FS1379.183	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the submission, which seeks to delete the minimum lot size for subdivision in the CLZ. Removing the subdivision lot size would effectively increase density around Hamilton, will result in inefficient and ad hoc subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries, and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure, which Hamilton would have no control over.	Accept	8.5
FS1388.383	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 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	8.5
466.30	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7 RDI Building setbacks to include consideration of reverse sensitivity as a matter of discretion.	An additional provision is sought to enable the potential for reverse sensitivity effects to be included as a matter to which discretion is restricted, particularly about the siting of buildings adjoining land used for commercial vegetable production.	Accept	7.7
662.30	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.8 RDI(a)(i) Subdivision - Building platform as follows: (i) has an area of 1,000m2 <u>500m2</u> exclusive of boundary setbacks;	Do not support requiring a 1,000m2 building envelope as this presents an excessively conservative development footprint. Generally supportive of the Propose District Plan providing design	Reject	12.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				guidance on the subdivision process. It is an overly restrictive design criteria. More adaptive solutions can be considered by the developer without the need for an expanded assessment matter through Council's unrestricted discretion.		
695.120	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.7.5 Building setbacks – Waterbodies and Rule 22.3.7.5 Building setbacks, to be made the same.	There does not appear to be a regulatory or logical reason for a difference with the Rural Zone.	Accept	7.9
695.140	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.7 RDI (a) Subdivision – Road frontage, to change the minimum width along the road boundary in the Country Living Zone from 15m to 20m.	It is 20m in Rule 24.4.9 RDI (a).	Reject	12.1
697.560	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete from Policy 5.6.3(a)(i) Subdivision within the Country Living Zone as follows: (i) The creation of undersized lots is avoided where character and amenity are compromised; AND Add to Policy 5.6.3(a) Subdivision within the Country Living Zone a new policy (vi) as follows: (vi) Character and amenity is not compromised	The wording "where character and amenity are compromised" weakens this policy, which supports a non-complying activity where proposed lots are undersized. It is proposed to make 'character and amenity' a separate criteria.	Accept	8.2
FS1287.33	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Blue Wallace seeks that the submission point be rejected.	The Submitter considers that undersized lots can be appropriate in certain instances so opposes the definitive nature of this submission point. The amendment sought by Blue Wallace will provide appropriate flexibility in subdivision design.	Reject	8.2
FS1387.61 I	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	Reject	8.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
697.860	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.3(1) Earthworks, as follows: (1) Rule 23.2.3.1 – Earthworks General, provides the permitted rules for earthworks activities for the Rural Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rule 23.2.3.1A, 23.2.3.2, 23.2.3.3 and 23.2.3.4.</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that the rules in 23.2.3(2) apply to the areas specified in that rule instead of the general earthworks rule.	Accept	6.6
697.880	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.6.2 PI (a) Signs - effects on Traffic, as follows: (a) Any sign directed at road users must meet the following conditions: (i) Not imitate the content, colour or appearance of any traffic control sign; and (ii) Be located at least 60m from controlled intersections, pedestrian crossings and any other sign; and (iii) Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections; and (iv) Be able to be viewed by drivers for at least 250m; and (v) Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 symbols; and (vi) Have lettering that is at least 200mm high; and (vii) Comply with the following Where the sign directs traffic to a site entrance the sign must be at least: A. 175m from the site entrance on any road with a speed limit of 80 km/hr or less; or B. 250m from the site entrance on any road with a speed limit of more than 80km/hr.	The amended wording provides clarity for the rule and consistency with other rules. This rule is unachievable and not appropriate for the purpose of the Country Living Zone.	Accept	6.8
FSI 264.26	Bootleg Brewery	Oppose	Seek that either the submission point is disallowed OR The Matangi site is excluded/exempt from these rules, on the basis effects from the operation of the site on local community are addressed through a bespoke precinct zone, commercial agreement, or effects are negligible and there is no need to apply a restriction.	Bootleg supports a framework which provides for the permissive operation of a brewery with on and off premise, as well as promotes economic growth and regeneration of the site to realise its full potential. The rules unnecessarily restrict or result in additional cost to operators, which there is no significant adverse effect to be managed. The anticipated effects are either negligible or can be managed through commercial outcomes. On this basis, the proposed rules will have a negative effect on economic growth and regeneration of the site, which will benefit the local community.	Reject	6.8

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
697.890	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.3.1 PI Dwelling, as follows: (a) One dwelling within a <u>site record of title</u> ; (b) The dwelling must not be located within any of the <u>following landscape and natural character areas</u> : (i) ...	The reference to "record of title" has been included for correction and other words for clarity of the rule.	Accept in part	7.2
FS1387.722	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 in part	7.2
697.920	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RDI General Subdivision, as follows: (a) Subdivision must comply with all of the following conditions, <u>where applicable</u> : (i) All proposed lots must have a net site area of at least 5000m ² . (ii) Where the land being subdivided is wholly inside the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary or wholly or partly inside the SEL 95 Boundary identified on the planning maps, the average net site area of all proposed lots must be at least 1.1ha; (iii) Where the land being subdivided straddles the Airport Subdivision Control Boundary, the maximum number of proposed titles must be the smallest nearest whole number calculated by the following formula: <u>Proposed Record of Titles lots = area (ha) outside* + area (ha) inside*</u> 0.5 1.1 * outside and inside Airport Subdivision Control Boundary (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Adverse effects on amenity values; (v) Effects on the <u>operation of the airport</u> Airport Subdivision Control Boundary or the SEL 95 Boundary.	This provides additional clarity.	Accept	9.1

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
FS1253.30	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Support	Seek that the whole part of this submission be allowed.	The proposed new wording provides additional clarity to the rules.	Accept	9.1
724.2	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Oppose	Delete Rule 23.3.2 (b)(i) Minor Dwelling which requires this building to be located within 20 metres of the primary dwelling.	The condition to locate the minor dwelling within 20 metres of the primary dwelling is not necessary if it will not be occupied by a dependent relative. The site setback requirements and sharing a single driveway access with the existing dwelling are sufficient.	Reject	7.3
FS1387.800	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	7.3
724.10	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Oppose	Amend the building setbacks from Tamahere Commercial Areas A and B, by reinstating the requirements of the Operative District Plan rule that enables an accessory building or non-habitable building to be built within the 100m setbacks from these areas.	A non-habitable building should be able to be built within this setback area.	Accept	7.7
742.240	New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 23.3.7.2 PI Building setback - sensitive land use as notified (subject to relief sought in other submissions on acoustic treatment).	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.	Accept	7.8
746.120	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.2 RDI (a)(i)-General Subdivision as follows: All proposed lots must have a <u>minimum net site area of 3500m²</u> and an <u>average net site area of at least 5000m²</u>	A blanket minimum lot size can present challenges when designing a subdivision where there are different parent lot shapes, sizes and	Reject	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				topographical/vegetative/other constraints. Incorporating a minimum net size area and average net size area for the subdivision will provide for greater flexibility in the instances where physical constraints exist.		
FS1127.7	Vineyard Road Properties Limited	Support	Reduction in the minimum lot size is supported so long as a distinction between the CLZ and Village Zone is achieved. The distinction between the two zones is unclear in the Proposed District Plan.	In part.	Reject	8.5
FS1379.290	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to reduce lot sizes within the CLZ. Reducing the subdivision lot size will result in increased densities of subdivision near to Hamilton's boundaries and is likely to result in impacts upon infrastructure within Hamilton, namely transport, 3 waters and social infrastructure. Such development could also detract from growth in towns and other identified locations for growth.	Accept	8.5
FS1387.976	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	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
831.80	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.1.1 P2 Permitted Activities, to require registration of homestay or visitor accommodation.	Air bnb 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 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.	Reject	5.8
FS1276.253	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission 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 their essential jobs.	Reject	5.8
923.160	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/Amend	Add new Rule 23.2.1.X applying to activity in Tamahere Commercial Areas A and B, worded as follows: <u>PI Farming noise, and sound generated by emergency generators and emergency sirens. P2 Sound measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008 must not exceed: (a) The following noise limits at any point within any other site in Tamahere Commercial Areas A and B: (i) 65dB LAeq(15min), 7am to 10pm; (ii)50dB LAeq(15min), 10pm to 7am; (iii)75 dB LAFmax, 10pm to 7am the following day; (b)The following noise limits at any point within any site outside the Tamahere Commercial Areas A and B: (i) 55dB LAeq(15min), 7am to 10pm; (ii) 40dB LAeq(15min), 10pm to 7am; (iii) 70dB LAFmax, 10pm to 7am the following day; D1 (a)Sound that is outside the scope of NZS 6802:2008 or a permitted activity standard; and (b)Sound that does not comply with Rule 23.2.1.X PI or P2.</u>	The preceding submission point refers to the Tamahere commercial area and the need to create a separate rule.	Deferred until expert advice received prior to Hearing	6.3
986.90	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 23.4.2 General subdivision (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>Reverse sensitivity effects, including on land transport networks</u> AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	• 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 buildings, including those containing sensitive or noise sensitive activities, their location and the design and location of access ways may all have an	Accept	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				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.		
986.120	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.2.6.2 PI Signs – Effects on traffic as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (a) Any sign directed at road land transport 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 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.	Accept in part	6.8
697.930	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 23.4.8 RD1(a) Subdivision - Building platform, as follows: (a) Subdivision, other than an access allotment or utility allotment, must provide a building platform on every the proposed lot. The building platform must that meet all of the following conditions: (i) has an area of 1000m2 exclusive of boundary setbacks; (ii) has an average gradient no steeper than 1:8; (iii) has vehicular access in accordance with Rule 14.12.1 P1; (iv) is certified by a geotechnical engineer as geotechnically stable and suitable for a building platform; (v) is not subject to inundation in a 2% AEP storm or flood event; (vi) a dwelling could be built on as a permitted activity in accordance with Rule 23.3.	Wording to provide clarity to this rule.	Accept	12.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
738.2	Shand Properties Limited	Support	Retain Section 5.6 Country Living Zone Objectives and Policies.	The proposed objectives and policies generally provide an appropriate framework for implementing rules for assessing and managing effects of activities.	Accept in part	4.4
FS1349.5	Allen Fabrics Ltd.	Support	Support submission point 738.2 as submitted.	<i>The area is partially in use now as lifestyle residential. Direct access to the Huntly's commercial area without having to use the expressway will give the town a much needed boost.</i>	Accept in part	4.4
FS1387.824	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		<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 in part	4.4
738.4	Shand Properties Limited	Support	Retain Chapter 23 Country Living Zone Rules, except Rule 23.4 Subdivision.	The proposed rules generally provide an appropriate framework for assessing and managing effects of activities in the Country Living Zone.	Accept in part	5.2
FS1349.7	Allen Fabrics Ltd.	Support	Support submission point 738.4 as submitted.	<i>The area is partially in use now as lifestyle residential. Direct access to the Huntly's commercial area without having to use the expressway will give the town a much needed boost.</i>	Accept in part	5.2
FS1387.826	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood</i>	Accept in part	5.2

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
				<i>provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
738.6	Shand Properties Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 23.4.4 Title boundaries, so that the activity status for a subdivision not complying with the standards is discretionary rather than non-complying.	It is not clear why subdivision not meeting the standards is a non-complying activity but equivalent rules in the Rural Zone are discretionary. This should be changed for consistency.	Accept	11.1
FS1349.9	Allen Fabrics Ltd.	Support	Support submission point 738.6 as submitted.	<i>The area is partially in use now as lifestyle residential. Direct access to the Huntly's commercial area without having to use the expressway will give the town a much needed boost.</i>	Accept	11.1
FS1387.828	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose		<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</i>		11.1

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>		
624.2	Glenn Soroka & Louise Meredith for Trustees of the Pakau Trust		Add new Country Living Zone subdivision rules in Rule 23.4 Subdivision, to recognise Pakau Trust's residual entitlement of 35 Environmental Lots which can be used as transferable rural title rights, as follows: Rule 23.4.XX Pakau Trust Entitlement Rule For the purpose of Rule 23.4.XX, 35 transferable rural lot rights exist, that were secured by the protection of 204 hectares of significant indigenous vegetation at Klondyke Road, Port Waikato. Those transferable rural lot rights may be utilised under Rule 23.4.XXX where: (i) The number of transferable rural lot rights available, will reduce by the number utilised at each receiving property when a survey plan is lodged for the subdivision approved at that receiving property; (ii) A subdivision plan is only required for the receiver property; (iii) Transferable rural lot rights cannot be generated on any other donor property. Rule 23.4.XXX Transferable Rural Lot Right Subdivision RD1 (a) Transferable Rural Lot Right Subdivisions utilising transferable rural lot rights under Rule 23.4.XX [Pakau Trust Entitlement Rule] must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) All proposed lots must have a net site area of at least 2500m ² ; (ii) Two additional lots can be created on the receiver property for every one transferable lot right originating under Rule 23.4.XX [Pakau Trust Entitlement Rule]. (b) For the purposes of this rule a subdivision plan is required only for the receiver property and not the donor property. (c) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters at the receiving property: (i) subdivision layout and design including dimensions, shape and orientation of the proposed lots; (ii) adverse effects on amenity values. D1 Transferable rural lot right subdivision that does not comply with Rule 23.4.XXX RDI AND Amend the Proposed District Plan further with	The Proposed District Plan fails to provide an appropriate opportunity for, and recognition of, the protection in perpetuity of significant indigenous vegetation. The cost to a property owner of protecting and maintaining, in perpetuity, significant stands of indigenous vegetation are substantial, in real financial terms. The property owner foregoes development potential, and subdivision of that property, where a significant environmental and community benefit is achieved by the protection of significant indigenous vegetation. In effect, the legal protection of significant indigenous vegetation provides a public benefit, at the expense of the private property owner. This should be recognised and compensated for. The subdivision application lodged in April 2012 secured Pakau Trust's entitlement to 64 Environmental Lots - 29 of which have been used and 35 remain to be used as transferable rural lot rights. Transferable rural lot rights enable an environmental feature to be protected while relocating the development potential elsewhere on appropriate receiver properties. Pakau Trust's position is unique.	Deferred to Hearing 19	8.5

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision requested	Reasons	Recommendation	Section of this report where the submission point is addressed
			any necessary consequential or other relief that addresses Pakau Trust's concerns.			
FS1387.17	Mercury Energy Limited	Oppose		At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Deferred to Hearing 19	8.5