

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
Objective 5.1.1- The Rural Environment						
697.555	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Chapter 5 Rural Environment navigation box as follows: The following objectives and policies apply to the Rural Zone. Specific policies apply to <del>Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area (Objective 5.5.1 and Policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.2)</del> and the following Specific Areas: · Agricultural Research Centres (Policy 5.3.16) · Huntly Power Station Coal and Ash Water (Policy 5.3.17) · Whaanga Coast Development Areas (Policy 5.3.18); and · <del>Hamilton's Urban Expansion Area (Objective 5.5.1 and Policies 5.5.1 and 5.5.2)</del>	Would provide clarity to the reader by rearranging the content.	Accept	
FS1387.6069	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	
12.6	Carl Ammon	Support	Add more policy like Chapter 5 Rural Environment.	More policy like this is needed.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1386.8	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	
164.3	Hiini Kepa		No specific decision sought, but submission states support for Chapter 5 Rural Environment.	Allows autonomy, growth and independence.	Accept	
FS1386.141	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	
FS1210.7	Ara Poutama Aotearoa (Department of Corrections)	Not stated	Support in part. The Department seeks that submission point 164.3 be allowed, but with the imposition of the Corrections Zone to replace the existing Rural Zone over the SHCF site (also designated as "P1" in the PWDP). The introduction of the Corrections Zone into the Plan would require a new Chapter containing objectives and policies within Section B.	The Department supports this submission insofar as the Rural Environment provisions in Chapter 5 are applied to the Rural zoned sites surrounding SHCF site, but with a new set of provisions applying to a new Corrections Zone under Section B of the Plan (refer to the further submission on submission point 496.10, above, for further reasoning).	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
330.56	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Chapter 5 Rural Environment.	No reasons provided.	Accept	
FS1386.437	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	
579.90	Simon Ash for Lakeside Developments 2017 Limited	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission generally supports the objectives and policies relating to Rural development (Chapter 5 Rural Environment).	No reasons provided.	Accept	
FS1087.14	Ports of Auckland Limited	Support	Support submission point 579.90	Ports of Auckland Limited supports Chapter 5 as notified.	Accept	
514.2	DP & LJ Ramsey Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment, as notified.	Protecting high class soils from adverse effects of inappropriate use and development is of national importance and is recognised with a NPS for Versatile Land and High Class Soils under consideration. Urban subdivision is an inefficient use of rural production land. Urban subdivision, particularly ad-hoc subdivision, may undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas. Submitter supports the strengthening of wording in the objective and agrees that urban development within the Rural Environment is an outcome contrary to the intent of the Proposed District Plan.	Accept in part	
FS1388.547	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	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
FS1062.65	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 514.2.	The rural environment as notified does not take into account fragmented land. • All land owners should be able to realise their own investment potential and amenity value.	Accept in part	
693.2	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The Rural Environment as notified.	Supports the vision to ensure that subdivision, use and development within the rural environment are contained or restricted especially where (ii) and (iii) are concerned. While it is the intention of the Council to seek the zoning of the two Alstra properties on Great South and River Roads as Residential, from Rural, they are still rural activities that can be impacted by urban style by urban style subdivision. These activities are specifically located within the rural environment to counteract the perceived effect on the urban dweller, provided appropriate rules are put in place to provide reverse sensitivity protection for these ongoing operations.	Accept in part	
FS1387.372	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	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
777.1	Radio New Zealand Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment, especially Objective 5.1.1(a)(iii), except for the amendments sought below;  AND Amend 5.1.1 Objective - The rural environment as follows: Subdivision, use and development <u>is provided for</u> within the rural environment where: ...	Supports the policy. The requested text results in this objective being expressed more clearly.	Accept	
FS1387.1173	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
695.50	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	No specific decision sought with regards to Objective 5.1.1(a)(i) The rural environment, but the submission states that the matter of high class soils fragmentation could be fully solved/avoided by: Ensuring any Rural Zoned lots over 20ha can undertake a transferable rural lot subdivision; and On lesser sized Rural Zones land where	This is option is not currently provided for. This would eliminate any concern over fragmenting high-class soils and reduction of viable production land in the area. The certificate of title would record the parent land has had such a subdivision and cannot be further subdivided under that provision via a Section 221 consent	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			high class soils exist, enabling a rural lot transfer option. AND Council should reconsider the exclusion of transferable rural lot rights.	notice. Created lots would have to occur within a define zoned location, not on the subdivided site (except to prove viability). It will eliminate the need to fragment high class soil on lesser sized rural zoned land, where high class soils exist. The relief sought is consistent with the Proposed District Plan objective to protect rural land soil resources.		
FS1387.312	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1379.263	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes any changes to the Rural Zone subdivision rules that allow for more subdivision in the Rural Zone. Subdivision should only be of a scale and size to support productive rural uses.	Accept	
FS1138.16	Glenn Michael Soroka and Louise Claire Mered as Trustees of the Pakau Trust	Support	In part. This is an appropriate environmental mechanism, but it must be refined and workable.	In part.	Reject	
FS1138.14	Glenn Michael Soroka and Louise Claire Mered as Trustees of the Pakau Trust	Support	Null	In part.	Reject	
FS1129.19	Auckland Council	Oppose	Null		Accept	
794.11	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment as follows: Objective 5.1.1 is the strategic objective	Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p>for the rural environment and has primacy over all other objectives in Chapter 5. (a) Subdivision, use and development within the rural environment where: (i) high class soils are protected for productive rural activities; (ii) productive rural activities are supported, while maintaining and enhancing the rural environment; (iii) urban subdivision, use and development in the rural environment is avoided, <u>and other subdivision is managed.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a</p>		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils where practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.		
FS1375.5	Radio New Zealand	Oppose	To the extent that subparagraph (a)(iii) is intended to allow subdivision in the rural environment, RNZ rejects the relief sought.	It is unclear what the amendment to subparagraph (a)(iii) means. To the extent that it is intended to allow subdivision in the rural environment, RNZ opposes the amendment.	Accept	
FS1387.1243	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	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
797.11	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The Rural environment as notified.	Supports the primacy of the objective and the clear direction set out in respect of support for productive rural activities and resources.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1262	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	
81.210	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.1.1(a)(i) The rural environment to incorporate peat soils as follows (for example): high class soils <u>and peat soils</u> are protected for productive rural activities.	The Objective gives effect to WRPS Implementation Method 14.2.1 regarding high class soils and supporting productive rural activities: WRPS Provisions related to the Built Environment, including 6.1.5 and 6A regarding urban subdivision, use and development. Peat soils form a substantial component of Waikato District's soils, and are another valuable soil resource for the District. There is an opportunity to also seek peat soils to be protected for productive rural activities in this objective, giving effect to Policy 14.5 of the WRPS.	Reject	
827.41	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Amend Objective 5.1.1(a)(ii) The rural environment as follows (or words to similar effect): (ii) productive rural activities and other	The extraction of mineral resources is a productive rural activity and existing extractive activities contribute to the	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			activities including mineral extraction are supported... AND Any other further or consequential amendments required.	wellbeing of the district. These activities cannot be located within urban setting or where it will become vulnerable to reverse sensitivity issues. Productive rural activities, and mineral extraction in particular, need to be addressed in the strategic objectives and directions.		
FS1198.23	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	It is appropriate that mineral extraction be provided for in the Rural zone.	Accept in part	
923.81	Waikato District Health Board	Support	FS1387.1517	Objective 5.1.1 gives effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement Implementation Method 14.2.1 regarding high class soils and supporting productive rural activities and provisions Waikato Regional Policy Statement relate to the Built Environment, including 6.1.5 and Section 6A. The submitter considers protecting food production and security as important community health and wellbeing considerations for the Waikato District and its residents. Concentrating urban development within identified growth locations is important to protect the rural land resource.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1517	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	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
509.1	Denise and Harold Williams	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment, as notified.	The Waikato District has valuable areas of high class soils which are of primary importance for food production both regionally and nationally. Protecting these soils from adverse effects of inappropriate use and development is of national importance and is recognised with a National Policy Statement for Versatile Land and High Class Soils under consideration. Urban subdivision is an inefficient use of rural production land. Urban subdivision, particularly ad-hoc subdivision, may undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas. Submitter supports strength of wording in this objective and agrees that urban development in the rural environment is contrary to the intent of the Proposed District Plan and should be avoided.	Accept in part	
FS1062.51	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point.	<i>The rural environment as notified does not take into account use of fragmented land within the rural zone.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1388.522	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
513.1	Vanoo Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment as notified.	The Waikato District has valuable areas of high class soils which are of primary importance for food production both	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				regionally and nationally. Protecting these soils from adverse effects of inappropriate use and development is of national importance and is recognised with a National Policy Statement for Versatile Land and High Class Soils under consideration. Urban subdivision is an inefficient use of rural production land. Urban subdivision, particularly ad-hoc subdivision, may undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas. Submitter supports the strengthening of wording in this objective and agrees that urban development in the rural environment is contrary to the intent of the Proposed District Plan and should be avoided.		
FS1062.54	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow entire submission.	•The rural environment as notified does not take into account fragmented land. • All land owners should be able to enjoy amenity value.	Accept in part	
FS1388.539	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	
517.1	Amanda and Brian Billington	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment, as notified.	The Waikato District has valuable areas of high class soils which are of primary importance for food production both regionally and nationally. Protecting high class soils from adverse effects of inappropriate use and development is of	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				national importance and is recognised with a NPS for Versatile Land and High Class Soils under consideration. Urban subdivision is an inefficient use of rural production land. Urban subdivision, particularly ad-hoc subdivision, may undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas. Supports the objective and agrees that urban development within the rural environment should be avoided.		
FS1388.565	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
746.100	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1- The rural environment as notified.	The Waikato District encompasses valuable areas of high class soils that are of primary importance for food production both regionally and nationally. Protecting these soils from adverse effects of inappropriate use and development that may impact their life-supporting capacity is of national importance, this is now being recognised with a national policy statement for Versatile Land and High Class Soils under consideration. Urban subdivision is an inefficient use of rural production land. Urban subdivision, particularly ad-hoc subdivision, may undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				The submitter supports the strength of wording in this objective and agrees that urban development within the Rural Environment is an outcome contrary to the intent of the Proposed Plan and should be avoided.		
FS1062.102	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 746.100.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important to recognise that not all rural environments are the same.</li> <li>• Land fragmentation has occurred and the land should be able to have its amenity value recognised.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
FS1387.970	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	
873.1	Anita Moleta & Penny Gooding	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment, as notified.	The Waikato District encompasses valuable areas of high-class soils that are of primary importance for food production both regionally and nationally. Protecting these soils from adverse effects of inappropriate use and development that may affect their life-supporting capacity is of national importance, this is now recognized with a NPS for Versatile Land and High Class Soils under consideration. Urban subdivision is an inefficient use of rural production land. Urban subdivision, particularly ad-hoc subdivision, may undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1387.1430	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	
874.1	Louise & Tony Cole	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment, as notified.	The Waikato District encompasses valuable areas of high-class soils that are of primary importance for food production both regionally and nationally. Protecting these soils from adverse effects of inappropriate use and development that may affect their life-supporting capacity is of national importance, this is now recognized with a NPS for Versatile Land and High Class Soils under consideration. Urban subdivision is an inefficient use of rural production land. Urban subdivision, particularly ad-hoc subdivision, may undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1437	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
972.1	Mark Scobie	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment, as notified.	Protecting these soils from adverse effects of inappropriate use and development that may affect their life-supporting capacity is of national importance, this is now recognised with NPS for Versatile Land and High Class Soils under consideration. Urban subdivision is an inefficient use of rural production land. Urban subdivision, particularly ad-hoc subdivision, may undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1608	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	
982.1	Joanna & Kevin Sands	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment, as notified.	Protecting high class soils in the Waikato District is a matter of national importance which is now being recognised with the development of the National Policy Statement for Versatile Land and High Class Soils. Urban subdivision, particularly ad hoc development, in the rural environment should be avoided because this is an inefficient use of productive rural land which may	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas. Supports the strength of wording in this objective and agrees that urban development within the rural environment is an outcome contrary to the intent of the Proposed Plan and should be avoided.		
FS1387.1616	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	
985.1	Neil Crispe for Koch Farms Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.1.1 The rural environment as notified.	The Waikato District encompasses valuable areas of high class soils that are of primary importance for food production both regionally and nationally. Protecting high class soils from adverse effects of inappropriate use and development is of national importance and is recognised with a NPS for Versatile Land and High Class Soils under consideration. Urban subdivision is an inefficient use of rural production land. Urban subdivision, particularly ad-hoc subdivision, may undermine the integrated development of identified townships and expansion areas. Supports the objective and agrees that urban development within the rural environment should be avoided.	Accept in part	
FS1076.19	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	<i>Submitter recognises the importance of the protection of high-class soils from inappropriate use and</i>		Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<i>development. NZPork supports this objective and agree that urban development within rural environments should be prevented.</i>			
FS1387.1625	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	
<b>Objective 5.2.1 – Rural Resources</b>						
311.2	Harpal Singh-Sandu	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources.	It is appropriate to direct inappropriate subdivision and land use away from productive soils to support the retention of rural land and activities.	Accept in part	
FS1386.372	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</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
724.14	Sue Robertson for Tamahere Community Committee	Support	Retain Chapter 5: Rural Environment provisions which address the protection of quality soils so they remain for production of food.	Quality soils need to remain available for food production.	Accept in part	
FS1387.807	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	
332.3	Gwyneth & Barrie Smith	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Support maintaining and enhancing the life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource. Support the enhancement and/or restoration of natural ecosystems, surface and ground water quality, and the natural characteristics of fresh waterbodies and coastal waters. A method of enhancement should be incentivising the stock exclusion, restoration of biodiversity, and protection of waterways through rural subdivision. Providing for conservation lot subdivision via enhancement and/or restoration would enable this policy.	Accept	
FS1386.458	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>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<p>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>		
FS1138.18	Glenn Michael Soroka and Louise Claire Mered as Trustees of the Pakau Trust	Support	Null		Accept	
355.2	Scott & Tina Ferguson	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Objective 5.2.1(a)(i) Rural resources as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, accessibility and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils; ...</p>	<p>Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1386.513	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	
362.3	CYK Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Objective 5.2.1 (a)(i) Rural Resources, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p>	<p>Support sub-policy (i) to maintain or enhance the life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to</p>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a)(i) Rural Resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular...	versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource. Support the enhancement and/or restoration of natural ecosystems, surface and ground water quality, and the natural characteristics of fresh waterbodies and coastal waters as set in sub-parts ii, iii and iv of this Policy. A method of enhancement should be incentivising the stock exclusion, restoration of biodiversity, and protection of waterways through rural subdivision. Providing for conservation lot subdivision via enhancement and/or restoration would enable this policy.		
FS1386.524	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
364.2	Michael Innes	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1(a)(i) Rural resources, as follows: Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Support the maintenance or enhancement of life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is a key consideration in managing this resource.	Accept	
FS1386.536	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</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
433.1	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a) Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain <del>of</del> and where required, enhance the: ... (iv) Life-supporting <u>characteristics</u> and intrinsic <u>natural characteristics values of ecosystems</u> of water bodies and coastal waters and the catchments between them; <del>(v) The ecological health of fresh water bodies and ground water, including their catchments and connections.</del></p> <p>AND/OR</p> <p>Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.</p>	<p>The Vision and Strategy is intended to be the primary direction setting document for the Waikato River. The restoration and protection of the Waikato River is to be regarded as a primary objective guiding policy and outcomes under the Resource Management Act and this includes improving the quality of Waikato River water quality over a reasonable period. The phrase 'intrinsic natural characteristics' used in sub-clause (iv) needs to be either defined or reworded to be consistent with the term in the Resource Management Act.</p>	Reject	
FS1083.1	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Support	<p>The changes sought in submission 433.1 better achieve Waikato River Vision and Strategy and the RMA 1991</p>	<p>Allow the submission point in full.</p>	Accept	
FS1330.37	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	<p>Accept Submission</p>	<p>The changes are appropriate to better protect and enhance freshwater quality.</p>	Accept	
507.2	Whitford Farms Limited	Not Stated	<p>Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a) (i) Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...</p>	<p>Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.</p>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1388.514	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	
509.2	Denise and Harold Williams	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources. as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, accessibility and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Support sub policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1388.523	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	
512.2	Enton Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below	Supports sub-policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life supporting	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils....	capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.		
FS1388.532	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	
513.2	Vanoo Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;...	Supports sub-policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1062.55	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow entire submission.	• The rural environment as notified does not take into account fragmented land. • All land owners should be able to enjoy amenity value.	Reject	
FS1388.540	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	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
514.3	DP & LJ Ramsey	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 (a)(i) Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1(a)(i) Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Supports sub-policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and that 'accessibility' should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1388.548	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	
516.2	Anthony and Maureen Vazey	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Supports sub-policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1388.558	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</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
517.2	Amanda and Brian Billington	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Supports sub policy (i) seeking to maintain or enhance the life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1388.566	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	
519.2	B and N Balle Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Supports sub policy (i). Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1388.574	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	
520.2	Finlayson Farms Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, accessibility and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Supports sub policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1388.582	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	
521.2	Max and Denise Irwin for A Irwin & Son Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendment sought below	Support sub policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life-supporting	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, accessibility and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.		
FS1388.591	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	
522.2	Joy & Wayne Chapman	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, accessibility and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Support sub-policy (i) which seeks to maintain and enhance the life supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1388.600	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	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
523.2	R & B Litchfield Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Supports sub policy (i) which seeks to maintain and enhance the life supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1388.608	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	
526.2	Roy & Lesley Wright	Neutral /Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Support sub policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1388.637	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</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
527.2	Mark Scobie	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Support sub policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1388.643	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	
529.3	Wilcox Properties Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy. Support the sub-parts ii,iii and iv of the policy. Providing for conservation lot subdivision via enhancement/restoration would enable this policy. Support sub-parts (i) which	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				seeks to maintain or enhance the life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils.		
FS1388.651	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	
530.2	John Van Lieshout	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Objective - Rural Resources, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural Resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, accessibility and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Support sub policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing the soil resource.	Accept	
532.2	Joanne & Kevin Sands	Neutral/Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a)(i) Rural Resources as follows: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, accessibility and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Support sub policy (i) in part. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing the soil resource.	Accept	
FS1388.667	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	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
533.2	Colin & Rae Hedley	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a)(i) Rural Resources, as follows: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Support sub policy (i) in part. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing the soil resource.	Accept	
FS1388.675	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	
536.2	LJ & TM McWatt Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resource, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1(a)(i) Rural Resources as follows: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Support sub-policy (i). Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing the soil resource.	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1388.722	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	
539.2	Garyowen Properties (2008) Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendment sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a)(i) Rural Resources as follows: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Support sub policy (i) in part. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing the soil resource.	Accept	
FS1388.731	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	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
540.3	Glen Alvon Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural Resources, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a) (i)- Rural Resources as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing the soil resource.	Accept	
FS1388.739	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	
544.2	KR & BC Summerville	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural Resources, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural Resources (a)(i) as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing the soil resource. Supports the enhancement and/or restoration of natural ecosystems, surface and groundwater quality and the natural characteristics of fresh water bodies and coastal waters in clauses (ii),(iii) and (iv).	Accept	
FS1388.757	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.</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
686.3	Reid Crawford Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a) (i) Rural resources as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource. Suggests 'accessibility' be included in this policy. Supports the enhancement and/or restoration of natural ecosystems, surfaces and groundwater and the natural characteristics of fresh water bodies and coastal waters.	Accept	
FS1387.260	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	
872.2	Tarati Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.2.1(a)(i) Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1387.1424	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</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
873.2	Anita Moleta & Penny Gooding	Support	<p>Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural Resources, except for the amendments sought below AND</p> <p>Amend 5.2.1(a)(i) Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, accessibility and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils; ...</p>	The submitter supports sub-policy (i) however accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource.	Accept	
FS1387.1431	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject	
874.2	Louise & Tony Cole	Support	<p>Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural Resources, except for the amendments sought below; AND</p>	The submitter supports sub-policy (i), however accessibility to versatile land is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Amend 5.2.1(a)(i) Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils; ...	also a key consideration in managing this resource.		
FS1387.1438	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	
972.2	Mark Scobie	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural Resources, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a)(i) Rural resources, as follows: "(a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils; "	The submitters support this sub-policy, however accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource.	Accept	
FS1387.1609	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	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>risk 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>		
982.2	Joanne & Kevin Sands	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a)(i) Rural Resources, as follows: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils;	Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing the soil resource.	Accept	
FS1387.1617	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	
985.2	Neil Crispe for Koch Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Supports sub-policy (i) which seeks to maintain or enhance the life supporting capacity and versatility of soils. Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1387.1626	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>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
419.93	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, as notified.	The submitter supports the provision on productive versatility of rural resources.	Accept in part	
FS1388.221	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	
466.41	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources as notified.	The submitter supports this objective.	Accept in part	
FS1388.421	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	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
535.29	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources.	The submitter supports the intent of this objective which is to protect rural land.	Accept in part	
FS1388.702	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
680.57	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources. AND Any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought and/or concerns raised in the submission	The submitter opposes this policy and remind Waikato District Council that it is the Regional Council's role to control land use for the purpose of soil conservation. The district council's role, as directed by the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS), is to ensure land use is managed in a way that does not decline the availability of high class soils for primary production due to inappropriate subdivision, use or development (WRPS Policy 14.2). The relief sought in relation to Objective 5.1.1 above will better meet RMA and the WRPS requirements and renders 5.2.1(a)(i) unnecessary and inappropriate. Submitter is unsure what resource management issue 5.2.1(a)(ii) is	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				trying to address or what 'rural land' means in this context. Objective 5.2.1 is also, in part, an unnecessary duplication of resource management issues which are being addressed under Chapter 3 Natural Environment. There are other elements of the objective which are also outside the functions of a district council.		
FS1171.71	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	This submission is opposed. This submission proposes the removal of Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources which seeks to support the inherent life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils, in particular high-class soils.	Accept	
FS1387.168	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	
FS1168.52	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission to the extent that duplication is removed.	The submitter opposes this policy and reminds Waikato District Council that it is the Regional Council's role to control land use for the purpose of soil conservation. The district council's role, as directed by the Waikato Regional Policy Statement (WRPS), is to ensure land use is managed in a way that does not decline the availability of high class soils for primary production due to inappropriate subdivision, use or development (WRPS Policy 14.2). The relief sought in relation to Objective 5.1.1 above will better meet RMA and the WRPS	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				requirements and renders 5.2.1(a)(i) unnecessary and inappropriate. Submitter is unsure what resource management issue 5.2.1(a)(ii) is trying to address or what 'rural land' means in this context. Objective 5.2.1 is also, in part, an unnecessary duplication of resource management issues which are being addressed under Chapter 3 Natural Environment. HortNZ supports removal of duplication of provisions..		
FS1379.244	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought by the submitter to delete Objective 5.2.1 Rural Resources. HCC seek to retain this objective and its protection of rural land.	Accept	
794.12	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1244	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	
797.12	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below AND Delete Objective 5.2.1(a)(iii) Rural resources. AND Any consequential amendments and/or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	This matter is regulated through the Regional Plan. Amend the policy direction to delete reference to water quality. Supports the policy direction.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FSI 387.1263	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	
FSI 139.29	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Reject	
FSI 108.30	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate amendment.	Reject	
81.212	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources wording to incorporate peat soils.	Peat soils form a substantial component of Waikato District's soils, and are another valuable soil resource for the District. There is an opportunity to also seek peat soils to be protected for productive rural activities in this objective, aligning with Policy 14.5 of the WRPS.	Reject	
FSI 223.51	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	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
81.213	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Objective 5.2.1 (a)(ii) Rural resources as follows: The health and wellbeing of rural land and natural ecosystems and biodiversity;	To ensure that biodiversity is adequately considered this should be included with this objective, giving effect to WRPS provisions Policies 11.1 and 11.2.	Reject	
FS1223.52	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>	Reject	
923.82	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Objective 5.2.1 - Rural resources as notified.	The submitter supports the objective noting the inclusion of maintaining and enhancing high class soils and freshwater bodies and their catchments which enable environmental and community health and wellbeing outcomes.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1518	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</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
872.2	Tarati Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.2.1 Rural resources, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.2.1(a)(i) Rural resources, as follows: (a) Maintain or enhance the: (i) Inherent life-supporting capacity, <u>accessibility</u> and versatility of soils, in particular high class soils...	Accessibility to versatile land is also a key consideration in managing this resource and should be included in this policy.	Accept	
FS1387.1424	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>Policy 5.2.2 – High Class Soils</b>						
332.4	Gwyneth & Barrie Smith	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils.	Support retaining high class soils and ensuring adverse effects do not compromise the life supporting properties of high class soils.	Accept	
355.3	Scott & Tina Ferguson	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2. High class soils, as notified.	Policy 5.2.2 seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
362.4	CYK Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High Class Soils.	Supports the policy which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
364.3	Michael Innes	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2. High class soils.	Support that the policy seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life supporting properties of high class soil.	Accept	
507.3	Whitford Farms Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Policy 5.2.2 seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
509.3	Denise and Harold Williams	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Submitter supports Policy 5.2.2 which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
512.3	Enton Farms Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Submitter supports Policy 5.2.2 which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
513.3	Vanoo Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils as notified.	Submitter supports Policy 5.2.2 which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life supporting properties of high class soil.	Accept	
<i>FS1062.56</i>	<i>Andrew and Christine Gore</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow entire submission.</i>	<i>• The rural environment as notified does not take into account fragmented land. • All land owners should be able to enjoy amenity value.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	
514.4	DP & LJ Ramsey Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Submitter supports Policy 5.2.2 which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
516.3	Anthony and Maureen Vazey	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Submitter supports Policy 5.2.2 which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
517.3	Amanda and Brian Billington	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 seeking to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
519.3	B and N Balle Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 seeking to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
520.3	Finlayson Farms Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 seeking to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
521.3	Max and Denise Irwin for A Irwin & Son Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Submitter supports Policy 5.2.2 seeking to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
FS1388.592	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	
522.3	Joy & Wayne Chapman	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 seeking to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
523.3	R & B Litchfield Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 seeking to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.		
526.3	Roy & Lesley Wright	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 seeking to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
527.3	Mark Scobie	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 seeking to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
529.4	Wilcox Properties Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
530.3	John Van Lieshout	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 Policy - High class soils as notified.	Submitter supports this policy seeking to retain high class soils and ensure that adverse effects do not compromise their life-supporting properties.	Accept	
532.3	Joanne & Kevin Sands	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils as notified.	Supports this policy seeking to retain high class soils and ensure that adverse effects do not compromise their life-supporting properties.	Accept	
533.3	Colin & Rae Hedley	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	This policy seeks to retain high class soils and ensure that adverse effects do not compromise their life-supporting properties.	Accept	
536.3	LJ & TM McWatt Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils as notified.	Supports this policy seeking to retain high class soils and ensure that adverse effects do not compromise their life-supporting properties.	Accept	
539.3	Garyowen Properties (2008) Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports this policy seeking to retain high class soils and ensure that adverse effects do not compromise their life-supporting properties.	Accept	
540.4	Glen Alvon Farms Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils.	This policy seeks to retain high class soils and ensure that adverse effects do not compromise their life-supporting properties.	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
544.3	KR & BC Summerville	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils as notified.	Supports this policy which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure that adverse effects do not compromise their life-supporting properties.	Accept	
686.4	Reid Crawford Farms Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2-High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
872.3	Tarati Farms Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	Supports Policy 5.2.2 seeking to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
873.3	Anita Moleta & Penny Gooding	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High Class Soils, as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept	
874.3	Louise & Tony Cole	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High Class Soils, as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept	
972.3	Mark Scobie	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High Class Soils, as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept	
982.3	Joanne & Kevin Sands	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	This policy seeks to retain high class soils and ensure that adverse effects do not compromise their life-supporting properties.	Accept	
985.3	Neil Crispe for Koch Farms Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils as notified.	Submitter supports Policy 5.2.2 which seeks to retain high class soils and ensure adverse effects do not compromise the life support properties of high class soil.	Accept	
372.26	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2. High class soils.	Supports provisions that protect and retain high class soils, particularly for their value in food production.	Accept	
FS1330.24	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject Submission.	"Production" in the Proposed Plan and the AC submission is too narrowly defined and needs to include activities that maintain and enhance ecosystem services.	Reject	
419.54	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils, as notified.	The submitter supports the provision on productive versatility of rural resources.	Accept	
FS1171.35	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. This submission seeks to retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils as notified.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
466.42	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept	
535.30	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils.	The submitter supports the intent of this policy which is to protect rural land.	Accept	
680.58	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Delete Policy 5.2.2 (b) High class soils. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	The submitter understands the intent of the policy, but reminds Waikato District Council (WDC) that management of chemical and biological properties of soils is not a territorial authority function. They are concerned about unnecessary duplication, overlap and added costs arising from over-regulation, without added value. WDC can realistically do its part in protection of soils by way of subdivision and development controls, but submitter is concerned that (b) has the potential to capture and control other activities inappropriately.	Reject	
FS1379.245	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought by the submitter to delete Policy 5.2.2.(b) High Class Soils.. HCC seek to retain this policy and its protection of rural land.	Accept	
FS1171.72	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	This submission proposes the removal of Policy 5.2.2(b) High class soils. This submission is opposed as this would remove the policy seeking to support the inherent life-supporting capacity and versatility of soils, in particular high-class soils.	Accept	
FS1168.53	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission to the extent that b) is deleted.	The submitter understands the intent of the policy, but reminds Waikato District Council (WDC) that management of chemical and biological properties of soils is not a territorial authority function. They are concerned about unnecessary duplication, overlap and added costs arising from over-regulation, without added value. WDC can realistically do its part in protection of soils by way of subdivision and development controls, but submitter is concerned that (b) has the potential to capture and control other activities inappropriately. HortNZ would support deletion of b) from the policy	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>as it is not Council's function to manage the chemical and biological properties of soil.</i>		
794.13	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Policy 5.2.2 High class soils as follows: (a) Soils, in particular high class soils, are retained for their <del>primary</del> productive value. (b) Ensure the adverse effects of activities do not compromise the physical, chemical and biological properties of high class soils.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add the distinction between "elite" and "prime" high class soils into the Proposed District Plan (similar to the Auckland Unitary Plan) to better manage soil resources, including appropriate changes to the objectives, policies and rules.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils where practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.		
797.13	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils as notified.	The Policy provides appropriate recognition and protection of a critical resource.	Accept	
81.214	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2 High class soils.	This objective and associated policies are supported due to how they give effect to WRPS provisions such as 14.2 and 14.2.1. Policy 14.2 of the WRPS seeks to avoid a decline in the availability of high class soils for primary production due to inappropriate subdivision, use or development. The Proposed District Plan provisions acknowledge the impacts that land fragmentation and other use and development, can have on high class soils.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1062.15	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Seek to disallow submission point 81.214.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Some land with high class soils is fragmented and unable to use as agriculture.</li> <li>The policy needs to reflect this.</li> <li>A blanket approach is not acceptable.</li> </ul>	Reject	
923.83	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.2- High class soils as notified.	Submitter supports the objective noting the inclusion of maintaining and enhancing high class soils which enable environmental and community health and wellbeing outcomes.	Accept	
Policy 5.2.3 – Effects of subdivision and development on soils						
311.3	Harpal Singh-Sandhu	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils.	It is appropriate to direct inappropriate subdivision and land use away from productive soils to support the retention of rural land and activities.	Accept in part	
FS1386.373	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	
332.5	Gwyneth & Barrie Smith	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils, except for the amendment sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils as follows: (b) Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/or where</p>	Support incentivising the protection, enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity values, however this policy only provides for subdivision where existing indigenous biodiversity is being protected. There are a number of waterways and wetlands in the Rural Zone that would benefit from stock exclusion, enhancement and/or restoration. The cost of restoration is approximately	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			indigenous biodiversity is being protected, enhanced, and/or restored (with plantings).	\$45,000 + GST per ha and subdivision offers an incentive for landowners to undertake restoration works which they would be unlikely to do without a financial offset. This policy will support the protection/restoration outcomes sought in Policy 5.2.1 (a)(ii) and the enhancement outcome sought in Policy 3.1.2. The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River seeks restoration of health and wellbeing of the Waikato River Catchment. The incentives offered in this policy will contribute to the achievement of the objectives of the Vision and Strategy.		
FS1386.459	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 in part	
362.5	CYK Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.2.3 (b) Effects of subdivision and development on soils, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.2.3 (b) Effects of subdivision and development on soils, as follows: (b) Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected, enhanced, and/or restored (with plantings).	Supports provisions that incentivise protection, enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity values within the Waikato District through subdivision. This Policy only provides for subdivision where existing indigenous biodiversity is being protected. There are a number of waterways and wetlands in the Rural Zone of the Waikato District that would benefit from stock exclusion (through fencing) and enhancement and/or restoration. The cost of full restoration is approximately \$45,000 + GST per ha	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				(excluding fencing of revegetated areas from stock). Subdivision offers an incentive for landowners to undertake restoration works which they would be unlikely to do without a financial offset. To allow for the protection and/or restoration, particularly of water ways, would achieve the outcome sought in Policy 5.2.1(a)(iii), being the enhancement of water quality. Would support Policy 3.1.2 which seeks enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values through planting, pest control and other biosecurity measures. The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River seeks restoration of the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River Catchment - improvements over time. Incentivising the fencing and restoration of waterways in the Waikato District would contribute positively to the improvement of water quality and achieving the objectives of the Vision and Strategy.		
FS1386.525	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 in part	
514.5	DP & LJ Ramsey Limited	Not Stated	Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils. AND	This policy only provides for subdivision where existing indigenous biodiversity is being protected. There are a number of waterways and wetlands in the Rural Zone	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Amend Policy 5.2.3(b) Effects of subdivision and development on soils, as follows: Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected, <u>enhanced, and/or restored (with plantings).</u>	that would benefit from stock exclusion and enhancement and/or restoration. Subdivision offers an incentive for landowners to undertake restoration works which they would un-likely do without a financial offset, restoration is around \$45,000 + GST / hectare. Allowing for the protection and/or restoration, particularly of waterways, would achieve Policy 5.2.1(a)(iii). It would also support Policy 3.1.2. Incentivising the fencing and restoration of waterways would contribute positively to the improvement of water quality and achieving the objectives of the Vision and Strategy.		
FS1388.549	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
529.5	Wilcox Limited Properties	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.2.3. (b) Effects of subdivision and development on soils, as follows: (b) Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/ or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected, <u>enhanced, and/or restored (with plantings).</u>	This policy only provides for subdivision where existing indigenous biodiversity is being protected. There are waterways and wetlands in the Rural Zone that would benefit from stock exclusion and enhancement/restoration. The cost of restoration is approximately \$45,000 per ha. Subdivision offers an incentive for landowners to undertake restoration works. To allow for protection/restoration would achieve Policy 5.2.1(a)(iii) and Policy 3.1.2.	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				Incentivising restoration would achieve the objectives of the Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River, improving water quality.		
FS1388.652	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	
540.5	Glen Alvon Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils, except for the amendment sought below; AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.2.3- effects of subdivision and development on soils as follows: (b) Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected, <u>enhanced, and/or restored (with plantings).</u></p>	<p>Policy is supported in part. The notified policy only provides for subdivision where existing indigenous biodiversity is protected. There are a number of waterways and wetland in the Rural Zone that would benefit from stock exclusion (through fencing), enhancement and/or restoration. The cost of full restoration is approximately \$45,000+GST per ha (excluding fencing to revegetated areas). Subdivision offers an incentive for landowners to undertake restoration works which would unlikely occur unless there was a financial offset. Protection and/or restoration (particularly waterways) would achieve the outcome sought in Policy 5.2.1 (a)(iii) which is to enhance water quality and support Policy 3.1.2 which seeks enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values through planting, pest control and other biosecurity measures. The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River seeks</p>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				restoration of the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River catchment over time. Incentivising the fencing and restoration of waterways would contribute positively to the improvement of water quality and achieve the objective of the Vision and Strategy.		
FS1388.740	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	
544.4	KR & BC Summerville	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils, except for the amendments sought below; AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.2.3 (b) as follows: (b) Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected, <u>enhanced and/or restored (with plantings)</u>.</p>	The notified policy only provides for subdivision where existing indigenous biodiversity is protected. There are a number of waterways and wetland in the Rural Zone that would benefit from stock exclusion (through fencing), enhancement and/or restoration. The cost of full restoration is approximately \$45,000 + GST per ha (excluding fencing to revegetated areas). Subdivision offers an incentive for landowners to undertake restoration works which would unlikely occur unless there was a financial offset. Protection and/or restoration (particularly waterways) would achieve the outcome sought in Policy 5.2.1(a)(iii) which is to enhance water quality and support Policy 3.1.2 which seeks enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values through planting, pest control and other	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				biosecurity measures. The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River seeks restoration of the health and welling of the Waikato River catchment over time. Incentivising the fencing and restoration of waterways would contribute positively to the improvement of water quality and achieve the objectives of the Vision and Strategy.		
FS1388.758	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	
686.5	Reid Crawford Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.2.3 (b) Effects of subdivision and development on soils, as follows: (b) Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected, enhanced, and/or restored (with plantings).	Support provisions that incentivise protection, enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity values within the Waikato District through subdivision. This Policy only provides for subdivision where existing indigenous biodiversity is being protected. There are a number of waterways and wetlands in the Rural Zone of the Waikato District that would benefit from stock exclusion (through fencing) and enhancement and/or restoration. The cost of full restoration is approximately \$45,000 + GST per ha (excluding fencing of revegetated areas from stock). Subdivision offers an incentive for landowners to undertake restoration works which they would be unlikely to do without a financial	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				offset. To allow for the protection and/or restoration, particularly of water ways, would achieve the outcome sought in Policy 5.2.1(a)(iii), being the enhancement of water quality. It would support Policy 3.1.2 which seeks enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values through planting, pest control and other biosecurity measures. The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River seeks restoration of the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River Catchment - improvements over time. Incentivising the fencing and restoration of waterways in the Waikato District would contribute positively to the improvement of water quality and achieving the objectives of the Vision and Strategy.		
FS1387.261	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	
419.55	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils, as notified.	The submitter supports the provision on productive versatility of rural resources.	Accept in part	
FS1171.36	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. This submission seeks to retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils as notified.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FSI 388.202	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	
466.43	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.2.3 (a) Effects of subdivision and development on soils to avoid fragmentation. AND Amend Policy 5.2.3 (b) Effects of subdivision and development on soils to reflect that subdivision is directed away from high-class soils where viable primary production can occur.	The submitter supports directing the location of development and avoiding fragmentation. The submitter supports avoiding development on high-class soils where viable primary production activities can occur, particularly given the scarcity of elite soils in this area. It is noted that high-class soils are one component of a viable primary production operation with other considerations including topography, productivity, sustainability (specifically avoidance of soil pests and diseases; suitably consented irrigation water), reverse sensitivity and economic viability.	Accept in part	
FSI 168.54	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	The submitter supports directing the location of development and avoiding fragmentation. The submitter supports avoiding development on high-class soils where viable primary production activities can occur, particularly given the scarcity of elite soils in this area. It is noted that high-class soils are one component of a viable primary production operation with other considerations including topography, productivity, sustainability (specifically avoidance of soil pests and	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>diseases; suitably consented irrigation water), reverse sensitivity and economic viability.</i>		
FS1388.422	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
535.31	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils as notified.	The submitter supports the intent of this policy which is to protect rural land.	Accept in part	
FS1388.703	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
680.59	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.2.3 (a) and (b) Effects of subdivision and development on soils, as follows: (a) Subdivision, use and development minimises the fragmentation of productive rural land,	The submitter considers that subdivision and development policies and planning should provide for managed growth in rural communities. While land use	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p>particularly where high class soils are located. (b) Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle and economic options is <u>managed in a way that ensures rural resources, character and environmental values are retained, directed away from high class soils and/or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	<p>change, subdivision and land development activities in rural areas may result in the loss of productive land, there is a need to recognise that farmers may need to undertake small lot subdivision for a number of reasons, including: providing for farm succession, disposing of surplus dwellings and for providing on-farm accommodation for family members and employees, and rearrangement of lot boundaries to enable more efficient land management. Considered, well-managed growth in rural communities provides for diversity and vibrancy in rural areas, sustains essential community infrastructure, and provides employment flexibility and opportunities. The submitter considers that there are benefits to enabling subdivision and other rural-residential opportunities, however, this should be done in a way that appropriately protects rural character and enables and maintains a reasonable use of productive land. FFNZ oppose the protection of rural landscapes or amenity on farmland which is characterised by ever-changing working landscapes, that are largely there as a result of farming activities that you would expect to find in a rural zone. Furthermore, they consider that land use and subdivision don't need to be controlled to protect areas of significant indigenous vegetation where there are clearly no more than minor effects, or where the effects can be successfully mitigated through permitted or controlled activity standards.</p>		
FS1387.169	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p><i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</i></p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Mercury</i></p>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<i>FSI379.246</i>	<i>Hamilton City Council</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>HCC opposes the relief sought by the submitter to amend Policy 5.2.3(a) and (b) Effects of subdivision and development on soils. HCC seek to retain this policy as notified.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FSI171.73</i>	<i>Phoebe Watson for Barker &amp; Associates on behalf of T&amp;G Global</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow the proposed additional text, but disallow the proposed deletion of text.</i>	<i>This submission proposes amendments to Policy 5.2.3 (a) and (b) Effects of subdivision and development on soils. This amendment is opposed in so far as it would detract from the intention to direct subdivision within the rural area away from high class soils, but is supported in terms of ensuring that any subdivision is managed in a way that ensures the retention of rural resources.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FSI308.102</i>	<i>The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>For part (a) "Use" should be retained within this policy to capture activities that may not fall under the umbrella of development or subdivision, this may include inappropriately located land use activities such as fertilizer storage for example. For part (b) we are also seeking provisions that provide for new areas of indigenous biodiversity and enhancement of existing areas. Granting relief to this submission point as written does not address this matter.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FSI139.47</i>	<i>Turangawaewae Trust Board</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Inappropriate addition.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FSI108.56</i>	<i>Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Inappropriate addition.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
794.34	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils as follows: (a) Subdivision, use and development minimises the fragmentation of productive rural land, particularly where high class soils are located. (b) Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected, <u>where practicable</u>.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<p>had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils where practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.</p>		
FS1387.1256	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p><i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</i></p> <p><i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and</i></p>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1308.134	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support the proviso attached to (b) 'where practical'. This recognises that while retention of high-class soils and protection of indigenous vegetation are the priority it is not practical in every situation.	Reject	
797.41	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils as notified.	The Policy provides appropriate recognition and protection of a critical resource.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1278	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	
81.215	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.3 Effects of subdivision and development on soils.	This objective and associated policies are supported due to how they give effect to WRPS provisions such as 14.2 and 14.2.1. Policy 14.2 of the WRPS seeks to avoid a decline in the availability of high class soils for primary production due to inappropriate subdivision, use or development. The Proposed District Plan provisions acknowledge the impacts that land fragmentation and other use and development, can have on high class soils.	Accept in part	
FS1223.53	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	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>therefore not clear from a land use management 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>		
923.84	Waikato District Health Board	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.3- Effects of subdivision and development on soils as notified.	Submitter supports the objective noting the inclusion of maintaining and enhancing high class soils which enable environmental and community health and wellbeing outcomes.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1519	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	
746.1	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Policy 5.2.3- Effects of subdivision and development on soils, except for the amendments sought below AND	The submitter supports policies that incentivise protection, enhancement and/or restoration of biodiversity values within the Waikato District through subdivision. However, this Policy only provides for a subdivision where existing	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Amend Policy 5.2.3 (b)- Effects of subdivision and development on soils as follows: Subdivision which provides a range of lifestyle options is directed away from high class soils and/or where indigenous biodiversity is being protected, <u>enhanced, and/or restored (with plantings).</u>	indigenous biodiversity is being protected. There are a number of waterways and wetlands in the Rural Zone of the Waikato District that would benefit from stock exclusion (through fencing) and enhancement and/or restoration. The cost of full restoration is approximately \$45,000 + GST per ha (excluding fencing of re-vegetated areas from stock). Subdivision offers an incentive for landowners to undertake restoration works which they would be unlikely to do without a financial offset. To allow for the protection and/or restoration, particularly of water ways, would achieve the outcome sought in Policy 5.2.1(a)(iii), being the enhancement of water quality. It would also support Policy 3.1.2 which seeks enhancement of indigenous biodiversity values through planting, pest control and other biosecurity measures. The Vision and Strategy for the Waikato River seek restoration of the health and wellbeing of the Waikato River Catchment - improvements over time. Incentivising the fencing and restoration of waterways in the Waikato District would contribute positively to the improvement of water quality and achieving the objectives of the Vision and Strategy.		
FS1268.11	Jennie Hayman	Oppose	<i>Support/Oppose in part. Delete the reference to "lifestyle options" (whatever they might be) and acknowledge and provide for the incentivisation of the maintenance and enhancement of indigenous biodiversity.</i>	<i>This point touches on the inherent contradictions and conflicts within this policy, i.e. notions of what constitutes fragmentation, the nature of "productive" land and high-class soils, and how these resources are to be sustainably managed, while at the same time providing for indigenous biodiversity. This latter matter is addressed, in the proposed plan, by mapping a (confusing and possibly inaccurate) array of "significant" or "natural character" areas of vegetation. How these are to be sustainably managed (and who bears the cost) is not made explicit. Biodiversity is not static – it is constantly changing and could be significantly enhanced/extended.</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1293.53	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	DOC supports the addition to this policy as it benefits indigenous biodiversity that may not be identified but is still important.	Accept in part	
FS1387.902	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	
<b>Objective 5.3.1 – Rural character and amenity</b>						
332.6	Gwyneth & Barrie Smith	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Need to recognise the variation of what defines rural character and amenity across the district. The district encompasses a variety of landscapes and activities, including coastal areas, hill country which comprise of large landholdings and pastoral uses and smaller landholdings. Consideration of rural character should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, land use activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
355.4	Scott & Tina Ferguson	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports the intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				Consideration of "Rural Character" should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.		
362.6	CYK Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Support in part the intent of this objective, however, recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District is needed. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings, particularly in the northern part of the District which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
364.4	Michael Innes	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) - Rural character and amenity, as follows: <u>Rural character and amenity are maintained while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Support the intent of this objective. However recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District is needed. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholding, particularly in the northern part of the District which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
507.4	Whitford Farms Limited	Not Stated	Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, as follows: <u>Rural character and amenity are maintained while recognising the localised character of different parts of the district.</u>	Supports the intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of "Rural Character" should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.		
509.4	Denise and Harold Williams	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports the intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings particularly in the northern part of the district which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of "Rural Character" should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
512.4	Enton Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the district.</u>	Supports the intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings particularly in the Northern part of the district and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of "Rural Character" should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
513.4	Vanoo Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND	Supports the intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings particularly in the northern part of the district and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of "Rural Character" should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.		
FS1062.57	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow entire submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The rural environment as notified does not take into account fragmented land.</li> <li>• All land owners should be able to enjoy amenity value.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
514.6	DP & LJ Ramsey Limited	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND</p> <p>Amend Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u></p>	Recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District is needed. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
516.4	Anthony and Maureen Vazey	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND</p> <p>Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u></p>	Supports the intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings particularly in the northern part of the district and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
517.4	Amanda and Brian Billington	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports the intent of the rule but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings, particularly in the northern part of the district, which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
519.4	B and N Balle Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports the intent of the policy but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings particularly in the northern part of the district and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
520.4	Finlayson Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings particularly in the northern part of the district and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, land use activities, vegetation and geomorphology.		
521.4	Max and Denise Irwin for A Irwin & Son Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND  Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings particularly in the northern part of the district which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
522.4	Joy & Wayne Chapman	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND  Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings particularly in the northern part of the district and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
523.4	R & B Litchfield Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND  Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.		
526.4	Roy & Lesley Wright	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings, particularly in the northern part of the district which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
527.4	Mark Scobie	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports the intent of the objective. Needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings particularly in the northern part of the district and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
529.6	Wilcox Properties Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Support the intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings particularly in the northern	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				part of the district which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.		
530.4	John Van Lieshout	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1- Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 - Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	The variation in rural character and amenity values needs to be recognised. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings used primarily for pastoral use, and smaller landholdings (particularly in the north) used for higher value productive activities such as intensive cropping and greenhouses. Rural character varies depending on local landholding patterns, built form, land uses, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
532.4	Joanne & Kevin Sands	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports the intent of the objective but the variation in rural character and amenity values needs to be recognised. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings used primarily for pastoral use, and smaller landholdings (particularly in the north) used for higher value productive activities such as intensive cropping and greenhouses. Rural character varies depending on local landholding patterns, built form, land uses, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
533.4	Colin & Rae Hedley	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports the intent of the objective but the variation in rural character and amenity values needs to be recognised. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings used primarily for pastoral use, and smaller landholdings (particularly in the north) used for higher value productive activities such as intensive cropping and greenhouses. Rural character varies depending on local	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation
				landholding patterns, built form, land uses, vegetation and geomorphology.	
536.4	LJ & TM McWatt Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports the intent of the objective but the variation in rural character and amenity values needs to be recognised. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings used primarily for pastoral use, and smaller landholdings (particularly in the north) used for higher value productive activities such as intensive cropping and greenhouses. Rural character varies depending on local landholding patterns, built form, land uses, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part
539.4	Garyowen Properties (2008) Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u> AND Retain Policy 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity as notified.	Supports the intent of the objective but the variation in rural character and amenity values needs to be recognised. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings used primarily for pastoral use, and smaller landholdings (particularly in the north) used for higher value productive activities such as intensive cropping and greenhouses. Rural character varies depending on local landholding patterns, built form, land uses, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part
540.6	Glen Alvon Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, by adding text shown in underlined italics, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Support in part however the variation in rural character and amenity values needs to be recognised. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings used primarily for pastoral use, and smaller landholdings (particularly in the north) used for higher value productive activities such as intensive cropping and greenhouses. Rural character varies depending on local landholding patterns, built form, land uses, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
544.5	KR & BC Summerville	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 - Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports in part the intent of this objective but considers that the variation in rural character and amenity values needs to be recognised. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings used primarily for pastoral use, and smaller landholdings (particularly in the north) used for higher value productive activities such as intensive cropping and greenhouses. Rural character should take into account the unique variables, including local landholding patterns, built form, land uses, <u>vegetation and geomorphology.</u>	Accept in part	
686.6	Reid Crawford Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports in part the intent of the objective. Recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District is needed. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, <u>vegetation and geomorphology.</u>	Accept in part	
872.4	Tarati Farms Limited	Support	Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Support in part the intent of this objective, however needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern,	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.		
873.4	Anita Moleta & Penny Gooding	Support	Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	The submitter supports this policy, however, recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District is needed. The District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings, particularly in the northern part of the District which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses, etc.	Accept in part	
874.4	Louise & Tony Cole	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	The submitter supports this policy, however, recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District is needed. The District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings, particularly in the northern part of the District which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses, etc.	Accept in part	
972.4	Mark Scobie	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	The submitters support this objective, however, recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District is needed. The District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings, particularly in the northern part of the District, which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses, etc.	Accept in part	
982.4	Joanne & Kevin Sands	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity as notified, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports in part the intent of the objective. The variation in rural character and amenity values needs to be recognised. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings used primarily for pastoral use, and smaller landholdings (particularly in the north) used for higher value productive activities	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				such as intensive cropping and greenhouses. Rural character varies depending on local landholding patterns, built form, land uses, vegetation and geomorphology.		
985.4	Neil Crispe for Koch Farms Limited	Not Stated	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) Rural character and amenity as follows: Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	Supports the intent of the objective but needs recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings particularly in the northern part of the district and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, landuse activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
394.12	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Oppose	Delete Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, and replace with a new objective that enables rural activities in rural zones. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.	The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to appropriately identify the issues and challenges facing Waikato District; The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to have appropriate regard to relevant National Policy Statements including the National Policy Statement for Freshwater management and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity; The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to have appropriate regard to the Regional Policy Statement and/or misapplies the strategic direction of that document; The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to provide practical solutions to the challenges facing farming in the northern part of the Waikato District and places undue emphasis on the protection of versatile soils without acknowledging other limitations for farming such soils; Council has failed to undertake an adequate section 32 analysis, particularly with respect to the extent and location of a countryside living zone,	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				subdivision opportunity for ecological enhancement or protection and provision of innovative subdivision developments such as farm parks; and The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to identify sufficiently and appropriately located areas for countryside living - particularly where there is good access to appropriate infrastructure.		
FS1379.110	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the deletion of Objective 5.3.1 as it is appropriate for achieving the purpose of the Rural Zone and guides the important policies that fall beneath it.	Accept in part	
419.56	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, as notified.	An objective seeking to maintain rural character and amenity is supported. It is important that the policy framework clearly establishes the rural character and amenity and expectations for the Waikato District.	Accept in part	
466.44	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity as notified.	The submitter supports this objective.	Accept in part	
680.60	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.3.1 (a) Rural character and amenity, as follows: (a) <u>The values which contribute to</u> Rural character and amenity are maintained. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	The submitter supports the intent of the objective. However, some amendment is required to ensure the plan is appropriately focused and consistent with broader policy direction. The submitter considers that there are benefits to enabling a range of land use opportunities within the Rural Zone, and that this should be done in a way that appropriately maintains the values that contribute to the rural character and amenity of the zone. The submitter opposes the protection of rural landscapes or amenity on farmland which is characterised by ever-changing working landscapes, that are largely there as a result of farming activities that would be expected to be found in a rural area. A focus on 'values' would introduce a degree of flexibility that is necessary to recognising the evolving nature of rural farming areas.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
794.35	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Support	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
827.42	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support	Retain Objective 5.3.1 Rural character and amenity, subject to the amendments to Policy 5.3.2 as sought below.	The phrase "rural character and amenity" could mean different things to different people.	Accept in part	
746.2	The Surveying Company	Support	Amend Objective 5.3.1(a) - Rural Character and amenity as follows: (a) Rural character and amenity are maintained <u>while recognising the localised character of different parts of the District.</u>	The submitter supports in part the intent of this objective; however, recognition of the variation of what defines rural character and amenity values across a large District is needed. The Waikato District encompasses coastal areas, hill country comprising large landholdings and primarily pastoral uses and smaller landholdings, particularly in the northern part of the District which is used for higher value production activities such as intensive cropping, greenhouses etc. Consideration of 'Rural Character' should take into account the unique variables of the locality including land holding pattern, built form, land use activities, vegetation and geomorphology.	Accept in part	
FS1268.12	Jennie Hayman	Support	<i>Support in part. Define some of the terms that appear to be accepted as givens (when they cannot be so). I acknowledge that defining "rural" character, and amenity, etc. is a challenging task, but that deficiency should be acknowledged and addressed via changes to provisions that reflect the variability within the rural environment. If there is case law relevant to these definitions, this could be acknowledged.</i>	<i>Rural character and amenity are not defined, and as this submitter notes, "rural character" may be highly variable. Amenity values are defined in the RMA, but that definition is insufficient to support an entire suite of objectives and policies for the management of the rural environment (whatever that might be). The closest any relevant document gets is the WRPS definition of "natural character", but this does not include the rural environment, except by association. It is noted that "outstanding" and "significant" (areas) are defined as locations on a map.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1387.903	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</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>Policy 5.3.2 – Productive rural activities</b>						
197.6	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.2- Productive rural activities.	The submitter supports the directive policy for recognising and protecting the continued operation of the rural environment as a productive working environment. It is noted that the policy recognition does not align with the limitation on building coverage for rural buildings.	Accept in part	
281.5	Zeala Ltd for Trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities. AND Amend rules to be consistent with this policy.	Rural rules need to be consistent with this policy as in further submission points. The policy recognises the importance of buildings associated with farming, rural industry and established rural activities and is supported.	Accept in part	
636.4	Anna Noakes	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities, to include Intensive Farming.	Policy is not clearly defined and open for interpretation. Intensive farming relies on the productive capacity of soils on the site.	Accept in part	
FS1265.4	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with the changes to Policy 5.3.2 as per our original submission (833.4).	Intensive farming is an activity that is appropriate within the rural environment. However, we note that not all intensive farming relies on productive soils.	Accept in part	
FS1316.11	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 636.4 in part with changes to Policy 5.3.2 as per the Mainland submission point 833.4.	Intensive farming is an activity that is appropriate within the rural environment. However, we note that not all intensive farming relies on productive soils.	Accept in part	
FS1388.616	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	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<p><i>management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</i></p> <p><i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i></p>		
676.2	T&G Global Limited	Not Stated	Retain Policy 5.3.2 - Productive Rural Activities.	<p>Productive rural activities should be specifically provided for within rural areas to ensure the achievement of the objectives specified for that zone, and the efficient use of resources.</p> <p>The submitter is concerned to ensure that reverse sensitivity effects of locating incompatible land uses within the Rural Zone are addressed within the provisions of the District Plan on the basis that such activities detract from the stated objectives for that zone.</p>	Accept in part	
821.7	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities, except for the amendments outlined below;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.2(a)(i) Productive rural activities, as follows: (a) Recognise and protect the continued operation of the rural environment as a productive working environment by:</p> <p>(i) Recognising that buildings and structures associated with farming, <u>intensive farming</u>, and forestry and other operational structures for productive rural activities contribute to rural character and amenity values; ...</p>	<p>Intensive farming is a productive rural activity that can only locate in the Rural Zone. Should be recognised in the plan that these types of activities also contribute to rural character.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1316.10	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 821.7.	<p><i>Intensive farming is an activity that is appropriate within the rural environment. As such we agree with the Poultry Association's comment that "it (intensive farming) should be recognized in the plan that these types of activities also contribute to rural character".</i></p>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1317.8	Quinn Haven Investments Limited and M & S Draper	Oppose	Null	Farming and Forestry are permitted activities in the Rural Zone. Intensive farming is not. Structures associated with intensive farming therefore are not anticipated as part of rural character or amenity.	Accept in part	
FS1265.3	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow the submission point's amendment to Policy 5.3.2.	Intensive farming is an activity that is appropriate within the rural environment. As such we agree with the Poultry Association's comment that "it (intensive farming) should be recognised in the plan that these types of activities also contribute to rural character."	Accept in part	
833.4	Phil Page on behalf of Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.2 (a)(i) Productive rural activities, as follows: Recognise and protect the continued operation of the rural environment as a productive working environment by: (i) Recognising that buildings and structures associated with farming, intensive farming, and Forestry...	Intensive farming is a productive rural activity that can only locate in the Rural Zone and should be enabled. Buildings associated with intensive farming are a legitimate aspect of rural character.	Accept in part	
FS1316.9	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 833.4.	Support the intent of the submission given that intensive farming is an activity that can only occur in the rural zone.	Accept in part	
FS1076.10	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	Intensive farming is a productive rural activity that can only locate in the Rural Zone and should be enabled. Buildings associated with intensive farming are a legitimate aspect of rural character.		Accept in part	
FS1338.1	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd	Support	Null	This is submission is consistent with Combined Poultry Industry ("CPI") submission that intensive farming is a productive rural activity and it should be recognised in the plan that these activities contribute to rural character.	Accept in part	
419.58	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities, as notified.	The policy recognises and protects the continued operation of the rural environment as a productive working environment is supported. Recognising that buildings and structures associated with farming and forestry and other operational structures for productive rural activities contribute to rural character and amenity values, is	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				supported. The plan proposes limitations on building coverage that conflicts with this policy. Those establishing rural production activities look at the regulatory regime before making decisions on location choice. The methods proposed in this plan will discourage rural production activity from locating and investing in the Waikato district.		
466.58	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept in part	
FS1062.47	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 466.58.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities as notified does not allow for fragmented land.</li> <li>Allowance needs to be considered for fragmented land.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
581.13	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Add a new clause (iv) to Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities as follows: <u>(iv) Encourage the adoption of sustainable farming practices to ensure long-term operation of farming as part of the rural economy.</u>	Supports the adoption of best practice in farming. Synlait "Lead with Pride" programme recognises and rewards suppliers who achieve dairy farming practice. Synlait considers a similar policy should be incorporated into the Proposed District Plan to support long-term economic use and land use within a quality rural environment.	Reject	
FS1330.47	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Accept Submission.	Maintain the life supporting capacity of rural areas.	Reject	
FS1341.29	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road and in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential re-zoning.</li> <li>Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations.</li> <li>Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate</li> </ul>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.</i>		
<i>FSI342.147</i>	<i>Federated Farmers</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Disallow submission point 581.13.</i>	<i>FFNZ supports farming communities in their efforts to adopt sustainable farming practices, however the proposed policy is unnecessary and not appropriate within a district plan context.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	
680.61	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities, as notified, subject to the amendment sought below:</p> <p>5.3.2 Policy - <del>Productive</del> Rural production activities (a) Recognise and protect the continued operation of the rural environment as a productive working environment by: (i) Recognising that buildings and structures associated with farming and forestry and other operational structure for productive rural activities contribute to rural character and amenity values; (ii) Ensuring <del>productive</del> rural activities contribute to rural character and amenity values (iii) Providing for lawfully-established rural activities and protecting them from sensitive land uses <u>and reverse sensitivity effects.</u> (iv) <u>Recognising the use and development of rural resources enables people and communities to provide for their economic, social and cultural wellbeing.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought and/or concerns raised in the submission</p>	<p>The activities required to operate in the rural environment should be the overall focus of this policy. Submitter is not sure what is meant by 'productive rural activities' in this context and believe Waikato District Council (WDC) has inadvertently used the terms 'productive rural activities' and 'rural production activities' interchangeably. They are not interchangeable in our view. It is also important to acknowledge that change may occur as new markets and technologies are created. Therefore, production techniques will need to adapt and such change is not detrimental to rural amenity. A good example is the rise of viticulture in New Zealand over the last 20 years and the change from pastoral landscapes to vineyards. Farmers want the opportunity to continue to innovate and invest and adopt in new technologies and retain the flexibility to respond to markets. Submitter acknowledges that WDC has an important role to play in ensuring the Proposed District Plan does not stifle primary production with overly restrictive and unnecessary land use controls. That important goal can be achieved with acceptance of the relief sought across the submission.</p>	Accept	
<i>FSI 168.55</i>	<i>Horticulture New Zealand</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow the submission.</i>	<i>The activities required to operate in the rural environment should be the overall focus of this policy. Submitter is not sure what is meant by 'productive rural activities' in this context and believe Waikato District Council (WDC) has inadvertently used the terms 'productive rural</i>	<i>Accept</i>	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<p>activities' and 'rural production activities' interchangeably. They are not interchangeable in our view. It is also important to acknowledge that change may occur as new markets and technologies are created. Therefore, production techniques will need to adapt and such change is not detrimental to rural amenity. A good example is the rise of viticulture in New Zealand over the last 20 years and the change from pastoral landscapes to vineyards. Farmers want the opportunity to continue to innovate and invest and adopt in new technologies and retain the flexibility to respond to markets. Submitter acknowledges that WDC has an important role to play in ensuring the Proposed District Plan does not stifle primary production with overly restrictive and unnecessary land use controls.</p>		
FS1198.27	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Not Stated	The submission point be disallowed in part to the extent that the wording changes may exclude extractive activities.	It is agreed that productive rural activities and rural production activities are not the same thing. However to the extent that the submission seeks to exclude mineral extraction by its amendments, the submission is opposed.	Accept in part	
FS1265.5	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with the changes to Policy 5.3.2 as per our original submission (833.4).	We support the submission that activities required to operate in the rural environment should be the focus of this policy. We consider that this should include intensive farming activities as the Rural Zone is the appropriate location for such activity.	Accept	
FS1316.12	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 680.61 in part with the changes to Policy 5.3.2 as per Mainland submission point 833.4.	We support the submission that activities required to operate in the rural environment should be the focus of this policy. We consider that this should include intensive farming activities as the Rural Zone is the appropriate location for such activity.	Accept	
FS1171.74	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes amendments to Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities. This submission is supported as the proposed amendment supports rural production uses in the rural environment.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
794.36	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities as follows: (a) Recognise and <del>protect</del> <u>enable</u> the continued operation of the rural environment as a <del>productive</del> working environment by: (i) Recognising that buildings and structures associated with farming and forestry and other operational structures for productive rural activities contribute to rural character and amenity values; (ii) Ensuring <del>productive</del> rural activities are supported by appropriate rural industries and services; (iii) Providing for lawfully-established rural activities and protecting them from sensitive land uses.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it</p>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils where practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.		
797.42	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.2 Productive rural activities as notified.	The Policy provides appropriate recognition and protection of rural production and lawfully established activities.	Accept in part	
827.43	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Add a new clause (iv) to Policy 5.3.2(a) Productive rural activities as follows: (a) Recognise and protect the continued operation of the rural environment as a productive working environment by: ... <u>(iv) Recognising other productive activities that are located in the rural environment, including mineral extraction activities.</u>	The extraction of mineral resources is a productive rural activity which contributes to the wellbeing of the district. This activity should be acknowledged and provided for.	Reject	
FSI 198.24	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	<i>The submission point be allowed in full.</i>	<i>It is appropriate that mineral extraction be provided for in the rural zone.</i>	Reject	

Policy 5.3.9 – Non-rural activities

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
402.9	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.9 (a) Non-rural activities, as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) manage any non-rural activities, including equestrian centres, horse training centres <u>and forestry and rural industries</u> , to achieve a character, scale, intensity and location that are in keeping with rural character and amenity values. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission	Tuakau Protein Limited considers that rural industries are rural activities and should not be included in a list of activities which are considered to be 'non-rural.' Tuakau Protein Limited also wish to highlight that the Waikato District Council have included all the non-rural activities listed in Policy 5.3.9 as Permitted Activities under 22.1.2 with the exception of rural industry which is listed as a Restricted Discretionary Activity 22.1.3.	Accept in part	
FS1388.142	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	
781.4	Ministry of Education	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new policy in Chapter 5: Rural Environment to provide for education facilities in the rural environment as follows: <u>Policy - Education Facilities within the Rural Environment To allow activities which are compatible with the role, function and predominant character of the Rural Environment, while managing the effects of the activities on the environment, including: Education facilities</u>	There are no policies that currently provide for education facilities in the rural environment. Education facilities such as schools, community education, early childhood education, tertiary education institutions, work skills training centres, outdoor education centres and sports training establishments located within rural areas are essential social infrastructure required to support rural areas.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1213	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 in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
FS1379.321	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<p>While HCC supports the work by the Ministry of Education to provide appropriately planned schools for existing and future communities, it is noted the definition of education facilities is very broad, including childcare facilities and specialised training facilities. Given the broad range of uses potentially provided for, HCC opposes a policy that is supportive of potentially large scale and commercial operations within the rural zone. Key purposes of the Rural Zone include protecting the productive nature of the land and ensuring 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.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1345.129	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept in part.	<p>Genesis supports the ability for education facilities to be located within the rural environment. However, the rule framework needs to ensure that there are no reverse sensitivity issues (i.e. by not allowing sensitive activities to be located next to industry or infrastructure).</p>	Accept in part	
499.3	Adrian Morton	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities, to include "gun club shooting activities".	<p>The noise and obtrusiveness of this activity is completely incompatible with the area, especially as it occurs over weekends. The inclusion would allow management/avoidance of existing/proposed gun club activities, which are incompatible with the local rural amenity values.</p>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1311.33	Ethan & Rachael Findlay	Oppose	Null	Disagree with submission point.	Accept in part	
FS1276.38	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of this submission point be allowed.	Non-rural activities, include "gun club shooting activities" because rural shooting is dispersed, not in one place where it creates noise nuisance for neighbours.	Accept in part	
FS1388.503	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	
757.3	Karen White	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.3.9 (a) Non-Rural Activities to include "gun club shooting activities."	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
297.34	Dave Glossop for Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/ Amend	Add to Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities a new point as follows: <u>(c) ensure any non-rural 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	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1386.314	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 in part	
378.62	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities, to the extent that it anticipates non-rural activities in the Rural Zone AND Amend Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities, as follows: (a) Manage any non-rural activities, including equestrian centres, horse training centres, <u>emergency service facilities</u> , forestry and rural industries, to achieve a character, scale, intensity and location that are in keeping with rural character and amenity values, (b) Avoid buildings and structures dominating land on adjoining properties, public reserves, the coast or waterbodies; and (c) <u>Enable non-rural activities that provide for the health, safety and well-being of the community and that service or support an identified local need.</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 supports Policy 5.3.9 to the extent that these provisions anticipate non-rural activities in the Rural 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-rural activities in the Rural Zone. For instance providing for emergency services that have a functional and operational need to be located in close proximity to the communities they serve. Amendments sought better achieve the purpose of the RMA by providing for the health and safety of people and communities.	Accept in part	
FS1388.50	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,	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
<i>FS1035.169</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>	
<i>419.64</i>	<i>Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand</i>	<i>Neutral /Amend</i>	<i>Amend the title of Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities, as follows: Policy 5.3.9 <u>Other</u> Non-rural activities AND Amend Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities, to further clarify and refine the policy OR Amend Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities by combining it with Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</i>	<i>The policy describes the listed activities as non-rural activities but, by their nature, these are rural activities that require a rural location to exist and operate. This is particularly the case for packing sheds and post-harvest facilities.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1171.40</i>	<i>Phoebe Watson for Barker &amp; Associates on behalf of T&amp;G Global</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.</i>	<i>This submission seeks amendments to Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities. This submission is supported to the extent that it intends to clarify the difference between other rural activities with a need to be located within the rural environment, and non-rural activities that do not have the same functional requirement.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1340.54</i>	<i>TaTa Valley Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>The submitter supports submission point 419.64 in that other activities, better describes activities of this nature. Whilst these activities may not be perceived as traditional rural activities, they require a rural location to exist and operation. As such, 'Other rural activities' is a more fitting title.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1345.100</i>	<i>Genesis Energy Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Reject in part.</i>	<i>Genesis appreciates the intent of the submission, given that the policy does list rural-based industries. However, there needs to be provision for non-rural activities to locate</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>in the rural zone where they have functional or operational requirement to.</i>		
FS1370.3	Aztech Buildings for Zeala Limited	Support	Allowed.	Policy 5.3.9(a) as drafted in part replicated Policy 5.3.3 in relation to Rural Industries, but is defined as a non-rural activity. Amending the heading Policy 5.3.9 as suggested in the submission to 'Other rural activities' and 5.3.3(a) could be deleted in its entirety.	Accept in part	
FS1388.207	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	
466.63	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept in part	
FS1388.430	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	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
535.52	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities.	The submitter supports the intent of this policy which is to manage non-rural activities in the Rural zone, particularly within Hamilton's 'Area of Interest'.	Accept in part	
FS1388.705	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
575.30	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities, as notified.	Supports the management of non-rural activities and structures in the rural zone. Concerned that non-rural activities may cause reverse sensitivity effects on quarry operations undertaken within the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
FS1292.44	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Null	<i>McPherson supports the retention of this policy which seeks to managed non-rural activities located in the Rural Zone. Such activities have the potential to have adverse effects on extraction activities.</i>	Accept in part	
576.11	Transpower New Zealand Ltd	Oppose	Add a new clause (c) to Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities, as follows: <u>(c) Recognise that some activities require a rural location</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter opposes Policy 5.3.9 in so far as it fails to recognise those activities which require a rural location but may not be in keeping with rural character and amenity values.	Accept in part	
FS1345.23	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	<i>For the reasons outlined in the Transpower submission.</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1258.59	Meridian Energy Limited	Support	Allow	Acknowledging that Chapter 14 provides for infrastructure, including renewable electricity generation and electricity transmission, it is appropriate to recognise in the Rural Chapter that some activities, including renewable electricity generation and electricity transmission, have particular requirements that mean they need to locate in the rural environment.	Accept in part	
FS1340.88	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports submission point 576.11 in principle subject to appropriate drafting.	Accept in part	
680.68	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities. AND Any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought and/or concerns raised in the submission.	The submitter considers Policy 5.3.9 an unnecessary duplication of issues which are addressed by other policies within the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	
FS1334.45	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	It is appropriate to retain this policy to ensure that non-rural activities are managed. Such activities have the potential to have adverse effects on extraction activities.	Accept	
FS1258.74	Meridian Energy Limited	Support	Allow	Meridian supports the deletion of Policy 5.3.9, to the extent that it conflicts with other policies in Chapter 6, which address the adverse effects of infrastructure in the rural environment.	Reject	
FS1292.45	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	It is appropriate to retain this policy to ensure that non-rural activities are managed. Such activities have the potential to have adverse effects on extraction activities.	Reject	
FS1379.249	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought by the submitter to delete this policy. HCC considers the intent of this policy to manage non-rural activities in the Rural Zone, within HCC's Area of Interest, is important to retain. Non-rural uses can alter the character of the zone, can fragment land, and can direct growth away from towns and the city.	Accept	
FS1345.36	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis considers that a policy for non-rural activities is required.	Accept	
FS1387.173	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	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<p><i>management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</i></p> <p><i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i></p>		
691.12	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.9 - Non-rural activities, as notified. This relief is sought in the event that any part of the submission from point 691.1 to 691.15 is not accepted by WDC.	McPherson supports the management of non-rural activities were to occur. As McPherson operates a quarry in a rural area, non-rural activities may cause reverse sensitivity effects, which could compromise their quarry operations. Persons carrying out other activities may complain due to the environmental effects created by typical quarry activities	Accept in part	
FS1334.44	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	Fulton Hogan supports the retention of this policy which seeks to manage non-rural activities located in the Rural Zone. Such activities have the potential to have adverse effects on extraction activities.	Accept in part	
695.52	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Oppose	Delete Policy 5.3.9(a) Non-rural activities.	These are rural activities naturally associated with the rural sector.	Accept in part	
FS1387.313	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p><i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</i></p> <p><i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood</i></p>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>risk 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>		
FS1379.265	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>HCC opposes the deletion of Policy 5.3.9 on non-rural activities. HCC supports the intent of the policy as notified, particularly within HCC's Area of Interest. 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. Non-rural activities within the Rural Zone can undermine the intent of the zone and compromise future urban development.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1292.46	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	<i>It is appropriate to retain this policy to ensure that non-rural activities are managed. Such activities have the potential to have adverse effects on extraction activities.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1334.46	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	<i>It is appropriate to retain this policy to ensure that non-rural activities are managed. Such activities have the potential to have adverse effects on extraction activities.</i>	Accept in part	
827.46	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Delete Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities	The strategic direction in section 1.4.3.1 refers to productive rural; activities including horse breeding/training, mining and forestry, however this provision suggested that its listed activities are not rural activities. There are a wide range of rural activities with varying effects to the district plan should be consistent in its recognition that all such activities are part of the character of the rural environment.	Reject	
FS1379.339	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>HCC opposes the deletion of Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural Activities. The policy as notified will ensure that uses of an appropriate type and scale locate within the Rural Zone.</i>	Accept	
FS1334.48	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	<i>It is appropriate to retain this policy to ensure that non-rural activities are managed. Such activities have the potential to have adverse effects on extraction activities.</i>	Accept	
FS1292.48	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	<i>It is appropriate to retain this policy to ensure that non-rural activities are managed. Such</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				activities have the potential to have adverse effects on extraction activities.		
697.557	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities heading as follows: Policy – <del>Non-rural activities</del> <u>Managing activities in the rural zone.</u>	The policy needs to reflect activities.	Accept in part	
FS1168.62	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	The submitter seeks after Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities a new policy for retirement villages. Retirement villages are a sensitive urban activity that should be discouraged from rural production areas.	Accept in part	
FS1387.608	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	
697.558	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.9(a) Non-rural activities as follows: <del>Manage any non-rural non-farming activities, including: equestrian centres, horse training centres, forestry animal boarding, daycare, breeding and training establishments, and rural industries...</del> AND Add to Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities a new policy (c) as follows: <u>(c) Provide for and manage facilities associated with recreational and sporting activities, including equestrian centres, and horse training centres.</u>	This revised policy has been focused to provide specifically for non-farming activities and to provide for recreational and sporting activities.	Accept in part	
FS1292.47	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	It is appropriate to retain this policy as drafted to ensure that non-rural activities are managed. Such activities have the potential to	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				have adverse effects on extraction activities. However, the use of the term "non-farming" in place of "non-farming" excludes activities such as quarries which have a legitimate need to locate in rural areas.		
FS1334.47	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	It is appropriate to retain this policy to ensure that non-rural activities are managed. Such activities have the potential to have adverse effects on extraction activities. However, the use of the term "non-farming" in place of "non-farming" exclude activities such as quarries which have a legitimate need to locate in rural areas.	Accept in part	
FS1342.183	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 697.558 in part. Preference is to delete but changes are better than the notified version.	FFNZ's preferred position is to delete this policy for reasoning outlined in our original submission. However if it is retained the proposed amendments are an improvement.	Accept in part	
FS1387.609	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	
697.559	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Add after Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities a new policy for retirement villages as follows: <u>5.3.9A Policy – Retirement villages (a) Provide restricted opportunities for retirement villages within 800m distance of towns and villages within the rural environment.</u>	This policy is to support the proposed restricted discretionary activity rule for retirement villages in the rural zone.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1004.7	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Tamahere Eventide Retirement Village	Oppose	Allow submission point 697.559 in part: - Disallow any reference to a minimum distance from towns and villages.	• Support that part of the submission seeking the addition of a new policy for retirement villages. However, the reference to '800m distance of towns and villages' is opposed and Policy 5.3.9A should be amended to remove that reference.	Accept	
FS1005.11	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Atawhai Assisi Retirement Village	Oppose	Allow submission point 697.559 in part: - Disallow any reference to a minimum distance from towns and villages.	• Support the part of the submission seeking the addition of a new policy for retirement villages. However, the reference to '800m distance of towns and villages' is opposed and Policy 5.3.9A should be amended to remove that reference.	Accept	
FS1345.70	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis is concerned that the policies and rules proposed in respect of retirement villages could affect the Huntly Power Station which is surrounded by Rural Zone land and it is in close proximity to the Huntly town / urban environment.	Accept	
FS1379.272	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC is opposed to retirement villages in the Rural Zone, particularly within HCC's Area of Interest. The submission seeks for them to be allowed to locate within 800m of towns and villages, which is problematic as they could locate adjacent to HCC's boundary or adjacent to towns or villages within HCC's Area of Interest. 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. Retirement villages are not rural in nature and are normally a type of high density residential development more appropriately located in towns and other areas identified for growth. Given the significant cross-boundary impacts that higher levels of development within the area are likely to have infrastructure within Hamilton, HCC opposes the suggested more lenient provisions for retirement villages.	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1387.610	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	
Policy 5.3.3 – Industrial and commercial activities						
302.44	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Add provision to Policy 5.3.3(b) Industrial and commercial activities for industrial and commercial activities where effects on rural character can be mitigated. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	It is appropriate that provision is made for industrial and commercial activities in rural areas where their effects can be appropriately managed.	Accept in part	
FS1287.10	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	Blue Wallace seeks that the submission point be accepted in full.	The Submitter supports this submission point as it acknowledges that non-rural activities can be provided within the rural zone in appropriate instances.	Accept in part	
FS1386.355	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 in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
FS1379.67	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>HCC opposes the submission to allow for commercial and industrial activities in the Rural Zone. This relief would undermine the integrity of the Rural Zone. The policy is important to protect rural land from industrial and commercial development, particularly within HCC's Area of Interest. The key purpose 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.</i>	Accept in part	
419.59	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities, to further clarify and refine the policy OR Amend Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities by combining it with Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter supports avoiding locating industrial and commercial activities in rural areas that do not have a genuine functional connection with the rural land or soil resource. There is some confusion between this policy and Policy 5.3.9 Non-rural activities, which appears to cover the same activities and could potentially be combined. Rural industry is defined but it is not clear what "services" or "commercial activities" are anticipated or accommodated in the rural areas by this policy.	Accept	
FS1340.53	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	<i>The submitter notes that some industrial and commercial activities do have a functional need to be situated within the rural environment. Where this is the case, these activities should be enabled. The submitter supports clarification of these policies so long as appropriate commercial and industrial activities retain the ability to be situated within the rural environment due to their functional relationship.</i>	Accept	
FS1370.2	Aztech Buildings for Zeala Limited	Support	Allowed.	<i>Policy 5.3.9(a) as drafted in part replicated Policy 5.3.3 in relation to Rural Industries, but is defined as a non-rural activity. Amending the heading Policy 5.3.9 as</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>suggested in the submission to 'Other rural activities' and 5.3.3(a) could be deleted in its entirety.</i>		
FS1388.204	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	
466.59	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept in part	
FS1388.428	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	
575.28	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities except for the amendments sought below. AND Add a new clause to Policy 5.3.3 -Industrial and Commercial Activities, by adding on an additional	Fulton Hogan supports the restriction of Industrial and Commercial activities in the Rural Zone. Amendment sought to ensure that aggregate and mineral extraction is still specifically catered for in the Rural	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			point as follows: (a) Rural industries and services are managed to ensure they are in keeping with the character of the Rural Zone. (b) Avoid locating industrial and commercial activities in rural areas that do not have a genuine functional connection with the rural land or soil resource. (c) <u>Allowing for mineral and aggregate extraction activities insofar as they are lawfully established in the Rural Zone.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Zone. This industry is of both regional and district-wide importance and protection of the same is consistent with the RPS (which safeguards mineral extraction to ensure that the region can continue to grow).		
FS1377.147	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to provide greater flexibility in addressing the potential effects arising from earthworks. In addition, as an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater flexibility for extractive industries.	Reject	
FS1319.12	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow in part. NZS seeks the policy to be amended as follows: (b) Avoid locating industrial and commercial activities in rural areas that do not have a genuine functional connection with the rural land or soil resource or other resources (such as minerals).	NZS supports the ability to locate industrial and commercial activities in rural areas where there is a functional requirement to do so. This policy should recognise other resources that create a locational requirement, such as mineral resources.	Reject	
FS1198.28	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed and modified to include future as well as existing mineral extraction.	Existing and future mineral extraction in the rural zone should be provide for and supported.	Reject	
FS1292.35	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in full.	McPherson supports the inclusion of policy which recognises that extractive industries have a need to be located in the Rural Zone where aggregate is located.	Reject	
FS1332.37	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	
680.62	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities as follows: (a) (b) <u>Industrial and commercial</u> Rural industries and services are managed to ensure that any potential adverse effect on the they are in keeping with the character	The submitter understands the intent of this policy, it is considered that the amendments are required to ensure the wording is consistent with stated policy header and other policies within this	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			of the Rural Zone <u>are avoided, remedied or mitigated</u> . (b)(a) Avoid locating industrial... AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	section. The order of (a) and (b) would make more sense if the order was swapped. The key point being that activities without a functional need to be in the zone should be avoided. The supporting point is that if they are going to be in the zone any potential adverse effects on the rural character needs to be managed.		
FS1387.170	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	
FS1379.247	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought by the submitter, seeking amendment to part (b) of the policy, allowing adverse effects to be "avoided, remedied or mitigated". HCC considers the policy as notified would result in better outcomes and provide a clearer directive.	Accept in part	
691.10	McPherson Resources Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities, except for the amendments sought below; AND Add clause (c) to Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities, as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>(c) Allowing for mineral and aggregate extraction activities insofar as they are existing in the Rural Zone. This relief is sought in the event that any part of the submission from point 691.1 to 691.15 is not accepted by WDC;</u>	The change requested by the addition of (c) is to ensure that aggregate and mineral extraction activities are still specifically catered for in the Rural Zone, being the most appropriate zone for activities of this kind based on location of the resource and the types of effects created by such activities. This industry is of both regional and district-wide importance and protection of the same is consistent with	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	the Regional Policy Statement (which safeguards mineral extraction to ensure that the region can continue to grow). The submitter supports the restriction of Industrial and Commercial activities in the Rural Zone.		
FS1319.26	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	NZS seeks the policy to be amended as follows: (b) Avoid locating industrial and commercial activities in rural areas that do not have a genuine functional connection with the rural land or soil resource or other resources (such as minerals).	NZS supports the ability to locate industrial and commercial activities in rural areas where there is a genuine functional requirement to do so. This policy should recognise other resources that create a locational requirement, such as mineral resources.	Reject	
FS1334.35	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in full.	Fulton Hogan supports the inclusion of the policy which recognises that extractive industries have a need to be located in the Rural Zone where aggregate is located.	Reject	
794.37	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1257	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	
827.44	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.3.3(b) Industrial and commercial activities as follows (or words to similar effect): (b) Avoid locating industrial and commercial activities in rural areas that do not have a genuine functional connection with the rural land or soil resource or other resources (such as minerals).	This policy should recognise that other resources that create a locational requirement. Supports the ability to locate industrial and commercial activities in rural areas where there is a genuine functional requirement to do so.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			AND Any other further or consequential amendments required.			
FSI334.34	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow alongside the addition to Policy 5.3.3 as per Fulton Hogan's original submission point 575.28.	Fulton Hogan support the inclusion of policy which recognises that extractive industries have a need to be located in the Rural Zone where aggregate is located.	Reject	
FSI198.25	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	It is appropriate that mineral extraction be provided for in the Rural zone.	Reject	
FSI292.34	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow alongside the addition to Policy 5.3.3 as per McPherson's submission point 691.10.	McPherson supports the inclusion of policy which recognises that extractive industries have a need to be located in the Rural Zone where aggregate is located.	Reject	
FSI345.68	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons set out in the NZ Steel Submission.	Reject	
924.47	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Add clause (c) to Policy 5.3.3- Industrial and Commercial Activities as follows: <u>(c) Provide for the existing coal and ash transport and management facilities associated with the Huntly Power Station.</u>	The submitter considers that the matters listed should be extended to include the coal transport and ash management activities associated with the Huntly Power Station.	Reject	
FSI387.1555	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	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
662.2	Blue Wallace Surveyors	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities, except for the amendments sought below AND  Add a new clause (c) to Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>(c) Recognise that activities associated with non-rural infrastructure be provided for within the rural environment.</u>	The rural industrial integrity of the Rural Zone is an important message to be contained in the Plan. Considers that non-rural industries can operate in the Rural Zone where they abut infrastructure such as a state highway. Recognise that the rural environment is influenced by non-rural infrastructure, and some non-rural activities can occur in the zone e.g. a service station.	Accept in part	
FS1387.95	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	
FS1379.222	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC opposes the relief sought to add a clause to Policy 5.3.3 Industrial and commercial activities. The key purpose 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.	Accept in part	
Policy 5.3.10 – Temporary events						
367.6	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.10 Temporary events.	No reasons provided.	Accept	
Policy 5.3.11 – Home occupations						



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
499.4	Adrian Morton	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.11 to include "promote". AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to remove the requirement for resource consent for home occupations; OR Amend the Proposed District Plan to make it easier and cheaper to obtain permission for a home office.	There are real benefits in promoting and supporting occupation activities, including improved productivity by removing travel time, less travel and resulting in better environmental outcomes and promotes sustainable rural communities.	Accept in part	
FS1388.504	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
757.4	Karen White	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.11 (a) Home occupations to include "promote" and make it easier for people working from home.	Make it easier for people working from home to achieve Policy 5.3.11. Avoid the high costs associated with applying for resource consents. There are a number of real benefits in promoting and supporting occupation activities such as improved productivity by removing travel time, less travel and resulting in better environmental outcomes while promoting sustainable rural communities.	Accept in part	
Policy 5.3.12 – Meremere Dragway, Definition and Rule 22.1.2 (P5)						
791.4	Andrew Michael Basford Green for Meremere Dragway Inc	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Meremere Dragway activity" in Chapter 13 Definitions to read as "Drag Way Park Specific Activity". AND Amend the definition of "Meremere Dragway activity" in Chapter 13 Definitions to provide for	The submitter seeks the name change to provide consistency with the name change of the overlay sought in this submission. Appropriate provision should be made for the activities that are currently being	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p>the addition of non-motorised activities as follows (or a similar variation): <del>Meremere Dragway activity Drag Way Park Specific Activity</del> Means an activity at <del>Meremere Dragway activity Drag Way Park Specific Area</del> as shown on the planning maps that involves <del>motor propulsion to provide entertainment, education or training for the general public or to an individual participating in the activity; and includes but is not limited to driver training or education, police or security training, and vehicle testing</del> <u>motorised recreational activity, non-motorised recreational activity, static-automotive activity and a film and advertising production activity.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to the Proposed District Plan to give effect to the relief sought in this submission.</p>	<p>undertaken on the site and future activities, which are not incompatible with the existing environment that includes Hampton Downs Motorsport Park, landfill and prison. The Proposed District Plan does not realise the potential of the Meremere Dragway as a multipurpose site, including for the provision of non-motorised activities. A number of organisations have approached the Meremere Dragway seeking to use the facility. The Meremere Dragway is a specialist facility needed for the safe conduct of potentially harmful activities that may be inappropriate elsewhere. The Meremere Dragway is an ideal location for motorsport activity that is not acceptable in an urban area.</p>		
Policy 5.3.1.13 – Waste management activities, Rules 22.1.4 (D4) and 22.1.5 (NC3) and definition						
367.7	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Neutral/ Amend	Add a point to Policy 5.3.13 Waste management activities, to ensure no leeching into nearby waterways.	There is a need to monitor or be aware of what materials and waste are or have been deposited at quarries and landfills. There is a great risk for certain substances to leech back into soil and waterways, contaminating them and deeming them unusable.	Reject	
585.6	Lucy Roberts for Department of Conservation	Oppose	Delete Policy 5.3.13(c) Waste management activities.	Waste management facilities should not be located within the identified outstanding landscape or natural character areas and significant natural areas.	Accept in part	
FS1045.11	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	<i>We agree that waste management facilities should not be located within the identified outstanding landscape or natural character areas and significant natural areas.</i>		Accept in part	
746.4	The Surveying Company	Support	Amend Policy 5.3.13 (a) - Waste management activities as follows: (a) Provide for the <del>rehabilitation of existing quarry sites, including landfill and cleanfill activities, where siting is appropriate, environmental effects are managed</del> and there is environmental gain. AND	The submitter supports, in part, the inclusion of Policy 4.6.2. Due to the extensive growth in the Auckland and Waikato Regions, there is a surplus of fill material and it is becoming increasingly difficult to find locations to dispose of this material. The Proposed Plan in no way recognises disposal of surplus	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Amend Policy 5.3.13- Waste management activities to provide for landfills - Classes 1-5 in the Rural Zone, subject to appropriate siting.	material as an essential part of the construction process or the need to provide for it within the Rural Zone. The Franklin Section of the Waikato District Plan recognises landfills (including cleanfill) as an Essential Service under Section 15. In particular Objective 15.1.1.1 of the Franklin Section recognises the importance to the economic and social well-being of the district and the essential nature of network and other utilities and other essential services and to provide for their development, operation and maintenance. While the Industrial Zone provides for effects associated with waste management activities (dust, traffic), this land is in relatively short supply (compared with Rural Zone) and as such cleanfills often seek to locate in the Rural Zone. To recognise the necessity of these facilities to the economic, health and wellbeing of the District.		
FS1334.52	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend Policy 5.3.13 as per submission point 575.31.	It is not appropriate to delete the reference to quarries in this policy. Fulton Hogan supports the rehabilitation of quarries upon decommission. The rehabilitation of quarries once the extraction has concluded should be encouraged by the plan.	Accept in part	
FS1377.245	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	An outdoor living area of 80m2 is excessive for the Residential Zone and the minimum lot size of 450m2.	Accept in part	
FS1292.52	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend Policy 5.3.13 as per submission point 691.13.	It is not appropriate to delete the reference to quarries in this policy. McPherson support the rehabilitation of quarries upon decommission and therefore it is appropriate to recognise this as per Policy 5.3.13.	Accept in part	
860.6	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.13 (a) Waste management activities AND Add a similar policy for mining sites.	The rehabilitation of quarry sites brings huge benefits for the community in the form of biodiversity or wet land sinks or a recreational or residential areas. The same	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				applies to mining sites and this needs to be recognised by the plan.		
FS1334.53	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.3.13 as per submission point 575.31.	Fulton Hogan supports the rehabilitation of quarries upon decommission. The rehabilitation of quarries once the extraction has concluded should be encouraged by the plan.	Accept in part	
FS1292.53	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.3.14 as per submission point 691.13.	McPherson support the rehabilitation of quarries upon decommission and therefore it is appropriate to recognise this as per Policy 5.3.13.	Accept in part	
FS1332.6	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1285.15	Terra Firma Mining Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.13(a) Waste Management activities: "Provide for the rehabilitation of existing quarry sites, including landfill and cleanfill activities, where there is an environmental gain." AND Add a similar policy for mining sites.	TFM agrees with the submitter that the rehabilitation of quarry and mining sites can bring substantial benefits to the community. Lake Puketirini is a good example.	Accept in part	
302.45	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Amend Policy 5.3.13(b) Waste management activities to provide for waste management facilities that may not be completely compatible with the rural environment. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	It is difficult for waste management facilities to be compatible with rural environments; however, rural land acts as an effective buffer for their effects, which should be acknowledged by the policy.	Accept in part	
575.31	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.13 Waste management activities, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.13 (a) Waste management activities, as follows (or words to similar effect): Provide for the rehabilitation of existing quarry sites upon decommission, including landfill and cleanfill activities, where there is an environmental gain. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as	Support the provision but seek amendment so that rehabilitation occurs upon decommission (unless a particular site lends itself to ongoing rehabilitation, which will be determined by site specific factors). Wants to ensure that once extractive processes of the quarry are no longer viable and/or equitable, the proposed district plan will encourage restoration of the landscape. The original state of the environment may not be able to be achieved but with then right steps, quarry sites will be able to blend	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	into the environment after being decommissioned.		
FS1292.50	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	McPherson support the rehabilitation of quarries upon decommission and therefore it is appropriate to recognise this as per Policy 5.3.13.	Reject	
FS1332.39	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	
FS1027.5	Peter Ayson on behalf of Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated	Oppose	<i>Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. NAG opposes this submission and supports on-going rehabilitation. Rehabilitation should certainly not be left to the time of decommissioning of the quarry. As aggregate recovery decreases, the viability of the business is likely to be at a lower point, potentially reducing the ability of the business to fund rehabilitation. In addition, decommissioning may be several years after extraction, with limited options to achieve any sustainable biodiversity improvement or landscape rehabilitation. To maintain community values, on-going rehabilitation is essential.</i>	We seek to disallow the whole of this submission because on-going rehabilitation is essential to community values, and rehabilitation left to time of decommissioning opens up the risk of this not happening at all, or that, after so much time of non-rehabilitation, the physical environment is so compromised that sustainable options are lost.	Accept	
680.70	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.13 Waste management activities, as notified.	The submitter broadly supports the intent of this policy with the focus of (b) and (c) on waste management facilities appropriate.	Accept in part	
691.13	McPherson Resources Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.13 (a) Waste management activities, as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Provide for the rehabilitation of existing quarry sites upon decommission, including land and clean fill activities, where there is an environmental gain.	McPherson supports the provision for rehabilitation of existing quarry sites, insofar as any rehabilitation carries out upon decommission of such quarries. The McPhersons want to ensure that once	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			This relief is sought in the event that any part of the submission from point 691.1 to 691.16 is not accepted by WDC. AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	extractive processes of the quarry are no longer viable and/or equitable, that the landscape is restored as much as possible. As it is, based on the make-up of the McPherson Quarry (being one coherent site), the site does not lend itself well to staged rehabilitation as the entirety of the site is likely to be used for the duration of the quarry being in operation. As such, it is proposed that the words 'upon decommission' is added for certainty as to when rehabilitation is required.		
FS1334.50	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	Fulton Hogan supports the rehabilitation of quarries upon decommission. The rehabilitation of quarries once the extraction has concluded should be encouraged by the plan.	Reject	
723.11	Tyler Sharratt on behalf of Winstone Aggregates	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.13 Waste Management Activities.	Reasons not provided.	Accept in part	
FS1292.51	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend policy 5.3.13 as per submission point 691.13.	McPherson supports the rehabilitation of quarries upon decommission and therefore it is appropriate to recognise this as per Policy 5.3.13.	Accept in part	
FS1334.51	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.3.13 as per submission point 575.31.	Fulton Hogan supports the rehabilitation of quarries upon decommission. The rehabilitation quarries once the extraction has concluded should be encouraged by the plan.	Accept in part	
Policy 5.3.16 – Specific area – Agricultural research centres						
680.72	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.16 Specific area - Agricultural research centres, as notified.	Submitter supports recognition of the need for research centres.	Accept in part	
637.1	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Neutral/ Amend	Delete Policy 5.3.16 Specific Area- Agricultural Research Centres AND Add the following new Objectives and Policies: <u>5.7 Specific Area – Agricultural Research Centres</u> <u>5.7.1 Objective – Specific Area – Agricultural Research Centres To recognise, provide for and protect the continued operation and development of Agricultural Research Centres that are an integral part of the agricultural sector. 5.7.1.1</u>	Policy 5.3.16(a) focuses on recognising and protecting the continued operation of Agricultural Research Centres, but does not adequately recognise and provide for the future development of these facilities. This is inconsistent with the parallel Policy 6.8.4 in the Operative District Plan (submission sets this out). The submitter seeks that provision for future	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p><u>Policy – Operation and Development of Agricultural Research Centres Enable the continued operation and development of the Livestock Improvement Corporation and DairyNZ Agricultural Research Centres by providing for a wide range of agricultural research activities and rural activities that complement each other. AND</u></p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>development of Agricultural Research Centres be continued in the relevant policy framework of the Proposed District Plan. Policy 5.3.16 is one of the various policies listed to implement Objective 5.3 Rural Character and Amenity. Policy 5.3.16 is focused on recognising and protecting Agricultural Research Centres so is not considered relevant to rural character and amenity issues. In comparison, the Operative District Plan includes Objective 6.8.1 which is relevant to Agricultural Research Centres (submission sets out objective). Objective 6.8.1 is supported by four policies in the Operative District Plan. The submitter considers that the Proposed District Plan should continue the same approach by including an Objective and Policy specific to Agricultural Research Centres.</p>		
639.1	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Delete Policy 5.3.16 Specific Area- Agricultural Research Centres AND Add the following new Objectives and Policies: <u>5.7 Specific Area – Agricultural Research Centres</u> <u>5.7.1 Objective – Specific Area – Agricultural Research Centres To recognise, provide for and protect the continued operation and development of Agricultural Research Centres that are an integral part of the agricultural sector. 5.7.1.1 Policy – Operation and Development of Agricultural Research Centres Enable the continued operation and development of the Livestock Improvement Corporation and DairyNZ Agricultural Research Centres by providing for a wide range of agricultural research activities and rural activities that complement each other. Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities – Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: P76 A staff facility that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research that includes: A dwelling located at least 200m from the site containing Inghams Feed Mill in Hamilton City</u></p>	<p>Policy 5.3.16(a) focuses on recognising and protecting the continued operation of Agricultural Research Centres, but does not adequately recognise and provide for the future development of these facilities. This is inconsistent with the parallel Policy 6.8.4 in the Operative District Plan (submission sets this out). The submitter seeks that provision for future development of Agricultural Research Centres be continued in the relevant policy framework of the Proposed District Plan. Policy 5.3.16 is one of the various policies listed to implement Objective 5.3 Rural Character and Amenity. Policy 5.3.16 is focused on recognising and protecting Agricultural Research Centres so is not considered relevant to rural character and amenity issues. In comparison, the Operative District Plan includes Objective 6.8.1 which is relevant to Agricultural Research Centres (submission sets out objective). Objective 6.8.1 is supported by</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p><u>Council's jurisdiction; A recreational facility;</u>  <u>Social club; Cafeteria or café.</u>  AND  Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>four policies in the Operative District Plan. The submitter considers that the Proposed District Plan should continue the same approach by including an Objective and Policy specific to Agricultural Research Centres.</p>		
FSI 168.64	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	<p>Allow the submission,</p>	<p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission. Policy 5.3.16(a) focuses on recognising and protecting the continued operation of Agricultural Research Centres, but does not adequately recognise and provide for the future development of these facilities. This is inconsistent with the parallel Policy 6.8.4 in the Operative District Plan (submission sets this out). The submitter seeks that provision for future development of Agricultural Research Centres be continued in the relevant policy framework of the Proposed District Plan. Policy 5.3.16 is one of the various policies listed to implement Objective 5.3 Rural Character and Amenity. Policy 5.3.16 is focused on recognising and protecting Agricultural Research Centres so is not considered relevant to rural character and amenity issues. In comparison, the Operative District Plan includes Objective 6.8.1 which is relevant to Agricultural Research Centres (submission sets out objective). Objective 6.8.1 is supported by four policies in the Operative District Plan. The submitter considers that the Proposed District Plan should continue the same approach by including an Objective and Policy specific to Agricultural Research Centres. The submission should be allowed and extend to Agricultural and Horticultural Research Centres.</p>	Reject	
Rule 22.5 – Specific Area – Agriculture Research Centres						



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
637.8	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research, as follows: (a) The rules that apply to a permitted activity within the Agricultural Research Centres Specific Area as identified on the planning maps are as follows: (i) Rule 22.2 Land use - Effects; (ii) Rule 22.3 Land Use - Building; except for building within a Campus. A. Rule 22.3.4.1 Height - Building general will not apply and Rule 22.5.34 will apply instead; and Rule 22.5.34 will apply instead; and B. Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage will not apply and Rule 22.5.45 will apply instead. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Rule 22.5.2 lists permitted activities within the Agricultural Research Centres Specific Area. "An agricultural or horticultural research activity" is permitted in addition to various activities incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. Under Schedule 25C (Agricultural Research Centres) of the Operative District Plan, Rule 25C.4.1(e) provides for "a commercial activity" that is "incidental to agricultural and horticultural research" as a permitted activity. This rule has not been transferred to Rule 22.5.2. As a result, Rule 22.1.5(1)(D), a discretionary activity resource consent would be required for a "commercial activity". The submitter seeks a continued permitted activity status consistent with Schedule 25C of the Operative District Plan.	Accept in part	
639.8	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: (a) The rules that apply to a permitted activity within the Agricultural Research Centres Specific Area as identified on the planning maps are as follows: (i) Rule 22.2 Land use - Effects; (ii) Rule 22.3 Land Use - Building; except for building within a Campus A. Rule 22.3.4.1 Height - Building general will not apply and Rule 22.5.34 will apply instead; and Rule 22.5.34 will apply instead; and B. Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage will not apply and Rule 22.5.45 will apply instead. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Rule 22.5.2 lists permitted activities within the Agricultural Research Centres Specific Area. "An agricultural or horticultural research activity" is permitted in addition to various activities incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. Under Schedule 25C (Agricultural Research Centres) of the Operative District Plan, Rule 25C.4.1(e) provides for "a commercial activity" that is "incidental to agricultural and horticultural research" as a permitted activity. This rule has not been transferred to Rule 22.5.2. As a result, Rule 22.1.5(1)(D), a discretionary activity resource consent would be required for a "commercial activity". The submitter seeks a continued permitted activity status consistent with Schedule 25C of the Operative District Plan.	Accept in part	
637.15	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: P6 Disposal or storage of solid organic waste or cleanfill that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research where the extracted	P6 is not necessary to provide for the on-site disposal or storage of solid organic or cleanfill waste, or an extractive industry for on-site use. The relevant Waikato	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			material is used on the Agricultural Research Centre site. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Regional Plan rules are adequate and can be relied upon.		
637.16	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: <del>P7</del> A staff facility that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research that includes: A dwelling located at least 200m from the site containing Inghams Feed Mill in Hamilton City Council's jurisdiction; A recreational facility; <del>Social club; Cafeteria or café.</del> AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	P7 is not necessary, as there is no need for a 200m setback for a dwelling in relation to the Inghams Feed Mill under P7(1). This rule has been transferred from Rule 25C.4.1(j) of Schedule 25C of the Operative DP. It was only relevant to the AgResearch Centre, which is no longer located within the Waikato District (now within HCC). The Inghams Feed Mill is located over 2.5km from the nearest boundary of the LIC or DairyNZ Agricultural Research Centres. 200m setback is not necessary. A "social club" has not been included as an example of a staff facility despite being included in the original Rule 25C.4.1(j) of Schedule 25C of the Operative DP.	Accept in part	
637.17	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Neutral/ Amend	Add the following activities to Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: <del>P7</del> A Commercial activity that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. <del>P8</del> Offices that are incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. <del>P9</del> Laboratories that are incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. <del>P10</del> Warehouse or storage facilities that are incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. <del>P11</del> Conference facilities that are incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. AND Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: <del>P7</del> A staff facility that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research that includes: A dwelling located at least 200m from the site containing Inghams Feed Mill in Hamilton City Council's jurisdiction; A recreational facility; <del>Social club; Cafeteria or café.</del>	Under Rule 22.5.2, there are a number of other key activities integral and essential to the operation of the LIC and DairyNZ Agricultural Research Centres which are not listed as permitted activities. These include: offices, laboratories, conference facilities, warehouse or storage facilities and staff cafeterias or cafes. Concern that these activities would default to a non-complying activity. This was not as problematic with the Operation District Plan because it has a more effects based where any activity is permitted if it complies with the relevant performance standards (and is not listed as restricted discretionary, discretionary or prohibited).	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.			
637.18	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Support	Retain Chapter 22.5 Specific Area - Agricultural Research Centres, with amendments sought in the submission.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
639.15	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: P6 Disposal or storage of solid organic waste or cleanfill that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research where the extracted material is used on the Agricultural Research Centre site. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	P6 is not necessary to provide for the on-site disposal or storage of solid organic or cleanfill waste, or an extractive industry for on-site use. The relevant Waikato Regional Plan rules are adequate and can be relied upon.	Accept in part	
639.16	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: P7 A staff facility that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research that includes: A dwelling located at least 200m from the site containing Inghams Feed Mill in Hamilton City Council's jurisdiction; A recreational facility; Social club; Cafeteria or café. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	P7 is not necessary, as there is no need for a 200m setback for a dwelling in relation to the Inghams Feed Mill under P7(1). This rule has been transferred from Rule 25C.4.1(j) of Schedule 25C of the Operative DP. It was only relevant to the AgResearch Centre, which is no longer located within the Waikato District (now within HCC). The Inghams Feed Mill is located over 2.5km from the nearest boundary of the LIC or DairyNZ Agricultural Research Centres. 200m setback is not necessary. A "social club" has not been included as an example of a staff facility despite being included in the original Rule 25C.4.1(j) of Schedule 25C of the Operative DP.	Accept in part	
639.17	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/ Amend	Add the following activities to Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: P7 A Commercial activity that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. P8 Offices that are incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. P9 Laboratories that are incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. P10 Warehouse or storage facilities that are incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. P11 Conference facilities	Under Rule 22.5.2, there are a number of other key activities integral and essential to the operation of the LIC and DairyNZ Agricultural Research Centres which are not listed as permitted activities. These include: offices, laboratories, conference facilities, warehouse or storage facilities and staff cafeterias or cafes. Concern that these activities would default to a non-complying activity. This was not as	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			that are incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	problematic with the Operation District Plan because it has a more effects based where any activity is permitted if it complies with the relevant performance standards (and is not listed as restricted discretionary, discretionary or prohibited).		
639.18	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Support	Retain Chapter 22.5 Specific Area - Agricultural Research Centres, with amendments sought in the submission.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
781.28	Ministry of Education	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.5.2 P2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: P2 An education facilities that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research. <u>Any education facilities which are not incidental to agricultural or horticultural research is a restricted discretionary activity.</u> AND Add a new Rule 22.5.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: <u>22.5.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities (1) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities</u> Activity RD3 Education facilities Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: <u>The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity within the Rural 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>	The submitter supports the permitted activity status for agricultural and horticultural research in the Rural Zone. However, other education facilities such as schools, community education, early childhood education, tertiary education institutions, outdoor education centres and sports training establishments locate within rural areas are an essential social infrastructure. A restricted discretionary activity status is therefore requested for education facilities that are not incidental to agricultural and horticultural research.	Accept in part	
FS1345.133	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis considers that Discretionary Activity status is more appropriate for education facilities within the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
637.10	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Neutral/A mend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include the provisions from the Operative District Plan in Schedule 25C for Agricultural Research Centres as they were originally intended.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
637.11	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Neutral/A mend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to recognise and provide for all key existing and future activities in the Agricultural Research Centres.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
637.12	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Oppose	Delete any site-specific conditions relating to Agricultural Research Centres that are sufficiently covered by District-wide provisions.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
639.10	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to include the provisions from the Operative District Plan in Schedule 25C for Agricultural Research Centres as they were originally intended. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
639.11	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the Proposed District Plan to recognise and provide for all key existing and future activities in the Agricultural Research Centres. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
639.12	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Oppose	Delete any site-specific conditions relating to Agricultural Research Centres that are sufficiently covered by District-wide provisions. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
330.171	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.5 Specific Area- Agriculture Research Centres.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
330.172	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.5.1 Application of Rules.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
330.173	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
330.174	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.5.3 Discretionary Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
330.175	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.5.4 Building Height - within a Campus.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
330.176	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.5.5 Building Coverage - within a Campus.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
680.248	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Section 22.5 Specific Area - Agriculture Research Centres, as notified.	Support is extended to the planning approach taken.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.			
697.842	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.5.2 Specific Area - Agricultural Research Centre heading, as follows: Permitted activities — <del>Agricultural and horticultural research activities</del>	This is to provide consistency with across the zones.	Accept	
<i>Definitions -Agricultural and horticultural research activities</i>						
637.2	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Support	Retain the definition of "Agricultural and horticultural research activities" in Chapter 13 Definitions as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept	
637.3	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Support	Retain the definition of "Agricultural Research Centres" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	Supports retention of the definition.	Accept	
637.4	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Support	Retain the definition of "Campus" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	Supports retention of the definition.	Accept	
639.2	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Support	Retain the definition of "Agricultural and horticultural research activities" in Chapter 13 Definitions as notified.	No reasons provided.	Accept	
639.3	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Support	Retain the definition of "Agricultural Research Centres" in Chapter 13 Definitions as notified.	The submitter supports retention of the definition.	Accept	
639.4	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Support	Retain the definition of "Campus" in Chapter 13 Definitions as notified.	The submitter supports retention of the definition.	Accept	
707.4	Soil & Health Association of New Zealand (S&H) on behalf of	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of Agricultural and Horticulture Research Facilities, in Chapter 13-Definitions, to include the following: ...Commercial application of such activities <u>For the avoidance of doubt, this definition does not include veterinary vaccines that use Genetically Modified Organisms, or any activities that involve Field Trials, or Release of Genetically Modified Organisms.</u>	Definitions are requested in support of other requested provisions relating to GMOs.	Reject	
FS1387.789	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</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
FS1342.194	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 707.4.	FFNZ opposes the amendment for reasons outlined in our further submissions relating to proposals to introduce GMO provisions in the District Plan.	Accept	
466.52	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain the definition for "Agricultural and horticultural research activities" in Chapter 13 Definitions as notified.	The submitter supports this definition.	Accept	
695.56	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain the definition for "Agricultural and horticultural research activities" in Chapter 13 Definitions which no longer contains references to "Genetic Engineering".	Genetic engineering has been dropped, which is supported.	Accept	
FS1342.259	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 695.56.	Genetic engineering is best managed by the Environmental Protection Authority on a case by case basis.	Accept	
FS1343.3	Bruce Cameron	Support	Allow this whole submission point.	Genetic engineering is best managed by the Environmental Protection Authority on a case by case basis.	Accept	
FS1295.1	Life Sciences Network Incorporated	Support	Allow this whole submission point.	Genetic engineering is best managed by the Environmental Protection Authority on a case by case basis.	Accept	
FS1212.1	David Stewart Bull	Support	Allow this whole submission point.	Genetic engineering is best managed by the Environmental Protection Authority on a case by case basis.	Accept	
FS1192.1	J H & R Cotman	Support	Allow this whole submission point.	Genetic engineering is best managed by the Environmental Protection Authority on a case by case basis.	Accept	
FS1276.74	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Oppose	WED seeks that the whole submission point be disallowed.	WED does not support genetic engineering being dropped from the Plan, as it poses health and economic threats.	Reject	
FS1225.1	BIOTech New Zealand	Support	Allow this whole submission point.	Genetic engineering is best managed by the Environmental Protection Authority on a case by case basis.	Accept	
FS1214.1	Forest Owners Association	Support	Allow this whole submission point.	Genetic engineering is best managed by the Environmental Protection Authority on a case by case basis.	Accept	
FS1320.1	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Support	Allow this whole submission point.	Genetic engineering is best managed by the Environmental Protection Authority on a case by case basis.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
419.11	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain the definition of "Agricultural and horticultural research activities" in Chapter 13: Definitions, as notified.	These activities are an integral component of rural production, require a rural location and access to the rural resources and are necessary to continue to maintain and grow rural production in New Zealand.	Accept	
680.126	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain the definition of "Agricultural and horticultural research activities" in Chapter 13: Definitions.	The submitter supports this definition.	Accept	
697.371	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete from Chapter 13: Definitions the definition for "Campus".	This term is only used in the context of the Specific Area - Agriculture Research Centre and a definition is not needed.	Reject	
Policy 5.3.17 – Specific area – Huntly Power station – coal and ash water – and associated rules 22.6						
860.8	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.17 (b) Specific area - Huntly Power Station - Coal and ash water.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1334.5	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow subject to amendments sought in Fulton Hogan's original submission.	Fulton Hogan generally agrees with these submission points and in particular support the inclusion of provisions which give recognition to quarries and extractive industries.	Accept in part	
FS1292.5	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow subject to amendments sought in Fulton Hogan's original submission.	McPherson generally agrees with the submission point and in particular support the inclusion of provisions which give recognition to quarries and extractive industries.	Accept in part	
FS1332.8	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
924.15	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.17 (b)- Specific Area- Huntly Power Station- Coal and ash water as follows: (b) Provide for specific facilities that include the handling, <u>stockpiling</u> and haulage of coal and the <del>disposal</del> <u>management</u> of coal ash and associated water within identified areas in close proximity to Huntly Power Station.	The submitter supports Policy 5.3.17 as it recognises and provides for facilities that are integral to the operation of the Huntly Power Station. It is appropriate that the overlay in the planning maps specifies the area in which these activities occur and facilities are located. Policy 5.3.17 (b) Incorrectly lists the facilities as being for disposal of coal ash but those facilities provide for the management of the coal ash. The submitter considers this policy should be amended to correctly reflect the purpose for which the ash management	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
				site exists. Policy 5.3.17 does not list coal stockpiling in this specific area but this is an activity that is undertaken within the identified area and is integral to the operation of Huntly Power Station.		
Rule 22.6 – Specific Area – Huntly Power Station – Coal and Ash Water						
924.38	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited		Amend Section 22.6 Specific Area-Huntly Power Station-Coal and Ash Water to create a stand alone set of rules for the Huntly Power Station as set out in the submission.		Accept in part	
330.177	Andrew and Christine Gore		No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.6 Specific Area - Huntly Power Station- Coal and Ash Water.		Accept in part	
330.178	Andrew and Christine Gore		No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.6.1 Application of Rules.		Accept in part	
330.179	Andrew and Christine Gore		No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.6.2 Permitted Activities - Huntly Power Station.		Accept in part	
330.180	Andrew and Christine Gore		No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.6.3 Discretionary Activities - Huntly Power Station.		Accept in part	
330.181	Andrew and Christine Gore		No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.6.4 Building Setback and Location - Huntly Power Station.		Accept in part	
330.182	Andrew and Christine Gore		No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.6.5 Building Height.		Accept in part	
330.183	Andrew and Christine Gore		No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.6.6 Coal stockpile height, setback and coverage.		Accept in part	
330.184	Andrew and Christine Gore		No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.6.7 Ash disposal and transport of coal ash water.		Accept in part	
330.185	Andrew and Christine Gore		No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.6.8 Energy corridor - transportation of minerals and substances.		Accept in part	
Policy 5.3.6 – Intensive farming						
821.5	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg	Neutral/ Amend	Add to Chapter 5 Rural Environment a separate policy for poultry hatcheries, as follows: <u>To enable poultry hatchery operations to be located where</u>	Include a separate policy for poultry in the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
	Producers Federation of on behalf of		<u>the anticipated effects are consistent with the underlying zone.</u>			
FS1316.7	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 821.5.	Support the intent of the submission to allow for poultry hatcheries in the Rural.	Accept in part	
FS1265.2	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow the submission point, which seeks the addition of a policy in section 5 which provides for poultry hatchery operations.	Support the intent of the submission to allow for poultry hatcheries in the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
833.8	Phil Page on behalf of Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Chapter 5 Rural Environment to provide for poultry farming where it can meet the performance standards.	Poultry farming does not result in adverse effects on soils or in contamination of soils or water and is therefore more consistent with the policies and objectives of the Proposed District Plan and the Regional Policy Statement, than other intensive farming and many permitted farming activities.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1358	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	
197.9	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.6 Intensive farming activities.	The submitter supports specific policy support for intensive farming activities and that they operate in accordance with industry best practice.	Accept in part	
FS1265.7	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow by retaining Policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	Support the retention of this policy which provides for intensive farming activities that operate in accordance with industry best practice.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1316.13	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 197.9.	Support the retention of this policy which provides for intensive farming activities that operate in accordance with industry best practice.	Accept in part	
281.7	Zeala Ltd for Trading as Aztech Buildings	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.6(a) Intensive farming activities, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.6 (a) Intensive farming activities as follows: <del>Enable Provide for</del> intensive farming activities <del>provided they operate in accordance with industry best practice and management of that are not reliant on the productive capacity of the soil on the site provided that the operative effectively manages the</del> adverse effects both on-site and on any neighbouring sites.	Support the enabling policy with regard to Intensive farming where the proposal is shown to mitigate the potential adverse effects of operations. Amend the wording of what constitutes intensive farming so that the definition excludes farming operations that are dependent on the productive capacity of the soils on site. Rules need to be consistent with this Policy - see following section on Rural Rules, while the current definition is not reflective of this Policy - and frankly does not make sense. See later discussion on definition of Intensive farming.	Accept in part	
FS1265.8	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and retain policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	Support the retention of a policy which provides for intensive farming operations, however, we consider that it is important to acknowledge that best practice be followed.	Accept in part	
FS1316.14	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 281.7 and retain Policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	Support the retention of a policy which provides for intensive farming operations; however, we consider that it is important to acknowledge that best practice be followed.	Accept in part	
567.7	Ngati Tamaoho Trust	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new clause (b) to Policy 5.3.6 - Intensive farming activities, as follows: (b) promote the use of earth-bunds and silt traps for all cropping, tree clearance and harvesting activities.	No reasons provided.	Reject	
FS1316.17	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 567.7 and retain Policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	The proposed amendment is too specific as it relates to cropping, tree clearance and harvesting activities and not all intensive farming. Further the type of mitigation suggested may not be appropriate for all activities.	Accept	
FS1265.11	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and retain Policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	The proposed amendment is too specific as it relates to cropping, tree clearance and harvesting activities and not all intensive farming. Further the type of mitigation suggested may not be appropriate for all activities.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
636.3	Anna Noakes	Oppose	Delete Policy 5.3.6 (a) Intensive farming activities.	Policy is not clearly defined and open for interpretation.	Reject	
FS1265.10	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and retain policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	Policy 5.3.6 provides for intensive farming which ensures the economic growth of the district. The deletion of this policy would adversely affect this industry in the district.	Accept	
FS1338.2	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd	Oppose	Null	CPI supports this policy as it is currently worded.	Accept	
FS1316.16	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 636.3 and retain Policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	Policy 5.3.6 provides for intensive farming which ensures the economic growth of the district. The deletion of this policy would adversely affect this industry in the district.	Accept	
693.4	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.6 - Intensive farming activities as notified.	While this policy is stated within the Rural Character and Amenity section of the PDP, it applies to Alstra and is supported. The support of well operated intensive farming activities as indicated in Policy 5.3.6, will ensure the economic growth of the district. Alstra alone provides employment for 45 people across their farms with the bulk of these being local Ngaruawahia community members	Accept in part	
FS1265.14	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow and retain policy 5.3.6 as drafter or amend as per submission point 466.46.	Support the intent of the submission in that well operated intensive farming activities ensure economic growth for the Waikato District.	Accept in part	
798.9	Ngati Te Ata	Not Stated	Add a new clause to Policy 5.3.6 Intensive farming activities as follows: <u>(b) promote the use of earth-bunds and silt traps for all cropping, tree clearance and harvesting activities.</u>	No reasons provided.	Reject	
FS1265.13	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and retain policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	The proposed amendment is too specific as it relates to cropping, tree clearance and harvesting activities and not all intensive farming. Further the type of mitigation suggested may not be appropriate for all activities.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1171.104	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	This submission proposes the addition of a new clause to Policy 5.3.6 Intensive farming activities to promote the use of earth-bunds and silt traps for all cropping, tree clearance and harvesting activities. This submission is opposed on the basis that the general earthworks provisions should be applicable.	Accept	
821.8	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.6 Intensive farming activities, as notified.	Poultry farming is a positive feature in the rural environment and should be enabled in the Rural Zone as it cannot locate in other areas.	Accept in part	
FS1265.6	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow submission point by retaining Policy 5.3.6 as drafter or amend as per submission point 466.46.	Poultry farming is best located in the Rural Zone and should be enabled.	Accept in part	
FS1316.19	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 821.8 or amend as per submission point 466.46.	Poultry farming is best located in the Rural Zone and should be enabled.	Accept in part	
466.46	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.6 Intensive farming activities as follows: Enable intensive farming activities provided that they operate in accordance with industry best practice and management of any adverse effects both on the site and at the boundary of any adjoining sites.	The submitter supports this policy, although suggests improved wording.	Accept	
FS1316.15	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 466.46.	Support the retention of this policy which provides for intensive farming. The amended wording is clearer and improves the policy as drafted.	Accept	
FS1265.9	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow the amendment of policy 5.3.6 as below: Enable intensive farming activities provided that they operate in accordance with industry best practice and management of any adverse effects both on the site and at the boundary of any adjoining sites.	Support the retention of this policy which provides for intensive farming. The amended wording is clearer and improves the policy as drafted.	Accept	
680.65	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.6 Intensive farming activities, as follows: (a) <del>Enable</del> <u>Recognise that</u> intensive farming activities <del>may be increasingly required as the twin pressures on land required for urban growth and food production increases, provided they operate in accordance with industry best practice and management of adverse effects both</del>	Policy 5.3.6 is misguided and an unnecessary duplication as written. The management of potential adverse effects from an intensive farming activity is addressed under Policy 5.3.7(h) and as such the second part of this policy is not required. The Proposed District Plan is	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Decision Requested	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p><del>on-site and any neighbouring sites. (b) Ensure that intensive farming activities operate in such a way as to appropriately manage adverse effects both on-site and on any neighbouring sites.</del></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	<p>short-sighted and not sufficiently future focused in its current response to intensive farming activities. Although NZ is a pastoral farming nation, intensive farming is a relevant way to increase production and reduce overhead costs. Increasing land prices mean that the ability to purchase large tracts of land for extensive production is becoming less viable. Policy about management of effects associated with intensive farming should be a separate policy.</p>		
FS1316.18	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 680.65 and retain Policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	We submit that Policy 5.3.6 should continue to enable intensive farming activities which operate in accordance with industry best practice.	Accept	
FS1108.57	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	
FS1139.48	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate addition.	Accept	
FS1275.6	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Allow.	The new and amended policies as drafted in the submission- with the addition of 'following best industry practice' to end the proposed 5.3.6(b) is supported to recognise changes in food production and community expectations.	Reject	
FS1265.12	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and retain policy 5.3.6 as drafted or amend as per submission point 466.46.	We submit that policy 5.3.6 should continue to enable intensive farming activities which operate in accordance with industry best practice.	Reject	
FS1379.248	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	The submitter seeks amendments to part (a) of the policy to recognise a greater need for intensive farming activities. HCC opposes the amendments sought; the policy as notified in the Waikato PDP would result in better outcomes and provide a clearer directive.	Reject	

Definitions – Intensive Farming

636.1	Anna Noakes	Oppose	Amend definition of "Intensive Farming" by reverting to the definition in the Operative District Plan. AND Delete "Goat Farming" from the definition of "Intensive Farming."	The definition is confusing and contradictory. Intensive Goat Farming should not form part of the intensive farming list. Goat farming, whether housed or outdoor, is dependent on the fertility of the soils on which it is located. The only difference between housed and outdoor dairy stock is housed have their grass cut and brought to them while outdoor walk to the paddock and eat the grass.	Accept in part	
FS1316.31	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 636.1 and amend definition as per submission point 833.2.	The submission outlines that the 'intensive farming' definition should be reverted back to the operative plan definition. However, we consider that the proposed definition for intensive farming be clarified as per the amendments we have sought in our submission.	Accept in part	
FS1265.34	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.2).	The submission outlines that the 'intensive farming' definition should revert back to the operative plan definition. However, we consider that the proposed definition for intensive farming be clarified as per the amendments we have sought in our submission.	Accept in part	
636.5	Anna Noakes	Oppose	Amend the definition of Intensive Farming, by reverting to the Operative Plan definition for Intensive Farming.	The proposed Intensive Farming definition is inconsistent.	Accept in part	
FS1388.617	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	Accept in part	

				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1265.35	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.2).	The submission outlines that the 'intensive farming' definitions should revert back to the operative plan definition. However, we consider that the proposed definition for intensive farming be clarified as per the amendments we have sought in our submission.	Accept in part	
FS1316.32	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 636.5 and amend definition as per submission point 833.2.	The submission outlines that the 'intensive farming' definition should be reverted back to the operative plan definition. However, we consider that the proposed definition for intensive farming be clarified as per the amendments we have sought in our submission.	Accept in part	
676.6	T&G Global Limited	Not Stated	Amend the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions to specifically exclude horticulture activities under cover of either a greenhouse or shade house. AND Any further or consequential amendments necessary to address the concerns raised in the submission.	This reflects the existing provisions of the Operative Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section.	Accept in part	
FS1168.106	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Seeks to amend the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions to specifically exclude horticulture activities under cover of either a greenhouse or shadehouse. The National Planning Standard defines intensive primary production and this term and definition should be used in the Plan.	Accept in part	



705.1	Jean Hamilton	Oppose	Delete the definition of "intensive farming" from Chapter 13 Definitions.	The definition is contradictory. The definition states that intensive farming is not dependent on the fertility of soil, but also states feed can be produced on the land. Soil fertility is an important part of producing food for any farming and if the farming type is reliant on it, it cannot be deemed to be intensive. Intensive farming is usually reliant on food being brought in to the site and not the productive capacity of the soil of the site. Therefore, farming dependent on the soil capacity should not be termed 'intensive'. The housing of animals are buildings are normal for farms.	Accept in part	
FS1316.35	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 705.1 and amend definition as per submission point 833.2.	Deletion of the definition of "intensive farming" along with poultry farming being excluded from the definition of "farming" would result in the plan failing to make specific provision for poultry farming. Poultry farming (including free-range) is an important industry and is appropriate within the rural environment.	Accept in part	
706.2	Francis and Susan Turton	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission questions the definition of "intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions.	It is unclear whether the term "intensive farming" relates to soil fertility, cropping and/or feed being brought in.	Accept in part	
813.1	Hamish Noakes	Oppose	Delete the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions; OR Amend the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions, to remove confusion. e.g. Farming dependent on the soils of the site should not be classed as intensive and intensive farming is reliant on food being brought in.	Farming dependent on the soils of the site should not be classed as intensive (i.e. goat farming). Intensive farming is reliant on brought in food and not on the soil quality where it is sited. Rule should be stating that.	Accept in part	
FS1316.37	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 813.1 and amend definition as per submission point 833.2.	Deletion of the definition of "intensive farming" along with poultry farming being excluded from the definition of "farming" would result in the plan failing to make specific provision for poultry farming. Poultry farming (including	Accept in part	

				<i>free-range) is an important industry and is appropriate within the rural environment.</i>		
FS1265.40	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.2).	Deletion of the definition of "intensive farming" along with poultry farming being excluded from the definition of "farming" would result in the plan failing to make specific provision for poultry farming. Poultry farming (including free-range) is an important industry and is appropriate within the rural environment.	Accept in part	
821.2	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Intensive Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows; Means farming which is not dependent on the fertility of the soils on which it is located and which may be under cover <del>or within an outdoor enclosure</del> , and be dependent on supplies of food produced on and/or off the land where the operation is located. ... (c) poultry or game bird farming undertaken wholly or principally within sheds or other shelters or buildings; (d) free-range poultry or game bird farming while inside an enclosure; ...	Amend to exclude range areas for free range poultry if the birds are outside they are livestock that are permitted under the definition of farming. All paddocks are outdoor enclosures. This definition does not limit or describe what is meant by "enclosure" and it should be deleted.	Accept in part	
FS1265.41	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow the amendment of the "Intensive Farming" definition.	Support the exclusion of range areas for free-range poultry from the definition of Intensive Farming, in that livestock located outside are permitted as per the definition of farming. Reference to outdoor enclosure should be deleted, as the term is not clear.	Accept in part	
FS1316.38	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 821.2.	Support the exclusion of range areas for free-range poultry from the definition of Intensive Farming, in that livestock located outside are permitted as per the definition of farming. Reference to outdoor enclosure should be deleted, as the term is not clear.	Accept in part	
833.2	Phil Page on behalf of Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means farming which is not dependent on the fertility of the soils on which it is located and which may be under cover <del>or within an outdoor enclosure</del> and be	Amend to exclude range areas used for free-range poultry. If the birds are outside they are livestock that are permitted under the definition of farming. All paddocks are outdoor	Accept in part	

			dependent on supplied of food produced on and/or off the land where the operation is located... (c) poultry or game bird farming undertaken wholly or principally within sheds or other shelters or buildings; (d) free-range poultry or game bird farming <u>while inside an enclosure.</u>	enclosures. This definition does not limit or describe what is meant by enclosure and it should be deleted.		
FS1316.26	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 833.2.	Support the intent of the submission in relation to the exclusion of free-range areas as "all paddocks are outdoor enclosures".	Accept in part	
FS1338.7	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd	Support	Null	Is consistent with CPI submission that if birds are outside they are livestock and that outdoor enclosures need to be deleted from the definition.	Accept in part	
281.19	Zeala Ltd for Trading as Aztech Buildings	Oppose	Delete the whole definition of "Intensive Farming" in Chapter 13: Definitions AND Add the following replacement definition for "Intensive Farming" in Chapter 13: Definitions: <u>Means the commercial raising and keeping of plants or animals contained in buildings or outdoor enclosures, that occurs independent of the soil fertility on the site, is dependent on a high input of food or fertiliser from beyond the site, and may (but not necessarily) involve artificially controlled growing conditions. It may include the use of feedlots for farmed animals; free range farming where feed is introduced from off site, and vegetable, fruit and herb growing operations indoors in artificially controlled growing conditions.</u>	The proposed definition of "Intensive Farming" does not make sense and is not consistent with the Objectives and Policies relating to Rural Productivity and Rural Effects and should be amended. What constitutes Intensive Farming throughout various Local Authorities varies, but the overriding theme relates to the lack of reliance on the productive capacity of the soils on site. I.e. factory farming where feed is imported and not grown in-site.	Accept in part	
FS1342.57	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow in part the amendment sought by submitter. Amend as follows: ... It may include the use of feedlots for farmed animals; free range farming where feed is introduced from off site, and vegetable,	FFNZ opposes the inclusion of feedlots being captured by the definition for reasons outlined in our original submission.	Accept in part	

			fruit and herb growing operations indoors in artificially controlled growing conditions			
FS1076.13	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	The submitter highlights interpretation issues with the current definition. NZPork opposes the inclusion of free-range pig farming in the definition of an intensive farming activity. These activities are dependent on the fertility of the soils on which the activity is located and in accordance with good management practice required to maintain grass cover. Supplementary feed is brought on to the site as is the case many farming activities. Intensive indoor primary production is now defined in the National Planning Standards	NZPork opposes the inclusion of free-range pig farming in the definition of an intensive farming activity.	Accept in part	
FS1168.121	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Reject the submission.	Seeks to include a new definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 The National Planning Standard defines intensive primary production and this term and definition should be used in the Plan.	Accept in part	
FS1171.3	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission proposes a new definition of intensive farming. This submission is opposed in so far as it includes horticultural activities under cover of greenhouses or shade houses within the definition of intensive farming.	Accept in part	
FS1316.27	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 281.19 and amend definition as per submission point 833.2.	The submission outlines that all commercial raising or keeping of animals and plants should be classes as intensive farming. However, we consider that the proposed definition for intensive farming should not include outdoor ranging areas.	Accept in part	
FS1265.30	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.2).	The submission outlines that all commercial raising or keeping of animals and plants should be classed as intensive farming. However, we consider that the proposed definition for intensive farming should not include outdoor ranging areas.	Accept in part	
746.18	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend the definition of "intensive farming" in Chapter 13: Definitions as follows: Intensive pig	Intensive farming is the growing of fungi, livestock, or poultry within a building or	Accept in part	

			<p>farming undertaken wholly or principally in sheds or other shelters or buildings; (a) Intensive pig farming undertaken wholly or principally in sheds or other shelters or buildings; <del>(b) Free-range pig farming;</del> (c) Poultry or game bird farming undertaken wholly or principally within sheds or other shelters or buildings; <del>(d) Free-range poultry or game bird farming;</del> (e) Mushroom farming; and <del>(f) Intensive goat farming animal feedlots feeding livestock on food other than pasture grasses.</del> It excludes the following, provided the building is used for the purpose for which it was built: ...; and <del>(d) Glass house production or nurseries; (e) Free-range poultry or game bird farming; (f) Free-range pig farming; and (g) Concentrated but temporary wintering of stock as part of normal farming operations, such as using animal feedpads and standoff pads. (h) Poultry Hatcheries</del></p>	<p>structure, or an animal feed lot with limited or no dependence on natural soil quality on the site. Free-range farming is a distinct land based activity that should not come under the definition of intensive farming. Poultry Hatcheries should also be excluded from this definition.</p>		
FS1374.7	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	<p>Allowed and Supplement 'intensive farming is the growing of fungi, livestock, or poultry within a building or structure, or an animal feed lot or other enclosed area, with limited or no dependence on the natural productive quality of the soil on site' as the opening sentence of the definition.</p>	<p>The Proposed Waikato District Plan definition as drafted does not appropriately differentiate between farming - which is reliant on the productive capacity of the soil on the site (whether the activity is housed or free range) and 'factory' operations where there is little or no reliance on the productive capacity of the land. The important characteristic of 'farming' being the productive capacity of the land to support the operation without the significant introduction of external supplements which then becomes 'Intensive Farming'. While supporting the changes to the inclusive and exclusive lists of what is and is not intensive farming as proposed in the submission, the definition should also include the growing of fungi, livestock or poultry.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1342.203	Federated Farmers	Support	<p>Disallow in part submission point 746.18. Disallow the following proposed amendment (f) to the definition: ...</p>	<p>FFNZ considers the submission to be inconsistent with other relief sought i.e. (g). It will create uncertainty and confusion and has</p>	Accept in part	

			(f) animal feedlots feeding livestock on food other than pasture grasses.	potential to capture activities that are not intensive.		
FS1316.36	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 746.18 in part with the changes as per submission point 833.2.	Support the intent of the submission to exclude free-range poultry and hatcheries activities from the definition of intensive farming.	Accept in part	
FS1265.39	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with the changes as per our original submission (833.2).	Support the intent of the submission to exclude free-range poultry and hatcheries activities from the definition of intensive farming.	Accept in part	
FS1076.1	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	The submitter notes that free-range farming is a distinct land based activity that should not come under the definition of intensive farming. The submission aligns with the original submission of NZPork. NZPork opposes the inclusion of free-range pig farming in the definition of an intensive farming activity. These activities are dependent on the fertility of the soils on which the activity is located and in accordance with good management practice required to maintain grass cover. Supplementary feed is brought on to the site as is the case many farming activities. Intensive indoor primary production is now defined in the National Planning Standards.		Accept in part	
FS1076.7	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	The submitter notes that the definition does not limit or describe what is meant by "enclosure" and it should be deleted. The definition must clearly exclude mobile shelters for outdoor pigs from the definition of building. Intensive indoor primary production is now defined in the National Planning Standards		Accept in part	
877.10	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Oppose	Amend the definition for "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: (a) intensive pig farming undertaken wholly or principally in sheds or other shelters or buildings; (b) <del>free-range pig farming</del> ; (c) poultry or game bird farming undertaken wholly or principally within sheds or other shelters or buildings; (d) <del>free-range poultry or game bird farming</del> (e) mushroom farming; and	Intensive farming is the growing of fungi, livestock, or poultry within a building or structure, or an animal feed lot with limited or no dependence on natural soil quality on the site. Free-range farming is a distinct land based activity that should not come under the definition of	Accept in part	

			(f) <del>intensive goal farming animal feedlots feeding livestock on food other than pasture grasses.</del> It excludes the following, provided the building is used for the purpose for which it was built: ... (c) calf pens or wintering accommodation for less than 30 stock (except where stock are being reared for the replacement of breeding stock to be used on the same property); and (d) glasshouse production or nurseries.; (e) <del>free-range poultry or game bird farming;</del> (f) <del>free-range pig farming;</del> (g) <del>concentrated but temporary wintering of stock as part of normal farming operations, such as using animal feedpads and standoff pads;</del> and (h) Poultry hatcheries.	intensive farming Poultry Hatcheries should also be excluded from the definition		
FS1316.39	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 877.10 in part with the changes as per submission point 833.2.	Support the intent of the submission to exclude free-range poultry and hatcheries activities from the definition of intensive farming.	Accept in part	
FS1265.42	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with the changes as per our original submission (833.2).	Support the intent of the submission to exclude free-range poultry and hatcheries activities from the definition of intensive farming.	Accept in part	
FS1076.8	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	The submitter notes that the definition does not limit or describe what is meant by "enclosure" and it should be deleted. The definition must clearly exclude mobile shelters for outdoor pigs from the definition of building. Intensive indoor primary production is now defined in the National Planning Standards		Accept in part	
FS1076.2	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	The submitter notes that free-range farming is a distinct land based activity that should not come under the definition of intensive farming. The submission aligns with the original submission of NZPork. NZPork opposes the inclusion of free-range pig farming in the definition of an intensive farming activity. These activities are dependent on the fertility of the soils on which the activity is located and in accordance with good management practice required to maintain grass cover. Supplementary feed is brought on to the site as is the case many farming activities. Intensive indoor		Accept in part	

			<i>primary production is now defined in the National Planning Standards</i>			
419.126	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Delete the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions and replace with a definition of "intensive primary production" as follows: <u>Intensive primary production Means primary production activities that involve the production of fungi, livestock or poultry that principally occur within buildings.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means farmin .... It excludes the following, provided the building is used for the purpose for which it was built: (a) woolsheds; (b) dairy sheds; (c) calf pens or wintering accommodation for less than 30 stock (except where stock are being reared for the replacement of breeding stock to be used on the same property); and (d) <del>glasshouse</del> <u>greenhouse</u> production or nurseries</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Delete reference to the number of stock if the definition of "Intensive primary production" is retained, and instead include those in the rules or conditions.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	The submitter supports the definition of "Intensive farming", particularly the exclusion of glasshouses, however suggests using the term 'greenhouse' (although no reasons have been provided). The proposed National Planning Standards has a definition for "intensive primary production" which would be appropriate to include in the Proposed District Plan. Standards relating to the number of stock should be included in the rules or conditions.	Accept in part	
FS1370.5	Aztech Buildings for Zeala Limited	Oppose	<i>Oppose submission point 419.126 so that provisions relate to the operation having 'little or no reliance' on the productive capacity of the land – whether or not the 'product' is housed or free range.</i>	<i>The NPS relating to Intensive Indoor Primary Production places no reliance on the productive capacity of the land to support the production (all feed could be imported). The NPS for Primary Production includes land and buildings for the production of commodities that are used for the production. The PWDP needs to differentiate between the productive capacity of the soil to support the 'farming' or 'primary production activity' on a site (whether it be a housed horticultural or pastoral based activity) and primary production where all or the majority of feed/growth inputs come from 'offsite'. The emphasis should be on the source of productivity – not whether the</i>	Accept in part	



				operation is housed or not – stocking rates largely being irrelevant subject to the site (and soils) being able to support the production. Note supporting production includes both inputs and outputs – housing stock enables quantification and regulation of both to support good environmental outcomes.		
FS1171.56	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. This submission seeks to amend the definition of intensive farming to specifically exclude greenhouse production or nurseries.	Accept in part	
FS1265.31	Mainland Poultry	Support	Allow in part with the changes as per our original submission (833.2).	Support the intent of the submission to include poultry as part of intensive farming, however we consider that our definition (keeping wording as intensive farming) is more inclusive.	Accept in part	
FS1316.28	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Support submission point 419.126 in part with the changes as per our original submission point 833.2.	Support the intent of the submission to include poultry as part of intensive farming, however, we consider that our definition (keeping the wording intensive farming) is more inclusive.	Accept in part	
587.1	Bruce Cameron	Not Stated	Amend the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions to increase the stock permitted from 30 to 500.	The definition of "Intensive farming" is too restrictive, particularly when it limits as a permitted activity less than 30 stock unless rearing for own replacements.	Accept in part	
680.253	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions AND Replace with the following definition of "Intensive Farming" in Chapter 13: Definitions: <u>Means the commercial raising and keeping of plants or animals permanently contained in buildings or outdoor enclosures, that occurs independent of the soil fertility on the site, is dependent on a high input of food or fertiliser from beyond the site, and may (but not necessarily) involve artificially controlled growing conditions and includes boarding kennels or catteries, but does not include the sheltered rearing and weaning of calves, lambs or goats undertaken indoors as part of a farming activity nor</u>	The proposed definition is overly complicated and has potential to extend the meaning of 'intensive' farming beyond usual definitions and capture normal farming activity (such as calf or lamb rearing and weaning in shelters, or feeding stock on standoff pads or in temporary feedlots, or break-feeding) within an onerous resource consent process for little or no environmental benefit.	Accept in part	

			<p>the use of wintering barns, stabling of horses, feed pads and stand-off pads where stock are not held on a permanent basis.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments needed to give effect to this relief.</p>			
FS1076.14	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	<p>The proposed definition is overly complicated and has potential to extend the meaning of 'intensive' farming beyond usual definitions and capture normal farming activity (such as calf or lamb rearing and weaning in shelters, or feeding stock on standoff pads or in temporary feedlots, or break-feeding) within an onerous resource consent process for little or no environmental benefit.</p>	<p>NZPork opposes the inclusion of free-range pig farming in the definition of an intensive farming activity</p>	Accept in part	
FS1171.95	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	<p>Disallow the submission.</p>	<p>This submission seeks to amend the definition of intensive farming. The amended definition is opposed in so far as it is inconsistent with the submission on this definition made by T &amp; G Global through including reference to artificially controlled growing conditions.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1265.36	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	<p>Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.2).</p>	<p>The submission seeks to include outdoor enclosures as part of intensive farming. However, we consider that all paddocks can be considered as outdoor enclosures and thus the definition creates unnecessary confusion.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1275.11	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	<p>Allow in part as per comments in reasons for further submission.</p>	<p>The PWDP definition as drafted does not appropriately differentiate between farming - which is reliant on the productive capacity of the soil on the site (whether the activity is housed or free range) and 'factory' operations where there is little or no reliance on the productive capacity of the land. The important characteristic of 'farming' being the productive capacity of the land to support the operation without the significant introduction of external supplements which</p>	Accept in part	

				<p>then becomes 'Intensive Farming. While in part supporting the changes to the definition proposed by the submitter the final part of the definition as proposed should be amended as follows: 'but does not include the sheltered rearing and weaning of calves, lambs or goats undertaken indoors as part of a farming activity nor the use of wintering barns, stabling of horses, feed pads (whether open or covered) loafing barns and stand-off pads'. where stock are not held on a permanent basis The important characteristic of 'Intensive Farming' is the source of the productivity - is the production 'reliant' on imported feed? if yes its intensive farming whether a housed operation or not. If the operation is reliant on the productive capacity of the land to produce the end product then the operation is not 'intensive farming' whether or not the stock or product is within a building. In many cases housed 'farming' operations result in increased productivity, better stock welfare AND enhanced environmental outcomes than free range farming operations. As an alternative reference to 'intensive farming' could be removed from the document and replaced with 'Factory Farming' - non reliant on the productive capacity of the soil.</p>		
FSI 16.33	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 680.253 and amend definition as per submission point 833.2.	The submission seeks to include outdoor enclosures as part of intensive farming. However, we consider that all paddocks can be considered as outdoor enclosures and thus the definition creates unnecessary confusion.	Accept in part	
FSI 168.122	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Reject the submission.	Seeks to include a new definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 The National Planning Standard defines intensive	Accept in part	

				<i>primary production and this term and definition should be used in the Plan.</i>		
697.395	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Intensive farming" as follows: Means farming which is not dependent on the fertility of the soils on which it is located and which may be under cover or within an outdoor enclosure, and <u>be is</u> dependent on supplies of food produced on and/or off the land where the operation is located....	Additional clarity for the definition.	Accept in part	
FS1374.4	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Oppose	Disallowed.	While the proposed minor amendment to the definition is a slight improvement of the original as drafted, it does not appropriately differentiate between farming – which is reliant on the productive capacity of the land. The definition could be improved by deleting the words 'on and/or' from the sentence, the important characteristic being the productive capacity of the land to support the operation without the significant introduction of external supplements	Accept in part	
FS1265.37	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.2).	This submission seeks to include outdoor enclosures as part of intensive farming. However, we consider that all paddocks can be considered outdoor enclosures which create unnecessary confusion around the definition.	Accept in part	
FS1316.34	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 697.395 and amend definition as per submission point 833.2.	The submission seeks to include outdoor enclosures as part of intensive farming. However, we consider that all paddocks can be considered outdoor enclosures which create unnecessary confusion around the definition.	Accept in part	
FS1168.123	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Reject the submission.	Seeks to amend the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13 The National Planning Standard defines intensive primary	Accept in part	

				production and this term and definition should be used in the Plan.		
FS1171.101	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Allow and Disallow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission proposes amendments to the definition of intensive farming. This submission is opposed as it does not provide additional clarity whether horticultural activities under cover of greenhouses or shade houses are considered as intensive farming activities.	Accept in part	
<b>Definitions – Poultry Farming</b>						
821.3	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	Add a definition for "Poultry Hatchery" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: <u>Poultry Hatchery means a place where eggs are incubated and hatched in a managed process.</u> OR Amend the definition of "Rural Industry" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means an industry that involves the direct handling or processing to the first stage of manufacture of any raw produce harvested from farming, rural contractors' depots, <u>poultry hatcheries</u> or any other land-related agricultural activity, but excludes waste disposal, extractive industries and electricity generation.	Wants a separate definition for 'poultry hatchery' as a hatchery is different from poultry farming and is closer to an industrial activity. Due to the effects, poultry hatcheries can be an activity provided for in the Rural or Industrial Zones.	Accept in part	
FS1265.43	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow the addition of the definition.	Support the intent of the submission to add a definition for 'poultry hatcheries.'	Accept in part	
877.3	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	Add to Chapter 13: Definitions a separate definition for "Poultry Hatcheries" as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	There needs to be a separate definition for this as it was in the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan	Accept in part	
FS1387.1449	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	Accept in part	

				<i>is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
746.12	The Surveying Company	Not Stated	Add a new definition for "Free Range Poultry Farming" to Chapter 13: Definitions as per the operative Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.911	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	
746.13	The Surveying Company	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new definition for "Poultry Hatcheries" to Chapter 13: Definitions as per the Franklin section of the Operative District Plan.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	

FS1387.912	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	
877.2	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Not Stated	Add to Chapter 13: Definitions a separate definition for "Free Range Poultry Farming" as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	Not Stated	Accept in part	
FS1168.87	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Support	Accept in part	
FS1387.1448	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	Oppose	Accept in part	

Definitions – Pig farming						
197.35	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Oppose	Delete reference to "free-range pig farming" from the definition of "Intensive farming" in Chapter 13: Definitions. AND Add a new definition to Chapter 13 Definitions for "Extensive Farming" as follows: <u>Extensive Farming Means the keeping, breeding or rearing of stock for commercial purposes, on pasture at a stocking density that sustains the maintenance of pasture or ground cover.</u>	NZPork opposes the inclusion of free-range pig farming in the definition of an intensive farming. These activities are dependent on the fertility of the soils on which the activity is located and in accordance with good management practice required to maintain grass cover Supplementary feed is brought on to the site, as is the case in many farming activities.	Accept in part	
FS1342.55	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow in part submission point 197.35. Disallow the proposed new definition for extensive farming.	FFNZ opposes the new definition on the basis that it will unnecessarily capture a broader range of farming types than WDC intended and has the potential to impose undue restrictions on those farming practices.	Accept in part	
Definitions – Animal feed lot						
697.365	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Delete from Chapter 13: Definitions the definition for "Animal feed lot".	This term is only used in the Specific Area - Agriculture Research Centre and a definition is not needed.	Accept in part	
FS1374.2	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Allowed.	The term does not need to be defined in the District Plan.	Accept in part	
FS1342.177	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 697.365 in part.	FFNZ supports the deletion if it is correct that the term is only referenced in the Specific Area - Agriculture Research Centre.	Accept in part	
680.128	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain the definition of "Animal feed lot" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The submitter supports this definition and exemptions.	Accept in part	
FS1275.8	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Oppose	Disallow - delete definition of feed lot.	The definition is only used in one part of the PWDP as drafted and in that case for only one specific development. A definition in these circumstances is not needed and can only lead to confusion.	Accept in part	



281.15	Zeala Ltd for Trading as Aztech Buildings	Oppose	Delete the definition of "Animal Feed Lot" in Chapter 13: Definitions.	It does not appear to be referenced elsewhere in the plan. Animal feed lot does not appear in either the list of landuse activities, land use effects, or land use buildings. The reference in the definition to the "intensively feeding animals" could give rise to confusion around "Intensive Farming".	Accept in part	
Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities						
833.3	Phil Page on behalf of Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new rule to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activity to provide for Poultry farming as a permitted activity where it can meet the performance standards for permitted farming activities.	Poultry farming does not result in adverse effects on soils or in contamination of soils or water and is therefore more consistent with the policies and objectives of the Proposed District Plan and the Regional Policy Statement, than other intensive farming and many permitted farming activities.	Accept in part	
FS1308.156	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	Further consideration needs to be given to allowing some currently defined 'intensive farming' activities such as free-range poultry farming to be established as permitted activities.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1354	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	
FS1379.345	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought, which is to change the activity status of Poultry Farming to a 'permitted use' in the Rural Zone. Within HCC's Area of Interest there needs	Accept in part	

				<i>to be a level of control on land uses that may be incompatible with current and future land uses.</i>		
833.5	Phil Page on behalf of Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Add a new permitted activity to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>Intensive farming limited to poultry farming</u> Conditions: (a) For housed poultry buildings are set back at least: (i) 50 metres from any site boundary (other than a road boundary); and (ii) 300 metres from a sensitive activity; and (iii) 500 metres from any boundary of a Residential, Village and Country Living Zone; (iv) Building coverage does not exceed 10% of the site. Rule 22.3.6 (Building Coverage does not apply; (v) Building height does not exceed 15m. Rule 22.3.4 (Building Height) does not apply; (b) It is not located in: (i) An Outstanding Natural Feature; (ii) An Outstanding Natural Landscape; (iii) A Significant Amenity Landscape; (iv) An Outstanding Natural Character Area; or (v) A High Natural Area</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new permitted activity to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities that enables poultry farming as a permitted activity that complies with the proposed conditions specifically to the property at 64 Old Road, Orini, being Part Lot 1 DP 12365.</p>	Adverse effects of poultry farming as a subset of Intensive farming are readily capable of mitigation through compliance with setback performance standards. Provided the conditions are complied with, poultry farming should be permitted.	Accept in part	
FS1379.346	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>HCC opposes the relief sought, which is to change the activity status of Poultry Farming to a 'permitted use' in the Rural Zone. Within HCC's Area of Interest there needs to be a level of control on land uses that may be incompatible with current and future land uses.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1387.1355	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</i>	Accept in part	

				risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
833.6	Phil Page on behalf of Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activity, to provide for poultry farming where it does not comply with the permitted activity conditions in Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities as proposed by the submission; AND Amend Rule 22.1.5 DI Discretionary Activities as a consequential amendment.	It shall be a restricted discretionary activity with the discretion restricted to the consequences of non-compliance with relevant conditions.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1356	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	
FS1338.12	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd	Support	Null	For the reasons in the CPI submission.	Accept in part	
680.187	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Add to Rule 22.1.2 a new permitted activity rule for Intensive farming, as follows: <u>PXX Intensive farming with activity specific conditions: (a) Not within 300 metres of an existing dwelling that is under separate ownership. (b) Not within 50 metres of any boundary (c) Meets all of the following conditions: (i) Land Use – Effects in Rule 22.2 (ii) Land Use – Building in Rule 22.3 (iii) Building coverage does not exceed 3% of the site: Rule 22.3.6 (Building</u>	The proposed setback distances from site boundaries for buildings, pens or areas used for intensive farming are excessive, and will create unnecessary restrictions for land use. The proposed rule is overly complicated and requires a restricted discretionary resource consent as a minimum requirement in every instance. Intensive farming	Accept in part	

			<p><u>Coverage) does not apply; (iv) Building height does not exceed 15m; A. Rule 22.3.4 (Building Height) does not apply;</u>  AND  Delete Rule 22.1.3 RDI (a) to (e) Restricted Discretionary Activities  AND  Add to Rule 22.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities the following: <u>RDI(a) Intensive farming activity that does not comply with Rule 22.1.1 PXX</u>  AND  Retain the matters of discretion in Rule 22.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities Matters of Discretion  AND  Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.  AND  Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.</p>	<p>activities are an expected and anticipated activity in the rural zone. Setback distances are a blunt planning tool, an enabling approach which is effects based can better meet the dynamic and evolving needs of resource users and planners in the long term. The opportunity to avoid, remedy or mitigate potential adverse effects should be afforded to new intensive farming operations who could utilise any number of ways to internalise effects. A restricted discretionary activity status is appropriate if permitted activity conditions are unable to be met in the first instance. This is a consistent and widely accepted approach which provides some certainty for plan users whilst retaining control when necessary to assess the potential off site effects of an intensive farming operation.</p>		
FS1265.46	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part with the changes as per our original submission (833.5).</p>	<p>We support for Intensive Farming as a Permitted Activity.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1275.15	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	<p>Allow.</p>	<p>Aztech Buildings supports this submission and note that in 'general terms' it would be very difficult to find a property of a size less than about 50ha that would be able to comply with the setback requirements as originally drafted (for a Restricted Discretionary Activity) and even then the development would need to be slap in the middle of the property without consideration of service vehicle access etc.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1306.44	Hynds Foundation	Support	<p>Support.</p>	<p>The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland</p>	Accept in part	

				Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.		
FS1308.96	The Surveying Copmany	Support		The submission generally aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company. However, further consideration needs to be given to allowing some currently defined 'intensive farming' activities such as free-range farming to be established as permitted activities	Accept in part	
FS1387.202	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	
746.69	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Add a new permitted activity (PI3) to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities for free-range poultry farming as follows: <u>Free-range poultry farming Activity Specific conditions (a) Coops and associated areas for the treatment and/or disposal of wastes and composting must be set back at least 20m from the nearest site boundary.</u>	Free-range poultry farming is a distinct land based activity utilising pasture and should be treated the same as any other permitted livestock activity that utilises natural soil quality on the site. The Rural Zone is the only location that a free-range poultry activity can occur where poultry has access to areas of open grazing land. The effects of free-range poultry farming can be mitigated by compliance with certain standards.	Accept in part	
FS1265.47	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with the changes as per our original submission (833.5).	We support provision for Intensive Farming as a Permitted Activity.	Accept in part	
FS1306.47	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as	Accept in part	

				permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.		
FS1387.943	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	
821.16	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new rule (P13) to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>P13 For poultry farming, (a) buildings are set back at least: (i) 100 metres from any site boundary (other than a road boundary); and (ii) 300m from a sensitive activity; and (iii) 500 metres from any boundary of a Residential, Village and Country Living Zone and (b) for free range, a vegetated range area is maintained.</u>	Where any adverse effects of Poultry Farming are mitigated through provision of setbacks so that the activity is consistent with other rural activities, Poultry Farming should be a permitted activity. Buildings associated with the activity would still need to meet performance standards that apply to permitted activities within the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
FS1265.48	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with the changes as per our original submission (833.5).	Given that the poultry farming activity can meet the performance standards for a permitted activity, poultry farming should be a permitted activity being best located in the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
FS1379.338	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought, which is to change the activity status of Poultry Farming to a 'permitted use' in the Rural Zone. Within HCC's Area of Interest there needs	Accept in part	

				<i>to be a level of control on land uses that may be incompatible with current and future land uses.</i>		
<i>FS1308.154</i>	<i>The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>Further consideration needs to be given to allowing some currently defined 'intensive farming' activities such as free-range poultry farming to be established as permitted activities.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>877.26</i>	<i>Leigh Michael Shaw &amp; Bradley John Hall</i>	<i>Neutral/ Amend</i>	<i>Add a new permitted activity to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities as follows: Activity: <u>Free-Range Poultry Farming Activity</u> specific conditions: <u>(a) Coops and associated areas for the treatment and/or disposal of wastes and composting must be setback at least 20m from the nearest site boundary.</u></i>	<i>Free-range poultry farming is a distinct land based activity utilising pasture and should be treated the same as any other permitted livestock activity that utilises natural soil quality on the site The Rural Zone is the only location that a free-range poultry activity can occur where poultry have access to areas of open grazing land. The effects of free-range poultry farming can be mitigated by the compliance with certain standards</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1308.161</i>	<i>The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>The submission aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1387.1466</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1306.65</i>	<i>Hynds Foundation</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	

				discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.		
FS1265.49	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with changes as per our original submission (833.5).	We support provision for Intensive Farming as a Permitted Activity.	Accept in part	
<b>Rule 22.1.3 – Restricted Discretionary</b>						
341.6	Brian Croad for Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities for Intensive Farming.	The matters listed for Council's discretion are more succinct and without the associated list of information requirements (for Intensive Farming) when compared to the Operative Plan. TGHl supports the Proposed Plan's more simplified consenting approach for Intensive Farming and Rural Industry activities.	Accept in part	
FS1265.51	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend Rule 22.1.2 and 22.1.3 as per our original submission (833.5 and 833.6).	We submit that Intensive Poultry Farming should be provided for as a Permitted Activity (as per submission point 833.5) and therefore seek activities that fail to comply with the relevant permitted activity conditions be considered as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Accept in part	
706.6	Francis and Susan Turton	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes Rule 22.1.3 RDI (a) and (b) Restricted Discretionary Activities and questions the use of the term "intensive farming" and whether this provision is concerned with soil fertility, cropping and or feed.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.787	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	Accept in part	



				framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1265.57	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend rules 22.1.2 and 22.1.3 as per our original submission (833.5 and 833.6).	We submit that Intensive Poultry Farming should be provided for as a Permitted Activity (as per submission point 833.5) and therefore seek activities that fail to comply with the relevant permitted activity conditions be considered as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Accept in part	
798.30	Ngati Te Ata	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 22.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities for Intensive farming as follows: (v) environmental effects.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1289	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	
FS1265.61	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject.	The proposed plan seeks to provide for Intensive Farming as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. It is not appropriate to restrict discretion to "environmental effects" as this term is wide ranging and negates the restricted discretionary activity status by allowing consideration of all potential effects on the environment.	Accept in part	
821.19	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI(a)(iii) Restricted Discretionary Activities relating to Intensive farming, as follows: (a) Intensive farming that meets all of the following conditions: (i) Land Use - Effects	Submitter recognises that the building coverage for intensive farms has increased to 3% of the site but this may still not be enough for poultry farming.	Accept in part	

	Producers Federation of on behalf of		in Rule 22.2 (ii) Land Use - Building in Rule 22.3 (iii) Building coverage does not exceed 3% of the site: ...	Given that visual effects and amenity effects (and other effects) are considered in relation to non-compliance with the performance standards we consider that any adverse effects from building coverage should be part of the Restricted Discretionary assessment for the activity. The buildings are intrinsic to intensive poultry farming activities.		
FS1076.18	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	Submitter recognises that the building coverage for intensive farms has increased to 3% of the site but this may still not be enough for poultry farming. Given that visual effects and amenity effects (and other effects) are considered in relation to non-compliance with the performance standards we consider that any adverse effects from building coverage should be part of the Restricted Discretionary assessment for the activity. The buildings are intrinsic to intensive poultry farming activities.		Accept in part	
FS1265.54	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with amendments in line with the relief sought as per submission point 833.5 and 833.6.	Generally support changes to Rule 22.1.3 to provide for poultry farming as a Restricted Discretionary Activity where it cannot comply with the permitted activity conditions.	Accept in part	
697.749	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI Intensive farming, as follows: (a) Intensive Farming that meets all of the following conditions: (i) Land Use – Effects in Rule 22.2 (ii) Land Use – Building in Rule 22.3 (iii) Building coverage does not exceed 3% of the site: A. Rule 22.3.6 (Building Coverage) does not apply; (iv) Building height does not exceed 15m; A. Rule 22.3.4 (Building Height) does not apply; (b) Intensive farming – it is not located in: (i) An Outstanding Natural Feature; (ii) An Outstanding Natural Landscape; (iii) A Significant Amenity Landscape; (iv) An Outstanding Natural Character Area; or (v) A High Natural Character Area (c) For pig farming (excluding free-range pig farming), buildings and adjacent yard areas outdoor enclosures are set back at least: (i) 300 metres from any site boundary; (ii) From any boundary of a Residential, Village or Country Living Zone: A. 1200 metres (500 or less fewer pigs); or B. 2000 metres (more than 500 pigs); (d) For free-range poultry farming, buildings and outdoor enclosures are set back at least: (i) 100 metres from any site boundary; and (ii) 500 metres from any boundary	This rule requires amendment to provide further clarification, particularly with respect to the term “adjacent yard areas”, which is proposed to be amended to “outdoor enclosures”.	Accept in part	

			of a Residential, Village and Country Living Zone; (e) For housed poultry and all other intensive farming, buildings and adjacent yard areas <u>outdoor enclosures</u> are set back at least: (i) 300 metres from any site boundary; and (ii) 500 metres from any boundary of a Residential, Village and Country Living Zone.			
FS1076.4	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Oppose	Referencing to outdoor enclosures without clarity in a definition provides uncertainty. The definition must clearly exclude mobile shelters for outdoor pigs from the definition of building. Intensive indoor primary production is now defined in the National Planning Standards		Accept in part	
FS1265.56	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend rules 22.1.2 and 22.1.3 as per our original submission (833.5 and 833.6).	We submit that Intensive Poultry Farming should be provided for a Permitted Activity (as per submission point 833.5) and therefore seek activities that fail to comply with the relevant permitted activity conditions be considered as a Restricted Discretionary Activity.	Accept in part	
FS1387.672	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	
481.4	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "intensive farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions, to be more detailed, in the context of Rule 22.4.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities.	There is no consistency with the activities that are included or excluded from the definition of "intensive farming." Glasshouses present a significant visual impact on the landscape and do not rely on the fertility of in-situ soils. There is no consistency with the activities that are included or excluded from the definition of "intensive farming." It is	Accept in part	

				unclear whether the use of stock feed or silage brought in from off-site might turn a farming activity into intensive farming.		
FS1171.60	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	Oppose in so far as this submission supports the reference to growing within greenhouses as a form of intensive farming.	Accept in part	
FS1265.32	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.2).	The submission is unclear as to what is sought. Further, we consider that the wording in the proposed plan outlines the types of farming activities that are expected to be intensive and under what means.	Accept in part	
FS1316.29	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 481.4 and amend definition as per submission point 833.2.	The submission is unclear as to what is sought. Further, we consider that the wording in the proposed plan outlines the types of farming activities that are expected to be intensive and under what means.	Accept in part	
482.7	Kirstie Hill on behalf of Hill Country Farmers Group	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Intensive Farming", in the context of Rule 22.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary activities.	There is no consistency with the activities that are included and excluded from the definition of 'intensive farming'. It is unclear whether the use of stock feed or silage brought in from off-site might turn a farming activity into intensive farming.	Accept in part	
FS1265.33	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.2).	The submission is unclear as to what is sought. Further, we consider that the wording in the proposed plan outlines the types of farming activities that are expected to be intensive and under what means.	Accept in part	
FS1316.30	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 482.7 and amend definition as per submission point 833.2.	The submission is unclear as to what is sought. Further, we consider that the wording in the proposed plan outlines the types of farming activities that are expected to be intensive and under what means.	Accept in part	
636.6	Anna Noakes	Oppose	Amend the activity status for Intensive farming from Restricted Discretionary to Permitted Activity.	Rules should support the status of intensive farming reliant on productive soils as a permitted activity Intensive farming should then need to be compliant with rural rules around their activities eg noise, odour, visual etc.	Accept in part	
FS1387.55	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	Accept in part	

				the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1379.217	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the change of 'Intensive Farming' from a Restricted Discretionary Activity to a Permitted Activity status, within Hamilton's Area of Interest. Rule 22.1.3 (1) RDI of the Waikato PDP lists matters of discretion that are subjective in nature and therefore may be difficult to incorporate as standards that a permitted activity has to comply with.	Accept in part	
FS1265.55	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with amendments in line with the relief sought as per submission point 833.5 and 833.6.	Generally support changes to Rule 22.1.3 to provide for poultry farming as a Restricted Discretionary Activity where it cannot comply with the permitted activity conditions.	Accept in part	
197.18	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: <u>INTENSIVE PIG FARMING is a restricted discretionary activity subject to meeting the following standards: (a) Compliance with the setback standards. (b) Activity does not generate dust or odour which create a nuisance at or beyond the boundary of a site. (c) Activity to operate in accordance with Pork Industry Board Code of Practice and Environmental Management Industry Guide. (d) Activity has an Industry Approved Farm Environment Plan. OUTDOOR PIG FARMING is a restricted discretionary activity subject to meeting the following standards: (a) Compliance with the setback standards. (b) Groundcover is maintained in accordance with best farming practices including any relevant industry good management practices. (c) Activity does not generate dust, which create a nuisance at or beyond the boundary of a site. (d) Activity has an Industry Approved Farm Environment Plan.</u> AND Add a new rule to Rule 22.1.5 Discretionary activity that any activity that breaches these standards is a	NZPork opposes the 3% building coverage limitation. There is a number of indoor piggeries (Intensive Pig Farming) that do not need the expansive farm land unrelated to the activity that this condition requires. Producers must meet the requirements of both the Animal Welfare (Pigs) Code of Welfare 2010 and the PigCare™ program. This includes a minimum lying space allowance for growing pigs. Pork production requires additional building areas for: grain milling, feed storage, plant and equipment rooms, and staff housing. NZPork supports a setback regime for pigs in both intensive and extensive situations. NZPork opposes the threshold numbers, which are arbitrary relative to effects. It is assumed this is 500 pigs at one time, which might mean 50 sows plus progeny. A medium sized farm with 400 sows would have 4800 pigs. A more effective and efficient method	Accept in part	

			Discretionary	Activity.	<p>would be to separately define Intensive and Extensive farming and to provide performance standards around each given the different effects. NZPork supports reducing the overlap between the regional and local authority, and thereby reducing planning costs and timeframes.</p> <p>Air quality is an important resource management issue and one that requires an integrated approach between regional and local authorities. Issues relating specifically to air quality (dust and odor), rather than general amenity or reverse sensitivity effects, are more appropriately addressed through the regional plan by the Waikato Regional Council as is currently the case.</p> <p>The regional Council controls stock numbers for Extensive Farming through Plan Change I. The justification for Waikato District Council to set a 500 pig per site threshold is not clear.</p> <p>Within the Rural Zone, farming activities and their associated effects should generally be expected to occur and therefore there should be an element of tolerance for this activity type. This sentiment is expressed through the creation of an extensive farming definition and rendering this activity type as permitted. This allows those activities that cause little or no effect to occur without needing resource consent.</p> <p>By having a definition for extensive and intensive farming, it provides clarity as to where a particular activity sits on the spectrum and if resource consent requirements have been triggered. There is a clear delineation between what could be considered an 'extensive' farm and an 'intensive' farm. An extensive farm would be considered to involve outdoor operations, with low stocking densities, grass cover being maintained, with low amounts of dust and odor being discharged from the activity. An intensive farm would</p>		
--	--	--	---------------	-----------	---	--	--

				primarily consist of an indoor high stock density operation.		
FS1386.201	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 in part	
281.12	Zeala Ltd for Trading as Aztech Buildings	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities so that Intensive Farming is a Permitted Activity subject to compliance with standards that reflect the potential adverse effects of differing types of intensive farming. AND Add a Restricted Discretionary Activity for Intensive Farming activities that do not comply with the Permitted Activity Standards, where the potential effects (odour, noise and visual amenity) are able to be assessed to avoid, remedy or mitigate such effects. AND Amend the yard setback requirement to 100 metres for Intensive Farming as a Permitted Activity. AND Delete the specific building coverage requirement for intensive farming and rely on the building coverage standards within Rule 22.3.6 and other general development standards within the Rural Zone, noting that the effects of "farming" operations that do not comply with standards relating to activities, effects or building contained in Rules 22.12, 22.2 and 22.3 (unless otherwise specified as controlled, restricted discretionary or non-complying), default to full Discretionary assessment	There is no justification within the Objectives or Policies of the Rural zone for the classification of Intensive Farming as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Further failure of the 'development standards' (land use effects and building effects rules) mean automatic default to Non-Complying. The proposed rule creates unnecessary restrictions on the ability to establish Intensive Farming operations on smaller land holdings. Standards that need to be met to achieve the Restricted Discretionary Activity include a setback of 300 meters for any building or yard from any site boundary (where the activity is deemed to be Intensive Farming). The impact of such restrictions would be that a small intensive farming operation would need to be located on approximately 40 hectares of land to avoid NON-COMPLYING status - this is not consistent with the Objectives and Policies for Intensive Farming. The proposed Rule creates unnecessary restrictions on the ability to establish	Accept in part	

			under Rule 22.1.5.	Intensive Farming Operations on smaller land holdings and is counter intuitive to the nature of Intensive Farming Operations which normally take place on such smaller holdings and are non-reliant on the productive capacity of the land. There is no justification for the 300 meter yard separation in dealing with the effects of buildings or yards associated with Intensive Farming, where the policy acknowledges potential effects are odour, noise, and visual amenity, and where such effects are 'permitted' for other rural activities. (green houses, silage bins, normal farming practices). The proposed rule does not recognize the potential positive environmental effect of buildings housing animals (either temporarily or permanently) in effectively separating stormwater from animal effluent, increased productivity through reduced farm pugging.		
FS1386.291	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 in part	
FS1035.18	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support the submission in full.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council needs to partner with Kaitiaki, mana whenua or review strategies with Waikato Tainui to ensure preservation and restoration of the Waikato River.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
FS1265.50	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with amendments in line with the relief sought as per submission points 833.5 and 833.6.	Generally support changes to Rule 22.1.3 to provide for poultry farming as a Restricted Discretionary Activity where it cannot	Accept in part	



				<i>comply with the permitted activity conditions.</i>		
<i>FS1379.57</i>	<i>Hamilton City Council</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>HCC opposes the relief sought, which is to change the activity status of Intensive Farming to a 'permitted use' in the Rural Zone. Within HCC's Area of Interest, there needs to be a level of control on land uses which may be incompatible with current and future land uses.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1076.17</i>	<i>New Zealand Pork Industry Board</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>The proposed Rule creates unnecessary restrictions on the ability to establish Intensive Farming Operations on smaller land holdings and is counter intuitive to the nature of Intensive Farming Operations which normally take place on such smaller holdings and are non-reliant on the productive capacity of the land.</i>		<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>746.71</i>	<i>The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Add a new controlled activity (C1) to Section 22.1 Land Use- Activities for poultry hatcheries.</i>	<i>Poultry Hatcheries are a Controlled Activity in the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan. The effects of production processing, incubation and hatching of fertilised eggs can be adequately controlled by performance standards and conditions of consent. This includes ancillary activities and buildings including rearing and production sheds which are essential to the biosecurity and operation requirements of a hatchery. Poultry Hatcheries also play a critical role in the continued operation and growth of the poultry industry which provides food for people and contributes to individual and community wellbeing.</i>		
<i>FS1387.944</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of</i>		

				risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1265.45	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.5).	Poultry farming and hatcheries are capable of mitigation of adverse effects where best practice is employed. Therefore, it is considered that poultry hatcheries should be a Permitted Activity.		
746.73	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Delete from Rule 22.1.3- Restricted Discretionary Activities any reference to free range poultry farming and impose more suitable setbacks.	Free-range poultry farming is a distinct activity that should not come under the definition of intensive farming. Free-range poultry farming should not be subject to a 100m boundary setback. A 20m setback is adequate for a permitted free-range farming activity excluding grazing which should be allowed to occur in paddocks up to the boundary of the site (as per any other permitted livestock activity). Condition 22.1.3(d)(ii) should not apply to free-range poultry farming which should be treated the same as any other permitted livestock activity.	Reject	
FS1387.946	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	
FS1338.9	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken;	Support	Null	CPI supports this submission for the reasons in the CPI submission, but with the setbacks proposed in the CPI submission.	Reject	

	<i>The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd</i>					
<i>FS1306.49</i>	<i>Hynds Foundation</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	
<i>FS1265.58</i>	<i>Mainland Poultry Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow in part with amendments in line with the relief sought as per submission points 833.5 and 833.6.</i>	<i>We submit that Intensive Poultry Farming should be provided for as a Permitted Activity (as per submission point 833.5) and therefore seek activities that fail to comply with the relevant permitted activity conditions be considered as a Restricted Discretionary activity.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	
<i>746.74</i>	<i>The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Delete from Rule 22.1.3 RDI- Restricted Discretionary Activities any reference to poultry hatcheries OR Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI- Restricted Discretionary Activities by excluding poultry from the conditions.</i>	<i>The condition is too restrictive for other types of poultry farming to achieve when combined with the 300m building setback for a sensitive land use. With the introduction of minor dwellings as a permitted activity, any application for a new poultry farm would result in potentially affected parties given that such a farming activity will restrict a neighbour's ability to establish a dwelling or minor dwelling (or other residential activity like a sleepout) as a permitted activity.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1387.947</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	

				the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1306.50	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Accept in part	
FS1265.59	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with amendments in line with relief sought as per submission points 822.5 and 833.6.	We submit that Intensive Poultry Farming should be provided for as a Permitted Activity (as per submission point 833.5) and therefore seek activities that fail to comply with the relevant permitted activity conditions be considered as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Accept in part	
FS1338.10	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd	Support	Null	CPI supports this submission for the reasons in the CPI submission, but with the setbacks proposed in the CPI submission.	Accept in part	
746.75	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Delete the 300m boundary setback requirement for poultry farming from Rule 22.1.3 RDI- Restricted Discretionary Activities. AND Add a reference to assessment criteria/guidelines and effects of the activity as per the Franklin Section	There is no 300m site boundary setback condition in the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan, only assessment criteria which provide a buffer area/guideline of 20m from the boundaries of a site and 100m from an	Accept in part	

			of the Operative District Plan.	existing dwelling on an adjacent property. This is considered to be more appropriate as it recognises changes and technological advancement in modern poultry shed design including ventilation and feeding/drinking systems which reduce the effects of poultry farming. Any site boundary setbacks need to changes and advances in technology and the effects of the activity including the lower bird densities being introduced across the poultry industry. Unable to find in Council's Section 32 report for the Rural Zone the justification for a 300m setback.		
FS1387.948	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	
FS1265.60	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with amendments in line with the relief sought as per submission points 833.5 and 833.6.	We submit that Intensive Poultry Farming should be provided for as a Permitted Activity (as per submission point 833.5) and therefore seek activities that fail to comply with the relevant permitted activity conditions be considered as a Restricted Discretionary activity.	Accept in part	
FS1374.8	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Support submission point 746.75.	Aztech Buildings supports this submission and note that in 'general terms' it would be very difficult to find a property of a size less than about 50ha that would be able to comply with these setback requirements (for a Restricted Discretionary Activity) and even	Accept in part	

				then the development would need to be slap in the middle of the property without consideration of service vehicle access etc.		
FS1338.11	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd	Support	Null	CPI supports this submission for the reasons in the CPI submission, but with the setbacks proposed in the CPI submission.	Accept in part	
FS1306.51	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Accept in part	
821.17	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI (d) Restricted Discretionary Activities relating to free-range poultry farming, as follows: (d) For free-range poultry farming, buildings and outdoor enclosures are set back at least: (i) <del>100-50</del> metres from any site boundary (other than a road boundary); and (ii) <u>200m from a sensitive activity</u> ; and (iii) 500 metres from any boundary of a Residential, Village and Country Living Zone; and (iv) <u>a vegetated range area is maintained.</u> ...	Amend the setbacks so that they apply from the nearest point of the intensive activity - which does not include the range areas (the submitter is seeking a change to the "farming" definition to recognise that the outdoor poultry are livestock and permitted). Amend the minimum setback from an internal boundary to be 50m from the nearest building associated with the activity and 200m in total for separation of farm building from sensitive activity. Road boundaries should be excluded because the road itself is a separation and any dwelling on the other side has a further separation. The requirement for a vegetated range area ensures mitigation against the potential for dust to be created.	Accept in part	

FS1265.52	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with amendments in line with the relief sought as per submission point 833.5 and 833.6.	Generally support changes to Rule 22.1.3 to provide for poultry farming as a Restricted Discretionary Activity where it cannot comply with the permitted activity conditions.	Accept in part	
877.29	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Oppose	Delete reference to free range poultry farming from Rule 22.1.3 RD1 Restricted Discretionary Activities. AND Delete Rules 22.1.3 RD1 (d)(i) and (ii) pertaining to setbacks for poultry farming. AND Add the assessment criteria/guidelines and effects of free range poultry farming as per the Franklin Section of the District Plan, particularly with regards to a more suitable setback as a permitted activity e.g. 20m.	Free-range poultry farming is a distinct activity that should not come under the definition of intensive farming. Refer to comments made elsewhere in the submission. Free-range poultry farming should not be subject to a 100m boundary setback. A 20m setback is adequate for a permitted free-range farming activity excluding grazing which should be allowed to occur in paddocks up to the boundary of a site as per any other permitted livestock activity. Free-range poultry farming should be treated the same as any other permitted livestock activity. There is no 100m site boundary condition in the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan, only assessment criteria which provide a buffer area/guideline of 20m from the boundaries of a site. Any site boundary setbacks need to reflect this and the effects of the activity including the lower bird densities found in the free-range poultry industry. The submitter was unable to find section 32 justification of the 300m setback.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1469	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept in part	

				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1265.62	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with amendments in line with the relief sought as per submission points 833.5 and 833.6.	Support the point that "free range poultry farming is a distinct activity," however; we consider that our submission more appropriately limits any effects that may be caused by poultry farming in general. Generally support changes to Rule 22.1.3 to provide for free range poultry farming as a permitted activity. However, we submit that all poultry farming should be provided for as a permitted activity.	Accept in part	
FS1308.165	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	The submission aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company.	Accept in part	
695.201	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI(c)(ii) B Restricted Discretionary Activities to have a minimum 1200m setback apply to the said zones and if an existing pig farm already occurs at the setback, then the effects of that have to be taken into account as well; AND Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI(c)(ii) B Restricted Discretionary Activities to require any development occurring within that setback to have an enforced Council no complaints covenant applied.	The concern with inequitable distribution rules such as this is that they do not relate to real world operations and realistic assessment of effects. What happens if a consented activity with 500 pigs approved later wishes to expand to 550 pigs in the same location and is 1,320m setback, the setback per pig is just the same as 500 pigs at 1,200m. If the same operator starts a second pig farm at 1,200m setback it would have the same effect as a 1,000 pig operation at 1,200m setback.	Accept in part	
FS1076.3	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	NZPork supports a setback regime for pigs in both intensive and extensive situations. NZPork opposes the threshold numbers which are arbitrary relative to effects. It is assumed this is 500 pigs at one time, which might mean 50 sows plus progeny. A medium sized farm with 400 sows would have 4800 pigs. A more effective and efficient method would be to separately define Intensive and Extensive farming and to provide performance standards around each given the different effects.		Accept in part	



FS1387.354	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	
Rule 22.1.5 – Non-complying Activities						
697.755	Waikato District Council	Support	Amend Rule 22.1.5 D16 Discretionary Activities, as follows: Animal boarding, daycare, breeding or animal training establishment.	Animal daycare activities have not been provided for in the Rural Zone, except as by default as a Non-Complying Activity. Including “daycare” into D16 makes it clear that this type of activity is included as a Discretionary Activity.	Accept in part	
FS1387.678	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Neutral/Amend	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
680.191	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Retain Rule 22.1.5 D16 Discretionary Activities if the definition is amended as per other submissions.	Conditional support will be extended to this rule if the definition is amended to	Reject	

			AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	incorporate submitter's relief sought. The exemptions to the definition are strongly supported but it is hard to understand what activities are hoped to be captured and controlled by this rule and for what purpose. The submission corrects the numbering error 22.1.5, which is duplicated for discretionary and non-complying activities.		
Policy 5.3.7 – Reverse sensitivity effects						
581.12	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add policies to Chapter 5 Rural Environment which specifically address the potential for increased housing density in the rural environment to encroach on lawfully established heavy industry activities in adjoining zones.	To achieve the objectives in Chapter 4.6 Heavy and Industrial Zones, it is essential that the efficient operation of heavy industrial activities located in appropriate zones is not threatened or undermined by the development and encroachment of dwellings or other sensitive activities within an adjoining rural zone.	Reject	
FS1388.950	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1377.154	Havelock Village Limited	Neutral/Amend	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater flexibility for development within the rural zone, in the event that it's requested rezoning is not granted.	Accept	
FS1341.28	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road</li> </ul>	Reject	

				<p>an in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential rezoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.</p>		
FS1345.58	Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Accept submission point in part.	For the reasons stated in the submission and subject to the exact nature of the provisions.	Reject	
FS1333.11	Fonterra Limited	Support	Allow the relief.	For the reasons stated in the submission.	Reject	
FS1306.30	Hynds Foundation	Neutral/Amend	Support.	Hynds Foundation support recognition in the Proposed Plan that small rural lots and rural dwellings can potentially result in reverse sensitivity effects and limit the use and efficiency of activities in the Industrial Zones. We support rules that would limit dwellings and other sensitive activities within a certain distance of a Heavy Industrial Zone without the consent of the owner of the Heavy Industrial zoned land.	Reject	
FS1330.46	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Support	Reject Submission.	As a general principle heavy industry should internalise its external affects within its zone and the land of the HI activity.	Accept	
281.8	Zeala Ltd for Trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Add a new line to Policy 5.3.7 (a) Reverse sensitivity effects as follows: <u>(vi) buildings associated with rural production.</u>	This Policy should recognise that farming/the rural environment may also contain large buildings/structures associated with rural production such as covered feed pads, wintering barns, glass houses, barns, implement sheds etc. Further having large rural buildings which may house farming stock, either on a temporary or permanent basis, enables the better mitigation of one of the potential adverse effects of ruminant	Reject	

				stock (effluent disposal) by separated stormwater from animal effluent whilst the animals are housed. This type of mitigation is supported at a Regional Council level. Housing animals also results in increased productivity, reduction in waste product and reduced pugging.		
FS1265.16	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Allow the addition of (vi) to policy 5.3.7 (a) as below: (a) Recognise the following features are typical of the rural environment and the effects are accepted and able to be managed: ... (vi) Buildings associated with rural production.	Support the intention to recognise farming activities that also contain large buildings/structures as part of the policy. Further support the retention of point (h) in policy 5.3.7 which provides for new intensive farming activities where adverse effects are managed.	Reject	
FS1171.2	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Neutral/Amend	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. This submission recognises that farming and activities in the rural environment may also contain large buildings and structures associated with and necessary for rural production, which may have additional reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	
FS1168.60	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	This policy should recognise that farming activities in the rural environment include large buildings/structures such as covered feed pads, wintering barns, glasshouses and implement sheds. Providing for large buildings that may house farming stock on a temporary or permanent basis would improve mitigation of adverse effects by separating stormwater from animal effluent which is supported by Waikato Regional Council and will result in increased productivity and a reduction in waste product and pugging.	Reject	
FS1168.59	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Like HortNZ, the submitter comments that the policy should recognise that farming/the rural environment may also contain large buildings/structures associated with rural production such as covered feed pads, wintering barns, glass houses, barns, implement sheds etc.	Reject	
FS1316.22	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Support submission point 281.8.	Support the intention to recognize farming activities that also contain large buildings/structures as part of the policy.	Reject	

				<i>Further support the retention of point h) in Policy 5.3.7 which provides for new intensive farming activities where adverse effects are managed.</i>		
281.9	Zeala Ltd for Trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.7(h) Reverse sensitivity effects. AND Amend rules to be consistent with this policy.	Rural rules need to be consistent with this policy as discussed in other submission points. Support the enabling policy with regard to Intensive farming where best practice is followed with regard to mitigating the potential adverse effects of operations.	Accept in part	
FS1265.17	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	<i>Allow the addition of (vi) to policy 5.3.7 (a) as below: (a) Recognise the following features are typical of the rural environment and the effects are accepted and able to be managed: ... (vi) Buildings associated with rural production.</i>	<i>Support the intention to recognise farming activities that also contain large buildings/structures as part of the policy. Further support the retention of point (h) in policy 5.3.7 which provides for new intensive farming activities where adverse effects are managed.</i>	Accept in part	
367.5	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Oppose	Retain Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1386.548	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 in part	
402.4	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Support	Amend Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects, as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Recognise the following features are typical of the rural environment and the effects are accepted and able to be managed: (i) Large numbers of animals being farmed, extensive areas of plants, vines or fruit crops, plantation forests and farm forests; (ii) Noise,	With regard to reverse sensitivity in the rural environment, rural industry should be recognised as being typical in the rural environment and the effects are to be accepted. To specifically include rural industry in the list of features in the rural environment is important to ensure	Accept in part	

			<p>odour, dust, traffic and visual effects associated with the use of land for farming, horticulture, forestry, farm quarries; (iii) Existing mineral extraction and processing activities; (iv) Minor dwellings; (v) Papakainga housing developments within Maori freehold land; (vi) Rural industry. (b) Avoid adverse effects outside the site and where those effects cannot be avoided, they are to be mitigated. (c) Reduce and/or mitigate the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity through the use of setbacks and the design and <u>location</u> of subdivisions and development. (d) The scale, intensity and timing and duration of activities are managed to ensure compatibility with the amenity and character of the rural environment. (e) Enable the use of artificial outdoor lighting for night time work. (f) Ensure glare and light spill from artificial lighting in the rural environment does not: (i) Compromise the safe operation of the road transport network; and (ii) Detract from the amenity of other sites within the surrounding environment. (g) Frost fans are located and operated to ensure adverse effects on the surrounding environment are minimised. (h) Provide for intensive farming activities <u>and rural industry</u>, recognising the potential adverse effects that need to be managed, including noise, visual amenity, rural character or landscape effects, and odour.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.</p>	<p>consistent direction in the objectives and policies in the Proposed District Plan relating to reverse sensitivity. Whilst Tuakau Protein Limited is located now in the Industrial zone, it is surrounded by the Rural Zone, and as a rural industry this should be accepted as an appropriate land use. It is also noted that the existing policy direction in the Franklin section of the Waikato District Plan in Objective 17C.2.1.4 refers to rural industry specifically. It is considered important to also provide a policy basis to ensure that when considering applications to subdivide and develop in the Rural Zone, that the location of subdivision itself needs to be considered in terms of reverse sensitivity mitigation, assisting in reducing rather than mitigating adverse effects.</p>		
FS1038.6	Simon Dromgool	Support	Oppose submission point 402.4.	<p>Oppose Tuakau Protein's submission regarding reverse sensitivity and changes in zoning to accommodate their operation. Believe the Business zone should be retained and Tuakau Protein's operation should be classed as rural industry and be classified restricted discretionary. Reference to the Tonkin and Taylor report referring to a 1000m buffer zone should not be allowed. The report refers to Australian zones because there is none in New Zealand, failed a peer review and should be withdrawn along with all associated with Plan Change 16 for Tuakau. There is no existing buffer zone or noise interface. Reverse sensitivity should favour the existing</p>	Accept in part	

				titles in the nearby residential zone given the subdivision was in the 1860's and the titles for such uplifted in the 1970's, well before Tuakau Protein's operations commenced. Given also that the Tuakau Protein site was where the original schoolhouse once was and that adjacent River Road was the intended Tuakau main street reverse sensitivity should favour the Business Zoning remaining.		
FS1388.138	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	
587.2	Bruce Cameron	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission states (with reference to policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects) that intensive farming must operate within their own boundaries and any setbacks must not extend into neighbouring properties and must not affect neighbouring properties in any activities they wish to carry out within their boundaries.	Intensive farming must not affect neighbouring properties in any activities they wish to carry out within their boundaries.	Accept in part	
FS1316.20	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 587.2.	Intensive farming activities are an important rural industry which should be protected from reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
FS1388.969	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	Accept in part	

				is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1265.19	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Reject the submission point.	Intensive farming activities are an important rural industry which should be protected from reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
676.4	T&G Global Limited	Oppose	Retain Policy 5.3.7(a)(iv) - Reverse Sensitivity Effects AND Amend Policy 5.3.7 - Reverse Sensitivity Effects to provide explicit recognition of workers' accommodation within the rural environment. AND Any further or consequential amendments necessary to address the concerns raised in the submission.	The submitter supports Policy 5.3.7 - Reverse Sensitivity Effects in so far as it recognises minor dwellings as a typical and accepted feature of the rural environment. The accommodation of seasonal and other horticultural or agricultural workers within the rural environment is an important aspect of the continuing function of productive rural activities. The nature of such a use does not give rise to reverse sensitivity effects in the same way as other residential activities because rural workers are aware of and familiar with the effects associated with rural production activities.	Accept in part	
FS1387.140	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 in part	



				risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
693.5	Alstra (2012) Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.7 - Reverse sensitivity effects as notified.	Alstra supports the WDC in terms of effects of reverse sensitivity. This is especially true in the sense that in a typical rural environment of the Waikato District, including around the periphery of urban areas where Alstra currently operates. Alstra considers it key that reverse sensitivity can be managed through implementation methods of Council and appropriate design of development taking into consideration these existing activities	Accept in part	
FS1387.374	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept in part	
FS1265.22	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Allow the retention of policy 5.3.7.	Support the retention of policy 5.3.7 which recognises reverse sensitivity issues.	Accept in part	
723.4	Tyler Sharratt on behalf of Winstone Aggregates	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.7 Reverse Sensitivity Effects.	Reasons not provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.798	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	Accept in part	

				<p>be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
777.3	Radio New Zealand Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.3.7(a)(ii) Reverse sensitivity effects, as follows: Recognise the following features are typical of the rural environment and the effects are accepted and able to be managed: ... (ii) Noise, odour, dust, traffic and visual effects associated with the use of land for farming, horticulture, forestry, farm quarries, and infrastructure; AND Add a new clause to Policy 5.3.7 Reverse Sensitivity effects, as follows: <u>(i) Avoid any adverse effects of reverse sensitivity to ensure the ongoing and efficient operation of infrastructure is not compromised.</u></p>	<p>Infrastructure which is typical of the rural environment may have associated noise, odour, dust and traffic effects with land use. For example, Radio NZ operates a back-up generator for testing and emergency purposes and this makes noise. Greater consistency is required with Policy 6.1.7 Reverse sensitivity and infrastructure, due to the submitter's concern with reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission in terms of their civil defence role.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1387.1175	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Support	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</p>	Accept in part	

				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
821.9	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Oppose	Retain Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects; AND Add an additional point (i) to Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects as follows: ... (h) Provide for intensive farming activities, recognising the potential adverse effects that need to be managed, including noise, visual amenity, rural character or landscape effects, and odour. (i) <u>Protect existing intensive farming activities from sensitive land uses to avoid future conflicts between users.</u>	While the policy specifies that intensive farming activities are provided for, it is also important that existing intensive farming activities are protected from new dwellings and other sensitive activities.	Accept in part	
FS1316.25	Alstra (2012) Limited	Neutral/Amend	Support submission point 821.9.	We support the addition of point (i) as submitted to recognize and provide protection to existing poultry farms in order to avoid conflict.	Accept in part	
FS1076.12	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Oppose	While the policy specifies that intensive farming activities are provided for, it is also important that existing intensive farming activities are protected from new dwellings and other sensitive activities.		Accept in part	
FS1265.15	Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/Amend	Allow the retention of Policy 5.3.7 along with the addition of (i) below: (i) <u>Protect existing intensive farming activities from sensitive land uses to avoid future conflicts between users.</u>	We support the addition of point (i) as submitted to recognise and provide protection to existing poultry farms in order to avoid conflict.	Accept in part	
860.5	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Oppose	Retain Policy 5.3.7 (a) (ii) and (iii) Reverse Sensitivity Effects.	Submitter supports this inclusion and notes its relevance to Policy 4.7.1.1.	Accept in part	
FS1334.41	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Allow and amend Policy 5.3.7 as sought by submission point 860.5 alongside the amendments as per Fulton Hogan's original submission point 575.29.	Support the retention of Policy 5.3.7 in that it recognises reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
FS1332.5	Winstone Aggregates	Oppose	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1292.41	McPherson Resources Limited	Neutral/Amend	Allow and amend Policy 5.3.7 as per Fulton Hogan's submission point 575.29.	Support the retention of Policy 5.3.7 in that it recognises reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
197.10	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Oppose	Retain Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.7 (a)(ii) Reverse sensitivity effects as follows: (ii) Noise, odour, dust, traffic and visual effects associated with the use of land for farming, horticulture, <u>Intensive Farming</u> , forestry, farm quarries;	The submitter supports policy that provides for intensive farming activities, recognising the potential adverse effects that need to be managed, including noise, visual amenity, rural character or landscape effects, and odor. These effects are typical of the rural environment and the policy would be	Accept in part	

				improved by recognizing this along with other farming horticulture, forestry, and farm quarries.		
FS1265.20	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Allow the amendment of policy 5.3.7 as below: (a) Recognise the following features are typical of the rural environment and the effects are accepted and able to be managed:... (ii) Noise, odour, dust, traffic and visual effects associated with the use of land for farming, horticulture, Intensive Farming, forestry, farm quarries;...	Support the inclusion of intensive farming within policy 5.3.7(a)(ii) as the practices associated with such activities are typical of the rural environment. Thus, amending the policy to include intensive farming would further improve the awareness of reverse sensitive effects of the industry.	Accept in part	
FS1316.21	Alstra (2012) Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Support submission point 197.10.	Support the inclusion of intensive farming within Policy 5.3.7(a)(ii) as the practices associated with such activities are typical of the rural environment. Thus, amending the policy to include intensive farming would further improve the awareness of reserve sensitive effects of the industry.	Accept in part	
330.57	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1386.438	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 in part	
372.28	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Oppose	Retain Policy 5.3.7. Reverse sensitivity effects.	Submitter supports policy that recognises types of rural environment activities and avoids and or mitigates the effects of these activities on other sensitive land uses.	Accept in part	

FS1388.8	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	
394.28	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects, to recognise the appropriateness of reverse sensitivity covenants AND/OR Amend other plan provisions as consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the relief sought. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1388.126	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	Accept in part	

				risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1334.36	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Allow the amendment of the policy to include the recognition of the appropriateness of reverse sensitivity covenants alongside the amendments as per Fulton Hogan's original submission point 575.29.	Support the intent of the submission to recognise the value of reverse sensitivity covenants.	Accept in part	
FS1375.8	Radio New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Reject relief sought.	District Plan policies are not an appropriate place to promote the use of private covenants for the management of effects. Covenants do not manage the effect; only the ability of people to complain.	Accept in part	
FS1292.36	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Allow the amendment of the policy to include the recognition of the appropriateness of reverse sensitivity covenants alongside the amendment as per Fulton Hogan's submission point 575.29.	Support the intent of the submission to recognise the value of reverse sensitivity covenants.	Accept in part	
FS1265.21	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Allow the amendment of the policy to include the recognition of reverse sensitivity covenants.	Support the intent of the submission to recognise the value of reverse sensitivity covenants.	Accept in part	
FS1316.23	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Support submission point 394.28.	Support the intent of the submission to recognize the value of reserve sensitivity covenants.	Accept in part	
419.62	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects, as follows: (a) Recognise the following features are typical of the rural environment and the effects are accepted and able to be managed: (i) Large numbers of animals being farmed, extensive areas of <u>commercial vegetable production</u> , plants, vines or fruit crops, plantation forests and farm forests; ... (c) <u>Avoid or</u> mitigate the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity through the use of setbacks and the design of subdivisions and development. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the recognition that extensive areas of plants, vines or fruit crops are typical features of the rural environment. Commercial vegetable production is defined term in Waikato Regional Plan Change 1. The design of subdivisions and development should, in the first instance, seek to avoid reverse sensitivity through the use of setbacks and design.	Accept in part	
FS1375.9	Radio New Zealand	Support	Accept relief sought.	RNZ's transmitter is in the proposed Rural Zone. Subdivision and development in proximity to its transmitter site could lead to reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission and impede the operation of RNZ's network.	Accept in part	
FS1388.206	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood	Accept in part	

				provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1171.39	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. This submission seeks to amend Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects to include commercial vegetable production. The reason for this support is that extensive areas of plants, vines or fruit crops are typical features of the rural environment, hence the effects are both acceptable and manageable.	Accept in part	
466.61	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept in part	
FS1388.429	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	Accept in part	

				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
553.37	Malibu Hamilton	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.7 (a)(v) Reverse sensitivity effects.	The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 in Policy (d) recognises Tangata whenua needs for papakāinga, marae. The Waikato Regional Policy Statement, 2016 also has Policy 6.4 Marae and papakāinga provisions. The Future Proof Strategy Planning for Growth November 2017 has Priority 15 that seeks developments of papakāinga housing that meets the needs and aspirations in the sub-region. RMA sections 6(e), 7(a), and 8 set out legal obligations when managing the natural and physical resources of the region to Tangata whenua.	Accept in part	
FS1388.792	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
575.29	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.7 (h) Reverse sensitivity effects, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.3.7 (h) Reverse sensitivity effects, as follows (or words to similar effect): (h) Provide for intensive farming activities and mineral and aggregate extraction activities, recognising the potential adverse effects that need to be managed, including noise, visual amenity, rural character or landscape effects, and odour.	Submission supports the policy but seeks the amendment to ensure that not only established quarries, but potentially new mineral or aggregate extraction activities are able to be established in the Rural Zone. Noting that it is vital to the survival of the aggregate extraction industry.	Accept in part	



			AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.			
FSI292.37	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in full.	McPherson supports the inclusion of policy which recognises the potential for reverse sensitivity effects. Such protection should be applied to new extraction activities.	Accept in part	
FSI332.38	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FSI319.13	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	NZS supports an amendment to Policy 5.3.7 to ensure new mineral and aggregate extraction activities (or Extractive Activities) are provided for.	Accept in part	
FSI198.29	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	It is appropriate that mineral extraction be provided for in the Rural zone and that reverse sensitivity issues with respect to mining are recognised.	Accept in part	
FSI377.148	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater flexibility for extractive industries.	Accept in part	
680.66	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.7 (a) and (b) and (c) Reverse sensitivity effects, as follows: (a) Recognise the following features are typical of the rural environment and the effects are accepted and able to be managed: (i) Large numbers of animals being farmed, extensive areas of plants, vines or fruit crops, plantation forests and farm forests; (ii) Noise, odour, dust, traffic and visual effects including buildings and structures associated with the use of land for farming, horticulture, forestry, farm quarries; (iii) Existing mineral extraction and processing activities; (iv) Minor dwellings; (v) Papakainga housing developments within Maaori Freehold land. (b) Manage activities to ensure that adverse effects (other than minor effects) are avoided, remedied or mitigated. Avoid adverse effects outside the site and where those effects cannot be avoided, they are to be mitigated. (c) Mitigate the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity	The submitter supports the intent of Policy 5.3.7, which is in part to raise awareness of the types of activities and associated effects which are considered appropriate within the rural environment. It is appropriate for the plan to be clear and upfront that farming activities must be able to function effectively and not be unduly restricted by new and encroaching activities being established within the rural zone. Amendments are required to ensure the plan accurately implements reverse sensitivity principles. The submitter accepts that where possible unacceptable nuisance effects such as noise and odour should be contained within the property boundary. However, farming requirements and weather	Accept in part	

			<p>through the use of setbacks and the design of subdivisions and development <u>where appropriate...</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add to Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects a new clause (i) as follows: <u>(i) Ensure that land use activities that are sensitive to the effects of rural activities do not constrain the operation of rural activities.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	<p>conditions mean that even with the best intention it is not always possible to avoid a level of nuisance effect. In such instances (which are generally intermittent and temporary) it is imperative that the Plan clearly allows for this to ensure the farm business is not unduly impacted upon. This could include such activities as harvesting contractors and farmers working through the night to harvest crops due to short weather windows, odour from the feeding out of silage in neighbouring paddock, and short term odour from the spreading of effluent on pasture. These effects are not unreasonable to expect in the Rural Zone, and that therefore 5.3.7(b) is inappropriate as presently worded. We consider that it could result in creating unreasonable expectations of the amenity of the Rural Zone, and perpetuate reverse sensitivity issues with people unaccustomed to the rural environment complaining about normal farming activities and expecting those effects to be avoided or mitigated in every instance. Farming in a rural area is a lawfully established existing activity Noise, lighting, odour and dust can be quite reasonable effects as a consequence of normal farming activities as outlined in (a) there are some concerns as to how (a) and (b) are to be read together, along with reference to the avoiding, or mitigating of usual and expected effects within the rural environment. The methods used to give effect to this policy must not place undue constraints on either the existing land use or the potential land use activity. Any decisions as to separation distance as a method to address such issues must be based on a case by case assessment and not an automatic planning response. The submitter supports adopting an approach for low probability and low impact scenarios of incurring occasional relatively minor</p>		
--	--	--	---	---	--	--

				adverse effects rather than imposing external buffer zones. Submitter is opposed to use of blanket external buffer zones as a proxy for triggering resource consent, as it places restrictions on adjoining landowners who have no responsibility for the adverse effect, and who receive no compensation for the restrictions placed on their activities. That said, it may be appropriate for sensitive activities to avoid locating within close proximity to activities that may emit objectionable odours and discharges.		
FS1387.172	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	
FS1338.3	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd	Support	Null	The relief sought by Federated Farmers is consistent with CPI submission that the policy as currently worded does not protect existing farming activities.	Accept in part	
FS1375.10	Radio New Zealand	Support	Accept relief sought.	RNZ's transmitter is in the proposed Rural Zone. Subdivision and development in proximity to its transmitter site could lead to reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission	Accept in part	

				and impede the operation of RNZ's network.		
FSI 1275.7	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Allow.	The policy on reverse sensitivity needs to recognise that buildings and other structures are an increasingly important part of the rural environment. The visual effects of buildings in this environment can be remedied or mitigated, and often such buildings result in enhanced environmental outcomes- including reduced reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
FSI 1292.38	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow the amendment to Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to remove the word "existing" alongside the amendment as per Fulton Hogan's submission point 575.29.	Support the amendment to Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to recognise both existing and future extraction and processing activities.	Accept in part	
FSI 1334.37	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow the amendment to Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to remove the word "existing" alongside the amendments as per Fulton Hogan's original submission point 575.29.	Support the amendment to Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to recognise both existing and future extraction and processing activities.	Accept in part	
FSI 139.49	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Support	Null	General support for the submission.	Accept in part	
FSI 171.76	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes amendments to Policy 5.3.7 (a) and (b) and (c) Reverse sensitivity effects. This submission is supported. The proposed amendments recognise buildings and structures ancillary to rural activities as typical features of the rural environment, and seek to ensure that land use activities that are sensitive to the effects of rural activities do not constrain the operation of rural activities.	Accept in part	
FSI 108.58	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Support	Null	General support for the submission.	Accept in part	
691.11	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.7(a)(iii) Reverse sensitivity effects, as notified. This relief is sought in the event that any part of the submission from point 691.1 to 691.15 is not accepted by WDC.	McPherson supports the specific protection of existing mineral extraction and processing in the Rural Zone, because insofar as these types of activities are located outside of a specific 'Aggregate Extraction Area', they are best performed in the rural environment.	Accept in part	

FS1334.38	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in and amend Policy 5.3.7 as per submission point 575.29.	Fulton Hogan supports the retention of Policy 5.3.7 in that it recognises reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
742.37	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.7(f)(i) Reverse sensitivity effects as follows: Compromise the safe operation of the <u>road land</u> transport network ... AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports Policy 5.3.7(f)(i) as it seeks to avoid adverse effects on the safe operation of the transport network, but requests that this is amended to align with a consistent definition of the land transport network.	Accept in part	
FS1387.859	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	
771.10	Alison Brown for Bathurst Resources Ltd and BT Mining Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.7(a)(iii) Reverse sensitivity effects as follows: (a) Recognise the following features are typical of the rural environment and the effects are accepted and able to be managed: .... (iii) Existing mineral extraction and processing activities <u>and future extraction and processing activities within Coal Mining Resource Areas;</u> AND Any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Consider that this should not apply not only to existing coal mining operations but also to future coal mining operations, particularly within those areas identified as coal mining resource areas.	Accept in part	
FS1285.8	Terra Firma Mining Limited	Support	Amend Policy 5.3.7(a)(iii) Reverse sensitivity effects to also apply to future extraction and processing activities within Coal Mining Resource Areas.	TFM agrees with the submitter's reasons.	Accept in part	

FS1334.39	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow amendment to Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to remove the word "existing" alongside the amendments as per Fulton Hogan's original submission point 575.29.	Support the intent to amend Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to recognise both existing and future extraction and processing activities. Such amendment should extend to all extraction activities.	Accept in part	
FS1292.39	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow the amendment to Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to remove the word "existing" alongside the amendment as per Fulton Hogan's submission point 575.29.	Support the intent to amend Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to recognise both existing and future extraction and processing activities. Such amendment should extend to all extraction activities.	Accept in part	
797.44	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Policy 5.3.7(c) Reverse sensitivity effects to read (or words to similar effect): Mitigate the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity through the use of setbacks for sensitive activities and the design of subdivisions and development. AND Delete Policy 5.3.7 (d) Reverse sensitivity effects AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	Amendment clarifies setbacks and design requirements should apply to sensitive activities rather than activities that are appropriate within a rural environment. Rural environments are unnecessarily restricted. Supports the policy subject to amendments.	Accept in part	
FS1171.103	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. Setbacks and design requirements should apply to sensitive activities rather than activities that are appropriate within a rural environment.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1279	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept in part	

				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1375.11	Radio New Zealand	Support	Accept relief sought.	RNZ's transmitter is in the proposed Rural Zone. Subdivision and development in proximity to its transmitter site could lead to reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission and impede the operation of RNZ's network.	Accept in part	
FS1265.18	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Support in part. Reject the submission point to delete point (d) of policy 5.3.7 with changes as per our submission.	Point (d) of policy 5.3.7 should be retained to recognise the need for new activities to be compatible with established activities. The submitted change to point (c) of the policy 5.3.7 is not necessary. As drafted, the policy allows consideration of reverse sensitivity that may occur between all land uses.	Accept in part	
FS1313.26	Perry Group Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	We support the inclusion of the reference to 'sensitive activities' within Policy 5.3.7 as not all activities lead to reverse sensitivity outcomes.		
FS1316.24	Alstra (2012) Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission point 797.44 and retain Policy 5.3.7 which changes as per submission.	Point (d) of Policy 5.3.7 should be retained to recognize the need for new activities to be compatible with established activities. The submitted change to point (c) of the Policy 5.3.7 is not necessary. As drafted, the policy allows consideration of reverse sensitivity that may occur between all land uses.	Accept in part	
FS1345.35	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the Fonterra submission. The Huntly Power Station is surrounded by rural land - it is important that sensitive activities are set back from the HPS and reverse sensitivity is managed.	Accept in part	
827.35	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support	Amend Policy 5.3.7 Reverse sensitivity effects as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Recognise the following features are typical of the rural environment and the effects are accepted and able to be managed: ... (iii) Existing <del>in</del> Mineral extraction and processing activities; ... (c) Mitigate the adverse effects of reverse sensitivity through the use of setbacks and design of subdivisions and development. <u>(cc) Avoid locating sensitive activities in a buffer area adjoining an Aggregate Extraction Area, unless those sensitive activities can avoid</u>	New Zealand Steel wishes to see provisions to effectively manage potential reverse sensitivity effects on the mine site. The mine is important to the social and economic wellbeing of the district and wider New Zealand. The Proposed District Plan should manage sensitive land uses within the vicinity of the mine site. Supports the inclusion of mineral extraction and processing activities in relation to	Accept in part	

			<p>compromising existing and future mineral extraction.... ..</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a comparable policy regarding reverse sensitivity in the event that a specific Maoro Mining Zone is introduced.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other further or consequential amendments required.</p>	reverse sensitivity. Seeks to address sensitive land use in the buffer area adjacent to the Aggregate Extraction Areas.		
FS1334.40	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow changes to Policy 5.3.7 as sought by submission point 827.35 alongside the amendments as per Fulton Hogan's original submission point 575.29.	Support the amendment to Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to recognise both existing and future extraction and processing activities. Support the addition of a new policy point which identifies that sensitive activities should avoid locating close to extraction activities.	Accept in part	
FS1198.30	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Not Stated	The submission point be allowed in full but to extend to Coal Mining Areas as well as Aggregate Extraction Areas.	It is appropriate that mineral extraction be provided for in the Rural zone and that reverse sensitivity issues with respect to mining are recognised and this should apply both to existing and future mining operations. There is no effects basis for a distinction to be drawn between Aggregate Extraction Areas and Coal Mining Areas.		
FS1292.40	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow the amendment to Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to remove the word "existing" alongside the amendment as per Fulton Hogan's submission point 575.29.	Support the amendment to Policy 5.3.7 (a)(iii) to recognise both existing and future extraction and processing activities. Support the addition of a new policy point which identifies that sensitive activities should avoid locating close to extraction activities.	Accept in part	
860.20	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.7 (b) Reverse sensitivities effects.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1334.42	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.3.7 as sought by submission point 860.20 alongside the amendments as per Fulton Hogan's original submission point 575.29.	Support the retention of Policy 5.3.7 in that it recognises reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
FS1285.18	Terra Firma Mining Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.7(b) - Reverse sensitivity effects.	This provision is appropriate.	Accept in part	
FS1292.42	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.3.7 as per Fulton Hogan's submission point 575.29.	Support the retention of Policy 5.3.7 in that it recognises reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	



FS1332.20	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
860.21	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.7 (c) Reverse sensitivity effects.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1285.19	Terra Firma Mining Limited	Support	Retain 5.3.7 Policy (c) - Reverse sensitivity effects.	This provision is appropriate.	Accept in part	
FS1332.21	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1292.43	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.3.7 as per Fulton Hogan's submission point 575.29.	Support the retention of Policy 5.3.7 in that it recognises reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
FS1334.43	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.3.7 as sought by submission point 860.21 alongside the amendments as per Fulton Hogan's original submission point 575.29.	Support the retention of Policy 5.3.7 in that it recognises reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
827.34	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Add provisions within Chapter 5: Rural Environment as follows (or words to similar effect), if the Waikato North Head mine sites retains a Rural Zone <u>Objective (1) The iron sand resource at Waikato North Head is effectively and efficiently utilised. Policies (1) Provide for ironsand mining and associated activities at the Aggregate Extraction Area identified at Waikato North Head. (2) Avoid, remedy or mitigate any significant adverse effects associated with activities at the Aggregate Extraction Area identified at Waikato North Head that require resource consent under the Waikato District Plan. AND</u></p> <p>Add rules to Chapter 22 Rural Zone to enable specified activities within the Aggregate Extraction Area at Waikato North Head to be a permitted activity (see submission for specific details).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other further or consequential amendments required.</p>	<p>Alternative to the specific zone, New Zealand Steel proposes to amend the applicable provisions within the Rural Zone. The Aggregate Extraction Area overlay may be amended to be made appropriate to the Waikato North Head site with update provisions which recognise the existing activities and the extent of future authorised activities, along with providing for reverse sensitivity issues adjacent to the site. The Proposed District Plan currently contains no specific rules which relate to mining activities within the Aggregate Extraction area, and therefore it is unclear how the Rural Zone rules apply. Given the context of the site, the submitter considers the Rural Zone permitted activity conditions are inappropriate, including those relating to earthworks and building height and therefore specific rules relating to the Aggregate Extraction Area would be more appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	
924.14	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add clause (vi) to Policy 5.3.7 (a)- Reverse Sensitivity Effects as follows: <u>(vi) Existing and</u>	The submitter considers that existing and proposed regionally significant industry and regionally significant	Accept in part	

			<u>proposed regionally significant industry and regionally significant infrastructure.</u>	infrastructure also forms part of the rural environment and should also be provided for in this policy.		
FSI 176.279	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports the addition of this clause to this policy for the reasons set out in the submission.	Accept in part	
FSI 198.31	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	It is appropriate that mineral extraction be provided for in the Rural zone and that reverse sensitivity issues with respect to mining are recognised and this should apply to both existing and future mining operations.	Accept in part	
FSI 350.8	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	The submission point is supported as it appropriately recognises that existing and regionally significant infrastructure also forms part of the rural environment.	Accept in part	
FSI 387.1547	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	
FSI 375.12	Radio New Zealand	Support	Accept relief sought.	RNZ agrees that existing and proposed regionally significant industry and regionally significant infrastructure also forms part of the rural environment and should also be provided for in this policy.	Accept in part	
433.4	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause to Policy 5.3.7 (a) Reverse sensitivity effects, as follows: <u>(vi) recreational hunting AND/OR</u>	Recreational hunting is typical of the rural environment and therefore the policy needs to recognise that noise	Accept in part	

			Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	from this activity should be accepted and can be managed.		
FS1083.4	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Support	Allow the submission point in full.	Adding recreational hunting to the policy is appropriate because it is a typical activity in rural areas and is venerable to reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
FS1083.5	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Support	Allow the submission point in full.	It is appropriate to consider shotgun noise associated with recreational hunting as a potential reverse sensitivity effect.	Accept in part	
<b>Rule 22.3.7.2 – Building Setback – Sensitive Land Use</b>						
461.1	Donna-Maria Lincoln	Support	No specific decision sought, but submission states support for Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback - sensitive land use. AND No specific decision sought, but submission expresses concern that a major and minor dwelling cannot be built on each of the 4 titles on the property at 100 McGovern Road, Waerenga.	The submitter purchased this property in 2015 with the intention of building a primary dwelling and minor dwelling on each of their four titles located at 100 McGovern Road, Waerenga. The current regime does not enable these developments, contrary to what Council advised at the time of purchase.	Accept in part	
FS1388.370	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	
676.9	T&G Global Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 - Building setback sensitive land use to enable the provision of accommodation for agricultural, horticultural and seasonal workers where that accommodation is within 300m of an intensive farming activity. AND	Sensitive land use includes residential includes residential activity. Any sensitive land use not complying with this standard is a discretionary activity. The nature of worker accommodation does not give rise to reverse sensitivity effects in the same way as other	Reject	

			Any further or consequential amendments necessary to address the concerns raised in the submission.	residential activities because rural workers are aware of and familiar with the effects associated with rural production activities.		
FS1387.144	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	
FS1348.19	Perry International Trading Group Limited	Support	Null	PITGL supports the amendment to Rule 22.3.7.2 that seeks the exclusion of workers accommodation from the definition of 'sensitive land use', given the land-based productive purpose of such a residential activity and to avoid the requirement of unnecessary resource consents.	Reject	
833.7	Phil Page on behalf of Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2P1 (a)(vii) Building setback - sensitive land use, as follows: (vii) 300m from <del>the</del> <u>any boundary of building on</u> another site containing an intensive farming activity;	Poultry farming is a rural activity that can only happen within a Rural Zone. It has no greater effects than many other farming activities permitted in the Rural Zone. Any adverse effects of reverse sensitivity nature are likely to result from the buildings that house birds, rather than from birds ranging outside. 300m separation from intensive farming buildings (instead of from the site boundary) is adequate separation from sensitive activities.	Accept	
FS1338.14	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry	Support	Null	Is consistent with CPI's submission that the rule should not be from the boundary of	Reject	

	Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd			another site containing an intensive farming activity.		
FS1387.1357	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	
197.29	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.2 PI Building setback sensitive land use as notified.	Physical separation achieved through a defined setback regime us supported by NZ Pork as an effective method to avoid, remedy, or mitigate potential conflicts and reverse sensitivity issues.	Accept in part	
FS1308.7	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	This rule sets an arbitrary distance for all 'intensive farming' which is not necessarily reflective of the effects of a poultry farm. It also results in all properties within 300m of the boundary of a site proposed for a poultry farming operation being considered as adversely affected for notification purposes. This is because the establishment of a new poultry farm would restrict a neighbor's ability to establish potential dwelling or minor dwelling (or other residential activity like a sleepout) as a permitted activity in the future. The setback distance needs to be justified, amended or deleted in relation to poultry farming and/or the definition of sensitive land use (which includes residential	Accept in part	

				<p>activities) amended so that it does not unduly result in the notification of applications for new poultry farms. In addition, any setback should be taken from the intensive farming activity itself, not the site boundary of the activity. This is because the effects that the setback is trying to mitigate are generated by/from the activity, not the site boundary. If an intensive farming activity decides to expand in the future within the site boundary then the effects of this on the receiving environment will simply need to be addressed at that time and the application considered on its merits. When combined with Rule 22.1.3(e)(i), there is a total setback of 600m that affect poultry farm applications (i.e. 300m from their site boundary to be a restricted discretionary activity and 300m from any dwelling/minor dwelling (or other sensitive activity like a sleepout) that is either existing or potentially able to be constructed on neighboring land. It is almost impossible for a site to be found in the District where the 'Building setback sensitive land use' rule would not affect the establishment/notification of a poultry farm.</p>		
FS1386.206	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	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 in part	

FS1265.68	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with changes as per our original submission (833.7).	Support the overall retention of Rule 22.3.7.2 with amendment to point vii to ensure 330m measured from a building where a sensitive land use occurs instead of from the site boundary, to avoid reverse sensitivity.	Accept in part	
372.18	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.2. Building setback - sensitive land use.	Building setbacks create separation for sensitive activities based on zone and site size. Specific rules for sensitive activities are included.	Accept in part	
FS1388.5	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	
FS1265.69	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with changes as per our original submission (833.7).	Support the overall retention of Rule 22.3.7.2 with amendment to point vii to ensure 300m measured from a building where a sensitive land use occurs instead of from the site boundary, to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
FS1308.25	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	For the reasons given in submission point 197.29.	Accept in part	
419.32	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback sensitive land use, except for the amendments sought below AND Add two new clauses (x) and (xi) to Rule 22.3.7.2 P1 (a) Building setback sensitive land use, as follows: (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: ... (x) 100m from the boundary of another site containing a rural industry or	The submitter supports the proposed rule which places the onus on the sensitive activity to be set back from existing activities. This is an effective means of managing reverse sensitivity effects. However, this should be extended to ensure setbacks from all	Reject	

			<p>services activity. (xi) 100m from the boundary of another site containing a farming activity where the sensitive land use is not a residential activity.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	<p>existing farming activities, including rural industry activities, which generate legitimate farm noise and spraying effects that are often hampered by reverse sensitivity effects. Care must be taken in differentiating between residential activities and other sensitive activities such as education facilities and hospitals. The submitter purports that many of these sensitive activities are not appropriate for the Rural Zone at all. The potential for reverse sensitivity effects is amplified and the ability to manage or mitigate reverse sensitivity effects becomes more difficult. Managing notification requirements to sensitive activities that are not residential activities becomes even more complicated as those facilities then have to notify all individuals who may be present at the time.</p>		
FS1388.189	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
FS1330.26	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject Submission.	<p>This proposed rule would compromise adjoining land owners rights to quiet enjoyment of their land and is too larger distance and does not take into account site characteristics.</p>	Accept	



FS1171.26	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes two new clauses to Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback sensitive land use with respect to sites containing rural industries or services activity and farming activities. This submission is supported to the extent that the relief sought is consistent with T & G Global's submission in relation to setbacks for sensitive land use.	Reject	
FS1265.70	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with changes as per our original submission (833.7).	Support the overall retention of Rule 22.3.7.2 with amendment to point vii to ensure 300m measured from a building where a sensitive land use occurs instead of from the site boundary, to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	
489.15	Ann-Maree Gladding	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 PI (iv) and (v) Building setback sensitive land use, to add text to clarify that the setback distances are taken from the actual extraction area only and not from the legal boundaries of the title that contains the extraction area; OR Amend the definition of "Aggregate Extraction Area" in Chapter 13 Definitions, to clarify that the setback distances are taken from the actual extraction area only and not from the legal boundaries of the title, that contains the extraction area.	The Council has interpreted the current operative rule incorrectly on subdivisions, and it has cost the submitter's clients a lot of money to legally clarify.	Reject	
FS1292.77	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Reject and amend rule as per our original submission (691.20) along with the relief sought by submission point 691.9.	Mineral and aggregate extraction is an important activity that can only occur on sites where the resource is present. Therefore, it is important that sensitive activities be setback appropriately to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. McPherson agree that it is not necessary that the setback be measured from the boundary of the title. However, given the importance of the industry, it is appropriate that sensitive land uses be setback from the boundary of the identified Aggregate Extraction Area overlay to provide for new extraction activities and expansion of existing activities. Furthermore, the protection provided by a setback should be applied to existing extraction activities that are not within the Aggregate Extraction Area. It is noted that	Reject	

				the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay has not been applied to McPherson's existing quarry operations. This relief is sought as per submission point 691.9.		
FS1334.80	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend the Rule as per our original submission point 575.21.	Mineral and aggregate extraction is an important activity that can only occur on sites where the resource is present. Therefore, it is important that sensitive activities be setback appropriately to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. Fulton Hogan agree that it is not necessary that the setback be measured from the boundary of the title. However, given the importance of the industry, it is appropriate that sensitive land uses be setback from the boundary of the identified Aggregate Extraction Area overlay to provide for new extraction activities and expansion of existing activities. Furthermore, the protection provided by a setback should be applied to existing extraction activities that are not within the Aggregate Extraction Area.	Accept	
FS1319.2	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Oppose	NZS seeks that the submission point be rejected.	In line with NZS's original submission point 827.37 NZS supports the proposed building setback from the Aggregate Extraction Area and considers the application of this standard is clear/does not require amending.	Accept	
FS1388.483	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	

489.16	Ann-Maree Gladding	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 PI (vii) Building setback sensitive land use, to be 300m from the actual intensive farming activity, rather than the boundary of the site. Submission seeks rewording and clarification of the rule.	If there is an intensive farming activity at one end of a very large site, it is unfair that a neighbouring property at the other end of the site (potentially several 100 meters away) cannot subdivide or develop because they are within 300m of the site boundary. It just does not make logical sense. One neighbouring property may be 301m away from the activity and can subdivide or develop, however a property that may be a 1000m or more away from the activity cannot because they are still within 300m of the site boundary.	Accept	
FS1308.71	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	For the reason given in submission point 197.29.	Reject	
FS1265.71	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend rule as per our original submission (833.7).	We agree that it is reasonable that buildings where sensitive land uses occur be set back from intensive farming activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Reject	
FS1388.484	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	
575.21	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.2 (a) Building setback sensitive land use except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 (a) Building setbacks sensitive land use, as follows (or word to similar effect): (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set	Mineral and aggregate extraction can result in effects which give rise to reverse sensitivity. By ensuring that appropriate setback rules apply not only to those quarries which are subject to the proposed overlays but also to others	Accept in part	

			back a minimum of... (iv) 200m from an Aggregate Extraction Area, <u>mineral or aggregate extraction activities</u> containing a sand resource; (v) 500m from an Aggregate Extraction Area, <u>mineral or aggregate extraction activities</u> containing a rock resource;... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	(including future quarries which would need to apply for a Plan change to have the same level of protection), this will provide sufficient safeguards for the industry going forward from reverse sensitivity.		
FS1292.79	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow along with the relief sought by submission point 691.9.	Mineral and aggregate extraction is an important activity that can only occur on sites where the resource is present. Therefore, it is important that sensitive activities be setback appropriately to avoid reverse sensitivity effects of both existing and future extraction activities.	Accept in part	
FS1332.35	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
580.10	Andrew Feierabend for Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	Add a new clause (x) into Rule 22.3.7.2P1(a) Building setback sensitive land use, as follows: <u>(x) the distance necessary to ensure wind turbine noise from any authorised or lawfully established large-scale wind farm does not exceed 40 dBA measured at the sensitive land use in accordance with NZS6808:2010.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Non-compliance with this rule triggers a discretionary activity status. The same reverse sensitivity noise issues arise for lawfully established large-scale wind farms and they equally warrant the protection of a minimum setback distance. Inclusion of a setback distance for large-scale wind farms is necessary to give effect to Objective 6.1.6 and Policy 6.1.7 addressing reverse sensitivity. The minimum setback would be specified by NZS 6808:2010	Reject	
581.32	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback - sensitive land use to include a requirement for sensitive land uses to be setback from a Heavy Industrial Zone boundary.	The Proposed District Plan fails to protect sensitive activities for Heavy Industrial zones and/or prevent reverse sensitivity effects from encroaching housing and sensitive activities. Encroachment of housing and sensitive activities may result in restrictions on the efficient operation of heavy industrial activities within the Heavy Industrial Zone.	Reject	
FS1341.49	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	• This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road	Reject	

				<p>an in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential zoning. • Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations. • Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.</p>		
FS1388.953	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
FS1377.155	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	<p>HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater flexibility for development within the rural zone, in the event that its requested rezoning is not granted.</p>	Accept	
591.11	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 PI Building setback sensitive land use, as follows: (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: (i) 5m from the designated boundary of the railway corridor; (ii)	<p>Where Aggregate Resource Areas are adjacent to Aggregate Extraction Areas it is clear that they provide expansion areas for the lawfully established industry</p>	Accept	

			15m from a national route or regional arterial road; (iii) 35m from the designated boundary of the Waikato Expressway; (iv) 200m from Aggregate Extraction Area or Aggregate Resource Area containing a sand resource; (v) 500m from an Aggregate Extraction Area or Aggregate Resource Area containing a rock resource; (vi) 100m from a site in the...	and this should be recognised. The building setback needs to be applied in the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas identified in the planning maps.		
FS1388.998	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	
FS1292.78	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow or make changes to Rule 22.3.7.2 as per submission point 691.20 along with the relief sought by submission point 691.9.	Mineral and aggregate extraction is an important activity that can only occur on sites where the resource is present. Therefore, it is important that sensitive activities be setback appropriately to avoid reverse sensitivity effects of both existing and future extraction activities.	Accept	
FS1334.81	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow or make changes to Rule 22.3.7.2 as per submission point 575.21.	Mineral and aggregate extraction is an important activity that can only occur on sites where the resource is present. Therefore, it is important that sensitive activities be setback appropriately to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept	
FS1146.19	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited on behalf of	Support	The proposed submission will enable the expansion of existing lawful extractive industries within the Aggregate Resource Area and Aggregate Extraction Area.	We seek that the whole submission is allowed as both Aggregate overlays are intended for current or future extractive purposes.	Accept	

676.13	T&G Global Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 - Building setback sensitive land use to classify sensitive activities as Restricted Discretionary Activities, and limit Council's discretion in the same way as Rule 22.3.7.4. AND Any further or consequential amendments necessary to address the concerns raised in the submission.	This will limit the Council's discretion in the same way as is provided for noise sensitive activities in Rule 22.3.7.4. The nature of worker accommodation does not give rise to reverse sensitivity effects in the same way as other residential activities because rural workers are aware of and familiar with the effects associated with rural production activities.	Reject	
FS1387.145	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	
676.16	T&G Global Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback - sensitive activities, to clarify that the setback does not apply where the sensitive land use is located on the same land as an intensive farming activity. AND Any further or consequential amendments necessary to address the concerns raised in the submission.	This is to enable and recognise workers' accommodation associated with rural production activities.	Accept in part	
FS1387.148	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	Accept in part	

				the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
691.20	McPherson Resources Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 PI (a) Building setback sensitive land use as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: .. (iv) 200m from an Aggregate Extraction Area, <u>mineral or aggregate extraction activities</u> containing a sand resource; (v) 500m from an Aggregate Extraction Area, <u>mineral or aggregate extraction activities</u> containing a rock resource; AND  Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	Mineral and aggregate extraction can result in effects which give rise to reverse sensitivities. This has the potential to threaten the commercial viability of existing and/or future extractive industries, which is of detriment to not only quarry operators but also to the whole district, which relies heavily on this industry for its GDP. By ensuring the appropriate setback rules apply not only to those quarries which are subject to the proposed overlays but also to others (including future quarries which would need to apply for a Plan change to have the same level of protection), it will provide sufficient safeguarding for the industry going forward.	Accept in part	
FS1334.82	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	Mineral and aggregate extraction is an important activity that can only occur on sites where the resource is present. Therefore, it is important that sensitive activities be setback appropriately to avoid reverse sensitivity effects of both existing and future extraction activities.	Accept in part	
746.85	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 Building Setback -Sensitive land use after further consideration of its effect on applications for poultry farming activities OR Delete the setback distances in relation to poultry farming in Rule 22.3.7.2 Building Setback -Sensitive land use	Rule 22.3.7.2(a)(vii) sets an arbitrary distance for all 'intensive farming' which is not necessarily reflective of the effects of a poultry farm. It results in all properties within 300m of the boundary of a site proposed for a poultry farming operation being considered as adversely affected for notification purposes. This because the establishment of a new poultry farm would restrict a neighbour's ability to establish a potential dwelling or minor dwelling (or other residential activity like a sleepout) as a permitted activity in the future. Furthermore, this is not a breach	Accept in part	



				<p>of poultry farm activity rule and can't be included as a consent requirement in the application. The setback distance needs to be justified, amended or deleted so that it does not unduly result in the notification of applications for new poultry farms. In addition, any setback should be taken from the intensive farming activity itself, not the site boundary of the activity. This is because the effects that the setback is trying to mitigate are generated by/from the activity, not the site boundary. If an intensive farming activity decides to expand in the future within the site boundary then the effects of this on the receiving environment will simply need to be addressed at that time and the application considered on its merits. Poultry farms also generally establish on large rural sites and therefore a 300m sensitive building setback from the boundary (and not the activity) is even more significant. This is evidenced when a poultry farm is located in just one corner or at one end of a large (eg 40-100 hectare) property. When combined with Rule 22.1.3(e)(i), there is a total setback of 600m that affect poultry farm applications (i.e 300m from the their site boundary to be a restricted discretionary activity and 300m from any dwelling/minor dwelling (or other sensitive activity like a sleepout) that is either existing or potentially able to be constructed on neighbouring land. It is almost impossible for a site to be found in the District where the 'Building setback sensitive land use' rule would not affect the establishment/notification of a poultry farm. The submitter was unable to find in Council's Section 32 report for the Rural Zone the justification for a 300m setback.</p>		
FS1265.72	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend rules as per our original submission (833.7).	We support the overall retention of Rule 22.3.7.2 with amendment to point vii to ensure 300m measured from a building where a sensitive land use occurs instead of from the site boundary, to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept in part	
FS1387.956	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	Accept in part	

				<p>be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
FS1338.13	<p>Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd</p>	Support	Null	<p>CPI agrees with the submitter that setbacks should be from the intensive farming activity and not the site boundary. CPI are seeking to amend this rule to have the setback of 300m from the closest point of a building.</p>	Accept in part	
777.13	Radio New Zealand Limited	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Add a new setback requirement to Rule 22.3.7.2 PI (a) Building setback - sensitive land use as follows: (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: ... <del>(x) 800m from the boundary of any radio transmitter owned and operated by Radio New Zealand, as defined in section 2(1) of the Radiocommunications Act 1989.</del></p>	<p>The submitter is concerned with any reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission in terms of its civil defence role. The requested 800m building setback is an effective way of mitigating and avoiding adverse effects.</p>	Reject	
FS1387.1181	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</p>	Reject	

				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
782.15	Jack Macdonald	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback - sensitive land use, by adding text to P1 (a) (iv) and (v) to confirm that the specified separation distances are measured from the identified Aggregate Extraction Area rather than the title boundaries that contain this extraction area OR Amend the definition of 'Aggregate Extraction Area' in Chapter 13: Definitions so that it refers to the consented extraction area, rather than the title boundary of the subject site.	The submitter has stated that some resource consent applications involving an Aggregate Extraction Area have been incorrectly assessed by Council staff and expensive legal opinions have had to be sought in order to confirm how the separation distance is to be calculated.	Reject	
FS1292.80	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	<i>Reject and amend rule as per our original submission (691.20) along with the relief sought by submission point 691.9.</i>	<i>Mineral and aggregate extraction is an important activity that can only occur on sites where the resource is present. Therefore, it is important that sensitive activities be setback appropriately to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. McPherson agree that it is not necessary that the setback be measured from the boundary of the title. However, given the importance of the industry, it is appropriate that sensitive land uses be setback from the boundary of the identified Aggregate Extraction Area overlay to provide for new extraction activities and expansion of existing activities. Furthermore, the protection provided by a setback should be applied to existing extraction activities that are not within the Aggregate Extraction Area. It is noted that the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay has not been applied to McPherson's existing quarry operations. This relief is sought as per submission point 691.9.</i>	Reject	
FS1387.1233	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</i>	Accept	

				framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1319.35	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Oppose	Seek that the submission point be rejected.	In line with NZS's original submission point 827.37. NZS supports the proposed building setback from the Aggregate Extraction Area and considers the application of this standard is clear/does not require amending.	Accept	
FS1334.83	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend the Rule as per our original submission point 575.21.	Mineral and aggregate extraction is an important activity that can only occur on sites where the resource is present. Therefore, it is important that sensitive activities be setback appropriately to avoid reverse sensitivity effects. Fulton Hogan agree that it is not necessary that the setback be measured from the boundary of the title. However, given the importance of the industry, it is appropriate that sensitive land uses be setback from the boundary of the identified Aggregate Extraction Area overlay to provide for new extraction activities and expansion of existing activities. Furthermore, the protection provided by a setback should be applied to existing extraction activities that are not within the Aggregate Extraction Area.	Accept	
782.16	Jack Macdonald	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 P1 (a)(vii) Building setback - sensitive land use, as follows: (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: ... (vii) 300m from the <u>actual</u> boundary of another site containing an intensive farming activity;	This rule needs to be clarified so that the 300m buffer distance applies to the intensive farming activity rather than the boundary of a title that contains that activity. For example, an intensive farming activity may be located at one end of a very large site. It would then be unfair to require an owner of an opposite property, which may be several hundred metres away, to locate their buildings at least 300m from the site that contains the intensive farming activity.	Accept	

FS1265.73	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with changes as per our original submission (833.7).	We agree that it is reasonable that buildings where sensitive land uses occur be set back from intensive farming activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept	
FS1387.1234	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	
797.33	Fonterra Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setbacks sensitive land use, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setbacks sensitive land uses to include the additional locations as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>200m from an identified Coal Mining Area, 300m from the boundary of another site containing a Factory Wastewater Irrigation Farm.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	Supports proposed requirements subject to inclusion of reference to 'Coal Mining Areas' and the Bruntwood Wastewater Irrigation Farm' which are critically important to the continued operation of dairy processing activities.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1273	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	Accept in part	

				framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
821.11	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 PI (a)(vii) Building setbacks - setback land use, as follows: (vii) 300m from the boundary of closest point of a building on another site containing an intensive farming activity;	It is reasonable that a building for a sensitive use should be set back from an intensive farming activity at the same distance as required for buildings used for that farming activity.	Accept	
FS1265.67	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow or the amendment as per submission point 833.7.	We agree that it is reasonable that buildings where sensitive land uses occur be set back from intensive farming activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept	
827.37	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.2(iv) and (v) Building setback sensitive land use	Effectively manages potential reverse sensitivity effects on the site. New Zealand Steel activities are important to the social and economic wellbeing of the district. Considers that this rule appropriately manages the establishment of buildings for sensitive land uses in the vicinity of an Aggregate Extraction Area.	Accept in part	
922.17	John Rowe	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 PI (a)(vii) Building setback - sensitive land use, as follows: (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of: ... (vii) 300m from the actual boundary of another site containing an intensive farming activity;	This rule needs to be clarified so that the 300m buffer distance applies to the intensive farming activity rather than the boundary of a title that contains that activity. For example, an intensive farming activity may be located at one end of a very large site. It would then be unfair to require an owner of an opposite property, which may be several hundred metres away, to locate their buildings at least 300m from the site that contains the intensive farming activity.	Accept	
FS1387.1478	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	Reject	

				is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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 265.74	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with changes as per our original submission (833.7).	We agree that it is reasonable that buildings where sensitive land uses occur be set back from intensive farming activities to avoid reverse sensitivity effects.	Accept	
924.37	Alice Barnett for Genesis Energy Limited	Not Stated	Add a new setback requirement to Rule 22.3.7.2 P1 Building Setback- Sensitive Land Use as follows: (x) <u>500m from the boundary of the Huntly Power Station.</u>	Land surrounding Huntly Power Station is zoned Rural. Huntly Power Station is not listed in P1 and The submitter considers it appropriate for the power station to also be listed.	Reject	
986.54	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback sensitive land use as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <del>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 ... P2 Railway corridor any new buildings or alterations to an existing building must be setback 5 metres from any designated railway corridor boundary</del> OR Retain Rule 22.3.7.2 P1(a)(i) Building setback sensitive land use if the primary relief above is not accepted AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Setting back buildings from the rail corridor boundary is a means of ensuring people's health and wellbeing through good design.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• A setback is</li> </ul>	Accept in part	

				the most efficient method of ensuring intensification does not result in additional safety issues for activities adjacent to the rail corridor, whilst not restricting the ongoing operation and growth of activity within the rail corridor. • The proposed provisions would require any development within the setback to obtain consent with matters of discretion relating to: (i)location, design and use of the proposed building or structure as it relates to the rail network (ii)impacts on the safe operation, maintenance and development of the rail network (iii)construction and maintenance management. • The relief provides for the rejection of the primary relief. This setback applies only to sensitive land use buildings which does not achieve the safety and amenity benefits sought throughout the district.		
FS1033.7	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	
FS1032.7	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.	Accept in part	
FS1031.7	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.	Accept in part	
680.230	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback sensitive land use, as notified, if the changes sought to the definition of "Sensitive land use" are accepted. OR Delete Rule 22.3.7.2 PI (a)(vii) Building setback sensitive land use from the rule. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	The submitter understands the intent of these rules and extends conditional support if the definition of sensitive land use is amended as per their relief sought in an earlier submission. The current definition captures homestay activities which they consider is unduly onerous	Accept in part	



			AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	and unnecessary given the nature of that activity.		
FSI 171.93	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 amendments to Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback for sensitive land use. This submission is supported to the extent that this is consistent with and would achieve the relief sought in T & G Global's submission relating to setbacks for sensitive activities, and in so far as this would ensure that the set back is not applied where the sensitive activity is located on the same site as the farming activity.	Accept in part	
FSI 258.78	Meridian Energy Limited	Not Stated	Allow or disallow to the extent consistent with submission number 580.	Meridian's own submission seeks that additional rules be inserted to require setback of sensitive land use activities and noise sensitive activities from lawfully established large scale wind farms. For that reason, Meridian also has an interest in any amendments to the definitions or other provisions relating to "Sensitive land use".	Accept in part	
697.811	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Add new rules to Rule 22.3.7.2 Building setback - sensitive land use, as follows: <u>22.3.7.2 Building setback - Sensitive land use P2 (a) Any building for a sensitive land use must be set back a minimum of:</u> (i) 10m from the centre line of any electrical distribution or transmission lines, not associated with the National Grid, that operate at a voltage of up to 110kV; (ii) 12m from the centre of line of any electrical distribution or transmission lines, not associated with the National Grid, that operate at a voltage of 110kV or more. P3 (a) Within the National Grid yard, alterations or additions to a building used for an existing sensitive land use must comply with all the following conditions: (i) Not increase the building height or footprint; and (ii) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions; and (iii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless Transpower has given written approval in	This is to replicate the rule regarding sensitive land uses from Chapter 14 into Chapter 22 for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Accept in part	

			<p>accordance with clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 D1 Any building for a sensitive land use that does not comply with Rule 22.3.7.2 P1 or P2. NC1 Any activity within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 22.3.7.2 P3. NC2 Any new building for a sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard NC3 Any change of use of an existing building to a sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard NC4 The establishment of any new sensitive land use within the National Grid Yard</p>			
FS1345.84	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the Waikato District Council submission.	Accept in part	
FS1350.116	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<p>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</p>	<p>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions</p>	Accept in part	

				do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, 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.		
742.229	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.2 PI Building setback sensitive land use, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.2 PI(a)(ii) Building setbacks sensitive land use as follows: <del>15m</del> <u>35m</u> from a national route or regional arterial road; AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 22.3.7.2 but considers that the proposed setback of 25m from the Waikato Expressway has the potential to result in adverse effects on health and wellbeing and reverse sensitivity effects. A setback of 35m from the Waikato Expressway (as per the Operative District Plan) will better avoid reverse sensitivity matters consistent with the policy direction in the Proposed District Plan. The submitter notes 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 in part	
FS1171.114	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	This submission seeks to increase the setback for arterial roads from 15m to 35m and this is opposed to the extent that it could result in a less efficient use of productive land.	Accept in part	
FS1221.4	Cindy and Tony Young	Oppose	Null	35m setback from a national route or regional arterial road for sensitive land uses does not constitute an efficient use of the land resource. The setback of a building from a front boundary has no relationship to the edge of the carriageway from which noise is generated. 15m setback from a national route or regional arterial road for sensitive land uses is adequate in terms of	Accept in part	

				<i>noise, vibration and amenity and does not need to be increased.</i>		
<i>FS1283.4</i>	<i>Parkmere Farms</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Oppose.</i>	<i>35m setback from a national route or regional arterial road for sensitive land uses does not constitute an efficient use of the land resource. The setback of a building from a front boundary has no relationship to the edge of the carriageway from which noise is generated. 15m setback from a national route or regional arterial road for sensitive land uses is adequate in terms of noise, vibration and amenity and does not need to be increased.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1387.896</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<b>Rule 22.1.1 – Prohibited Activities</b>						
<i>330.63</i>	<i>Andrew and Christine Gore</i>	<i>Not Stated</i>	<i>No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.1.1 Prohibited Activities.</i>	<i>No reasons provided.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1386.440</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	

				framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
606.16	Bill Wasley for Future Proof Implementation Committee	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1 Land Use - Activities, by changing the activity status for non-rural activities in the Urban Expansion Area to prohibited.	The Urban Expansion Area has been in place for some time as it reflects the strategic agreement between Waikato District Council and Hamilton City Council. It is important that this land is not compromised through fragmentation or establishment of non-rural activities. The existing prohibited rule therefore needs to be carried over from the Operative Waikato District Plan.	Reject	
FS1131.6	The Village Church Trust	Oppose	Reject the submission point.	Submitter seeks an amendment to Rule 22.1 Land Use - Activities, by changing the activity status for non-rural activities in the Urban Expansion Area to be prohibited. This is opposed because it does not allow people and communities to provide for their social, economic and cultural well-being and is a blunt instrument to achieve the purpose of the RMA. The amendment sought by the submitter would not necessarily achieve best community outcomes.		
FS1157.11	Gordon Downey	Support	Chapter 20 & 21 - d Planning Maps. We support future proofs plans for retention of existing industrial zones but oppose any new, unplanned industrial areas in Waikato District, particularly within the Newstead area as such expansion is not provided for in the Future Proof Strategy or Waikato Regional Policy Statement.	Allow with no amendments to the zoning maps in the Newstead area that would result in land being zoned industrial or equivalent		
FS1223.122	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.		
FS1171.106	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	This submission seeks to prohibit non-rural activities within the urban expansion zone. It is not considered that the use of a prohibited activity status is appropriate for such activities.		
<b>Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities</b>						
452.1	R Mitchell	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submitter opposes Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, and any change or restriction for their old historic title.	The submitter states that the property at 12 Koheroa Road is family land and the permitted activities (i.e. childcare facility and the like) should not change.	Accept in part	
FS1388.322	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	
780.43	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities as notified.	Considers it appropriate that the provisions for Marae and papakāinga are recognised and provided for in the Waikato Proposed District plan as it gives effect to a range of policies. The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (Policy d) The Waikato Regional Policy Statement (Policy 6.4) Future Proof Strategy (Priority 15)	Accept in part	

FS1387.1206	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	
825.43	John Lawson	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities	Considers it appropriate that the provisions for Marae and papakāinga are recognised and provided for in the Waikato Proposed District plan as it gives effect to a range of policies. The New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement 2010 (Policy d) The Waikato Regional Policy Statement (Policy 6.4) Future Proof Strategy (Priority 15)	Accept in part	
FS1387.1328	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	

697.742	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 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	
FS1387.665	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	
676.15	T&G Global Limited	Not Stated	Amend Chapter 22 Rural Zone to clarify that the activities listed as Permitted Activities within Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities include activities ancillary to those specifically provided for. AND Any further or consequential amendments necessary to address the concerns raised in the submission.	The inference is that the provisions are not clear.	Accept	
FS1387.147	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	Reject	



				<i>framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
746.79	The Company	Surveying Neutral/ Amend	Amend Section 22.3 Land use - Building to clarify what buildings are permitted and how this relates to the activities in Rule 22.1- Land Use- Activities. This is to avoid any confusion, particularly in regards to Section 9 of the Resource Management Act.	This rule refers to permitted dwellings and minor dwellings but does not reference other buildings such as accessory buildings (eg garages and sleepouts) to dwellings/minor dwellings. It also does not reference buildings such as milking sheds or greenhouses that are associated with permitted farming activities. It is unclear if section 9 of the RMA applies here in that all buildings not listed under Rule 22.3 are Permitted as they will not contravene a district rule? There is no overriding activity status for any other building not listed in Rule 22.3 like there is under Rule 22.1 Land Use - Activities, so it is assumed that the buildings themselves are all permitted (subject to meeting the other standards in Rule 22.3). It is intended that an industrial or commercial building is a permitted land use in the Rural Zone as long as it meets the other standards in Rule 22.3, noting that the use of the building itself (i.e the industrial use/activity within the building) requires resource consent under Rule 22.1 land Use - Activities.	Accept	
FS1387.952	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</i>	Reject	

				<i>mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
877.16	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3 Land Use - Building to provide clarification around what buildings are permitted and how this relates to the activities in Rule 22.1 Land Use - Activities.	This rule refers to Permitted dwellings and minor dwellings but does not reference other buildings such as accessory buildings (e.g. garages and sleep outs) to dwellings/minor dwellings. It does not reference buildings such as milking sheds or greenhouses that are associated with permitted farming activities. There is no overriding activity status for any other building not listed in Rule 22.3 like there is under Rule 22.1, so it is assumed that the buildings themselves are all permitted. Amendments should be made to avoid any confusion, especially if their understanding of the applicability of Section 9 of the RMA and what Rule 22.3 allows for is incorrect. Submitter questions how an industrial or commercial building is permitted but the use of the building requires resource consent.	Accept	
FS1387.1460	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	

697.741	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22(2) Rural Zone, as follows: The rules that apply to subdivision in the Rural Zone are contained in Rule 22.4 and the relevant rules in 14 Infrastructure and Energy and 15 Natural Hazards and Climate Change (Placeholder).	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	
FS1387.664	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	
Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted activities (P2 – Temporary events)						
877.12	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P2 (a) Permitted Activities to increase temporary event occurrences from three to six times per year.	This would still only allow for an average of one event every two months which is considered to be appropriate given the other standards are complied with (e.g. hours of operation and general noise levels). This is consistent with the Operative District Plan: Franklin Section.	Accept	
FS1306.62	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer	Accept	

				to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.		
FS1308.158	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	The submission aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company.	Accept	
FS1168.67	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	The submitter seeks the addition of new permitted activities to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities consistent with the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan as follows: On Site Primary Produce Manufacturing Pack house and cool store. These activities are appropriate for the Rural Zone as they are associated with farming activities and can be readily expected to establish without the need for resource consent.	Accept	
FS1387.1456	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
746.66	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P2- Permitted Activities to increase event occurrences to 6 times per year.	It is consistent with the Franklin Section of the District Plan. An increase to 6 event occurrences allow for an average of one event every 2 months which is appropriate given other standards (eg hours of operation and general noise levels) are required to be complied with.	Accept	
FS1387.940	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.	Reject	

				<i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FSI306.45	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Accept	
FSI168.66	Horticulture Zealand New	Support	Allow the submission.	The submitter seeks the addition of new permitted activities to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities consistent with the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan as follows: On Site Primary Produce Manufacturing Packhouse and coolstore. These activities are appropriate for the Rural Zone as they are associated with farming activities and can be readily expected to establish without the need for resource consent.	Accept	
742.222	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P2 Permitted Activities 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 in part	
FSI387.895	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	Accept in part	

				<p>how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (P4 – Home occupations)						
680.177	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	<p>Retain Rule 22.1.2 P4 A home occupation, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.</p>	<p>Support is given for the permitted, with conditions, nature of this activity. It provides for small scale diverse business opportunities within the rural zone which can help to sustain a vibrant rural community. Potential noise, vehicle and visual adverse effects should be adequately addressed by the conditions.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1387.193	Mercury NZ Limited	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 in part	
988.1	Graham McBride	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.1.2 P4 Permitted Activities - A home occupation, by adding a rigid maximum coverage limitation for home occupation structures.</p>	<p>There has been an incremental creep of industrial buildings/activity in the Rural Zone. Within Te Kowhai, the cumulative effect from industrial buildings/activity has become noticeable</p>	Accept in part	

				and the rural character is diminished. Currently the maximum building coverage is limited but consent is being granted to go above the maximum, being deemed as having minor effect. The number of oversized structures and associated activity is becoming significant.		
FS1387.1634	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	
697.743	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P4 A home occupation, as follows: ... <del>(d)</del> Unloading and loading of vehicles and/or the receiving of customers or <del>of</del> deliveries only occur after 7:30am and before 7:00pm on any day; <del>(e)</del> Machinery <del>may</del> can only be operated after 7:30am and up to 97pm on any day.	To align the hours for the activity with the noise rule (22.2.1) for this zone.	Accept	
FS1387.666	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	Reject	

				<i>appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
746.67	The Surveying Company	Support	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P4 (b)- Permitted Activities to allow for the storage of materials and machinery outside provided that they are fully screened (not visible) from places off site, including roads and highways.	Some rural properties are large enough and have sufficient on site features to ensure that materials and machinery can be adequately screened. Screening will achieve the same intent as storing them in a building.	Accept in part	
FS1387.941	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	
FS1306.46	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	<i>The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.</i>	Accept in part	
877.13	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P4 (b) Permitted Activities to allow for the storage of materials and machinery outside provided that they are fully screened (not visible) from places off site (including roads and	Condition (b) should allow for the storage of materials and machinery outside provided that they are fully screened from places off site including	Accept in part	



			highways).	roads and highways. Some rural properties are large enough and have sufficient on site features to ensure that materials and machinery can be adequately screened. This will have the same intent as storing them in a building.		
FS1387.1457	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	
FS1306.63	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Accept in part	
FS1308.159	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	The submission aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company.	Accept in part	
<b>Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (P6 and P8 Forestry)</b>						
341.3	Brian Croad for Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P6 Permitted Activities for Afforestation not in an Outstanding Landscape Area.	TGHL supports the provision of these activities in the Rural Zone as a permitted activity subject to meeting all the relevant Rural Zone effect and	Accept in part	

				building conditions. TGHL own and manage a number farming and forestry operations throughout the Waikato District. In enabling farming and forestry activities within the Rural Zone the importance of these primary industries to the economic wellbeing of the Waikato District, wider region and country is appropriately provided for. Retain the 'activity based' structure of the Proposed Plan whereby activity tables establish the status of the activities provided for in a zone. This approach has also reduced the replication of the numerous conditions/performance standards within each zone chapter of the Proposed Plan, compared to the Operative Plan, and has consequently improved readability and provided greater certainty.		
341.15	Brian Croad for Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Not Stated	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P8 Permitted activities for Forestry.	TGHL supports the provision of these activities in the Rural Zone as a permitted activity subject to meeting all the relevant Rural Zone effect and building conditions. TGHL own and manage a number farming and forestry operations throughout the Waikato District. In enabling farming and forestry activities within the Rural Zone the importance of these primary industries to the economic wellbeing of the Waikato District, wider region and country is appropriately provided for. Retain the 'activity based' structure of the Proposed Plan whereby activity tables establish the status of the activities provided for in a zone. This approach has also reduced the replication of the numerous conditions/performance standards within each zone chapter of the Proposed Plan, compared to the Operative Plan, and has consequently improved readability and provided greater certainty.	Accept in part	
680.178	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the activity specific conditions for Rule 22.1.2 P6 Afforestation not in an Outstanding Landscape Area, as follows: Activity specific conditions: Nil-(a) In accordance with Resource	Afforestation in this context means planting and growing plantation forestry trees on land where there is no plantation forestry and where plantation	Accept in part	

			<p><u>Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.</p>	<p>forestry harvesting has not occurred within the last 5 years. Whilst the submitter understands an enabling approach, plantation forestry can cause significant adverse effects on neighbouring properties such as shading and leaf litter and consequential risk of livestock poisoning or disease from some types of trees. Falling trees and branches can also endanger neighbouring properties including damage to fences and other structures. The National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry Regulations 2017 includes permitted activities conditions which are designed to avoid remedy or mitigate some of these adverse effects. P6 should include specific conditions in conjunction with Afforestation activities having permitted activity status.</p>		
FS1387.194	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p><i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i></p>	Accept in part	
680.180	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend the activity specific conditions for Rule 22.1.2 P8 Forestry, as follows: Activity specific conditions: <del>Nil</del>-(a) <u>In accordance with Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) Regulations 2017</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p> <p>AND</p>	<p>Whilst the submitter understands an enabling approach, plantation forestry can cause significant adverse effects on neighbouring properties such as shading and leaf litter and consequential risk of livestock poisoning or disease from some types of trees. Falling trees and branches can also endanger neighbouring properties including damage to fences</p>	Accept in part	

			Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	and other structures. The National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry Regulations 2017 includes permitted activities conditions which are designed to avoid remedy or mitigate some of these adverse effects. P8 should include specific conditions in conjunction with Afforestation activities having permitted activity status.		
986.125	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.1.2 P6 Permitted activities as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): P6 Afforestation not in an Outstanding Landscape Area Activity specific conditions: <u>Non-forestry replanting is setback a minimum of 10m from the rail corridor boundary if it occurs within 5 years after harvesting.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.1.2 P8 Permitted activities as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): P8 Forestry Activity specific conditions: <u>Non-forestry planting is set back a minimum of 10m from any railway corridor</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new restricted discretionary activity to Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary activities as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>Afforestation or forestry not meeting permitted activity criteria</u> Council's discretion is restricted to: <u>Effects on the health, safety and efficiency of the railway corridor</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.</p>	<p>• Both 'Afforestation not in an Outstanding Landscape Area' and 'Forestry' are defined in the Plan and permitted activities in the Rural Zone. • The National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry controls the planting and location of plantation forestry. Under regulation 14 of the Resource Management (National Environmental Standards for Plantation Forestry) (NES) Regulations 2017 an afforestation setback of at least 10m is required from an adjoining property (which includes the railway corridor). Afforestation means planting and growing plantation forestry trees on land where there is no plantation forestry, and where plantation forestry harvesting has not occurred within the last 5 years. This leaves a temporal gap under the NES where the replanting of trees within 5 years of harvest, closer than 10m to the adjoining property (e.g. railway corridor) appears to be permitted. This means that if replanting of a harvested forest occurs within 5 years, trees may be located closer than 10m to a property boundary. There is currently no rule in the Plan controlling this time period. • There are also other forms of forestry which are not covered by the NES – such as woodlots and shelter belts less than 30m wide – which may have a safety impact on transport networks and sightlines. KiwiRail seeks a change to the forestry definition to cover these. • KiwiRail has experienced safety issues with forestry and forest lots being too close to the rail corridor and therefore wish to ensure</p>	Accept in part	

				that a standard setback (consistent with the distance provided the NES) is imposed to reduce potential safety risks.			
697.744	Waikato Council	District	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P6 Afforestation not in an Outstanding Landscape, as follows: Afforestation not in an Outstanding Landscape Area <u>Natural Landscape</u> AND Amend table as follows: <del>Nil</del> (a) For areas less than 1ha.	Reference to Outstanding Landscape Area is incorrect and should refer to "Outstanding Natural Landscape". In addition the NES for plantation forestry covers Afforestation for areas more than 1ha in area. The amendment to include: "for areas less than 1ha" makes the rule clear that it only captures any areas below 1ha.	Accept in part	
FS1387.667	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	
697.745	Waikato Council	District	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P8 Forestry, as follows: <del>Nil</del> (a) For areas less than 1ha.	The NES for plantation forestry covers forestry for areas more than 1ha in area. The amendment to include: "for areas less than 1ha" makes the rule clear that it only captures any areas below 1ha.	Reject	
FS1387.668	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	Accept	

				framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate		
Rule 22.1.4 – Discretionary activities						
680.190	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.5 D15 Discretionary Activities as follows: 22.1.4.5 D15 Afforestation of any part of an Outstanding or Natural Character Area or High Natural Character Area. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The notified rule is unnecessarily restrictive for an activity which could provide positive economic and biodiversity outcomes. The rule prioritises amenity over and above these other important values and as such does not strike the right balance. Further the planning maps do not differentiate between high natural character and natural character areas, this creates uncertainty for plan users and has the potential to capture more areas than intended to be controlled in this manner. The submission corrects the numbering error 22.1.5, which is duplicated for discretionary and non-complying activities.	Accept in part	
81.160	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5 D15 Discretionary Activities to include afforestation of significant natural areas as a discretionary activity.	In the Rural Zone "Afforestation of any part of an Outstanding or Natural Character Area or High Natural Character Area" is a discretionary activity. National Environmental Standard for Plantation Forestry Regulation 12 states that afforestation must not occur within a SNA or an outstanding natural feature or landscape. Regulation 16 (1) states that afforestation is a restricted discretionary activity if regulation 12 cannot be met. Regulation 6 provides certain circumstances in which a rule in a plan can be more stringent than the regulations. These include where a rule gives effect to NZCPS policies 11, 13, 15 and 22 and matters of national importance (Outstanding Natural Feature Landscape and SNA). Given this, it is considered that a discretionary	Accept in part	

				activity status is available and appropriate to ensure that the WRPS and NZCPS are given effect to. However, it is noted that the drafting of D15 should include afforestation as a discretionary activity in SNAs also. As currently drafted it could be considered a permitted activity under 22.1.2 P8.		
341.5	Brian Croad for Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Add to Rule 22.1.5 Discretionary Activities "Permanent Sawmills and Timber Processing Facilities" as a discretionary activity. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The definition of Forestry within Chapter 13 of the Proposed Plan excludes the establishment and/or use of permanent sawmills or other methods of timber processing, and under Rule 22.1.5 (Non-Complying Activities) any activity that is not listed as Prohibited, Permitted, Restricted Discretionary or Discretionary is assessed as a non-complying activity. The specific inclusion of Permanent Sawmills and Timber Processing Facilities such a definition will provide certainty around the activity status for these facilities.	Accept in part	
FS1379.90	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought, as it relates to Hamilton's Area of Interest. The addition of Permanent Sawmills and Timber Processing Facilities into the activities listed in the discretionary activities within Rule 22.1.5 would not be appropriate within HCC's Area of Interest. It is anticipated that this type of activity could lead to inappropriate cross-boundary impacts on Hamilton's infrastructure and could result in reverse sensitivity if located near urban areas.	Accept in part	
Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (P7 Farming and Agricultural and horticultural research)						
419.8	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P7 Farming, as notified.	The submitter supports the provision for farming activities as a permitted activity with no additional specific conditions.	Accept in part	
FS1388.177	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	Accept in part	

				results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1306.6	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Accept in part	
FS1171.11	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	The provision of farming activities as permitted activities within the rural zone is supported in so far as it includes horticultural activities.	Accept in part	
341.14	Brian Croad for Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Not Stated	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P7 Permitted Activities for Farming.	TGHL supports the provision of these activities in the Rural Zone as a permitted activity subject to meeting all the relevant Rural Zone effect and building conditions. TGHL own and manage a number farming and forestry operations throughout the Waikato District. In enabling farming and forestry activities within the Rural Zone the importance of these primary industries to the economic wellbeing of the Waikato District, wider region and country is appropriately provided for. Retain the 'activity based' structure of the Proposed Plan whereby activity tables establish the status of the activities provided for in a zone. This approach has also reduced the replication of the numerous	Accept in part	



				conditions/performance standards within each zone chapter of the Proposed Plan, compared to the Operative Plan, and has consequently improved readability and provided greater certainty.		
466.10	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P7 Farming as notified.	The submitter supports the definition of farming and supports commercial vegetable production being a permitted activity.	Accept in part	
746.68	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain farming as a permitted activity in Rule 22.1.2 P7 Permitted Activities; note that amendments to the definition of "farming" are sought elsewhere in the submission.	The submitter supports Farming as a permitted activity, however, seek to have the definition of farming amended.	Accept in part	
FS1387.942	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	
877.25	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Farming as a permitted activity in Rule 22.1.2 P7 Permitted Activities.	The submitter supports Farming as a permitted activity, however seek to have the definition of farming amended as per their comment under Chapter 13: Definitions.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1465	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</i>	Accept in part	

				framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1306.64	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Accept in part	
FS1308.160	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	The submission aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company.	Accept in part	
680.179	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P7 Farming, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The effects arising from legitimate primary production activities need to be recognised in the District Plan as being appropriate and acceptable, ensuring that primary production is protected from reverse sensitivity. There is no other zone where primary production can occur, so it is vital that it is not marginalised from the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
FS1387.195	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	Accept in part	

				mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
197.17	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P7 Permitted Activities, as notified.	The submitter supports the Permitted Activity status for Farming.	Accept in part	
FS1386.200	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 in part	
30.2	Henk Ensing	Neutral/Amend	Amend the permitted activity provisions to enable exotic vegetation to be cleared at 383 Kakarariki Road, Hamilton	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1386.25	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 in part	

Definitions – Farming

676.5	T&G Global Limited	Not Stated	<p>Retain the definition of "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions in terms of providing for horticultural activities as well as the processing of produce grown on the land, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the definition of "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions to allow for the processing of produce grown on other sites owned or leased by the same owners, and the submitter cites the definition of "On-site Primary Produce Manufacturing" in the Operative Waikato District Plan (Franklin Section) as better reflecting the needs of growers</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the definition of "farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions to ensure that horticultural activities undertaken within greenhouses and shade houses, including hydroponics, are included in the definition.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any further or consequential amendments necessary to address the concerns raised in the submission.</p>	<p>The definition of "On-site Primary Produce Manufacturing" in the Operative District Plan (Waikato section) provides for the more efficient use of resources by reducing the need for dispersed on-site produce manufacturing which can lead to greater environmental impacts across the district. The submitter also seeks clarification within the definition of farming to ensure that horticultural activities undertaken within greenhouses and shade houses are considered as farming activities. While the proposed definition refers to horticulture, it is not specific in whether or not that includes activities undertaken within greenhouses or under shade cover or that may not rely on the soil, for example hydroponics. The existing definition of farming within the Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section refers to horticulture. No corresponding definition of horticulture has been provided within the Proposed Plan. Furthermore, the definition of Intensive Farming provided under the Proposed Plan creates some uncertainty as it specifically includes farming which is not dependent on the fertility of the soils on which the activity is located, including glasshouse production and nurseries. If horticulture activities undertaken under glass house or shade covers are to be considered as intensive farming then this has considerable ramifications in terms of the Rural Zone activity rules as such activities would require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary activity. This cannot be the intended outcome of the Proposed Plan and as this would be a departure from the established rules of the operative Plan the submitter would oppose this outcome.</p>	Accept in part	
FSI 168.95	Horticulture Zealand	New Support	Allow the submission.	The definition of "On-site Primary Produce Manufacturing" in the Operative District	Accept in part	

				<p>Plan (Waikato section) provides for the more efficient use of resources by reducing the need for dispersed on-site produce manufacturing which can lead to greater environmental impacts across the district. The submitter also seeks clarification within the definition of farming to ensure that horticultural activities undertaken within greenhouses and shade houses are considered as farming activities. While the proposed definition refers to horticulture, it is not specific in whether or not that includes activities undertaken within greenhouses or under shade cover or that may not rely on the soil, for example hydroponics. The existing definition of farming within the Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section refers to horticulture. No corresponding definition of horticulture has been provided within the Proposed Plan. Furthermore, the definition of Intensive Farming provided under the Proposed Plan creates some uncertainty as it specifically includes farming which is not dependent on the fertility of the soils on which the activity is located, including glasshouse production and nurseries. If horticulture activities undertaken under glass house or shade covers are to be considered as intensive farming then this has considerable ramifications in terms of the Rural Zone activity rules as such activities would require resource consent as a Restricted Discretionary activity. This cannot be the intended outcome of the Proposed Plan and as this would be a departure from the established rules of the operative Plan the submitter would oppose this outcome.</p>		
FS1387.141	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</p>	Accept in part	

				prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
433.49	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new definition to Chapter 13: Definitions for "productive rural activities".  AND/OR  Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FSI 168.86	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow submission with input from interested parties.	The submitter seeks a definition for productive rural activities as the term is used in the Plan. However no specific wording is sought. While clarification would assist the Plan there needs to be involvement of interested parties in the development of any definition.	Accept in part	
FSI 168.82	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Reject submission.	The submitter seeks a definition for productive rural activities as the term is used in the Plan. However no specific wording is sought. While clarification would assist the Plan there needs to be involvement of interested parties in the development of any definition.	Accept in part	
FSI 223.89	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	Accept in part	

				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
833.1	Phil Page on behalf of Mainland Poultry Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means an agricultural, horticultural or apicultural activity having as its primary purpose the production of any livestock (including poultry or eggs) or crop using the in-situ soil, water and air as the medium for production. It includes...	The definition should include poultry. Poultry do not have adverse effects that are materially different or more adverse than livestock. Delete reference to in-situ soil, which otherwise adds unnecessary complexity.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1353	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	
FS1338.5	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd	Support	Null	Is consistent with the CPI submission that poultry ought to be included in the definition of farming and that 'in situ' ought to be removed.	Accept in part	
877.8	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition for "Farming" in Chapter 13: Definitions to include free-range poultry farming.	Include free-range poultry as part of "farming"	Accept in part	
FS1265.29	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with the changes as per our original submission (833.1).	Support the intent of the submission to acknowledge poultry farming as farming activity, however we consider that the definition should extend to egg production as well.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1454	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	Accept in part	

				land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
197.32	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain the definition of "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions as notified.	The inter-relationship between rural production activities, mixed farming operations and intensive farming must be encapsulated in the higher order rural production issues, objectives and policies.	Accept in part	
FS1386.208	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 in part	
FS1171.1	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	This submission is opposed. This submission seeks to retain the definition of farming as notified. This submission is opposed to the extent that it is not consistent with the amendments to the definition of Farming which have been sought in T & G Global's submission.	Accept in part	



341.11	Brian Croad for Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions as follows: Means an agricultural, horticultural or apicultural activity having as its primary purpose the production of any livestock or crop using the in-situ soil, water and air as the medium for production. It includes: <u>Ancillary buildings and structures such as barns and dairy sheds;</u> Ancillary produce stalls; Processing of farm produce grown on the land, such as cutting, cleaning, grading, chilling, freezing, packaging and storage AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The relief sought will provide clarity that ancillary buildings and structures associated with farming operations fall within this activity.	Accept in part	
FS1171.4	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission amends the definition of farming to include ancillary buildings and structures. This submission is supported in so far as it is consistent with T & G Global's submission seeking that the Proposed Plan should clarify that permitted activities should include those activities ancillary to those activities specifically provided for.	Accept in part	
FS1340.44	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 341.11 which seeks to include facilities that are often required to support farming practices which will occur in the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
FS1342.61	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 341.11, and extend the inclusions in the amended wording to include other typical farm buildings.	FFNZ supports the amendment. It will provide clarity that ancillary buildings and structures associated with farming operations fall within this activity.	Accept in part	
419.120	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Delete the term "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions, and replace with the term "Primary production" as follows: Primary production <u>Means (a) any agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, forestry or aquaculture activities for the purpose of commercial gain or exchange; and (b) includes any land and auxiliary buildings used for the production of the products, including storing, washing and packing of product for market, that result from the listed activities; but (c) does not include processing of those products into a different product.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan by replacing all uses of the term "farming" with "primary production" OR Amend the definition of "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means an agricultural,	The Draft National Planning Standards has a definition for "primary production". The submitter prefers the use of the term "primary production" and seeks that all references to farming be amended to primary production. Alternatively, the submitter seeks that the definitions of "farming" is amended to include indoor horticulture.	Accept in part	

			horticultural or apicultural activity having as its primary purpose the production of any livestock or crop using the in-situ soil, water and air as the medium for production, <u>or the indoor production of plants</u> . It includes: (a) Ancillary produce stalls; (b) Processing of farm produce grown on the land, such as cutting, cleaning, grading, chilling, freezing, packaging and storage. (c) Greenhouses AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.			
FS1171.55	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission seeks to replace the definition of farming with the proposed definition of primary production. This definition includes any horticultural activity for the purpose of commercial gain or exchange. This submission is supported in so far as it is consistent with the relief sought in T & G Global's submission which sought an amendment to the definition of farming.	Accept in part	
FS1340.55	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports the submission in principle subject to amendments to drafting.	Accept in part	
680.134	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Add to the definition of "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions, a new clause (c) as follows: (c) Ancillary Rural Earthworks AND Any consequential amendments needed to give effect to this relief.	Ancillary Rural Earthworks should be included in the list of activities included in the definition of Farming, consistent with our relief sought in relation to the definition of Ancillary Rural Earthworks.	Accept in part	
FS1168.96	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Seeks that Ancillary Rural Earthworks should be included in the list of activities included in the definition of Farming.	Accept in part	
FS1275.10	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Not Stated	Disallow and amend definition to in part incorporate Primary Production as defined in NPS.	Perhaps the definition of 'farming' could better align with the National Planning Standards on 'Primary Production', but note that 'farming' (rather than intensive farming or factory farming) uses the in-situ soil etc for its medium of production.	Accept in part	
FS1387.188	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	Accept in part	

				framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
697.385	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Farming" as follows: Means an agricultural, horticultural or apicultural activity having as its primary purpose the production of any livestock or crop using the in-situ soil, water and or air as the medium for production. It includes: (a) <del>Ancillary produce stalls;</del> (b) Processing of farm produce grown on the land, such as cutting, cleaning, grading, chilling, freezing, packaging and storage. (c) <del>loading areas for helicopters and airstrips for top dressing and spraying. It excludes intensive farming.</del>	There is significant overlap between the definition of "farming" and "rural industry", with a single activity potentially being covered by both terms with different activity statuses. The processing of produce is retained in the definition of "farming" and recognises that produce may not be grown on the land. The definition is expanded to include loading areas for helicopters and airstrips for top dressing and spraying. For clarity the definition needs to recognise that intensive farming is a separate activity.	Accept in part	
FS1338.4	Combined Poultry Industry on behalf of The Poultry Industry Association of NZ; Inghams Enterprises (NZ) Ltd; Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of NZ; and Tegel Foods Ltd	Support		The amended wording proposed by WDC recognises that farming has a variety of forms and not all rely on the in-situ soils as a medium for production. The submitter considers the CPI submission proposed a preferred version of the Farming definition.	Accept in part	
FS1374.3	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Oppose		The definition for farming should be consistent with the National Planning Standard for Primary Production: means; Any aquaculture, agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, mining, quarrying or forestry activities; and Includes initial processing, as an ancillary activity, of commodities that result from the listed activities in a); Includes any land and buildings used for the production of the commodities from a) and used for the initial processing of the commodities in b); but Excludes further processing of those commodities into a different product.	Accept in part	
FS1265.26	Mainland Poultry Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend definition as per our original submission (833.1).	The submission outlines that 'intensive farming' should not be classified as farming. However, we consider that the definition should extend to intensive farming (in	Accept in part	

				particular poultry and egg production) as they are all legitimate forms of farming.		
FSI168.117	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Accept in part.	The submitter seeks to amend the definition of farming by adding airstrips for farming activities but exclude intensive farming. HortNZ seeks that the term primary production is used and the definition be that in the National Planning Standards.	Accept in part	
FSI171100	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 amendments to the definition of farming. This submission is supported in so far as it acknowledges the matters raised in T & G Global's original submission, with respect to processing of farm produce that may be grown on land owned by the same landowner.	Accept in part	
FSI340.126	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose	The submitter opposes submission 697.385 as Ancillary produce stalls should be able to occur in collaboration with farming activities.	Accept in part	
FSI342.180	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 697.385. Support is extended to the proposed amendments with the inclusion of our original submission on this point.	Support is extended to the proposed amendments with the inclusion of our original submission on this point.	Accept in part	
FSI387.554	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	
821.1	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Farming" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means an agricultural, horticultural or apicultural activity having as its primary purpose the production of any livestock, (including ranging poultry) or crop using the in-situ soil, water and air as the medium for production...	Wishes to have ranging poultry as permitted livestock. Poultry have access to outdoor areas and should be similarly treated to other farmed animals. The reference to "in-situ" is irrelevant to whether it is farming if the animal is farmed on soil that has fertiliser or some other additive.	Accept in part	

FS1317.7	Quinn Haven Investments Limited and M & S Draper	Oppose		The effects of free-range chicken farming can be significant and are not akin to traditional farming (dairy, sheep) predominantly due to the density of chickens on that land. This density can result in adverse noise, smell and dust effects on neighbouring sites, where such effects are made worse when abutting a zone that is not rural as well. Free range poultry farming is still an intensive use of land and should remain as being defined as intensive farming.	Accept in part	
FS1265.28	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow in part with the changes as per our original submission (833.1).	Support the intent of the submission which acknowledges that poultry should be included as permitted livestock; however we consider that the definition should extend to all poultry and egg production. Also support the removal of "in situ soil" from the definition.	Accept in part	
Definition – Horticultural Activity						
695.66	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a definition for "Horticultural Activity" to Chapter 13 Definitions.	There should be a definition of "Horticultural Activity".	Reject	
FS1387.320	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	
FS1342.176	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 695.66.	It is difficult to determine the merits of the submission point as no wording is included and no reasoning given as to why a definition is required.	Accept	
FS1168.98	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Seeks to add a definition for "Horticultural Activity" to Chapter 13 Definitions. There	Reject	

				should be a definition of "Horticultural Activity".		
<b>Definition - Greenhouse</b>						
419.122	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a definition for "Greenhouse" to Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: <u>Greenhouses are a totally enclosed structure where plants are grown in a controlled environment.</u>  AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	No reasons provided.	Reject	
FS1388.228	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	
<b>Definitions – Packhouse</b>						
746.16	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Add a new definition for "Packhouse" in Chapter 13: Definitions as per the Operative Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	No reasons provided.	Reject	
877.5	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/Amend	Add to Chapter 13: Definitions a separate definition for "Packhouse" as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	There needs to be a separate definition for this as it was in the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan	Reject	
FS1387.1451	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	Accept	

				considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (P6 Produce stall)</b>						
746.72	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain produce stalls as a permitted activity in Rule 22.1.2 P9 Permitted Activities as notified; note that amendments to the definition of "Produce Stall" are sought elsewhere in the submission.	The submitter supports Produce Stalls as a permitted activity, however, seek to have the definition of produce stall amended.	Accept	
FS1387.945	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	
877.28	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P9 Permitted Activities to enable Produce Stalls as a Permitted Activity.	The submitters support Produce Stalls as a permitted activity, however seek to have the definition of Produce Stall amended as per their comment under Chapter 13: Definitions.	Accept	
FS1308.163	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	The submission aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company.	Accept	
FS1306.67	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are	Accept	

				compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.		
FS1387.1468	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	
680.181	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P9 Produce stall, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Support is given for the permitted nature of this activity with no specific conditions – it is important the district plan does not place unnecessary compliance burdens on these minor and beneficial activities. Produce stalls are an opportunity for consumers to purchase produce that was picked that morning; was grown locally; to meet the grower or farmer; and for a price that does not include packaging, storage or transport. Produce stalls contribute to rural amenity and allow consumers to experience the primary production purpose of the rural zone.	Accept	
FS1387.196	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	Reject	



				how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
<b>Definitions – Produce stall</b>						
746.21	The Surveying Company	Support	Amend the definition of "Produce stall" in Chapter 13: Definitions to include the sale of farm and garden produce grown or produced on a site owned by the same landholder.	There can be multiple sites either side by side or throughout the District that may be owned by the same person and therefore it makes sense for this landowner to sell produce from their stall that is grown on other land that they own.	Accept	
877.11	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition for "Produce Stall" in Chapter 13: Definitions to include the sale of farm and garden produce grown or produced on a site owned by the same landowner.	This definition should include the sale of farm and garden produce grown or produced on a site owned by the same landholder. There can be multiple sites side-by-side or throughout the District that may be owned by the same person and therefore it makes sense for this landowner to sell produce from their stall that is grown on other land that they own.	Accept	
<b>Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted activities (PI0 Home stay and D10 – Travellers Accommodation)</b>						
680.182	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 PI0 Home stay, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Support is given for the permitted nature of this activity. It provides for small scale diverse business opportunities within the rural zone which can help to sustain a vibrant rural community and district.	Accept in part	
FS1387.197	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the	Accept in part	

				<i>results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
780.23	John Lawson (Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated on behalf of Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Incorporated Society	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P10 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.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1199	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	
435.14	Jade Hyslop	Oppose	Amend Home stay provisions in Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, to provide for registration of Homestay or Visitor accommodation.	Raglan needs a plan similar to Queenstown 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.	Accept in part	
FS1388.259	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood</i>	Accept in part	

				<p>provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
825.23	John Lawson	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P10 Permitted Activities to provide for the registration of Homestay or Visitor accommodation.	<p>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.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1387.1322	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 in part	

831.81	Gabrielle Parson on behalf of Raglan Naturally	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 D10 Discretionary 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.	Accept in part	
FS1276.254	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point is 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 its essential jobs.	Accept in part	
788.4	Susan Hall	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P10 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.	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	Accept in part	

				easier to ban the use of new houses or new ownership from short-term rental use than retrospectively introducing this to those already relying on the income (as long as these existing house stick to the under five-person rule.) It should be possible for neighbours to complain if guest numbers and/or noise gets out of hand in a country living property as well.		
FS1276.249	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of 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.	Accept in part	
697.746	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 P10 Homestay, as follows: (a) Home stay for up to 4 people	A homestay activity has been provided for as a Discretionary Activity for more than 5 people. This amendment makes it clear that the activity is permitted for up to 4 people.	Accept in part	
FS1387.669	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	
697.747	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 22.1.2 P13 Travellers Accommodation as follows: Travellers Accommodation for up to 5 people "Nil" Conditions	Travellers' Accommodation has been provided for as a Discretionary Activity for more than 5 people. This amendment makes it clear that the activity is permitted for up to 4 people.	Accept in part	
FS1302.5	Mercer Airport	Support	Mercer support the submission point 697.747 and seek that the submission point is allowed.	Clarifies the permitted activities relating to traveller's accommodation.	Accept in part	
FS1308.111	The Surveying Company	Support		Travellers' Accommodation has been provided for as a Discretionary Activity for more than 5 people. The amendment makes	Accept in part	

				it clear that the activity is permitted for up to 5 people.		
FS1340.132	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports in part submission 697.747 as providing quantification of how many people the permitted travellers' accommodation rule provides for provides rule clarity. However, the submitter is of the opinion that more than 5 people should be included in the permitted rule for travellers' accommodation. Travellers' accommodation accommodating just 5 people cannot be considered as travellers' accommodation due to its scale.	Accept in part	
FS1387.670	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	
471.49	Andrew Wood for CKL	Neutral/ Amend	Add "travellers' accommodation for less than 5 people" as a permitted activity to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Retain consistency with the Operative District Plan. Rule 22.1.5 D5 lists "travellers' accommodation for more than 5 people".	Accept in part	
FS1388.466	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	Accept in part	

				framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1306.9	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Accept in part	
FS1302.8	Mercer Airport	Support	Mercer Airport support submission point 471.49 and seek that the submission point is allowed.	Clarifies the permitted activities relating to traveller's accommodation.	Accept in part	
<b>Rule 22.1.4 – Discretionary Activities</b>						
697.756	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 22.1.5 new D17 Discretionary Activities, as follows: <u>Homestay for 4 or more people.</u>	A homestay activity has been provided for as a permitted activity, which has also been proposed to be amended to include provision for up to 4 people. However for clarity, homestay for 5 or more people needs to be provided as a Discretionary activity.	Accept in part	
FS1387.679	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	Accept in part	

				mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (P11 Equestrian Centres and P12 – Horse Training Centres)						
696.4	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P11 Permitted Activities (Equestrian Centre).	Equestrian centres are appropriate in the Rural Zone. They generate less effects than farming activities.	Accept in part	
FS1387.381	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	
696.11	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P12 Permitted Activities (Horse Training Centre)	Horse training centres are appropriate in the Rural Zone. They generate lesser effects than farming activities.	Accept in part	
680.183	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P11 Equestrian centre, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Support is given for the permitted nature of this activity. It provides for diverse opportunities for businesses reliant on land within the rural zone, which can help to sustain a vibrant rural community and district.	Accept in part	
FS1308.94	The Surveying Company	Support		Equestrian centres provide for diverse opportunities for businesses reliant on land within the rural zone, which can help to sustain a vibrant rural community and district.	Accept in part	
FS1387.198	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	Accept in part	



				<i>how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
680.184	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.2 P12 Horse training centre, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Support is given for the permitted nature of this activity. It provides for diverse opportunities for businesses reliant on land within the rural zone, which can help to sustain a vibrant rural community and district.	Accept in part	
FS1308.95	The Surveying Company	Support		<i>Horse training centres provide for diverse opportunities for businesses reliant on land within the rural zone, which can help to sustain a vibrant rural community and district.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1387.199	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	

Definitions – Horse training centre

697.393	Waikato Council	District	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition of "Horse training centre" as follows: Means facilities for the housing and training of <del>thoroughbred and Standardbred</del> horses, and usually involves some form of <u>includes training tracks and arenas (both indoor and outdoor)</u> , but does not...	The definition should not be specific to any particular breed and include arenas (both indoor and outdoor).	Accept	
Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (Residential activities)							
697.748	Waikato Council	District	Neutral/Amend	Add to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities P14, as follows: <u>Residential Activity Nil</u> (Conditions)	Residential Activity in the Rural Zone needs to be provided for as a permitted activity.	Accept	
FS1345.85	Genesis Energy Limited		Not Stated	Accept submission point in part.	Genesis agrees that a residential activity needs to be listed in the "permitted activities" in the Rural Zone. However, Genesis considers that it would be prudent to include appropriate setbacks (as a standard) for residential activities from the boundary of existing industrial activities to reduce the potential for reverse sensitivity issues.	Accept in part	
FS1379.273	Hamilton City Council		Oppose		The relief sought would add allow for Residential Activities in the Rural Zone. If Retirement Villages are added to the definition of Residential Activities (as sought by sub 761.13), the consequential result would be that Retirement villages are permitted in the Rural Zone. HCC opposes this outcome, which would undermine the intent of the Rural Zone and direct growth to rural areas.	Reject	
FS1387.671	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	

				<i>risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
943.21	McCracken Surveys Limited		Add "Residential activity" as a Permitted activity to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities.		Accept	
FS1387.1571	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D		Oppose submission 943.21		Reject	
471.48	Andrew Wood for CKL		Add "residential activity" as a permitted activity to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.		Accept	
FS1388.465	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E		Oppose submission 471.48		Reject	
<b>Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (Child care, education, health and spiritual activities)</b>						
259.2	Wendy Rowell for Pokeno Playcentre	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities by adding childcare facility as a permitted activity.	ECE confers large benefit to the young, growing Pokeno community. It is appropriate for ECEs to be in the Residential Zone where people live. An ECE will not have adverse effects on residential and recreational activities. The only zone where the proposed plan permits ECEs is the Business Zone. In Pokeno this is a very limited area where pick up /drop offs will be dangerous. Wish to develop a site for the Pokeno playcentre, which we will lose due to the Pokeno school expansion.	Accept in part	
FS1386.260	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept in part	

				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
596.2	Raewyn Detmar on behalf of Pokeno Playcentre	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, to add a Child Care facility as a permitted activity.	Supports a play centre being in close vicinity to homes. Does not support childcare centres being in amongst commercial buildings as per the current rules.	Accept in part	
FS1388.1004	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1379.201	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>HCC opposes the amendment of childcare from a discretionary activity to a permitted activity in the Rural Zone. 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 and compromise future urban development.</i>	Accept in part	
617.2	Nicole Falkner for Pokeno Playcentre	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, by adding childcare facility as a permitted activity.	Early childhood education provides a large benefit to the young, growing community of Pokeno. Appropriate for early childcare education centres to be located in Residential Zone, close to where people reside. Will not have adverse effects on recreational activities. Only zone permitting early childcare education centres is the Business Zone, however the area is limited resulting in	Accept in part	

				dangerous pickups/drop offs. Losing current site due to expansion of school.		
FS1379.214	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the inclusion of childcare as a permitted activity in the Rural Zone to ensure that land use within the Area of Interest is controlled to avoid inefficient use of land and infrastructure and non-rural land uses. 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 and compromise future urban development.	Accept in part	
FS1387.12	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	
607.2	Stephanie Hooper	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities by adding childcare facility as a permitted activity.	Pokeno Playcentre is due to lose its facility as Pokeno School is reclaiming the land for expansion. Early childcare education allows great benefits for preschools and families within the Pokeno community. The Plan permits that early childcare education is in the Business Zone only. Within the Business Zone adds further risk to children on the road during drop offs and pick up times.	Accept in part	
FS1379.211	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the inclusion of childcare as a permitted activity in the Rural Zone. Land use within the Area of Interest should be controlled to avoid inefficient use of land and	Accept in part	

				<p>infrastructure and non-rural land uses. 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 and compromise future urban development.</p>		
FS1387.2	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 in part	
696.3	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Neutral /Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, to include small scale childcare as a permitted activity.	<p>Small-scale childcare offers a vital social service to the community. Small-scale childcare has no effects greater than a large family. This activity is appropriate in the Rural Zone and will not undermine the rural character. Inclusion of childcare as a separate activity will clarify the distinction between home occupations (which are permitted) and education facility (which currently requires a consent as a discretionary activity).</p>	Accept in part	
FS1387.380	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p>	Accept in part	

				<i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
654.1	Ngaakau Tapatahi Trust	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities to enable "health facilities" as a Permitted Activity on land legally described as Lot 1 DPS 13189 (104A Duncan Road, Tamahere); OR Amend the zoning of Lot 1 DPS 13189 (104A Duncan Road, Tamahere) from the Rural Zone to Business Zone and any other amendments to provide relief sought in submission.	Tamahere Hospital and Healing Centre (Tamahere Hospital) is sited on approximately 3.8 ha of culturally historic whenua in the heart of Ngaati Haua, between Cambridge and Hamilton. Hospital delivers services from a kaupapa Maori perspective but also provide services to accommodate individuals seeking an alternative health approach. Subsequent to its initial construction, Ngaakau Tapatahi Trust, applied for, and obtained, multiple resource consents to accommodate the hospital's expansion. Consents were triggered because the hospital exceeded the maximum site coverage permitted in the Rural Zone (2% of the site area, or 500m2, whichever is the larger, and/or because non-residential buildings are limited to a maximum of 400m2 (hospital is already around 1400m2). Thus any form of physical development will trigger a resource consent requirement, irrespective of whether the hospital operates in accordance with original consent conditions. Recurring need for consents indicates Rural Zone provisions are not conducive to sustainable management of the facility. Inability to avoid RMA consent triggers is time-consuming and costly. The nature of the hospital's treatment philosophy means overdevelopment is not supported by the Trust excessive development would not eventuate. Requested change is consistent with purpose of RMA and ensures a physical	Accept in part	

				resource, set aside for health care purposes, can meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future patients.		
FS1277.139	Waikato Regional Council	Oppose	Oppose in part. Consider including site specific provisions for this site to enable the ongoing use and expansion of the hospital located at Lot 1 DPS 13189 (104A Duncan Road, Tamahere).	A business zone in this location is not supported as it is an isolated site surrounded by rural land and this opens the site up to a range of commercial activities should the hospital use of the site ceases. WRC has no objection to inserting site specific provisions for this site to enable the ongoing use and expansion of the site for a hospital.	Accept in part	
FS1379.220	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes both the inclusion of Health Facilities as a permitted activity in the Rural Zone, or rezoning land in Tamahere from Rural Zone to Business Zone. HCC wants to ensure that land use within the Area of Interest is controlled and enabled at a rate that is consistent with and prioritises strategic land use plans and urban growth strategies including avoidance of urban sprawl, inefficient use of land and infrastructure and non-rural land uses. 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 and compromise future urban development.	Accept in part	
373.1	Andrew Hutchison for The Church in Hamilton	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, to include religious gatherings under 150 people with a maximum vehicle movement condition of 200 vehicles per day.	There are already religious gatherings occurring in the zone. Such gatherings do not cause any disturbance to traffic or cause any other disturbance.	Accept in part	
FS1388.9	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	Accept in part	



				mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
Rule 22.1.3 - Restricted Discretionary Activities						
781.27	Ministry of Education	Neutral/ Amend	Delete Rule 22.1.5 D6 Discretionary Activities relating to an education facility. AND Amend Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities as follows: Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities (1) The activities listed below are restricted discretionary activities (2) <u>Discretion to grant or decline consent and impose conditions is restricted to the matters of discretion set out in the following table: Activity RD3 Education facilities Council's discretion shall be restricted to the following matters: The extent to which it is necessary to locate the activity within the Rural Zone. Reverse sensitivity effects of adjacent activities. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the streetscape. The extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the noise environment.</u>	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. Submitter requests consistency with their requested definition of 'Education facilities'.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1225	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	
FS1379.320	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	While HCC supports the work by the Ministry of Education to provide	Accept in part	

				appropriately planned schools for existing and future communities, it is noted the definition of education facilities is very broad, including childcare facilities and specialised training facilities. Given the broad range of uses potentially provided for, HCC opposes the change of activity status of education facilities from discretionary to restricted discretionary activities within the Rural Zone. Key purposes of the Rural Zone include protecting the productive nature of the land and ensuring 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.		
FS1345.132	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Genesis considers that Discretionary Activity status is more appropriate for education facilities within the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
FS1202.86	New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Support submission point 781.27.	The Transport Agency supports the inclusion of c. the extent to which the activity may adversely impact on the transport network.	Accept in part	
<b>Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (Rural commercial)</b>						
330.145	Andrew and Christine Gore	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, to include agribusiness activities.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1306.3	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities	Accept in part	
FS1379.84	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC is unsure what the definition of 'agribusiness activities' is, and accordingly opposes the request to allow for these to be permitted activities within the Rural Zone Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, in relation to the UEA and HCC's Area of Interest.	Accept in part	

FS1386.410	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 in part	
746.76	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Add new Restricted Discretionary Activities to Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities for small-scale commercial / retail activities that may be ancillary to rural activities occurring on the site e.g. Rural commercial services that support rural production activities; Small scale commercial activities ancillary to a primary rural activity, such as cafes on berry picking farms; Tourism activities and ancillary commercial or food and beverage activities; Small wedding venues; Veterinary Clinics; Boarding Kennels and Catteries; Care Centres (less than 10 people);	Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan definition and provisions for similar activities. The Plan fails to provide opportunities for small scale commercial/retail activities that may be ancillary to rural activities. There are a range of small scale activities that support the rural economy and can be appropriately accommodated in the Rural Zone. For example, the District has tourism opportunities which rural land owners may want to draw upon however the Plan makes no provision for. Changing the Plan to allow for some more Restricted Discretionary Activities will give more clarity around the types of non-productive activities that may be acceptable in the Rural Zone and are reasonably expected to locate in this area.	Accept in part	
FS1379.293	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	The submission seeks Restricted Discretionary provisions for small scale commercial/retail activities ancillary to rural activities occurring on the site. HCC supports the reasoning behind this submission, as small-scale shops and cafes that are ancillary to the main use can be appropriate. However, HCC opposes the submission, as	Accept in part	

				there is not sufficient detail around the scale of the commercial activities.		
FS1348.24	Perry International Trading Group Limited	Support	Null	PITGL supports the amendment to the Proposed District Plan to make provision for activities ancillary to rural activities. PITGL recommends the following ancillary activities should be provided for in the Rural Zone, but considers that they should be a permitted activity subject to appropriate standards rather than a restricted discretionary activity: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administration offices,</li> <li>• Worker accommodation,</li> <li>• Related construction and repair activity,</li> <li>• Storage of product and equipment,</li> <li>• Laboratory,</li> <li>• Production/packing plant,</li> <li>• Small scale commercial activities ancillary to a primary rural activity,</li> <li>• Visitor centre, a visitor experience, and facilities to cater to tourists.</li> </ul> The above list reflects a proposal being planned by PITGL for such an activity in the Te Kowhai location.	Accept in part	
FS1306.52	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Accept in part	
FS1387.949	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	Accept in part	

				<i>framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
330.144	Andrew and Christine Gore	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, to include veterinary activities.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1306.2	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	<i>The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1379.83	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		<i>HCC opposes the amendment to Rural Zone Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, as they relate to the UEA. Uses in the UEA should be rural, and commercial activities should be tightly controlled. Commercial activities are better directed to towns.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1386.409	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</i>	Accept in part	

				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>Rule 22.1.3 – Restricted Discretionary Activities</b>						
877.14	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	Add small scale commercial/retail activities that may be ancillary to rural activities occurring on the site to Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities. The submission refers to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition and provision for similar activities. Examples include the following: Rural commercial services that support rural production activities; Small scale commercial activities ancillary to a primary rural activity, such as cafes on berry picking farms. Tourism activities and ancillary commercial or food and beverage activities, Small wedding venues Veterinary Clinics Boarding Kennels and Catteries Care Centres (less than ten people).	The Plan fails to provide opportunities for small-scale commercial/retail activities that may be ancillary to rural activities occurring on the site. These are examples of activities that should be provided in limited capacity in the Rural Zone. There are a range of small-scale activities that may support the rural economy and can be appropriately accommodated in the Rural Zone. For example, the District has some great tourism opportunities which rural landowners may want to draw upon however the Plan makes no provision for. Changing the Plan to allow for some more Restricted Discretionary Activities will give more clarity around the types of non-productive activities that may be acceptable in the Rural Zone and a reasonable expected to locate in this area.	Accept in part	
FS1348.28	Perry International Trading Group Limited	Support	Null	<i>PITGL supports the amendment to the Proposed District Plan to make provision for activities ancillary to rural activities. However PITGL considers that the following ancillary activities should be a permitted activity subject to appropriate standards rather than a restricted discretionary activity:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Administration offices,</li> <li>• Worker accommodation,</li> <li>• Related construction and repair activity,</li> <li>• Storage of product and equipment,</li> <li>• Laboratory,</li> <li>• Production/packing plant,</li> <li>• Small scale commercial activities ancillary to a primary rural activity,</li> <li>• Visitor centre, a visitor experience, and facilities to cater to tourists.</li> </ul> <i>The above list reflects a proposal being planned by PITGL for such an activity in the Te Kowhai location.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1308.164	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<i>The submission aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1379.359	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>The submission seeks Restriction Discretionary provisions for small-scale commercial/retail activities ancillary to rural</i>	Accept in part	

				activities. HCC supports the reasoning behind this submission, as small-scale shops and cafes which are ancillary to the main use can be appropriate. However, HCC opposes the submission, as there is not sufficient detail around the scale of the commercial activities.		
FS1340.190	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports submission 877.14. Those activities sought to be added to Rule 22.1.3 are typical of rural areas and should be specifically provided for. If these activities are not specified then they fall to non-complying and this is not considered appropriate given the nature of the activities. The submitter notes however that with the addition of these activities there will be a need to add matters of discretion from which Council will assess a resource consent application.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1458	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	
<b>Definitions – Farm Visiting</b>						
746.15	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Add a new definition for "Farming Visit" to Chapter 13: Definitions as per the Operative Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	No reasons given.	Reject	
FS1387.914	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	Accept	

				how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
877.4	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	Add to Chapter 13: Definitions a separate definition for "Farming Visit" as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	There needs to be a separate definition for this as it was in the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan	Reject	
FS1387.1450	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (Rural industry)</b>						
746.70	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Add five new permitted activities to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities consistent with the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan as follows: <u>On Site Primary Produce Manufacturing Farming Visit Public Garden Packhouse and coolstore Farmers' market (meeting certain performance standards).</u>	There needs to be greater scope for Permitted Activities. These activities are appropriate for the Rural Zone as they are associated with farming activities and can be readily expected to establish without the need for resource consent.	Reject	
FS1306.48	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to	Reject	



				<p>con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.</p>		
877.27	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Add the following activities to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities: <u>On Site Primary Produce Manufacturing Farming Visit, Public Garden Packhouse and coolstore Farmers' market (meeting certain performance standards)</u></p>	<p>There needs to be greater scope in the Permitted Activity table to allow for these activities as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan These activities are appropriate for the Rural Zone as they are associated with farming activities and can be readily expected to establish without the need for resource consent.</p>	Reject	
FS1387.1467	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept	
FS1308.162	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<p>The submission aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company.</p>	Reject	
FS1306.66	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	<p>The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as</p>	Reject	

				<i>permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.</i>		
680.186	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Not Stated	Add to Rule 22.1.2 a new permitted activity rule for rural contractors' depot, as follows: <u>PXX Rural contractors' depot Activity specific conditions: Nil</u> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Rural contractors' depots present a low risk to the management of rural environments and these should be enabled as a permitted activity in the Rural Zone. Rural contractors' depots are relatively benign, from the perspective of effects on amenity values and quality of the rural environment. They generally present little environmental risk that cannot be managed within an appropriate permitted activity framework. Rural contractors need to co-locate in rural areas where their services are in demand by rural communities. Such facilities augment the social, cultural and economic wellbeing of rural communities. Rural communities tend to be more isolated from access to services than urban communities, and as such should not be subject to additional hardships otherwise caused by intensified isolation if rural contractor's depots are discouraged from being able to co-locate in rural areas where their services are in demand.	Accept in part	
FS1275.14	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Allow - noting that the 'development standards' should be as per other development controls within the Rural zone.	The rural zone is the most appropriate location for Rural Contractor depots. Machinery involved in Rural Contractor operations is often unsuited for travel even moderate distances on public roads and should be located within the community they serve.	Accept in part	
FS1306.43	Hynds Foundation	Support		The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as	Accept in part	

				permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.		
FS1379.234	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		The submission to make rural contractors' depots a permitted activity is opposed. This activity could create cross-boundary impacts that need to be managed. The subsequent investments and land fragmentation also compromise the ability to comprehensively redevelop land for urban purposes, if located in the UEA and wider Area of Interest.	Accept in part	
FS1387.201	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	
Rule 22.1.3 – Restricted discretionary						
402.8	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Oppose	Delete Rural Industry from Rule 22.1.3 RD2 Restricted Discretionary activities AND Add Rural Industry to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	Tuakau Proteins Limited does not consider the rural industry should be classed as Restricted Discretionary Activity in the Rural Zone. Waikato District Council has listed other 'non-rural' activities as Permitted Activities in the Rural Zone, such as forestry, equestrian centres and horse training centres. It is considered that including rural industry as Restricted	Reject	

				Discretionary is inconsistent with Policy 5.3.2.		
FS1388.141	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Oppose submission 402.8	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1379.119	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the change of Rural Industry from a restricted discretionary activity status to a permitted activity status as requested in this submission, within HCC's Area of Interest. Rule 22.1.3 (1) RD2 of the Waikato PDP includes matters of discretion, which are necessary to control the effects of rural industry.	Accept	
691.15	McPherson Resources Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RDI (a) Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Intensive farming and mineral or <u>aggregate extractive industries</u> that meet all of the following conditions: (i) Land Use - Effects in Rule 22.2; [subject to proposed amendments] (ii) Land Use - Building ion Rule 22.3; [subject to proposed amendments] (iii) ... AND Delete Rule 22.1.5 D8 Discretionary Activities. This relief is sought in the event that any part of the submission from point 691.1 to 691.15 is not accepted by WDC. AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	The Operative District Plan (Franklin Section) includes a chapter for aggregate extraction, which classifies aggregate extraction as either of Permitted, Controlled, Restricted Discretionary, and Discretionary, depending on the location of the activity (and the surrounding environment). The Proposed District Plan has dealt with this matter by applying overlays, one for 'Aggregate Extraction Areas' and one for 'Aggregate Resource Areas'. The application of these overlays will provide a certain level of protection for these types of activities (particularly if the changes proposed in these submissions regarding specific regulations for these areas are applied) however, the PDP has excluded the McPherson Quarry from	Accept in part	

				<p>both of these overlays. As a result, the Rural zoning of the McPherson Quarry leaves it without specific protection of its existing (or future) aggregate extraction activities.</p> <p>Rule 22.1.5 would unreasonably limit the ability of the McPhersons to expand their quarry footprint (which is a necessity when the available mineral/aggregate in a certain area has been exhausted) in that any expansion would require a resource consent as a Discretionary Activity. This means that Council has the ability to decline the application. This is unreasonable.</p> <p>The McPherson Quarry has operated from this site for over 60 years and the quarry is very much part of the existing environment. It is inherent in any quarry activity that in order to continue extracting the particular resource/mineral available (in this case aggregate), the footprint needs to expand over time.</p> <p>The extraction of minerals is a regionally significant activity that is protected by the RPS. In that sense, it is imperative that existing operations such as the McPherson Quarry are able to continue operating (and therefore, expand their footprint) as a quarry and that this ability is sufficiently protected by appropriate planning provisions in the Proposed District Plan.</p> <p>Based on the above, the McPhersons submit the proposed changes made to Rules 22.1.3 and 22.1.5 to ensure that extractive industries are identified as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in the Rural Zone.</p>		
FS1198.45	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	Extractive activities that meet the criteria within this rule should be treated as restricted discretionary activities given they are anticipated in this Zone.	Accept in part	
798.31	Ngati Te Ata	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 22.1.3 RD2 Matters of discretion for Rural Industry as follows: (vi) environmental effects.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1290	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	Accept in part	

				<p>available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
419.11	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Retain the restricted discretionary activity status for Rule 22.1.3 RD2 Rural Industry  AND  Delete matter of discretion (a)(iii) waste disposal in Rule 22.1.3 RD2 Rural Industry  OR  Amend matter of discretion (a)(iii) waste disposal in Rule 22.1.3 RD2 Rural Industry to provide more clarity around what waste disposal effects Council is attempting to manage.  AND  Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	<p>The submitter supports the restricted discretionary activity status for a Rural Industry. The submitter is unsure of the use of the term "waste disposal" as it is not defined in the Proposed District Plan. The Proposed District Plan defines "waste management", which includes waste disposal. The outcomes sought are not clear.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1388.180	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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 in part	

697.750	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RD2 Rural Industry, as follows: Rural Industry <u>not</u> in an Urban Expansion Area.	It is a Non-complying activity to undertake certain activities within the Urban Expansion Area. Rural Industry is to be included in the list of non-complying activities, hence the need to provide clarity in this rule.	Accept	
FS1171.105	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	This submission seeks to include rural industry within those activities which are noncomplying within the urban expansion zone. It is considered that a Discretionary activity status may be more appropriate.	Reject	
FS1387.673	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	
341.10	Brian Croad for Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.3 RD2 Restricted Discretionary Activities for Rural Industry.	The matters listed for Council's discretion are more succinct and without the associated list of information requirements (for Intensive Farming) when compared to the Operative Plan. TGHM supports the Proposed Plan's more simplified consenting approach for Intensive Farming and Rural Industry activities.	Accept	
466.11	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.3 RD2 Rural Industry as notified.	The submitter supports the restricted discretionary status for Rural Industry.	Accept in part	
FS1388.404	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	Accept in part	

				<i>is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
FS1308.54	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We support the restricted discretionary status for Rural Industry as they support rural production activities.	Accept in part	
680.188	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.3 RD2 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: RD2 Rural Industry <u>Depot</u> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Rural industry is an integral part of the rural sector, the activities of which are entirely appropriate and consistent with the underlying rural zone. The rule needs to be explicit in the intent which is to manage potential adverse effects of discrete sites or business locations on the surrounding area.	Accept in part	
FS1387.203	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	
<b>Definitions – Rural Industry</b>						
197.15	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain the definition for "Rural Industry" in Chapter 13 Definitions subject to clarifying that rurally	The definition is generally supported subject to clarity that rural located	Accept in part	



			located feedmills and feed manufacturing activities are included in this definition.	feedmills and feed manufacturing activities are included in this definition.		
FS1386.198	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 in part	
402.11	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Confirm the inclusion of rendering in the definition of "Rural Industry" in Chapter 13 Definitions. OR Amend the definition of "Rural Industry" in Chapter 13 Definitions to provide more clarity or examples of what rural industry activities would be. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	It is considered that Tuakau Proteins Limited's operation does fit within the definition of Rural Industry as it written. However, it is requested that Waikato District Council confirm this interpretation. It is acknowledged that the definition is more succinct than the existing definition in the Franklin Section of the plan. Therefore, it is important to ensure that the definition has not become more ambiguous in application.	Accept in part	
FS1388.143	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	Accept in part	

				<i>risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
419.135	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Delete the definition of "Rural Industry" from Chapter 13 Definitions AND Add a new definition for "Rural Industry and Services" to Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: <u>Rural industry and services means an activity undertaken within a rural area where the activity is directly related to rural production activities and includes: facilities for processing, packing and storing primary products and activities which service rural production rural contractors depots post-harvest facilities research facilities</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The proposed definition is too narrow. There are a number of activities which are undertaken within the rural area that support primary production and are appropriately located within rural areas. These supporting activities are critical to the future growth of the wider horticulture industry.	Accept in part	
FS1340.57	TaTa Valley	Support	Support in part.	<i>The proposed definition is too narrow. There are a number of activities which are undertaken within the rural area that support primary production and are appropriately located within rural areas. These supporting activities are critical to the future growth of the wider horticulture industry.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1388.232	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
680.265	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Delete the definition of "Rural Industry" from Chapter 13 Definitions AND	The proposed definition is too narrow. There are a number of activities which are undertaken within the rural area that	Accept in part	

			<p>Add a new definition for "Rural Industry and Services" to Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows:  <u>Rural industry and services means an activity undertaken within a rural area where the activity is directly related to rural production activities and includes: facilities for processing, packing and storing primary products and activities which service rural production rural contractors depots post-harvest facilities research facilities</u>  AND  Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	<p>support primary production and are appropriately located within rural areas. These supporting activities are critical to the future growth of the wider horticulture industry.</p>		
FS1387.232	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Support	Support in part.	<p>The proposed definition is too narrow. There are a number of activities which are undertaken within the rural area that support primary production and are appropriately located within rural areas. These supporting activities are critical to the future growth of the wider horticulture industry.</p>	Accept in part	
697.506	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend the definition for "Rural industry" as follows:  <del>Means an industry that involves the direct handling or processing to the first stage of manufacture of any raw produce harvested from farming, rural contractors' depots, or any other land-related agricultural activity, but excludes waste disposal, extractive industries and electricity generation. Within the Rural Zone, activities that directly support farming through supplying a product or service to farms, such as rural contractors. It excludes transport depots and retail services.</del></p>	<p>There is significant overlap between the definition of "farming" and "rural industry", with a single activity potentially being covered by both terms with different activity statuses. The processing of produce is retained in the definition of "farming" and recognises that produce may not be grown on the land. The definition of "rural industry" needs to be re-focused to recognise the rural services and products that service the farming sector. It needs to exclude activities that are more appropriate in a business or industrial zone.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1168.131	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Support submission 697.506	<p>The submitter seeks to amend the definition of rural industry. The National Planning Standard defines rural industry and this term and definition should be used in the Plan.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1340.129	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose submission 697.506	<p>The submitter opposes submission 697.506 as retail services are often required to occur in support of rural industry. Excluding retail services within this definition is perceived as overly restrictive.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1379.270	Hamilton City Council	Support	Support submission 697.506	<p>HCC supports amendment of the "rural industry" definition as included within the submission. The amended definition removes the overlap between this definition and the definition of "farming activity" and clarifies</p>	Accept in part	

				the exclusion of transport depots and retail services from the definition of "rural industry".		
FS1387.588	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	
<b>Definitions – On-site Primary Produce Manufacturing</b>						
746.14	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Add a new definition for "On Site Primary Produce Manufacturing" to Chapter 13: Definitions as per the Operative Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.913	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	

FSI 171.119	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes a new definition for onsite primary produce manufacturing as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan. This submission is supported in so far as it is consistent with T & G Global's submission.	Accept in part	
877.7	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Neutral/ Amend	Add to Chapter 13: Definitions a separate definition for "On Site Primary Produce Manufacturing" as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	There needs to be a separate definition for this as it was in the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan	Accept in part	
FSI387.1453	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	
FSI 168.88	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Seeks to add a separate definition for "On Site Primary Produce Manufacturing" as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan. There needs to be a separate definition for this as it was in the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan.	Accept in part	
Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (Emergency Facilities)						
378.114	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>(x) Emergency services training and management activities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Fire and Emergency New Zealand opposes the range of activities listed in Rule 22.1.2 as 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 sustainable management purpose of the Act and better enable Fire and Emergency New Zealand to achieve its	Accept in part	

				statutory function by facilitating firefighter and emergency response.		
FS1306.4	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Accept in part	
FS1388.75	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	
FS1035.221	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	
<b>Rule 22.1.3 – Restricted Discretionary Activities</b>						
378.115	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Oppose	Add a new activity to Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: <del>(x)</del> <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 22.1.3 as no provision is made for emergency service facilities. As no provision is made under this rule, emergency service facilities would default to non-complying activities under Rule 22.1.5. The default non-complying	Accept in part	

				<p>activity status is overly restrictive and inappropriate. Fire and Emergency New Zealand seeks the inclusion of emergency service facilities as a restricted discretionary activity to provide for emergency services in the Rural 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.</p>		
FS1388.76	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and</p>	Accept in part	

				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1035.222	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	
<b>Rule 22.1.3 – Restricted Discretionary Activities (Retirement Villages)</b>						
761.5	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Oppose	<p>Amend to Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities to a new rule RD3 to include specific provisions for a new Retirement Village, or alterations to an existing retirement village as follows: <u>RD3- A new retirement village, or alterations to an existing retirement village at 180 Horsham Downs Road (legally described as Lot 5 DP 505127) that meets all of the following conditions:</u> a) <u>Minimum living court or balcony area and dimensions:</u> i) <u>Apartment-</u> 10m<sup>2</sup> area within minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m. ii) <u>Studio unit or 1 bedroom unit-</u> 12.5m<sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; or iii) <u>2 or more bedroomed unit-</u> 15m<sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; b) <u>Minimum service court is either:</u> i) <u>Apartment-communal outdoor space (i.e. no individual service courts required);</u> or ii) <u>All other units-</u> 10m<sup>2</sup>. c) <u>Building height does not exceed 10m;</u> d) <u>Building setbacks-</u> a 7.5m setback is required from a local road, and a 12m setback is required from all other boundaries; except internal site boundaries where no setback shall apply. e) <u>The following Land Use-Effects rule in Rule 22.2 do not apply:</u> i. <u>Rule 22.2.6.1 (Signs- General).</u> ii. <u>Rule 22.2.6.2 (Signs- Effects on traffic).</u> f.) <u>The following Land Use- Building rules in Rule 22.3 do not apply:</u> i. <u>Rule 22.3.1 (No. of Dwellings);</u> ii. <u>22.3.6 Building Coverage</u> iii. <u>Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks</u> iv. <u>Rule 22.3.7.2 Building Setback- Sensitive Land Use.</u> g) <u>The following Infrastructure and Energy rule in Chapter 4 does not apply:</u> Rule 14.12.1 P4(1).(d.) <u>Traffic Generation</u> AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.</p>	Amendments are sought to Activity Status table in Rule 22.1.3 to include a new rule (RD3) to provide for new retirement villages and their future additions and expansion as a Restricted Discretionary Activity in the Rural Zone. Restricted Discretionary activity status is considered appropriate for new Retirement Village activities or alterations to an existing retirement village in the Rural Zone, including the proposed retirement village at 180 Horshams Downs Road. Conditions for a Retirement Village are proposed (based on activity specific conditions in Chapter 16 (Residential Zone)- Rule 16.1.2 (P3) which provide for 'A new retirement village or alteration to an existing retirement village' as a Permitted Activity in the Residential Zone). Adoption of a similar approach as in 16.1.2 is supported.	Reject	
FS1387.1114	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	Accept	



				<p>how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>			
FS1379.308	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<p>HCC opposes the inclusion of specific provisions to enable the location of retirement villages within the Rural Zone. 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. Unplanned, out of sequence, ad hoc development of non-rural activities locating within the Rural Zone can undermine the intent of the zone and compromise future urban development. Further, HCC is also concerned about the impacts on HCC's infrastructure from such development in the Rural Zone in Hamilton's Area of Interest.</p>	Accept		
697.751	Waikato Council	District Amend	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add new Rule 22.1.3 RD3 as follows: <u>RD3 A new retirement village or alterations to an existing retirement village that meets all of the following conditions: (a) The site or combination of sites where the retirement village is proposed to be located has a minimum net site area of 3ha; (b) The site is either serviced by or within 400m walking distance of public transport; (c) The site is either: (i) connected to public water and wastewater infrastructure; or (ii) serviced with on-site water and wastewater infrastructure. (d) Minimum living court or balcony area and dimensions: (i) Apartment – 10m<sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; (ii) Studio unit or 1 bedroom unit – 12.5m<sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m; or (iii) 2 or more bedroomed unit – 15m<sup>2</sup> area with minimum dimension horizontal and vertical of 2.5m;</u></p>	<p>Retirement villages in the Rural Zone should be provided for on the boundaries of towns and villages provided they can be serviced by infrastructure in the future. Retirement villages provide opportunities for residential development (aged care) that is not only confined to the residential zone.</p>	Reject	

			<p>(e) Minimum service court is either: (i) Apartment – Communal outdoor space (ie no individual service courts required) of at least 5m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres for each apartment; or (ii) All other units – 10m<sup>2</sup> with a minimum dimension of 1.5 metres for each unit; (f) Building height does not exceed 8m, except for 15% of the total building coverage, where buildings may be up to 10m high; (g) The following Land Use – Effects rule in Rule 22.2 does not apply: (i) Rule 22.2.7 (Signs); (h) The following Land Use – Building rules in Rule 22.3 do not apply: (i) Rule 22.3.1 (Dwelling); (ii) Rule 22.3.3 (Building Height); (i) The following Infrastructure and Energy rule in Chapter 14 does not apply: (i) Rule 14.12.1 P4(1)(a) (Traffic generation). (a) Council's discretion is restricted to: (i) Integration of the retirement village into the rural landscape; (ii) Adverse effects on rural character and amenity; (iii) Connectivity to existing towns and villages, including connections to existing walkways, roading infrastructure and public transportation; (iv) Connectivity to public reticulated public water supply and wastewater, or provision of services on site; (v) Bulk and scale of the retirement village development; (vi) Reverse sensitivity effects; (vii) Effects on the roading network.</p>			
FS1004.13	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Tamahere Eventide Retirement Village	Oppose	<p>Allow submission point 697.751 in part: - Add a new rule that provides for alterations and additions to existing retirement villages as a Permitted Activity (not restricted discretionary); and include the following conditions as applicable to the proposed permitted activity rule: o Conditions (a),(c),(d),(e) and (g) of proposed Rule RD3. - Do not include proposed conditions (b) and (f) of Rule RD3 as conditions for alterations and additions to an existing retirement village.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support that part of the submission that seeks the addition of a new rule to provide for retirement villages in the Rural Zone.</li> <li>• However, the restricted discretionary activity status and several of the proposed conditions are opposed, particularly insofar as they apply to alterations to existing retirement villages.</li> <li>• The existing retirement villages at Tamahere Eventide and Assisi would have existing non-compliances with respect to several of the proposed standards, and therefore would not comply with the proposed new rule.</li> <li>• For example, the existing retirement villages would not comply with the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o (b) Within 400m walking distance of public transport;</li> <li>or o (f) Maximum Building Height 8m/10m</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Both of the above standards (and the restricted discretionary activity status) are therefore opposed.</li> <li>• However, conditions a),(c),(d),(e) and (g) are</li> </ul>	Accept	

				supported (as conditions for a permitted activity). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support that part of the submission seeking the reference to 'serviced with on-site water and wastewater infrastructure' in standard (c)ii as an alternative to connecting to public water and wastewater infrastructure. This provision recognises that not all sites can connect to public services, but can still be appropriately serviced with onsite water and wastewater.</li> </ul>		
FS1005.17	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Atawhai Assisi Retirement Village	Oppose	Allow submission point 697.751 in part: - Add a new rule that provides for alterations and additions to existing retirement villages as a Permitted Activity (not restricted discretionary); and include the following conditions as applicable to the proposed permitted activity rule: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conditions (a), (c), (d), (e) and (g) of proposed Rule RD3.</li> </ul> - Do not include proposed conditions (b) and (f) of Rule RD3 as conditions for alterations and additions to an existing retirement village.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support that part of the submission that seeks the addition of a new rule to provide for retirement villages in the Rural Zone.</li> <li>However, the restricted discretionary activity status and several of the proposed conditions are opposed, particularly insofar as they apply to alterations to existing retirement villages.</li> <li>The existing retirement villages at Tamahere Eventide and Assisi would have existing non-compliances with respect to several of the proposed standards, and therefore would not comply with the proposed new rule.</li> <li>For example, the existing retirement villages would not comply with the following standards: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(b) Within 400m walking distance of public transport;</li> <li>or</li> <li>(f) Maximum Building Height 8m/10m</li> </ul> </li> <li>Both of the above standards (and the restricted discretionary activity status) are therefore opposed.</li> <li>However, conditions (a), (c), (d), (e) and (g) are supported (as conditions for a permitted activity).</li> <li>Support that part of the submission seeking the reference to 'serviced with on-site water and wastewater infrastructure' in standard (c)ii as an alternative to connecting to public water and wastewater infrastructure. This provision recognises that not all sites can connect to public services, but can still be appropriately serviced with onsite water and wastewater.</li> </ul>	Accept	
FS1333.14	Fonterra Limited	Oppose	Disallow the relief.	Without further amendment the proposed rule has the potential to enable activities that could result in reverse sensitivity effects on established regionally significant industrial activities.	Accept	
FS1345.82	Genesis Energy Limited	Oppose	Reject submission point.	Restricted Discretionary Activity status for a retirement in the village in the rural zone is	Accept	

				<p>not supported by Genesis. The more appropriate activity status for an intensive activity of this nature is discretionary. Genesis also is concerned that there are no requirements for an activity of this nature (being a sensitive activity) to be set back from Industrial / Heavy Industrial Activities (such as the Huntly Power Station) that are located near Rural and Residential Zones. Further consideration needs to be given to this activity in terms of ensuring there are no reverse sensitivity issues.</p>		
FS1308.112	The Surveying Company	Oppose		<p>For the reasons given in submission point 697.456. However, further consideration needs to be given to the conditions proposed such as "(b) – The site is either serviced by or within 400m walking distance of public transport;" Many of the Waikato District Towns have no public transport and even if a train line passes through the town, there is no service and station for the residents to use public transport. It is therefore highly unlikely that a rural zoned property will be serviced by or within 400m walking distance of public transport. I seek that the part of the submission to add new provisions for new retirement villages be allowed. I seek that the part of the submission to "be serviced by or within 400m walking distance of public transport" be disallowed.</p>	Accept	
FS1379.274	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		<p>HCC is opposed to retirement villages in the Rural Zone by the proposed the addition of a restricted discretionary activity rule, within HCC's Area of Interest. 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. Retirement villages are not rural in nature and are normally a type of high density residential development more appropriately located in towns and other areas identified for growth. Given the significant cross-boundary impacts that retirement villages within the Rural Zone are likely to have on Hamilton's infrastructure,</p>	Accept	

				<i>HCC opposes more lenient development provisions such as provision for retirement villages.</i>		
<i>FS1387.674</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	<i>Accept</i>	
<i>251.3</i>	<i>John Cunningham for Aparangi Retirement Village Trust</i>	<i>Neutral/ Amend</i>	<i>Amend the Proposed District Plan rules to enable retirement villages in Country Living and Rural Zones.</i>	<i>Aparangi could expand into Rural or Country Living in the future. If rules are in the District Plan, that will provide for expansion without the need for private plan changes.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1004.4</i>	<i>Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Tamahere Eventide Retirement Village</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Allow submission point 251.3.</i>	<i>Support the proposal to enable retirement villages in the Country Living and Rural Zones.</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	
<i>FS1386.256</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and</i>	<i>Accept in part</i>	

				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1202.68	New Zealand Transport Agency	Oppose	Oppose submission point 251.3.	Any rezoning of land which enables more development than currently provided for must be planned to ensure that adverse effects (for example, on the transport network) including cumulative effects, are identified and addressed. The effects upon surrounding transport infrastructure of the rezoning have not been addressed.	Accept in part	
FS1005.8	Tamahere Eventide Home Trust - Atawhai Assisi Retirement Village	Support	Allow submission point 251.3.	Support the proposal to enable retirement villages in the Country Living and Rural Zones.	Accept in part	
FS1386.254	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.		
Rule 22.1.5 NC5						
761.6	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.5 NC5 non-complying activities so that NC5 does not apply to a retirement village activity (including the proposed retirement village at 180 Horsham Downs Road) in the Rural Zone. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.	Retirement Villages are currently a non-complying activity under Rule 22.1.5 (NC5). Non-complying status is opposed. Retirement Village activities that are proposed at 180 Horsham Downs Road will provide an essential service for the local community. The establishment of a retirement village (and its future redevelopment or expansion) in the Rural Zone should be expressly provided for as a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Retirement village activities need to be excluded from Rule 22.1.5 NC5.	Reject	

FS1387.1115	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1379.309	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the inclusion of specific provisions to enable the location of retirement villages within the Rural Zone. 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. Unplanned, out of sequence, ad hoc development of non-rural activities locating within the Rural Zone can undermine the intent of the zone and compromise future urban development. Further, HCC is also concerned about the impacts on HCC's infrastructure from such development in the Rural Zone in Hamilton's Area of Interest.	Accept	
775.1	Sanderson Group Limited	Oppose	Amend the activity status for retirement villages within the Rural Zone to a Discretionary Activity, rather than a Non-Complying Activity as currently provided for under Rule 22.1.5 Non-Complying Activities. AND Any further relief and/or amendments necessary to support the relief as set out in the submission.	The submitter has lodged a resource consent application with the Waikato District Council to establish and operate a retirement village at 650 Airport Road, 618 Airport Road, 608 Airport Road and 46 Tamahere Drive (LUC0023/19). The site is an ideal location for those who have lived in the rural environment and do not desire to live in an urban environment upon retirement. Consultation with surrounding landowners has been undertaken. The retirement village will be developed with	Accept in part	

				minor and environmental effects. The aging population and concept of retirement villages is evolving, and this is recognised in the proposed retirement village. Retirement villages are currently a discretionary activity within the Operative District Plan and is a good fit for assessing proposed retirement villages. The objectives and policies for development in Rural Zones are similar in both the Operative and Proposed District Plans and therefore should retain the Discretionary activity status within the Proposed District Plan. The increasing importance of retirement villages supports the activity being recognised as a discretionary activity.		
FS1387.1172	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	
Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (Worker Accommodation)						
419.9	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>Workers' accommodation that comply with Rule 22.3.X Workers' accommodation.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter seeks a suite of provisions to provide for workers' accommodation as a permitted activity in the Rural Zone.	Reject	
FS1388.178	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood	Accept	



				provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1306.7	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation support the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Reject	
FS1171.12	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 the provision of workers accommodation subject to a number of conditions. This submission is supported in so far as it is consistent with T & G Global's submission also seeking to provide for workers accommodation within the Rural environment.	Reject	
Rule 22.1.3 – Restricted discretionary Activities						
419.12	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new restricted discretionary activity provision to Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows: <u>Workers' accommodation that does not comply with Rule 22.3 X Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: 1. Those matters in Rule 22.3.X that are not able to be met. 2. Methods to avoid, remedy or mitigate the</u>	The submitter seeks that a restricted discretionary standard be applied where workers' accommodation does not meet the permitted activity standards, although no reasons have been provided.	Reject	

			<p>effects on existing activities, including the provision of screening, landscaping and methods for noise control. 3. The extent to which the application complies with the Code of Practice for Able Bodied Seasonal Workers, published by the Department of Building and Housing 2008.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>			
FS1342.91	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.12.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission relating to worker accommodation in the rural zone and wish to remain involved as any planning response is adopted.	Reject	
FS1171.14	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission seeks the provision of restricted discretionary status for workers accommodation where worker's accommodation does not meet the proposed permitted activity standards. The provision for workers accommodation within the rural environment is supported, in so far as it is consistent with the submission by T & G Global however it is considered that noise effects are best dealt with in accordance with the general provisions of the Plan and that the reference to the Code of Practice is not a resource management matter.	Reject	
FS1388.181	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	

419.25	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Add a new provision to Rule 22.3 Land Use - Building, as follows: <u>Workers' accommodation is a permitted activity where it meets the following standards: (a) The relevant zone standards for yards, height, daylight protection and parking are complied with (b) Access - No additional formed accesses are to be created to any State Highway (c) Is associated with the horticultural activity (d) Comprises of a combination of communal kitchen and eating areas and sleeping and ablution facilities (e) Accommodates up to 12 workers (f) Complies with Code of Practice for Able Bodies Seasonal Workers, published by Department of Building and Housing 2008.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter seeks specific provision for workers' accommodation. The submitter seeks the insertion of a new rule to set the standards for workers' accommodation as a permitted activity, similar to those that have been adopted in the Proposed Opotiki District Plan.	Reject	
FS1171.20	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission is supported. This submission for the provision of workers accommodation provides an alternative to the provision for workers accommodation contained in T & G's own submission on the basis that the accommodation of workers for rural production activities should be provided for within the rural area, however the reference to the Code of Practice is not a resource management matter.	Reject	
FS1076.16	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	The submitter seeks specific provision for workers' accommodation.	Provide for farm workers accommodation for a range of rural production activities	Reject	
FS1308.33	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	We agree that there should be some provision made for workers' accommodation, even if this is provided for as a restricted discretionary activity. Workers accommodation can play an important part in the long term viability and expansion of legitimate rural production activities on sites under 40 hectares in size. Whilst a minor dwelling of up to 70m2 provides one option for housing farm workers, it does not adequately cater for a farm worker with a family or seasonal workers sharing communal facilities. A larger dwelling is required to cater for a farm employee and their family.	Reject	
FS1342.92	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.25.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission relating to worker accommodation in the rural zone and wish	Reject	

				to remain involved as any planning response is adopted.		
FS1388.186	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	
Rule 22.1.4 – Discretionary Activities (General)						
341.4	Brian Croad for Tainui Group Holdings Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the numbering of Rule 22.1.5 Discretionary Activities to Rule 22.1.4. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	The relief sought will correct the typographical error within the Proposed Plan which currently has Rule 22.1.5 subsequent to Rule 22.1.3.	Accept	
466.12	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5 Discretionary Activities to read as 22.1.4 Discretionary Activities.	Rule 22.1.4 is omitted. The numbering should be corrected.	Accept	
FS1388.405	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Reject	

				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
680.251	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.1.5 Discretionary Activities to be Rule 22.1.4. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	To correct a numbering error.	Accept	
FS1387.229	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	
680.189	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5 D5 Discretionary Activities as follows: 22.1.45—D5 Hazardous waste storage, processing or disposal <u>excluding chemicals, fuel and other hazardous substances used for farming.</u> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Storage of agrichemicals used for farming should not be subject to this rule. To do so would subject farmers to undue cost and delay in having to seek resource consent for little or no environmental benefit. Farmers regularly use chemicals in pesticides, fungicides and herbicides for pest and weed control, and other chemicals for animal husbandry. They also need to maintain on-site fuel storage for farm machinery and fertiliser storage. The hazardous nature of handling and storage of such chemicals and substances is managed under other legislation and there is no need for the Council to regulate this in the Proposed District Plan. The submission corrects the numbering error 22.1.5, which is	Accept in part	

				duplicated for discretionary and non-complying activities.		
FS1387.204	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	
697.752	Waikato Council District	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5 D1 Discretionary Activities, as follows: Any permitted activity that does not comply with one or more of the an activity specific conditions in Rule 22.1.2	Consistency with other chapters and additional clarity of the rule.	Accept	
697.753	Waikato Council District	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.1.5 D2 Discretionary Activities; AND Amend consequential renumbering of subsequent 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 in part	
697.754	Waikato Council District	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.15 D12 Discretionary Activities, as follows: Motorised <del>sport and recreation-activity</del> .	A new definition has been added for the term "motorised sport and recreation".	Accept in part	
Rule 22.1.5 – Non-complying Activities (General)						
680.193	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.1.5 NC4 (a)(i) and (iv) Non-Complying Activities AND Add a new Discretionary Activities rule as follows: <del>Dxx (a) Within the Urban Expansion Area, the following activities: (i) Intensive farming (ii) Extractive industry</del> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The proposed amendment is required to provide better consistency with the policy approach prescribed in Proposed District Plan. Whilst the submitter supports a forward looking plan, priority must be given to activities which can be expected and anticipated within the rural zone and are unable to be located elsewhere. Urban growth pressures must be addressed without an over reliance on ring-fencing and controlling legitimate activities within the rural zone. The submitter urges Council to contain the sprawling footprint of urban	Reject	

				expansion using more innovative and modern planning techniques.		
FS1062.91	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 680.193.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important that activities that support the rural community are located in the Rural zone.</li> <li>Production animal veterinary clinics should be permitted on this rule.</li> </ul>	Reject	
FS1379.235	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		The submitter seeks a more lenient activity for intensive farming and extractive industry within the UEA of the Rural Zone. HCC opposes this. Land within the UEA needs to be protected from incompatible land uses that will compromise the ability for comprehensive urban development of the land in the future.	Accept	
FS1387.207	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	
395.5	Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment for New Zealand Petroleum and Minerals	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Rule 22.1.5 (NC2) Non-Complying activities, as notified.	NZPM considers that non-complying activity status is appropriate for extractive activities in identified outstanding areas, which still allowed such activities to be assessed on its merits. NZPM's support for this rule is subject to the relief sought to Policy 3.3.3 as a non-complying status coupled with policy direction to avoid all adverse effects of extractive industries would effectively prohibit these activities in these areas.	Accept in part	
FS1198.47	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Oppose	The submission point be disallowed in full.	Extractive industries that do not meet restricted discretionary activity status should be discretionary. A non-complying status	Accept in part	

				<i>given the importance of minerals to the district and region, and functional need for extractive industries to be located where the minerals are, is inappropriate.</i>		
<i>FS1334.71</i>	<i>Fulton Hogan Limited</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Reject and amend Rule 22.1.5 NC2 as per submission point 575.15.</i>	<i>Fulton Hogan considers that the growth of existing extractive activities should not be restricted despite being located in an area that includes an ONFAL overlay.</i>	Accept in part	
466.57	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.1.5 Non-Complying Activities as notified, except for NC5.	The submitter supports NC1, NC2, NC3 and NC4.	Accept in part	



FSI388.427	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	
FSI062.46	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 466.57.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Activities as notified does not allow for fragmented land.</li> <li>Allowance needs to be considered for fragmented land.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
680.194	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Delete Rule 22.1.5 NC5 Non Complying Activities. AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.</p>	The submitter opposes this type of 'catch all' rule which they believe is poor planning practice and inconsistent with a number of RMA provisions. Under RMA section 9 the use of land is presumed to be permitted unless it is restricted by a rule in a plan. The submitter appreciates that not every eventuality can be covered with the use of activity lists, however Section 17(1) establishes that every person has a duty to avoid, remedy or mitigate any adverse effect on the environment arising from an activity carried on by or on behalf of that person, whether or not the activity is in accordance with a rule in a plan. This duty to avoid, remedy or mitigate adverse effects along with the enforcement options under Section 17(3) and option to notify a plan change or variation provide council with the appropriate opportunities to deal with unforeseen circumstances which may arise.	Reject	

FS1379.236	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC opposes the deletion of rule 22.1.5 NC5, which captures all unlisted activities and assigns them a non-complying activity status. It is not possible for a council to list all potential activities that people/businesses wish to undertake. It is appropriate to have a level of control over non-listed activities.	Accept	
FS1387.208	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
697.757	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5 Non-complying activities, by renumbering as Rule 22.1.6.	To correct a numbering error.	Reject	

FS1387.680	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
697.759	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5 NC3 Non-Complying Activities, as follows: (a) A waste management facility located within all or part of any of the following landscape and natural character areas: (i) Outstanding Natural Feature; (ii) Outstanding Natural Landscape; (iii) High Natural Character area; or (iv) Outstanding Natural Character Area.	Including the wording "landscape and natural character areas" provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	
697.760	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5 NC4 Non-Complying Activities, as follows: (ii) <u>The following activities located within the Urban Expansion Area, the following activities:</u> —(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) <u>rural industry.</u>	The introductory wording to the rule provides clarity to the rule and listing rural industry ensures activities are controlled within the Urban Expansion Area.	Accept	
FS1171.107	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow the submission.	This submission seeks to include rural industry as an activity that is non-complying within the urban expansion zone. It is considered that a Discretionary activity status may be more appropriate.	Reject	

FS1379.275	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC opposes the relief sought to have a more permissive activity status for Rural Industry. As per its original submission, HCC seeks the inclusion of all activities listed as Non-Complying within the UEA to be 'prohibited'. Rural Industry may compromise the ability to undertake comprehensive urban development on rural land within the UEA in the future.	Reject	
695.203	Sharp Planning Solutions	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5 NCI Non-Complying Activities to include an exemption clause in the situation where an indicative road remains on a planning map but has been constructed and is open to the public, either in the same location or very near.	The issue has occurred twice when preparing resource consent applications. There is no effect under the Act to address in that circumstance. It is ultra-vires.	Accept	
471.1	CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.5 NCI Non-Complying Activities, as follows: Construction of a building located on an indicative road <u>that has not yet been vested</u> .  AND  Any consequential amendments necessary.	The requested amendment will avoid the need for resource consent when a road has been located on a different alignment to that shown on the planning maps.	Accept	
943.22	McCracken Surveys	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.1.5 NCI - Non-Complying Activities, as follows; NCI Construction of a building located on an indicative road <u>that has not yet been vested</u> .	Avoids the need for resource consent when a road has been located in a different alignment than shown on the planning maps.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission			
Objective 5.4.1 – Minerals and extractive industries						
395.2	Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment for New Zealand Petroleum and Minerals	Support	Retain Objective 5.4.1 Minerals and extractive industries, as notified.	NZPM supports the intent of this objective to ensure that mining resource use can provide economic, social and environmental benefits to the Waikato District.	Accept in part	
575.5	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.4.1- Minerals and extractive industries, except for the amendments sought below AND	Fulton Hogan supports this objective based on the fact that it provides a level of protection for the mineral	Accept in part	

			Amend Objective 5.4.1 - Minerals and extractive industries, as follows (or words to similar effect): Mineral resource use <u>and mineral and aggregate extraction activities provides</u> economic, social and environmental benefits to the district <u>and these activities are protected.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	resource industry. By inserting the proposed words, the protection is strengthened which is key, given that this industry is vital to this district and contributes an important share of its GDP. This approach is supported by the RPS, particularly Objective 3.10 and Policies 4.4 and 6.8, which specifically protect regionally significant industries and recognise the importance of mineral extraction to sustain anticipated regional growth.		
FS1292.55	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow the submission point.	McPherson supports this objective which recognises the benefits of the mineral resource. The proposed additions to this objective provide clarity to include extraction of minerals, further strengthening this objective in accordance with the RPS.	Accept in part	
FS1332.25	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1319.4	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow the submission point in part as per NZS original submission (points 827.28, 827.29 and 827.50): Mineral resource use and Extractive Activities provides economic, social and environmental benefits to the district and these activities are protected.	The extraction of mineral resources is a productive rural activity and existing extractive activities contribute to the wellbeing of the district. However, NZS has sought the use of a single defined term "Extractive Activity."	Accept in part	
FS1377.142	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater support and flexibility for extractive industries.	Accept in part	
723.5	Tyler Sharratt on behalf of Winstone Aggregates	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Objective 5.4.1: Minerals and Extractive Industries, as follows: (a) Mineral resource use and extractive industries provides economic, social and environmental benefits to the district.	Proposed objective doesn't read properly. It states "Mineral use provides," whereas it makes sense to say "Minerals and Extractive Industries provide..."	Accept in part	
FS1334.56	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend Objective 5.4.1 as per submission point 575.5.	Fulton Hogan supports this objective which recognises the benefits of the mineral resource. The proposed additions to this objective provide clarity to include extraction of minerals, further strengthening the objective in accordance with the RPS.	Accept in part	
FS1319.33	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow the submission point in part as per NZS's original submission (points 827.28, 827.29 and 827.50): Mineral resource use and Extractive Activities provides economic, social and environmental benefits to the district and these activities are protected.	The extraction of mineral resources is a productive rural activity and existing extractive activities contribute to the wellbeing of the district. However, NZS has sought the use of a single defined term "Extractive Activity."	Accept in part	
FS1292.56	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend Objective 5.4.1 as per submission point 691.2.	McPherson supports this objective which recognises the benefits of the mineral resource. The proposed additions to this	Accept in part	

				<i>objective provide clarity to include extraction of minerals, further strengthening this objective in accordance with the RPS.</i>		
860.9	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Support	Retain Objective 5.4.1 (a) Minerals and extractive industries.	The minerals and extractive sectors continue to contribute \$2453 million in GDP and directly employ 6,050 people jobs, across New Zealand. The Waikato District has one of the larger extractive sectors in the country. In addition to this, the sector's outputs (coal, rock sand, and gravel etc.) are crucial to the growth of the district within the infrastructure and energy sectors.	Accept in part	
FS1292.58	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend Objective 5.4.1 as per submission point 691.2.	McPherson supports this objective which recognises the benefits of the mineral resource. The proposed additions sought by McPherson's submission provide clarity to include extraction of minerals, further strengthening this objective in accordance with the RPS.	Accept in part	
FS1334.58	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend Objective 5.4.1 as per submission point 575.5.	Fulton Hogan supports this objective which recognises the benefits of the mineral resource. The proposed additions sought by Fulton Hogan's submission provide clarity to include extraction of minerals, further strengthening the objective in accordance with the RPS.	Accept in part	
FS1285.16	Terra Firma Mining Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.4.1(a) Minerals and extractive industries.	For the reasons provided by the submitter.	Accept in part	
FS1332.9	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
680.73	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Objective 5.4.1 Minerals and extractive industries, as notified.	The submitter agrees with the Objective.	Accept in part	
797.15	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Objective 5.4.1 Minerals and extractive industries as notified.	Supports the recognition of economic value of the districts mineral resources.	Accept in part	
827.48	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support	Amend Objective 5.4.1 Minerals and extractive industries as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Mineral resource use provides economic and social and environmental benefits to the district. AND Any other further or consequential amendments required.	Unclear how mineral resource use can be required to provide environmental benefits. The use of 'environmental benefits' incorrectly implies that the environment is limited to the natural environment and does not include social and economic elements. Supports acknowledgement of the benefits of mineral use to the district.	Accept	

FS1292.57	McPherson Resources Limited	Oppose	Reject and amend Objective 5.4.1 as per submission point 691.2.	McPherson supports this objective which recognises the benefits of the mineral resource. The proposed additions sought by McPherson's submission provide clarity to include extraction of minerals, further strengthening this objective in accordance with the RPS.	Reject	
FS1334.57	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Reject and amend Objective 5.4.1 as per submission point 575.5.	Fulton Hogan supports this objective which recognises the benefits of the mineral resource. The proposed additions sought by Fulton Hogan's submission provide clarity to include extraction of minerals, further strengthening the objective in accordance with the RPS.	Accept	
691.2	McPherson Resources Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Objective 5.4.1 Mineral and extractive industries, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Objective 5.4.1 Mineral and extractive industries as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>Mineral resource use and mineral and aggregate extraction activities provides economic, social and environmental benefits to the district and are protected.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Submitter supports this objective as it provides a level of protection for the industry, which includes quarry operations. Protection is strengthened which is key, given that this industry is vital to this district in that contributes an important share of its GDP. This is supported by the Regional Policy Statement, particularly Objective 3.10 and Policies 4.4 and 6.8, which specifically protect regionally significant industries and recognize the importance of mineral extraction to sustain anticipated regional growth.	Accept in part	
FS1313.23	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow the submission point in part as per NZS's original submission (points 827.28, 827.29 and 827.50): <u>Mineral resource use and Extractive Activities provides economic, social and environmental benefits to the district and these activities are protected.</u>	The extraction of mineral resources is a productive rural activity and existing extractive activities contribute to the wellbeing of the district. However, NZS has sought the use of a single defined term "Extractive Activity."	Accept in part	
FS1334.55	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	Fulton Hogan supports this objective which recognises the benefits of the mineral resource. The proposed additions to this objective provide clarity to include extraction of minerals, further strengthening the objective in accordance with the RPS.	Accept in part	
827.34	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Add provisions within Chapter 5: Rural Environment as follows (or words to similar effect), if the Waikato North Head mine sites retains a Rural Zone <u>Objective (1) The iron sand resource at Waikato North Head is effectively and efficiently utilised. Policies (1) Provide for ironsand mining and associated activities at the Aggregate Extraction Area identified at Waikato North Head. (2) Avoid, remedy or mitigate any significant adverse effects associated</u>	Alternative to the specific zone, New Zealand Steel proposes to amend the applicable provisions within the Rural Zone. The Aggregate Extraction Area overlay may be amended to be made appropriate to the Waikato North Head site with update provisions which recognise the existing activities and the extent of future authorised activities, along	Accept in part	

			<p>with activities at the <u>Aggregate Extraction Area identified at Waikato North Head that require resource consent under the Waikato District Plan.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add rules to Chapter 22 Rural Zone to enable specified activities within the Aggregate Extraction Area at Waikato North Head to be a permitted activity (see submission for specific details).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other further or consequential amendments required.</p>	<p>with providing for reverse sensitivity issues adjacent to the site. The Proposed District Plan currently contains no specific rules which relate to mining activities within the Aggregate Extraction area, and therefore it is unclear how the Rural Zone rules apply. Given the context of the site, the submitter considers the Rural Zone permitted activity conditions are inappropriate, including those relating to earthworks and building height and therefore specific rules relating to the Aggregate Extraction Area would be more appropriate.</p>		
Policy 5.4.2. – Access to mineral and extractive industries						
591.6	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Policy 5.4.2 Access to minerals and extractive industries as follows: (a) Enable extractive industries, provided that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. (b) Protect access to, and <u>enable the extraction of, mineral resources by:</u> (i) Identifying lawfully established extractive industries in Aggregate Extraction Areas and Coal Mining Areas on planning maps <u>and enabling extractive industry within those areas;</u> (ii) Identifying the site of a potential extractive industry within an Aggregate Resource Areas on planning maps <u>and enabling the expansion of extractive industry from within adjacent Aggregate Extraction Areas;</u> (c) Ensure that <u>lawfully established extractive industries within Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas</u> are not compromised by new subdivision, use or development; (d) Avoid the location of any sensitive land use within <u>500 metres of Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas in the case of a rock resource and 200 metres in the case of a sand resource</u> <del>specified buffer areas otherwise risk the effective operation of a lawfully established extractive industry.</del></p>	<p>The policy does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement or Objectives 5.4.2 or 5.4.1 of the Proposed District Plan. The policy should protect access to and extraction of mineral resources by enabling that access and extraction within the areas identified for that purpose. Where Aggregate Resource Areas are adjacent to Aggregate Extraction Areas it is clear they provide expansion areas for the lawfully established extractive industry and this should be recognised in the policy. Vague reference to "specified buffer areas" needs to be made specific and apply not only to existing extractive industry. It is unnecessary to repeat "lawfully established" when referring to extractive industry within the Aggregate Extraction Area as by definition all such industry within such an area has been lawfully established.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1334.60	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	<p>Allow alongside amendments to Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 575.14.</p>	<p>Fulton Hogan supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safe guard extraction activities. We also agree that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1319.19	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	<p>NZS requests this submission point to be allowed in part subject to the relief specified in NZS's original submission point 827.49.</p>	<p>NZS supports the clarification of the meaning of "specified buffer area."</p>	Accept in part	



FS1292.60	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow alongside amendments to Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 691.7.	McPherson supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. We also agree that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	
FS1146.6	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited on behalf of	Support	The amendments proposed by the submissions safeguard the access and the actual extraction of the minerals. It further enables that future expansion areas are also protected. We agree that "specified" buffer areas" needs to be made specific.	We seek that the submission is allowed in order for extractive industries within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas to protect and extract the minerals.	Accept in part	
395.3	Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment for New Zealand Petroleum and Minerals	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.4.2 Access to minerals and extractive industries, which enables mineral use and extractive industries, except for the amendment sought below. AND Amend Policy 5.4.2- Access to minerals and extractive industries as follows (or similar wording): <u>Protecting and enabling</u> Access to minerals <u>use</u> and extractive industries (a) Enable extractive industries provided that adverse effects are <u>appropriately</u> avoided, remedied, <del>or</del> mitigated, <u>offset or compensated</u> . (b) Protect access to, and extraction of, mineral resources by: (i) <del>Identifying lawfully established existing</del> extractive industries in Aggregate Extraction Areas and Coal mining Areas on planning maps; (ii) Identifying the site of a potential extractive industry within an Aggregate Resource Area on planning maps; (c) Ensure that <del>lawfully established</del> extractive industries are not compromised by new subdivision, use or development; (d) Avoid the location of any sensitive land use within specified buffer areas which otherwise risks the effective operation of <u>an existing lawfully established</u> extractive industry. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or similar amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in submission.	NZPM generally supports the intent of this policy to protect and enable mineral use and extractive industries. Amendments make the title more aligned with the intent and focus of the policy. Ensures that offsetting and compensation are options available to manage residual adverse effects of mining activities that cannot be avoided, remedied and mitigated. Removes unnecessary references to 'lawfully established' extractive industries.	Accept in part	
FS1319.1	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	NZS seeks that the whole submission be allowed but with the addition of NZS's specified relief at original submission point 827.49.	NZS supports the requested amendments which: Make the title of the policy more aligned with the wording of the policy. Ensure that offsetting and compensation are options available to manage residual adverse effects of mining activities that cannot be avoided, remedied and mitigated. Remove unnecessary references to 'lawfully established' extractive industries.	Accept in part	

FS1292.59	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow change to the title of the policy to read as follows: "5.4.2 Policy- Protecting and enabling mineral use and extractive industries" And amend Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 691.7.	McPherson supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend to future extraction activities.	Accept in part	
FS1334.59	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow change to the title of the policy to read as follows: "5.4.2 Policy Protection and enabling mineral use and extraction industries" And amend Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 575.14.	Fulton Hogan supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend future extraction activities.	Accept in part	
FS1198.32	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	It is appropriate that mineral extraction be provided for in the Rural zone and that reverse sensitivity issues with respect to mining are recognised and this should apply both to existing and future mining operations.	Accept in part	
691.7	McPherson Resources Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain the intent of Policy 5.4.2 Access to minerals and extractive industries, except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend 5.4.2 - Access to minerals and extractive and industries as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Enable extractive industries provided that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated insofar as it is reasonable and practicable while still ensuring that the industry remains viable; (b) Protect access to, and extraction of, mineral resources by: (i) Identifying lawfully established extractive industries in <u>or outside of</u> Aggregate Extraction Areas and Coal Mining Areas on planning maps; (ii) Identifying the site of a potential extractive industry within <u>or outside of</u> an Aggregate Resource Area on planning maps; (c).... AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	<b>691.7</b>	Accept in part	
FS1334.61	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	FS1334.61	Accept in part	
FS1377.198	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	FS1377.198	Accept in part	
FS1319.24	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	NZS seeks that the submission point be allowed in part, but with the wording proposed in NZS's original submission: (aa) Provide for existing extractive industries (a) Enable new extractive industries provided that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated ... (d) Avoid the location of any sensitive land use within specified buffer areas adjoining existing extractive industries, which otherwise risks the effective operation of a lawfully established extractive industry.	FS1319.24	Accept in part	

723.6	Tyler Sharratt on behalf of Winstone Aggregates	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.4.2 (d) Access to minerals and extractive industries, as follows: (d) Avoid the location of any sensitive land use within the specified buffer areas which otherwise risks the effective operation of a lawfully established extractive industry or a site identified as an <u>Aggregate Resource Area</u> .	Wording of (d) does not protect any identified Aggregate Resource Area. Clause (d) needs to include both the established extractive industry and Aggregate Resource Area to prevent the identified resource from being sterilised or subject to development constraints due to reverse sensitivity issues. There is no point having an overlay if there is no policy that adequately protects them.	Accept	
FS1334.62	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow alongside amendments to Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 575.14.	Fulton Hogan supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. We also agree that such protection should extend to future extraction activities identified by the Aggregate Resource Area to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept	
FS1292.62	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow alongside amendments to Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 691.7.	McPherson supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. We also agree that such protection should extend future extraction activities identified as "Aggregate Resource Area" to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept	
575.14	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.4.2 Access to minerals and extractive industries, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.4.2 (a) and (b) Access to minerals and extractive industries, as follows (or words to similar effect): Enable extractive industries provided that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated insofar as it is reasonable and practicable while still ensuring that the industry remains viable. Protect access to, and extraction of, mineral resources by: Identifying lawfully established extractive industries in <u>or outside of</u> Aggregate Extraction Areas and Coal Mining Areas on planning maps; Identifying the site of a potential extractive industry within <u>or outside of</u> an Aggregate Resource Area on planning maps; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Submission supports the policy but seeks amendments as the protection afforded by the policy only extends to existing quarries and not new extractive industries. It provides no protection to new extractive industries; as such properties would have to apply for a plan change. Aggregate is a significant and economically vital natural resource and contributes to the economic and social wellbeing of the area.	Accept in part	
FS1377.144	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports	Accept in part	

				amendments that provide greater clarity and flexibility for extractive industries.		
FS1332.29	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1319.7	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	NZS seeks that the submission point be allowed in part, but with the wording proposed in NZS's original submission: (aa) Provide for existing extractive industries. (a) Enable new extractive industries provided that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. ... (d) Avoid the location of any sensitive land within specified buffer areas adjoining existing extractive industries, which otherwise risks the effective operation of a lawfully established extractive industry.	In line with NZS's original submission point 827.49, NZS agrees that the policy should enable new extractive industries.	Accept in part	
FS1292.61	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow the submission point.	McPherson supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. We also agree that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	
680.74	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.4.2 Access to minerals and extractive industries, as notified.	The submitter supports this policy approach provided that it doesn't inadvertently capture farm quarries in any resource consent process.	Accept in part	
771.11	Alison Brown for Bathurst Resources Ltd and BT Mining Ltd	Not Stated	Add a new clause (iii) to Policy 5.4.2(b) Access to minerals and extractive industries as follows: (b) Protect access to, and extraction of, mineral resources by: ... (iii) <u>Identifying the site of a potential coal extractive industry within the Coal Mining Resource Area on the planning maps.</u> AND Add a definition for "Coal Mining Resource Area" to Chapter 13: Definitions as follows: <u>Coal Mining Resource Area</u> means an area identified on the <u>planning maps.</u> AND Add a Coal Mining Resource Area Overlay to the Planning Maps to areas subject to significant coal deposits in the Waikato District and as a minimum this should cover the indicative Rotowaro Coalfield as attached in the original submission. AND Any consequential amendments necessary to give effect to Coal Mining Resource Areas.	To enable the continuation of coal mining in the district, it is appropriate to identify Coal Mining Resource Areas, as has been done for aggregates, to provide for future expansion of coal mining particularly into the Rotowaro coalfield.	Accept in part	
FS1285.9	Terra Firma Mining Limited	Support		TFM agrees with the submitter's reasons.	Accept in part	
797.16	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.4.2 Access to minerals and extractive industries except for the amendments sought below. AND	Supports the policy support for extractive industries subject to clarification that the continued operation and expansion of	Accept in part	

			Amend Policy 5.4.2 (a) Access to minerals and extractive industries as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>Enable the continued operation and development of extractive industries</u> provided that adverse effects are avoided, remedied or mitigated. AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	those regionally significant industries is provided for.		
FS1198.33	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	It is appropriate that mineral extraction be provided for in the Rural zone and that reverse sensitivity issues with respect to mining are recognised and this should apply both to existing and future mining operations.	Accept in part	
FS1345.33	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons outlined in the Fonterra submission.	Accept in part	
827.49	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.4.2 Access to minerals and extractive industries as follows (or words to similar effect): (aa) <u>Provide for existing extractive industries.</u> (a) <u>Enable new</u> extractive industries provided that ... .. (d) Avoid the location of any sensitive land use within specified buffer areas <u>adjoining existing extractive industries</u> , which otherwise risks the effective operation of a lawfully established extractive industry. AND Any other further or consequential amendments required.	Needs to specifically recognise existing extractive industries, such as the mine site and to clarify the meaning of "specified buffer area".	Accept in part	
FS1334.63	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow alongside amendments to Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 575.14.	Fulton Hogan supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard existing and provide for new extraction activities.	Accept in part	
FS1292.63	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow alongside amendments to Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 691.7.	McPherson supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard existing provision for new extraction activities.	Accept in part	
860.11	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Not Stated	Retain Policy 5.4.2 (b) (i) and (ii) Access to minerals and extractive industries.	Strongly support the identification of potential extractive industries sites. To secure future supplies of minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) it is in the community's interests to have identified these key resource areas and protect them.	Accept in part	
FS1292.64	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 691.7.	McPherson supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	

FS1332.11	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1334.64	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 575.14.	Fulton Hogan supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	
860.12	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Support	Retain Policy 5.4.2 (c) Access to Minerals and extractive industries.	Due to the nature of the extractive sector and its impacts- including noise, vibration and dust, it is for the benefit and comfort of residents as well as the general public, not to allow new dwellings in the vicinity of extraction activity.	Accept in part	
FS1292.65	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 691.7.	McPherson supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	
FS1334.65	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 575.14.	Fulton Hogan supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	
FS1332.12	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
860.13	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Support	Retain Policy 5.4.2 (d) Access to minerals and extractive industries.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1334.66	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 575.14.	Fulton Hogan supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	
FS1332.13	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1292.66	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 691.7.	McPherson supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	

860.17	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Support	Retain Policy 5.4.2 (a) Access to minerals and extractive industries.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1334.67	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 575.14.	Fulton Hogan supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	
FS1332.17	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1292.67	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow and amend Policy 5.4.2 as per submission point 691.7.	McPherson supports Policy 5.4.2 and this submission insofar as they seek to safeguard extraction activities. However, we consider that such protection should extend future extraction activities to ensure consistency with the RPS.	Accept in part	
Policy 5.3.4 – Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment						
197.7	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.4 - Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment.	The submitters support the policy recognizing the need for dwellings to support workers accommodation while noting the method provides a size limitation that would not support a family unit.	Accept in part	
FS1386.196	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 in part	
FS1168.56	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Like HortNZ, the submitter supports the policy recognizing the need for dwellings to support workers accommodation while noting	Accept in part	

				<i>the method provides a size limitation that would not support a family unit.</i>		
394.9	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Neutral/Amend	Add an objective to Chapter 5 Rural Environment, to encourage and enable innovative development opportunities which both provide additional living opportunities and enhance the sustainable utilisation of the rural environment through facilitating farm parks. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.	The Proposed Waikato District Plan and the section 32 analysis fail to recognise the ability for innovative uses of countryside living and farm parks to provide housing choice, better ecological outcomes and appropriate use of high value soils, given the constraints relating to water abstraction and nutrient control.	Reject	
FS1388.113	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FS1379.113	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	<i>HCC opposes the submission to add an objective that encourages additional subdivision within the Rural Zone of HCC's Area of Interest. The key purpose of the Rural Zone is to protect the productive nature of the land and to ensure growth is more appropriately directed to towns and other areas identified for growth. Growth for non-rural purposes within the Rural Zone is contrary to the principles of the WRPS and Future Proof Strategy and can undermine the intent of the zone.</i>	Accept	
676.3	T&G Global Limited	Not Stated	Retain Policy 5.3.4 (b) - Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment.	The submitter supports Policy 5.3.4-Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment insofar as that policy recognises at sub-paragraph (b) that additional dwellings are needed to support workers' accommodation for productive	Accept in part	



				rural activities. It is important to consider the accommodation of rural workers as part of the support within the Rural Zone for productive rural activities. This policy should inform the rules within the Proposed Plan for minor dwellings within the Rural Zone.		
FS1168.57	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Like HortNZ, submitter supports Policy 5.3.4-Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment insofar as that policy recognises at sub-paragraph (b) that additional dwellings are needed to support workers' accommodation for productive rural activities. It is important to consider the accommodation of rural workers as part of the support within the Rural Zone for productive rural activities. This policy should inform the rules within the Proposed Plan for minor dwellings within the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
FS1387.139	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	
777.2	Radio New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.4(a) Density of dwelling and buildings within the rural environment, as notified.	The submitter supports the retention of open spaces to ensure that rural character is maintained.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1174	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 in part	

				<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>		
394.13	Gwenith Sophie Francis	Oppose	<p>Delete Policy 5.3.4 (a) Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment OR Amend Policy 5.3.4 (a) Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment to encourage clustering AND/OR Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or further additional relief, as is appropriate to give effect to the intent of the submission.</p>	<p>The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to appropriately identify the issues and challenges facing Waikato District; The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to have appropriate regard to relevant National Policy Statements including the National Policy statement for Freshwater Management and the National Policy Statement on Urban Development Capacity; The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to have appropriate regard to the Regional Policy Statement and/or misapplies the strategic direction of that document; The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to provide practical solutions to the challenges facing farming in the northern part of Waikato District and places undue emphasis on the protection of versatile soils without acknowledging limitations for farming such soils; Council has failed to undertake an adequate section 32 analysis, particularly with respect to the extent and location of countryside living zone, subdivision opportunity for ecological enhancement or protection and provision of innovative subdivision developments such as farm parks; and The Proposed Waikato District Plan fails to identify sufficient and appropriately located areas for countryside living - particularly where there is good access to appropriate infrastructure.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1375.6	Radio New Zealand	Oppose	Retain Policy 5.3.4(a) as notified.	<p>RNZ's transmitter is in the proposed Rural Zone. Subdivision and development in proximity to its transmitter site could lead to</p>	Accept in part	

				reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission and impede the operation of RNZ's network. For this reason, RNZ supports the retention of open spaces and maintenance of rural character.		
419.60	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment, as notified.	Dwellings to support workers accommodation are a critical requirement of many rural production activities. The policy is supported, however the method limits the accommodation unit size to be too small to support a farm worker family situation or seasonal workers accommodation that might require a shared living arrangement.	Accept in part	
FS1388.205	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	
FS1171.38	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission seeks to retain Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment as notified. This submission is supported for those reasons provided in T & G Global's original submission.	Accept in part	
466.60	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment as notified.	The submitter supports this policy.	Accept in part	
680.63	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment, as follows: (a) <u>Shall be at a density and scale</u> Retain open spaces to ensure rural character is maintained. (b) Additional dwellings <u>shall be directly associated with the scale and intensity of the farming activities on</u>	The submitter is concerned with Council's reference within the policy to retain open spaces. Open space is one element which contributes to the rural character. Prioritising this value over others has the potential to create perverse outcomes. The submitter has concerns at the priority	Accept in part	

			<p><del>site support workers' accommodation for large productive rural activities.</del></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	<p>given to workers' accommodation and considers the policy should also recognise that farm properties may require extra dwellings which are occupied by non-staff, for example, other family members living on the farm who may not be employed on the property. There will be situations such as farm succession where retired family members will continue to live on the property. Furthermore, the term 'worker' may not cover the situation where more than one owner of the property resides on the farm in separate housing, as they aren't technically 'staff'.</p>		
FS1387.171	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 in part	
FS1375.7	Radio New Zealand	Oppose	Retain Policy 5.3.4(a) as notified.	<p>RNZ supports the retention of open spaces and maintenance of rural character as a means of managing subdivision and development in the Rural Zone.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1171.75	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	<p>This submission seeks to amend Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment. This submission is supported as it provides clarification on the aspects of the rural environment that should be retained when considering additional residential development.</p>	Accept in part	

794.38	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment as follows: (a) Retain open spaces to ensure rural character is maintained. (b) Additional dwellings support workers' accommodation for large productive rural activities. (c) <u>Require site specific design responses for subdivision provisions that avoid, remedy and mitigate, any potential significant adverse effects of buildings on rural character and amenity.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a</p>	Accept in part	
--------	---	-------------------	--	--	----------------	--

				<p>council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils where they are practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.</p>		
FS1387.1258	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p><i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i></p>	Accept in part	
330.132	Andrew and Christine Gore	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment to allow urban development to take place in an amended	It must be addressed where property is a Future Urban Zone and has restrictions on rural amenity imposed by current development.	Accept in part	

			environment that preserves the rural character, by less intensive urbanisation.			
FS1379.75	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC opposes the amendment of Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and buildings within the rural environment, which would allow urban development in the UEA. The amendment sought would apply to all rural-zoned land; it could result in unintended development in rural areas and would be contrary to the purpose of the UEA.	Accept in part	
FS1386.404	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 in part	
697.556	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Add to Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and building with the rural environment two new policies as follows: (c) <u>Additional dwellings and buildings do not compromise the rural character and amenity of the surrounding locality.</u> (d) <u>Provide for a minor dwelling, where it: (i) is located within proximity to the principal dwelling on a site; and (ii) maintains rural character and amenity.</u>	Additional policy (c) is required in order to make it clear that additional dwellings (i.e. second dwellings) and buildings are supported in the rural environment, provided they do not compromise rural character and amenity. Additional policy (d) is required to provide clear direction on minor dwellings to ensure rule 22.3.2 (minor dwelling) where the rule cannot be met given that it is a Discretionary activity.	Accept in part	
FS1168.58	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Additional policy (c) is required in order to make it clear that additional dwellings (i.e. second dwellings) and buildings are supported in the rural environment, provided they do not compromise rural character and amenity. Additional policy (d) is required to provide clear direction on minor dwellings to ensure rule 22.3.2 (minor dwelling) where the rule	Accept in part	

				cannot be met given that it is a Discretionary activity.		
FS1291.26	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	Buildings and minor dwellings should be permitted in rural areas. Locating a minor dwelling in proximity to the principal dwelling does not always promote the best landscape outcome.	Accept in part	
FS1171.102	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission proposes amendments to Policy 5.3.4 Density of dwellings and building with the rural environment. This submission is supported. Additional dwellings and buildings ancillary to rural activities should be supported in the rural environment, provided they do not compromise rural character and amenity.	Accept in part	
FS1377.227	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	Buildings and minor dwellings should be permitted in rural areas. Locating a minor dwelling in proximity to the principal dwelling does not always promote the best landscape outcome.	Accept in part	
FS1379.271	Hamilton City Council	Support		HCC supports the additional policies related to minor dwellings to ensure appropriate assessment of effects is undertaken.	Accept in part	
FS1387.607	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	
Policy 5.3.8 – Effects on Rural character and amenity from rural subdivision						
106.2	Bruce and Dorothy Chipman	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought	Clause (d) is amended to include the provision for the relocation of consented lots and Records of Title.	Accept in part	



			<p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.8(d) Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as follows: (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations <u>of consented lots and Records of Title</u> ensure the following:...</p>			
332.7	Gwyneth & Barrie Smith	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as follows: (b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained. ...</p>	<p>Policy 5.3.8(b) duplicates Policies 5.3.8(d)(ii) and 5.3.8(e), which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character varies in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. There are also areas of active and dynamic primary production rather than benign landscapes. Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings, however these are important components of primary production activities and form part of the rural environment.</p>	Accept in part	
355.9	Scott & Tina Ferguson	Support	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivisions, as follows: (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d)(ii) Maintenance of the localised rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (e) ... ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>Policy 5.3.8 (b) duplicates Policy 5.3.8(d)(ii) and 5.3.8(e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses and are recognised as important components of primary production activities which form part of the rural environment.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1375.14	Radio New Zealand	Oppose	Reject relief sought.	<p>RNZ supports the retention of open spaces and maintenance of rural character and amenity as a means of managing subdivision and development in the Rural Zone. What is meant by 'localised rural character' is not clear.</p>	Accept in part	

362.7	CYK Limited	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as follows: (a) Protect productive rural areas by directing urban forms of subdivision, use, and development to within the boundaries of towns and villages. <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> (c) Ensure subdivision, use and development minimise the effects or ribbon development. (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>Policy 5.3.8(b) duplicates (d)(ii) and (e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. It is recognised that the district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. These are recognised as important components of primary production activities and form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.</p>	Accept in part	
364.9	Michael Innes	Support	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>Policy 5.3.8(b) duplicates (d)(ii) and (e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. It is recognised that the district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.</p>	Accept in part	
450.3	Alison Green for Rushala Farm Ltd	Oppose	<p>No specific decision sought, but the submitter opposes Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision.</p>	<p>The submitter considers that it should be the right of the landowner to decide what to do with their land. Farming is becoming less viable as a result of compliance costs and restrictions. Subdivision enables farmers to survive and reduce debt.</p>	Accept in part	

FS1375.15	Radio New Zealand	Oppose	Reject relief sought.	RNZ's transmitter is in the proposed Rural Zone. Subdivision and development in proximity to its transmitter site could lead to reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission and impede the operation of RNZ's network.	Accept in part	
507.9	Whitford Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: ... (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy 5.3.8 (b) duplicates Policy 5.3.8(d)(ii) and 5.3.8.(e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses and are recognised as important components of primary production activities which form part of the rural environment.	Accept in part	
509.9	Denise and Harold Williams	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part with amendments. Policy 5.3.8 (b) duplicates Policy 5.3.8(d)(ii) and 5.3.8.(e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
512.9	Enton Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND	Policy is supported in part with amendments. Policy 5.3.8 (b) duplicates Policy 5.3.8(d)(ii) and 5.3.8.(e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural	Accept in part	

			Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and pack houses, however these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, which form part of the rural environment, and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.		
513.9	Vanoo Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part with amendments. Policy 5.3.8 (b) duplicates Policy 5.3.8(d)(ii) and 5.3.8.(e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
FS1062.62	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow entire submission.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The rural environment as notified does not take into account fragmented land.</li> <li>All land owners should be able to enjoy amenity value.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
514.7	DP & LJ Ramsey Limited	Not Stated	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of</del>	Policy is supported in part. There is duplication between Policy 5.3.8 (b), (d)(ii) and (e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and	Accept in part	

			<p>rural areas. (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses, however these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.</p>		
516.9	Anthony and Maureen Vazey	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses, however these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment, and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.</p>	Accept in part	
517.9	Amanda and Brian Billington	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are</p>	<p>Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses and are recognised as important components of primary production activities, however these form</p>	Accept in part	

			maintained.	part of the rural environment and generally considered rural in appearance and value.		
519.9	B and N Balle Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses, however these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
520.9	Finlayson Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and pack houses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
521.9	Max and Denise Irwin for A Irwin & Son Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i)	Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural	Accept in part	

			<p>Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.</p>		
522.9	Joy & Wayne Chapman	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.</p>	Accept in part	
523.9	R & B Litchfield Limited	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that</p>	<p>Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses.</p>	Accept in part	

			localised rural character and amenity values are maintained.	However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.		
526.9	Roy & Lesley Wright	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses and are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
527.9	Mark Scobie	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
529.7	Wilcox Properties Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below	Supported in part. Policies 5.3.8 (b),(d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity	Accept in part	



			<p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the localised rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and pack houses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance value.</p>		
530.9	John Van Lieshout	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 - Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.8 - Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as follows: ... <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the follow: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>Policy is supported in part. Clause (b) should be deleted as it duplicates the statements in clauses (d)(ii) and (e) which also seek to maintain rural character and amenity. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity as they can include active and dynamic primary productive activities. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can therefore be altered by structure and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. These are recognised as important components of primary activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.</p>	Accept in part	
532.9	Joanne & Kevin Sands	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as follows: ... <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the follow: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.</p>	<p>Policy is supported in part. Clause (b) should be deleted as it duplicates the statements in clauses (d)(ii) and (e) which also seek to maintain rural character and amenity. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity as they can include active and dynamic primary productive activities. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can therefore be altered by structure and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses, these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.</p>	Accept in part	

533.9	Colin & Rae Hedley	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: ... (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the follow: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part. Clause (b) should be deleted as it duplicates the statements in clauses (d)(ii) and (e) which also seek to maintain rural character and amenity. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity as they can include active and dynamic primary productive activities. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can therefore be altered by structure and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. These are recognised as important components of primary production activities, part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
536.9	LJ & TM McWatt Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Policy Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, so that it reads as follows: (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the follow: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part. Clause (b) should be deleted as it duplicates the statements in clauses (d)(ii) and (e) which also seek to maintain rural character and amenity. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity as they can include active and dynamic primary productive activities. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can therefore be altered by structure and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. These are recognised as important primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
539.9	Garyowen Properties (2008) Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: ... (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the follow: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part. Clause (b) should be deleted as it duplicates the statements in clauses (d)(ii) and (e) which also seek to maintain rural character and amenity. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity as they can include active and dynamic primary productive activities. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be altered by structure and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. These are recognised as important component of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	

540.7	Glen Alvon Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision except for the amendments sought below AND Amend 5.3.8 Policy - Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: ... (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained	Policy supported in part. Clause (b) should be deleted as it duplicates the statements in clauses (d)(ii) and (e) which also seek to maintain rural character and amenity. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity as they can include active and dynamic primary productive activities. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be altered by structure and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
544.6	KR & BC Summerville	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: ... (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part. Clause (b) should be deleted as it duplicates the statements in clauses (d)(ii) and (e) which also seek to maintain rural character and amenity. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity as they can include active and dynamic primary productive activities. It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be altered by structure and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. These are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
686.7	Reid Crawford Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained. ...	Policy 5.3.8 (b) duplicates 5.3.8.(d)(ii) and 5.3.8.(e), which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. There are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than benign landscapes. Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and pack houses and are recognised as important components of primary production activities which form part of the rural environment.	Accept in part	

746.3	The Surveying Company	Support	<p>Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Policy 5.3.8- Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as follows: (a) Protect productive rural areas by directing urban forms of subdivision, use, and development to within the boundaries of towns and villages. (b) <del>Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> (c) Ensure subdivision, use and development minimise the effects of ribbon development. (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained. ....</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggest removing Policy 5.3.8(b) duplicates 5.3.8(d)(ii) and 5.3.8(e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained.</li> <li>• Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity.</li> <li>• It is recognised that the district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes.</li> <li>• It should be recognised that rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses. However these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
FS1387.904	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p><i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</i></p> <p><i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i></p>	Accept in part	
777.4	Radio New Zealand Limited	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Policy 5.3.8(e) and (f) Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: (e) <del>Ensure s</del>Subdivision, use and development <del>does not compromise opportunities ensure that</del> rural character and amenity values are <del>maintained</del>. (f) Subdivision, use and development ensures <del>that</del> the effects on public infrastructure are <del>minimised</del> <u>avoided</u>.</p>	<p>The addition of the requested text in clause (e) expresses this policy more clearly. In respect to clause (f), greater consistency is required with Policy 6.1.7 Reverse sensitivity and infrastructure, due to the submitter's concern with reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission in terms of its civil defence role.</p>	Accept in part	

872.9	Tarati Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Support in part Policy 5.3.8 with amendments. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and are areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses and are recognised as important components of primary production activities which form part of the rural environment.	Accept in part	
FS1045.12	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Oppose	Oppose submission 872.9		Accept in part	
873.9	Anita Moleta & Penny Gooding	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: (a) Protect productive rural areas by directing urban forms of subdivision, use and development to within the boundaries of towns and villages. <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy 5.3.8(b) duplicates Policy 5.3.8(d)(ii) and (e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that structures and buildings such as greenhouses and pack houses could visually alter rural landscapes. However, these are recognized as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
874.9	Louise & Tony Cole	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: (a) Protect productive rural areas by directing urban	Policy 5.3.8(b) duplicates Policy 5.3.8(d)(ii) and (e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes,	Accept in part	

			forms of subdivision, use and development to within the boundaries of towns and villages. <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that structures and buildings such as greenhouses and pack houses could visually alter rural landscapes. However, these are recognized as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.		
972.9	Mark Scobie	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	(b) Duplicates (d) (ii) and (e) which both seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures. These are also areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that structures and buildings such as greenhouses and pack houses could visually alter rural landscapes. However, these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
982.9	Joanne & Kevin Sands	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: ... <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas.</del> ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: ... (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; ... (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Clause (b) should be deleted as it duplicates the statements in clauses (d)(ii) and (e) which also seek to maintain rural character and amenity. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity as they can include active and dynamic primary productive activities. Rural landscapes can be altered by structure and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses which form part of the rural environment.	Accept in part	

985.5	Neil Crispe for Koch Farms Limited	Not Stated	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: <del>(b) Ensure development does not compromise the predominant open space, character and amenity of rural areas. ...</del> (d) Rural hamlet subdivision and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) Protection of rural land for productive purposes; (ii) Maintenance of the <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural environment; (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects. (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that <u>localised</u> rural character and amenity values are maintained.	Policy is supported in part. Policies 5.3.8(b), (d)(ii) and (e) are duplicates which seek to ensure that rural character and amenity are maintained. Not all rural areas comprise open space character and amenity. The district's rural character is varied in nature and comprises landscapes, landforms and structures and areas of active and dynamic primary production and associated activities rather than necessarily benign landscapes. It should be recognised that Rural landscapes can be visually altered by structures and buildings such as greenhouses and packhouses, however these are recognised as important components of primary production activities, form part of the rural environment, and are generally considered rural in appearance and value.	Accept in part	
FS1379.379	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the suggested amendments to Policy 5.3.8 Rural character. The key purpose of the Rural Zone is to protect the productive nature of the land and to ensure growth is more appropriately directed to towns and other areas identified for growth. Growth for non-rural purposes within the Rural Zone is contrary to the principles of the WRPS and Future Proof Strategy.	Accept in part	
FS1076.20	New Zealand Pork Industry Board	Support	NZ Pork agrees with the submitter that not all rural landscapes comprise open space character and amenity. Rural buildings, irrespective of their size, are an accepted element of the character and amenity of rural areas.		Accept in part	
197.11	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision.	The submitter supports clear policy on managing effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision.	Accept in part	
330.58	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
372.27	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Oppose	Delete Policy 5.3.8(d) Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision.	The provisions enabling rural hamlet development do not cascade appropriately from the higher order strategic objectives of the plan and as the provisions enabling rural hamlets are sought for deletion, the associated policy is also sought for deletion.	Reject	

FS1342.65	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 372.27.	FFNZ considers the policy provides appropriate direction for plan users.	Accept	
FS1330.23	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Reject Submission.	Rural hamlets are a way of providing for the needs to people and the demand for rural residential living and can be used to leverage significant environmental protection and enhancement.	Accept	
419.63	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as notified.	The policy provides clear direction for managing effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision.	Accept in part	
466.62	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as notified.	The submitter supports this policy. The submitter supports the intention of Policy 5.3.8 to protect productive rural areas by directing urban forms of subdivision, use and development to within the boundaries of the towns and villages. However, it is considered that the rezoning of high-class soils for residential use surrounding townships, contradicts the intention of the Plan and areas of rezoning should be readdressed to protect high-class soil where it is appropriate to do so.	Accept in part	
FS1168.61	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	The submitter supports the intention of Policy 5.3.8 to protect productive rural areas by directing urban forms of subdivision, use and development to within the boundaries of the towns and villages. However, it is considered that the rezoning of high-class soils for residential use surrounding townships, contradicts the intention of the Plan and areas of rezoning should be readdressed to protect high-class soil where it is appropriate to do so.	Accept in part	
535.51	Lance Vervoort for Hamilton City Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision.	The submitter supports the intent of this policy which is to protect rural character and amenity.	Accept in part	
680.67	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.8 (e) Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: (e) Subdivision, use and development opportunities ensure that rural character and amenity values are maintained. Subdivision within the Rural Zone should give particular consideration to anticipated rural land use and development and recognise that integrated and well planned subdivision design: (i)	Submitter understands the intent of the policy but consider Waikato District Council's focus on rural character and amenity betrays a lack of understanding of the broader issues and drivers for subdivision within a rural environment. Subdivision is primarily a process of defining (or redefining) land	Accept in part	



			<p><u>Creates desirable places to live. (ii) Results in the efficient and effective land use. (iii) Provides for anticipated future land use and development. (iv) Recognises the physical layout and underlying topography of the site. (v) Integrates with existing utility services and infrastructure. (vi) Gives effect to any relevant outline development plan or structure plan. (vii) Implements best practice urban design principles (viii) Enables efficient utilisation of productive farmland through appropriate provision for rearranging property ownership to enable management of farmland according to landowner need</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p>	<p>parcel boundaries. However, for farmers and other large landowners, land is a critical asset, and there are important implications arising from regulation of subdivision that need to be appropriately considered. Submitter agrees that inappropriately designed or located subdivision can result in the inefficient use of natural and physical resources that can give rise to adverse environmental effects. These concerns should be appropriately addressed through the Proposed District Plan (PDP) in a way that provides certainty for developers and landowners, and which aligns subdivision provisions with Council's broader strategic planning. It is also important that the PDP recognises that unnecessary constraints on otherwise appropriate subdivision can also result in adverse effects. In considering the proposed rules around subdivision, the submission seeks to ensure there is a degree of flexibility for landowners in the rural area who need subdivision enabled in order to facilitate efficient management of the land resource. This recognises that economic and social drivers for subdivision may differ between farming operations, and that these different drivers often require different treatment. Farmers undertake low impact subdivision for a variety of reasons. These vary from diversifying their business into tourism operations (lodgings and or associated tourism development and infrastructure), providing for or disposing of a surplus dwelling on the property where a neighbouring farm is purchased, providing for a family member or staff member to live on the farm or to implement a succession plan for multiple siblings through small lot subdivision, or for boundary adjustment of boundary relocation to promote the more efficient administration of farm land. A farm may be valued considerably beyond its underlying productive capacity, simply because of the farm's proximity to the</p>		
--	--	--	---	---	--	--

				<p>urban centre and urban infrastructure, or the amenity afforded by proximity to a desirable locality, such as coastal areas. However, these reflect a piece of land's potential value for other land uses, and do not reflect its value for farming per-se. This situation can result in a farmer having to pay considerably more in rates or facing significantly increased opportunity costs from continuing to farm the land, as opposed to subdividing the property for some other land use. This in-turn creates a significant economic driver for subdivision. This tautological driver of land value needs to be carefully managed if NZ is to avoid losing valuable productive farmland in favour of non-farming development and use. This situation can be exacerbated where returns from farming are variable, due to a variety of factors including: weather conditions, economic conditions, individual property circumstances and market demands, which disrupt farming continuity. Therefore enabling diversification, flexibility, responsiveness and cash flow, are critically important to retaining the viability of farming.</p>		
FS1375.16	Radio New Zealand	Oppose	Reject relief sought.	<p>RNZ's transmitter is in the proposed Rural Zone. Subdivision and development in proximity to its transmitter site could lead to reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission and impede the operation of RNZ's network.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1348.23	Perry International Trading Group Limited	Support	Null	<p>PITGL supports the amendment to Policy 5.3.8 (e) as it provides developers' greater clarity in the outcomes sought as a result of rural subdivision.</p>	Accept in part	
695.51	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	<p>No specific decision sought with regards to Policy 5.3.8(d) Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, but submission states rural hamlet subdivision should not occur in an adhoc manner, which will cumulatively result in undermining the rural character. Such subdivision should have entitlements transferred to land around existing towns and villages.</p>	<p>Rural hamlet subdivision should not occur in an adhoc manner. It cumulatively results in undermining the rural character through dispersed development of non-rural activity. It contradicts to the Rural Zone objectives and policies in (ii) Maintenance of the rural character and amenity of the surrounding rural</p>	Accept in part	

				environment; and (iii) Minimisation of cumulative effects.		
FS1379.264	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes any changes to the Rural Zone subdivision rules that allow for more subdivision in the Rural Zone. Subdivision should only be of a scale and size to support productive rural uses. HCC opposes the provision for subdivision to be able to locate specifically around existing towns and villages as this would result in urban sprawl around those areas and could impede any further/denser development in those areas. Subdivision should be directed to the urban limits of existing towns.	Accept in part	
742.38	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: (c) Ensure subdivision, use and development <del>minimise</del> avoids the adverse effects of ribbon development ... (f) Subdivision, use and development ensures the adverse effects on public infrastructure are <u>avoided or mitigated</u> <del>minimised</del> AND Clarify what is meant by "urban forms of subdivision, use, and development" and "the boundaries of towns and villages" in Policy 5.3.8. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the development of accessible, liveable communities and therefore seeks Policy 5.3.8 is amended to align with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act to avoid the adverse effects of activities on the environment, including of ribbon development. Both clauses (c) and (f) refer to minimising effects, however the Resource Management Act definition of "effects" includes both positive and adverse effects. The policy uses the term "urban forms" in reference to subdivision, use and development, and also refers to "the boundaries" of towns and villages. Neither of these is defined. The latter may be better described as being land with specific zoning at the time the plan is made operative.	Accept in part	
FS1375.17	Radio New Zealand	Support	Accept relief sought.	RNZ's transmitter is in the proposed Rural Zone. Subdivision and development in proximity to its transmitter site could lead to reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission and impede the operation of RNZ's network.	Accept in part	
777.10	Radio New Zealand Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.8(f) Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision to replace the term "public infrastructure" with "infrastructure", and all other instances where this term is used; OR	It is not clear what kind of infrastructure Policy 5.3.8(f) refers to.	Accept in part	

			Add a new definition for "public infrastructure" to Chapter 13 Definitions, which includes Radio New Zealand.			
FS1387.1178	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	
794.14	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as follows: (a) Protect <del>productive</del> <u>the amenity values of</u> rural areas by directing urban forms of subdivision, use and development to within the boundaries of towns and villages. ... (d) Rural hamlet subdivision, <u>in situ environmental enhancement incentive subdivision</u>, and boundary relocations ensure the following: (i) <del>Protection of r</del><u>Rural land can continue to be used</u> for productive purposes. ...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Based on the Council's own evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not quality as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the</p>	Accept in part	

				<p>district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils where practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.</p>		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--

797.45	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision as notified.	Supports policy of directing urban development away from productive rural areas.	Accept in part	
81.217	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision.	WRPS Implementation Method 6.1.5 seeks to direct rural-residential development to areas identified in the district plan. This sits within a greater context of provisions around focusing the expansion of urban development in identified growth areas, in this case as defined through Future Proof Growth Strategy.	Accept in part	
FS1062.16	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Seek to disallow submission point 81.217 diverting expansion into urban growth areas.	• The Future Proof strategy does not allow for development of uneconomic rural blocks.	Accept in part	
330.133	Andrew and Christine Gore	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, so that urban development can take place in the form of rural development that does not have to regard the productive soils where the productive rural area is already compromised by development such as large scale public works.	In a situation such as the submitters', the rural land is no longer productive due to fragmentation out of their control. Rural subdivision should be able to take place without the clause protecting production.	Accept in part	
FS1375.13	Radio New Zealand	Oppose	Reject relief sought.	RNZ's transmitter is in the proposed Rural Zone. Subdivision and development in proximity to its transmitter site could lead to reverse sensitivity effects on its transmission and impede the operation of RNZ's network.	Accept in part	
FS1379.76	Hamilton City Council	Oppose		HCC opposes the amendment of Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision. The requested changes would allow for ad hoc, unchecked and unplanned development in rural areas. It would also result in increased subdivision in the UEA, contrary to the purpose of the UEA.	Accept in part	
433.5	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new clause to Policy 5.3.8 Effects on rural character and amenity from rural subdivision, as follows: (g) <u>Ensure that the form and location of subdivision does not compromise public access to rivers, streams, lakes and wetlands and the quality of these environments.</u> AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	The recreational values of waterbodies can be constrained by limited public access. Fish and Game has a statutory obligation to maintain and enhance access to sports fisheries and game bird hunting areas and public spaces can be fragmented by the subdivision process if not carefully managed. Furthermore, section 6(d) of the Resource Management Act notes that the maintenance and enhancement of public access to and along the coastal marine area, lakes and rivers is a matter of national importance and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement places an	Accept in part	

				obligation on Council to recognise the importance of public access to these areas.		
FS1223.68	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 in part	
FS1330.38	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited	Oppose	Oppose in current form. Reject subject to further amendments.	The proposal does not sufficiently acknowledge design constraints, and security and health and safety risks, of unfettered public access.	Accept in part	
<b>Rule 22.3.1 – Number of dwellings within a lot</b>						
292.5	David Yzendoorn for David and Barbara Yzendoorn	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.1 PI (a) Number of dwellings within a lot to permit more than one dwelling on lots less than 40ha.	The rule unreasonably restricts development of small lots. The submitter has approximately 5500m2 lot across the road from the Hamilton City boundary at 83 Greenhill Rd, and wishes to build a new home with a decent floor space, and also retain the small 85ish m2 existing house which is in above average condition.	Reject	
FS1379.61	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the relief sought to amend Rule 22.3.1 PI (a), to increase the number of dwellings within the Rural Zone. HCC opposes the relief sought to remove the date from the Rural Zone Subdivision Rules. This would enable more subdivision than is allowed by the notified plan and will result in unplanned growth and land fragmentation within HCC's Area of Interest.		

FS1386.300	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.		
471.5	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot, so that the term "lot" is replaced with "site". AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	The term "lot" is not defined in Chapter 13.	Reject	
FS1388.441	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.		
690.8	Paramjit & Taranpal Singh	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot, to allow for three dwellings on lots over 100ha as a permitted activity.	Should be permitted as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan. Lots over 100ha are able to absorb and mitigate effects of a third house by virtue of their size.	Accept	



FS1387.304	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	
676.17	T&G Global Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot insofar as the use of existing residential dwellings within the rural environment by agricultural, horticultural and seasonal workers is currently enabled as the use of a residential unit.	The submitter supports this rule on the basis that it provides for the occupation of dwellings by agricultural, horticultural and seasonal workers.	Accept in part	
FS1387.149	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Oppose submission 676.17	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
FS1168.72	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	The submitter supports this rule on the basis that it provides for the occupation of dwellings by agricultural, horticultural and seasonal workers.	Accept in part	

746.80	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.1 PI Number of dwellings within a lot to provide for three dwellings on lots over 100 hectares as a permitted activity.	Three Dwellings on lots over 100 hectares should be permitted as per the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan. Lots of over 100 hectares are able to absorb and mitigate the effects of a third house by virtue of their size.	Accept in part	
FS1387.953	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	
794.16	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot; AND Add a more enabling provision. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.	evidence there is no doubt that a significant resource management issue for the District is biodiversity loss, which continues to be at risk due to vegetation clearance, stock intrusion, animal and pest degradation, degradation of the margins for estuarine wetlands by stock. The submitter is concerned that the Proposed District Plan is largely focused on only protecting existing Significant Natural Areas and ignores restoring, linking and expanding indigenous biodiversity that does not qualify as Significant Natural Areas. There is no regulatory framework to increase indigenous vegetation and wetlands to a target vegetation cover of 30%, actively manage areas that can be considered Significant Natural Areas in the future, increase vegetation cover on steep and erosion prone land, incentivize fencing of riparian areas, incentivize the creation of new corridors, pest control, enrichment planting and restoration. No comprehensive research supports the claim that incentive-based planting in the district has resulted in sporadic, adhoc development. There appears to be no robust analysis of the success or failures of the limited amount of enhancement subdivision that has previously been undertaken in the Franklin part of the District that had these provisions. Several court decisions including Di Andre Estates Ltd v Rodney District Council, Arrigato Investments v Auckland	Reject	

				<p>Regional Council, Omaha Park and Cabra v Auckland Council are useful for establishing current best practice to meet the requirements of Part 2 of the RMA. Cabra v Auckland Council case law notes that the Council could not use the fact that there may be issues with weeds, or poor fencing, as a reason to oppose the inclusion of incentive provisions in the Plan, because it had the authority and responsibility to monitor consent conditions. There are a range of enforcement mechanisms available to a council, and the ability to recover costs from a consent holder, that mean managing compliance in these areas should not be onerous for a council. The court in the Cabra case has taken a far sighted and future oriented approach to the maintenance and enhancement of biodiversity. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the New Zealand Coastal Policy Statement. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the National Policy Statement for Freshwater Management. The Proposed District Plan does not adopt the vision of the Waikato River Settlement Act as there is not a strong emphasis in the vision on restoration. The Proposed District Plan does not give effect to the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. The submitter supports appropriate protection of high-class soils where practicable and where they are alternatives to using this land. However, sustainable land management may mean that subdivision on these soils is not always inappropriate.</p>		
FS1171.109	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow to the extent consistent with this further submission.	Support in so far as enabling additional dwellings can assist with providing worker accommodation in this rural environment, however need to ensure that this is balanced with reverse sensitivity issues for residential activities in rural areas.	Reject	
FS1387.1246	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</p>	Accept	

				development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
FS1379.326	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	HCC opposes the amendment to Rule 22.3.1 to allow more than one dwelling on a lot within the Rural Zone, within HCC's Area of Interest. Increasing the number of dwellings will increase the density and could result in residential growth within the Rural Zone. It is a requirement of the WRPS and a fundamental principle of the Future Proof Strategy that residential growth is directed to towns and other areas identified for growth.	Accept	
797.30	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot as notified.	Supports restriction to 1 dwelling per 40ha. This will assist in avoiding potential for reverse sensitivity effects to arise in respect to primary production activities and mining.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1271	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	
81.163	Waikato Regional Council	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot.	The submitter supports the provision of dwellings, buildings and structures in landscape or natural character areas as a discretionary activity. This gives effect to Policy 6.2, 12.1, 12.2, 12.3 of the WRPS.	Accept in part	
FS1223.35	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	Accept in part	

				<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>		
FS1062.11	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Oppose all of and disallow submission 81.163 that seeks to limit dwellings ha lot.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important that small block land use can be maximised.</li> <li>• It is important that small block owners can provide for families like farm blocks.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
943.13	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.1 (a) Number of dwellings within a lot, to replace the word "lot" with "site".	Lot is not defined within Chapter 13 Definitions.	Reject	
FS1387.1567	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept	
330.147	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1386.411	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	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</p>	Accept in part	

				<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>		
680.218	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot, as follows: (a) One dwelling within a lot containing less than <del>40</del> <u>20</u>ha, (b) No more than two dwellings within a lot <del>containing between 20 ha to 40ha</del> <u>or more</u>;</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new clause (c) to Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot, as follows: <u>(c) No more than three dwellings within a lot containing over 40 ha or more;</u> <del>(c)</del> <u>(d) Any dwelling(s) under Rule 22.3.1 PI</u> (a), (b) and <del>(c)</del> must not be located within any: (i) Outstanding Natural Feature; (ii) Outstanding Natural Landscape; <u>(iii) Outstanding Natural Character Area;</u> <del>(iii)</del> <u>(iv) High Natural Character Area.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.</p>	<p>The submitter understands the intent of this provision with regards to PI(c)(i) and (ii), however the rule should not apply to areas which do not meet RMA Section 6(b) status. The submitter supports the graduated approach to the number of dwellings on a site, however considers that the proposed numbers are currently overly restrictive for rural purposes. Many farms have extra dwellings as accommodation for farm managers, employees, or retired parents. Allowing for more than two dwellings per site on larger properties will enable the social well-being of rural communities.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1171.90	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	<p>Allow the submission.</p>	<p>This submission proposes amendments to Rule 22.3.1 Number of dwellings within a lot. This submission is supported. The amendment would increase the number of dwellings that can be provided on a rural property which could assist with accommodating workers for rural production activities, this is supported in so far as the density of such development is maintained at a level that is appropriate within the rural zone and that reverse sensitivity issues are addressed.</p>	Accept in part	

FS1387.213	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	
FS1379.237	Hamilton City Council	Oppose	Null	The submission seeks the ability to add additional dwellings on a lot. HCC opposes increased residential dwellings within our Area of Interest. This does not align with the intention to contain residential development within existing towns and areas identified for growth.	Accept in part	
695.211	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	No specific decision sought for Rule 22.3.1 PI(b) Number of dwellings within a lot, however the submitter has concerns that where land has been previously subdivided only the dwelling entitlement that was taken should count, and only on that parcel that was amalgamated. Any remaining entitlements that occur on the land should provide for entitlement to subdivide, and should not restrict subdivision of amalgamated titles where one of the parcels was not previously utilised.	The concern relates to subdivision entitlement, that where land has been previously subdivided only the dwelling entitlement that was taken should count.	Accept in part	
FS1387.359	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.	Accept in part	

				<i>This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>			
697.797	Waikato Council	District	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.1 PI Number of dwellings within a lot, as follows: (a) One dwelling within a <del>lot</del> <u>record of title</u> containing <u>an area</u> less than 40ha; (b) No more than two dwellings within a <del>lot</del> <u>record of title</u> containing <u>an area</u> 40ha or more; (c) Any dwelling(s) under Rule 22.3.1 PI (a) and (b) must not be located within any <u>of the following landscape and natural character areas</u> : (i) Outstanding Natural Feature; (ii) Outstanding Natural Landscape; (iii) Outstanding Natural Character Area; (iv) High Natural Character Area.	The definition "record of title" has been included for correction and other words for clarity of the rule.	Accept	
FS1387.690	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D		Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
<b>Rule 22.3.2 – Minor Dwellings</b>							
14.2	Steve Cochrane		Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.2 PI Minor dwelling to accommodate caregivers, not just dependent relatives. AND Amend Rule 22.3.2 PI Minor dwelling to provide more flexibility in the location of minor dwellings on	More leniency with respect to the location for the minor dwelling unit as it may not be possible to locate a minor dwelling as per the Council rules. Applications for resource consent requesting dispensation can be made, but at additional cost. It should be the right of the land owner and not at the discretion of council	Accept in part	



			the site.	Alterations will allow for someone who has become debilitated to stay in their present home rather than move.		
FS1386.11	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 in part	
FS1308.4	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	More leniency with respect to the location for the minor dwelling unit as it may not be possible to locate a minor dwelling as per the Council rules. Applications for resource consent requesting dispensation can be made, but at additional cost. It should be the right of the land owner and not at the discretion of council. Alterations will allow for someone who has become debilitated to stay in their present home rather than move.	Accept in part	
69.1	Lucy Stallworthy	Neutral/ Amend	Delete the part of Rule 22.3.2 Minor dwelling, requiring minor dwellings to be within 20m of an existing dwelling.	It may not be possible to have a minor dwelling within 20m if the site is constrained or has geographical features which prevent this. As there is no longer a requirement for dependents to live in a minor dwelling, it could be used for worker accommodation. It may not be desirable to have workers living that close to the main house.	Accept in part	
FS1308.103	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	For the reasons given in submission point 14.2	Accept in part	
FS1386.55	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	Accept in part	

				<p>management 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>		
70.1	Ben Stallworthy	Neutral/ Amend	Delete the part of Rule 22.3.2 Minor Dwelling requiring minor dwellings to be within 20m of an existing dwelling.	It may not be realistic to have a minor dwelling within 20m due to constraints of the site or geographical shape of the land. As there is no longer a requirement for dependents to live in a minor dwelling, it could be used for worker accommodation. It may be better for workers to live more than 20m away.	Accept in part	
FS1386.57	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	
128.2	Trevor Reid	Not Stated	Delete the requirement in Rule 22.3.2 PI (b)(l) Minor dwelling for the minor dwelling to be located within 20m of the existing dwelling. AND	There should be more flexibility in the rule to fit the circumstances of the residents and make better practicable use of existing land areas and driveways.	Accept in part	

			Delete the requirement in Rule 22.3.2 P1(b)(ii) Minor dwelling for a minor dwelling to share a driveway with the existing dwelling.			
FS1092.16	Garth & Sandra Ellmers	Support	<i>The rules for requirement of a minor dwellings to be located within 20M of the main dwelling AND for the minor dwelling to share a driveway with the existing dwelling is very restrictive and not necessary. Many rural blocks of land are large so can easily accommodate two dwellings without compromising the integrity of the rural environment. e.g. The main dwelling may accommodate elderly parents so that ability to build a minor dwelling on the same property can allow the property owners to remain on the land and be cared for appropriately. If the 'care giver' had children it may not be desirable to have unnecessary noise levels in close proximity to the main dwelling (within 20M) Having a minor dwelling adjacent to the main home on the land could also devalue the main building on the land. Allowing greater separation between major and minor dwellings will allow privacy and space for both parties. Sharing the same driveway may be practical in most instances but it should not be a necessary requirement and should depend on the contour and size of the land and traffic safety requirements for access.</i>	<i>Rule 22.3.2 P1 (b) (i) is too restrictive and should be deleted.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1039.9	Colette Brown	Support	<i>Seeks that the whole of the submission be allowed.</i>	<i>There should be more flexibility to fit circumstances of the residents.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1101.3	Christine McNeill	Support	<i>The rules for requirement of a minor dwellings to be located within 20M of the main dwelling AND for the minor dwelling to share a driveway with the existing dwelling is very restrictive and not necessary. Many rural blocks of land are large so can easily accommodate two dwellings without compromising the integrity of the rural environment. e.g. The main dwelling may accommodate elderly parents so the ability to build a minor dwelling on the same property can allow the property owners to remain on the land and be cared for appropriately. If the 'care giver' had children it may not be desirable to have unnecessary noise levels in close proximity to the main dwelling (within 20M) Having a minor dwelling adjacent to the main home on the land could also devalue the main building on the land. Allowing greater separation between major and minor dwellings will allow privacy and space for both parties. Sharing the same driveway may be practical in most instances but it should not be a necessary requirement and should depend on the contour</i>	<i>Rule 22.3.2 P1 (b) (i) is too restrictive and should be deleted.</i>	Accept in part	

			<i>and size of the land and traffic safety requirements for access.</i>			
FS1386.110	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 in part	
130.3	Kathleen Reid	Oppose	Delete the requirement in Rule 22.3.2 PI(b)(ii) for the minor dwelling to be located within 20m of the existing dwelling. AND Delete the requirement in Rule 22.3.2 PI(b)(ii) Minor dwelling for minor dwellings to share a driveway with the existing dwelling.	There should be more flexibility in the rule to fit the circumstances of the residents and to make better practicable use of the existing land areas and driveways.	Accept in part	
FS1308.3	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	More leniency with respect to the location for the minor dwelling unit as it may not be possible to locate a minor dwelling as per the Council rules. Applications for resource consent requesting dispensation can be made, but at additional cost. It should be the right of the land owner and not at the discretion of council Alterations will allow for someone who has become debilitated to stay in their present home rather than move.	Accept in part	
FS1386.114	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	Accept in part	

				considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
171.1	Louis Faesenkloet (Luke)	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.2 Minor Dwelling, particularly that a minor unit is a permitted activity that the maximum size is 70m2, that the minor dwelling is located within 20m of the dwelling and that the minor dwelling shares driveway access with the existing dwelling AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to clarify that the 70m2 maximum gross floor area for a minor dwelling does not include a garage.	Provision enables additional accommodation without needing consent, e.g for farmhands, elderly parents, teenagers.	Accept in part	
FS1386.148	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 in part	
276.6	Ted and Kathryn Letford	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.2 Minor dwelling.	Should be permitted to have a minor dwelling. Should be no requirement for it to be occupied by a dependent person related to the person in the main dwelling. Better outcome that the current Dependent Person Dwelling rule under the Operative Plan.	Accept in part	

FS1386.284	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 in part	
363.2	Divina Libre	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.2 (P1) Minor dwelling, and ensure that it does not include reference to dependent persons in the rule.	There is no need to stipulate that dependent persons live in a minor dwelling.	Accept in part	
FS1386.533	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 in part	
363.3	Divina Libre	Support	Delete Rule 22.3.2 (P1)(b)(i) Minor dwelling, that requires minor dwellings to be within 20m of the main dwelling.	This requirement for minor dwellings to be within 20m of the main dwelling is unnecessary. Takes no account of the topography or other features of the land. A better site on the land may be further away.	Accept in part	

FS1386.534	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 in part	
FS1006.1	Robert Burke	Support	I support the submission for the following reasons Discretion should be provided for a second dwelling to be located further than 20m from the main residence to allow for site topography, access to the main driveway, and drainage issues. Other factors should include protection of established plantings already in place ie orchards, the location of sewerage disposal areas, and the privacy of occupants of both dwellings.		Accept in part	
407.2	Mel Libre	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.2 PI Minor dwelling and do not include reference to dependent persons in the rule.	There is no need to stipulate that dependent persons live in a minor dwelling.	Accept in part	
407.3	Mel Libre	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.2 PI (b)(i) Minor dwelling, requiring a minor dwelling to be within 20m of the main dwelling.	The requirement for the minor dwelling to be within 20m of the main dwelling is unnecessary It takes no account of the topography and other features of the land. There might be a better site on the land which is further away.	Accept in part	
FS1308.31	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	For the reasons given in submission point 14.2.	Accept in part	
418.4	Ethan Findlay	Neutral/ Amend	Delete Rule 22.3.2 PI (a) Minor dwelling, which limits the gross floor area of a minor dwelling. AND Amend other parts of the district plan as necessary to give effect to the relief sought.	The size of the minor dwelling is best determined by the owner or end user and the building coverage rule for the Rural Zone already manages the size of this type of building. A gross floor area limit of 70m2 will not enable optimum building design for the intended use as it does not provide for sufficient storage room or flexibility to cater for the needs of different	Reject	

				occupants. The maximum gross floor area of 70m <sup>2</sup> is overly restrictive and makes no allowance for garaging within this rule.		
FS1003.1	Robert Fenton Burke	Support	I support Mr Findlays submission on the following basis. 1. 70m <sup>2</sup> unduly restricts the number of occupants who can live in the dwelling. I support a limit on the size of the dwelling but it should increase to 100m <sup>2</sup> . This limit should not include decks and garaging. 2. Restricting the size to 70m <sup>2</sup> will most likely create the need for other storage sheds etc to be built by landowners / occupants.		Reject	
FS1171.110	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow to the extent consistent with this further submission.	Support in so far as this seeks to enable greater flexibility and a larger footprint for minor dwellings. This should be balanced with reverse sensitivity issues for residential activities in rural areas.	Reject	
FS1388.162	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	
418.5	Ethan Findlay	Neutral/ Amend	Delete Rule 22.3.2 PI(b)(i) Minor dwelling, which requires minor dwellings to be 20m from the main dwelling. AND Amend other parts of the district plan as necessary to give effect to the relief sought.	The positioning of a minor dwelling relative to a dwelling should only be governed by the rules that address boundary setbacks and building coverage. This would allow landowners to optimise the permitted use of their land as they see fit. A 20 metre separation distance would also unlikely result in the best positioning of the minor dwelling in terms of solar performance, and accessibility, etc.	Accept in part	



FS1388.163	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	
426.2	Kim Angelo Libre	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.2 PI Minor dwelling and that it does not include reference to dependent persons in the rule.	There is no need to stipulate that dependent persons live in a minor dwelling.	Accept in part	
FS1062.41	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission in its entirety.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zoning of land between Waikato Expressway and rural to be sub dividable. This is no fragmented land.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
FS1388.254	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	
426.3	Kim Angelo Libre	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.2 PI (b) (i) Minor dwelling requiring the minor dwelling to be within 20 metres of the main dwelling.	This requirement is unnecessary. It takes no account of the topography and other features of the site. There may be a better site on the land further away.	Reject	

FS1388.255	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	
FS1062.43	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission in its entirety.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zoning of land between Waikato Expressway and rural to be sub dividable. This is not fragmented land.</li> </ul>	Reject	
FS1062.42	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission in its entirety.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Zoning of land between Waikato Expressway and rural to be sub dividable. This is not fragmented land.</li> </ul>	Reject	
452.2	R Mitchell	Support	No specific decision sought, but the submitter supports Rule 22.3.2 Minor dwelling as it would enable minor dwellings for use as per their original historic title.	The submitter states that they "wanted to use for the purpose allowed."	Accept in part	
FS1388.323	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	

471.6	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.2 Minor dwelling, so that the term "lot" is replaced with "site" AND Amend Rule 22.3.2 PI (a) Minor dwelling as follows: (a) One minor dwelling not exceeding 70m <sup>2</sup> gross floor area ( <u>excluding garage</u> ) within a lot. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	The term "lot" is not defined in Chapter 13. The submitter considers that garages should be excluded from the area of a minor dwelling.	Accept in part	
FS1388.442	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1060.1	Anthony Weddle	Support	Support submission point 471.6.	A minor dwelling of 70m <sup>2</sup> cannot reasonably include a garage, which could take away between quarter and half of the accommodation.	Accept in part	
489.6	Ann-Maree Gladding	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.2 PI (b)(i) Minor Dwelling, as follows: The minor dwelling must be located within <del>20m</del> <u>150m</u> of the dwelling;	The submitter commends having an actual separation distance stated as the Auckland Unitary plan just says 'in close proximity' which causes significant interpretation issues, however a minor dwelling 20m away from a main dwelling is far too close and does not allow for existing site restraints such as curtilage area, effluent disposal fields and other ancillary buildings. Everything in the rural area is at a much larger scale than residential environments and 150m is not far, so it will have no significant increase in potential adverse effects than 20m would. 150m will make a huge difference to the functionality of the rural property and will allow some degree of privacy between the main dwelling and minor dwelling.	Accept in part	

FS1388.479	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 Accept in part	
683.3	Carolyn Watson	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.2 P1(b)(i) Minor dwelling, as follows: (i) The minor dwelling must be located within <del>20m</del> 50m of the dwelling;	The section 32 analysis does not justify the proposed 20m separation distance. There is no longer a requirement for the minor dwelling to be occupied by a dependent and therefore a larger separation distance would provide more privacy for the residents of both the main dwelling and the minor dwelling. The requested 50m distance is not contrary to the objectives and policies specified in Chapter 5.	Accept in part	
FS1387.249	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	

696.7	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.2 Minor dwelling (a) A single minor dwelling is a permitted activity; (b)70m2 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, 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.	Accept in part	
FS1387.384	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	
696.8	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.2(b)(i) Minor dwelling, which requires the minor dwelling to be within 20m of the primary dwelling.	The condition is arbitrary. On a Rural zoned property, sheds can be located anywhere on the property so long as they comply with the yard requirements and daylight admission rules. Minor dwellings should have a similar approach. There are no effects with a minor dwelling being located greater than 20m from the principal dwelling. Will allow more effective use of the land and more optimal layout. No need for the principal and minor dwelling to be located in close proximity.	Accept in part	
FS1387.385	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</i>	Accept in part	

				<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. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
735.5	Cindy and Tony Young	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.2 Minor dwelling.	<p>Supports new single minor dwelling as a permitted activity on each site. Supports the following aspects of the rule: 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.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1387.820	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>	Accept in part	

				<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>		
735.6	Cindy and Tony Young	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.2(b)(i) Minor dwelling, which requires the minor dwelling to be within 20m of the primary dwelling.	The condition is arbitrary. On a Rural zoned property, sheds can be located anywhere on the property so long as they comply with the yard requirements and daylight admission rules and minor dwellings should have a similar approach. There are no effects with a minor dwelling being located greater than 20m from the principal dwelling. Will allow more effective use of the land and more optimal layout. No need for the principal and minor dwelling to be located in close proximity.	Accept in part	
FS1387.821	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	
754.5	Pieter Van Leeuwen	Support	Retain the following aspect of Rule 22.3.2 Minor Dwelling: Permitted activity status; 70m2 maximum gross floor area; Absence of limitations on the type of person occupying the minor dwelling; and Enabling the minor dwelling to be a permanent building.	Minor dwellings provide housing choice, particularly when families are changing in their makeup. Ability to provide housing choice is in accordance with the National Policy Statement for Urban Development Capacity and the Waikato Regional Policy Statement. Minor dwellings provide the elderly with independent living whilst maintaining a close distance to family for supported living. The effects are not different to that of a sleep out. Minor	Accept in part	

				<p>dwelling provide affordable options for housing. The size limit ensures they will be secondary to the primary dwelling. In terms of additional occupancy, they are no different to a large household.</p>		
FS1387.1105	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 in part	
754.6	Pieter Van Leeuwen	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.2 PI(b)(i) Minor dwelling requiring the minor dwelling to be within 20m of the primary dwelling.	<p>The condition requiring the minor dwelling to be located 20m away from the primary dwelling is arbitrary. On a Rural zoned property, sheds can be located anywhere on the property so long as they comply with the yard requirements and daylight admission rules. Minor dwellings should have a similar approach. In terms of rules, there are no effects with a minor dwelling being located greater than 20m from the principal dwelling. Deletion of this condition will allow more effective use of the land and more optimal layout. No need for the principal and minor dwelling to be located in close proximity.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1387.1106	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</p>	Accept in part	



				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
782.6	Jack Macdonald	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.2 PI(b)(i) Minor dwelling, as follows: (i) The minor dwelling must be located within <del>20m</del> <u>150m</u> of the dwelling;	Submitter supports specifying a separation distance. The proposed 20m separation distance is too small as it does not allow for existing site constraints such as curtilage area, effluent disposal fields and other ancillary buildings. The requested 150m distance will make a huge difference in terms of functionality of the property while providing some degree of privacy between the main dwelling and minor dwelling.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1229	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	
814.1	Jenny Goodwright for Awaroa Farm Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.2 Minor dwelling - PI (b)(i), as follows: The minor dwelling must be located within <del>20</del> <u>100</u> m of the dwelling;	20m away from a main dwelling is far too close. Especially in a rural environment, creating privacy is paramount.	Accept	
FS1387.1299	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	Reject	

				<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>		
922.6	John Rowe	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.2 P1(b)(i) Minor dwelling, as follows: (i) The minor dwelling must be located within <del>20m</del> <u>150m</u> of the dwelling;	Submitter supports specifying a separation distance. The proposed 20m separation distance is too small as it does not allow for existing site constraints such as curtilage area, effluent disposal fields and other ancillary buildings. The requested 150m distance will make a huge difference in terms of functionality of the property while providing some degree of privacy between the main dwelling and minor dwelling.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1473	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 in part	
970.1	Margaret O'Brien	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3 Land Use Building and Rule 22.3.2 Minor dwelling, to allow for a "Dependent Persons dwelling" to be designated as a "Minor dwelling", particularly at 2289B Kakaramea Road, Hamilton.	The submitter's cottage located at 2289B Kakaramea Road, Hamilton was considered as a Restricted Discretionary activity under the Operative District Plan. This submission removes the restrictions on the submitter's consent, thus will allow the submitter to manage and determine the future use of their home.	Accept in part	

FS1387.1607	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	
Rule 22.3.3 – Buildings and Structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas						
731.12	Jean Tregidga	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.3 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas, by permitting dwellings and accessory buildings within natural features and outstanding natural landscapes.	Requiring resource consent to construct any building within these area is unreasonable and will add significant cost to developing land for private use.	Reject	
FS1180.12	Jean Tregidga	Support	Seek that part of the submission be allowed. Seek that a small building i.e. shed, composting toilet etc. be allowed.	Reasons for my support area: In my original submission I asked that if my application under 731- District Plan (Proposed) was accepted. I would not require these other submissions. I ask that they now be accepted as they are all very relevant to development of the properties.	Reject	
330.149	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.3.3 Buildings and structures in Landscape and Natural Character Areas.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
Policy 5.3.14 – Signs						
450.4	Alison Green for Rushala Farm Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	No specific decision sought, but the submitter refers to Policy 5.3.14 (b) Signs.	The submitter considers that local landowners need to be consulted regarding what gets done in their area and cites an example of huge and wasteful costs that have been incurred with the painting of double yellow lines on Kaiaua Road which has made it more dangerous for all local residents.	Accept in part	
559.56	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.14 Signs, except for the amendments sought below. AND	The submitter supports Policy 5.3.14 Signs in part as the policy broadly assumes at (e) that signage can be placed on heritage	Accept	

	Zealand Lower Northern Office		Amend Policy 5.3.14(e) Signs as follows: (e) Provide for <u>appropriate signage</u> on heritage items, notable trees and Maori sites of significance for the purpose of identification <u>or and</u> —interpretation.	buildings for both identification and interpretation. The policy needs to be amended to a slightly more cautious approach given the sensitive nature of heritage items, and Maaori sites of significance to an inappropriate design or quantity of signage.		
742.39	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.14 Signs, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.14 Signs as follows: (b) <u>Ensure signage</u> —The location, colour, content, and appearance of signs directed at <u>or visible to road users traffic</u> is controlled <u>to ensure they</u> do not <u>distract, confuse or obstruct motorist, pedestrians and other road users adversely affect safety of road users.....</u> AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the recognition in Policy 5.3.14 of the potential adverse effects of signs on people using the land transport system but seeks minor amendments.	Accept	
433.6	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.14 (d) Signs, as notified.	Fish and Game signs, which would qualify under the definition of 'advertising sign', are a fundamental aspect of managing game bird shooting and sports fish angling activities and are permitted throughout much of New Zealand.	Accept in part	
FS1223.70	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	
986.26	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.14 Signs except for the amendments sought below AND	KiwiRail supports the policy as it provides for the assessment of the effects of signs	Accept in part	

			Amend Policy 5.3.14(b) Signs as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (b) Ensure signage directed at traffic does not distract, confuse or obstruct motorists, pedestrians and other <u>land transport road-users</u> . AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	on land transport safety. This is reflected in the minor amendment sought.		
416.2	Barry Green	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but the submission opposes Policy 5.3.14(b) Signs and mentions signs on Kaiaua Road and Waikato District Council area double yellow lines.	The double lines on Kaiaua Road have made this road very dangerous (people not passing slow vehicles and passing in dangerous spots where there are no yellow lines but where there should be). They are a waste of money and ratepayers should have been consulted.		
Rule 22.2.6 – Signs						
761.7	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.6 Signs- General so that the signage provisions in Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village (including the proposed retirement village at 180 Horsham Downs Road, Horsham Downs- the Lyndendale Lifestyle Village') by adding the following: 3.) Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village. OR Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 Signs-General and Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs-Effects on Traffic so that signage provisions do not apply to a retirement village. OR Add a new rule to Rule 22.2.6.1 Signs-General as follows: (x) Rules P1, P2, P3 and RD1 above do not apply to a retirement village. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.	Rules relating to signage should not be applicable to a Retirement Village, particularly those limiting the number, area and height of signage in Rule 22.2.6.1 (P2). Signage forms an integral part of a retirement village development. Signage is necessary to clearly identify the various buildings, facilities and car parking areas within a retirement village for residents, visitors and emergency vehicles. LFL are opposed to any restrictions regarding signage, insofar as they relate to their proposed Retirement Village Development at 180 Horsham Downs Road.	Accept in part	
761.8	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.6 Signs-effects on traffic so that signage provisions in Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village by including the following: <u>(3) Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village.</u> OR Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 Signs-General and Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs- Effects on traffic so that the signage provisions do not apply to a retirement village AND	Rules relating to signage (particularly those preventing signs from imitating the content, color or appearance of any traffic control sign and those restricting the location of the sign and the number of characters or symbols) in Rule 22.2.6.2 should not be applicable to Retirement Villages. Signage forms an integral part of a retirement village development. Signage is necessary to clearly identify the	Accept in part	

			<p>Add to Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs - effects on traffic the following: (x) Rules P1 and D1 above do not apply to a retirement village.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>various buildings, facilities and car parking areas within a retirement village for residents, visitors and emergency vehicles. LFL are opposed to any restrictions regarding signage for a retirement village. Rule 22.2.6.2 (Signs - effects on traffic) applies to 'any sign directed at road users,' therefore applying to any internal signage erected along a private road or internal access within a retirement village. Private internal access roads within a retirement village development need to be appropriately signposted and often include signage that imitates the appearance of a traffic control sign.</p>		
330.87	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.6 Signs and/or all rules sitting under Rule 22.2.6 Signs.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
Rule 22.2.6.1 – Signs - General						
761.7	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.6 Signs- General so that the signage provisions in Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village (including the proposed retirement village at 180 Horsham Downs Road, Horsham Downs- the Lyndendale Lifestyle Village) by adding the following: 3.) Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 Signs-General and Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs-Effects on Traffic so that signage provisions do not apply to a retirement village.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Add a new rule to Rule 22.2.6.1 Signs-General as follows: (x) Rules P1, P2, P3 and RD1 above do not apply to a retirement village.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Rules relating to signage should not be applicable to a Retirement Village, particularly those limiting the number, area and height of signage in Rule 22.2.6.1 (P2). Signage forms an integral part of a retirement village development. Signage is necessary to clearly identify the various buildings, facilities and car parking areas within a retirement village for residents, visitors and emergency vehicles. LFL are opposed to any restrictions regarding signage, insofar as they relate to their proposed Retirement Village Development at 180 Horsham Downs Road.</p>	Accept in part	
761.8	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.6 Signs-effects on traffic so that signage provisions in Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village by including the following: (3) Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village.</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 Signs-General and Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs- Effects on traffic so that the signage provisions do not apply to a retirement village</p>	<p>Rules relating to signage (particularly those preventing signs from imitating the content, color or appearance of any traffic control sign and those restricting the location of the sign and the number of characters or symbols) in Rule 22.2.6.2 should not be applicable to Retirement Villages. Signage forms an integral part of a retirement village development.</p>	Accept in part	

			<p>AND Add to Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs - effects on traffic the following: <del>(x) Rules P1 and D1 above do not apply to a retirement village.</del></p> <p>AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>Signage is necessary to clearly identify the various buildings, facilities and car parking areas within a retirement village for residents, visitors and emergency vehicles. LFL are opposed to any restrictions regarding signage for a retirement village. Rule 22.2.6.2 (Signs - effects on traffic) applies to 'any sign directed at road users,' therefore applying to any internal signage erected along a private road or internal access within a retirement village. Private internal access roads within a retirement village development need to be appropriately signposted and often include signage that imitates the appearance of a traffic control sign.</p>		
433.54	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 P1 Signs - General, as follows: A public information sign erected by a government agency and Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.</p>	<p>Auckland Fish and Game erects public information signs but it is not a recognised government agency.</p>	Accept in part	
433.55	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Delete Rule 22.2.6.1 P2 (a)(i) and (vii) Signs - General. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.</p>	<p>These notified conditions are too restrictive for signs that need to be erected by Auckland Waikato Fish and Game. In some instances, these conditions would need to be breached and resource consent should not be required, particularly when such signs are permitted around much of New Zealand.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1323.186	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<p><i>The amendments sought are declined.</i></p>	<p><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></p>	Accept in part	
559.85	Sherry Reynolds on behalf of Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 P2 Signs - general to exclude any type of signage on Heritage Items and Maaori Sites of Significance. AND Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 RDI 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 other heritage building related rules within the Chapter. AND</p>	<p>The submitter cannot support the P2 Signs General where the zone rules that relate to signage, including on heritage items or Maaori sites of significance are permitted activities with variations between the zones as to the permitted size and height of signage. While signs generally are not permitted in heritage buildings or Maaori sites of significance, a sign of 3m2 on a heritage building could be permitted in some zones if the sign was for identification or interpretation purposes.</p>	Accept in part	

			Provide for any consequential amendments as required.	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)).		
602.52	Greig Metcalfe	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.6.1. P3 (a) Signs - general as follows: (a) <del>Any real estate 'for sale' sign relating to the site on which it is located</del> must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) There is no more than 1 sign per agency <u>measuring 600mm x 900mm per road frontage of the site to which the sign relates;</u> (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) <del>The sign is not illuminated;</del> (v) <del>The sign does not contain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials;</del> (vi) <del>The sign does not project into or over road reserve.</del> (vii) <u>Any real estate sign shall be removed from display within 60 days of sale/lease or upon settlement, whichever is the earliest.</u> 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	
680.210	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Add new clause (b) to Rule 22.2.6.1 PI Signs-General, as follows: (b) <u>Signs required for legislative purposes</u> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone	Signs required by other legislation such as under the HSNO Act 1996, the Health and Safety in Employment Acts, The Biosecurity Act 1993, both on private property and on public land are also permitted.	Accept in part	



FS1345.39	Genesis Energy Limited		Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the Federated Farmers submission.	Accept in part	
697.783	Waikato Council	District	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 P2(a)(x) Signs - General, as follows: (x) The sign is for the purpose of <u>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>	The re-wording of this rule provides clarity.	Accept in part	
697.784	Waikato Council	District	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 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 <u>comply with all of the following conditions not:</u> (i) <u>Not have</u> There is no more than + 3 signs per site agency; (ii) <u>Be</u> The sign is not illuminated; (iii) <u>The sign does not</u> Ccontain any moving parts, fluorescent, flashing or revolving lights or reflective materials; (iv) <u>Project into or over road reserve.</u>	This rule excluded signs for rental properties and requires additional words to ensure consistency with rule 22.2.6.1. P3(a)(iv) is not required as the rural zone provisions do not apply within the road reserve.	Accept in part	
742.224	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency			Retain Rule 22.2.6.1 P1 Signs - General as notified. AND Retain Rule 22.2.6.1 P2 Signs - General as notified. AND Retain Rule 22.2.6.1 RDI Signs - General as notified.	The submitter supports Rules 22.2.6.1 P1 and P2 and the matters of discretion under RDI, particularly (b)(iii), (iv) and (v).	Accept in part	
Rule 22.2.6.2 – Signs – Effects on Traffic							
761.7	Lyndendale Limited	Farms	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.6 Signs- General so that the signage provisions in Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village (including the proposed retirement village at 180 Horsham Downs Road, Horsham Downs- the Lyndendale Lifestyle Village') by adding the following: 3.) Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village. OR Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 Signs-General and Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs-Effects on Traffic so that signage provisions do not apply to a retirement village. OR Add a new rule to Rule 22.2.6.1 Signs-General as follows: (x) Rules P1, P2, P3 and RDI above do not apply to a retirement village. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.	Rules relating to signage should not be applicable to a Retirement Village, particularly those limiting the number, area and height of signage in Rule 22.2.6.1 (P2). Signage forms an integral part of a retirement village development. Signage is necessary to clearly identify the various buildings, facilities and car parking areas within a retirement village for residents, visitors and emergency vehicles. LFL are opposed to any restrictions regarding signage, insofar as they relate to their proposed Retirement Village Development at 180 Horsham Downs Road.	Accept in part	
761.8	Lyndendale Limited	Farms	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.6 Signs-effects on traffic so that signage provisions in Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village by including the following: (3) Rules 22.2.6.1 and 22.2.6.2 do not apply to a retirement village.	Rules relating to signage (particularly those preventing signs from imitating the content, color or appearance of any traffic control sign and those restricting the location of the sign and the number of	Accept in part	

			<p>OR</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.2.6.1 Signs-General and Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs- Effects on traffic so that the signage provisions do not apply to a retirement village</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add to Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs - effects on traffic the following: <del>(x) Rules PI and DI above do not apply to a retirement village.</del></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.</p>	<p>characters or symbols) in Rule 22.2.6.2 should not be applicable to Retirement Villages. Signage forms an integral part of a retirement village development. Signage is necessary to clearly identify the various buildings, facilities and car parking areas within a retirement village for residents, visitors and emergency vehicles. LFL are opposed to any restrictions regarding signage for a retirement village. Rule 22.2.6.2 (Signs - effects on traffic) applies to 'any sign directed at road users,' therefore applying to any internal signage erected along a private road or internal access within a retirement village. Private internal access roads within a retirement village development need to be appropriately signposted and often include signage that imitates the appearance of a traffic control sign.</p>		
695.210	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.6.2 PI(a)(ii) Signs - Effects on Traffic, to delete the words "and any other sign";</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.2.6.2 PI(a)(ii) Signs - Effects on Traffic, as follows: Be located at least 60m from controlled intersections, pedestrian crossings and any other sign <u>on the same site.</u></p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.2.6.2 PI(a)(ii) Signs - Effects on Traffic, as follows: Be located at least 60m from controlled intersections, pedestrian crossings and <del>any other sign</del> <u>railway crossings (or roads under Council jurisdiction)</u></p>	<p>This is unrealistic The cost of the consent would usually be more than the cost of the sign.</p>	Accept in part	
697.785	Waikato Council District	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.6.2 PI(a)Signs - effects on traffic, as follows: (a) Any sign directed at road users must <u>meet the following conditions:</u> (i) Not imitate the content, colour or appearance of any traffic control sign; (ii) Be located at least 60m from controlled intersections, pedestrian crossings and any other sign; (iii) Not obstruct sight lines of drivers turning into or out of a site entrance and intersections; (iv) Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 symbols; (v) Have lettering that is at least 200mm high; and (vi) Where the sign directs traffic to a site entrance, it the sign must be at least: A. 175m from the entrance on roads with a speed limit of 80 km/hr or less; or B. 250m from the entrance on roads with a speed limit of more than 80km/hr.</p>	<p>The amended wording provides clarity for the rule and consistency with other rules.</p>	Accept in part	

742.225	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.2.6.2 Signs- effects on traffic, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.2.6.2 PI(iv) Signs - effects on traffic as follows: Contain no more than 40 characters and no more than 6 words, symbols or graphics; AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Rule 22.2.6.2 PI but seeks amendment to provide clarification on the maximum amount of words permitted. This will ensure that signage erected does not cause unnecessary visual clutter or affect the efficient, safe and effective functioning of the transport network.	Accept in part	
742.226	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.6.2 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 in part	
Policy 5.3.15 – Noise and Vibration						
367.8	Liam McGrath for Mercer Residents and Ratepayers Committee	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
433.7	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.15 (v) Noise and Vibration, as notified.	Shotgun noise associated with recreational hunting should be permitted and considered as a potential reverse sensitivity effect when urban and lifestyle encroachment occurs near traditionally hunted sites.	Accept in part	
499.5	Adrian Morton	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration to include: Defined flight path corridors for recreational and training light aircraft that avoid rural properties; Fly avoidance/exclusion zones; and Noise control of aircraft engines.	The number and frequency of light aircraft movement and noise within the area has increased dramatically over the past 10 years. The amenity is affected by the noise of small/light aircraft. The situation is likely to get worse with the demand for pilots and more local people flying. WDC need to map areas of low habitation and define acceptable flight path routes. The variation in engine noise of light aircraft needs to be managed. There are potential effects on resident's well-being and health.	Accept in part	
FS1276.39	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Noise from aircraft is a problem and like other problems should be resolved by the District Plan.	Accept in part	
693.6	Alstra (2012) Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.15 - Noise and vibration as notified.	With the understanding that noise is a common occurrence when it comes to intensive farming, Alstra supports the noise and vibration policy, particularly on the basis that existing activities should be protected from noise sensitive activities.	Accept in part	

FS1265.23	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow the retention of policy 5.3.15.	Support the retention of policy 5.3.15 given that some noise is commonplace for intensive farming activities and therefore existing activities should be protected from noise sensitive activities.	Accept in part	
757.5	Karen White	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration to include the provision for defined flight path corridors for recreational and schools/training light aircraft that avoid rural properties, fly avoidance/exclusion zones and noise control of aircraft engines. AND Amend Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration to include a total ban on engine stall on all rural land/housing and only allowed way offshore.	Number and frequency of light aircraft movement and noise within the area has increase dramatically over the past 10 years, mainly due to CTC training international pilots based out of Hamilton falling within flight routes. The Amenity of the quiet rural community is consistently being eroded and affected by frequency and noise of small/light aircraft either flying to Raglan Airport or by use of the air space by CTC Aviation Training facility who frequently circle for hours. With high demand for pilots worldwide and the increase in local people flying more regularly the situation is likely to get worse. Waikato District Council needs to map areas of low habitation and define acceptable flight path routes. Engine stall exercises are not only daunting but increases noise when they thrust engines back on. Variation in engine noise of light aircraft varies dramatically. Measures need to go beyond mere flying height or decibel requirement as effects on a very low decibel environment is incredibly intrusive and affects resident's wellbeing and health.	Reject	
FS1276.40	Whaingaroa Environmental Defence Inc. Society	Support	WED seeks that the whole of the submission point be allowed.	Noise from aircraft is a problem and like other problems should be resolved by the District Plan.	Reject	
777.5	Radio New Zealand Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.15(a)(v) Noise and vibration, as follows: (v) Managing the location of sensitive land uses noise-sensitive activities, particularly in relation to lawfully-established activities:	It is more appropriate to use the notified definition of "noise-sensitive activities" than "sensitive land use".	Reject	
807.5	Pukekohe Motorcycle Club	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.3.15 (a)(vi) Noise and vibration to include reference to the Harrisville Motocross Track. AND Any further or consequential relief to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The current Proposed Plan does not promote sustainable management of resources, will not achieve the purpose of the RMA and are contrary to Part 2 and other provisions of the RMA. The current Proposed Plan will not enable the social and economic wellbeing of the	Reject	

				community in the Waikato region The current Proposed Plan does not represent the most appropriate means of exercising the Council's functions, having regard to the efficiency and effectiveness of the provisions relative to other means.		
FS1200.5	Gerardus Aarts & Yvonne Gemma Aarts	Oppose	Oppose submission point 807.5.	We do not agree that the Pukekohe Motor cross track (or any other activity) needs to be specifically referenced in this policy. This policy should apply to any identified noise control boundary overlay shown on the planning maps. The comments made in submission point 1200.3 are applicable to this submission.	Accept	
860.7	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Not Stated	Retain Policy 5.3.15 (a)(i) Noise and Vibration.	Support but note this emphasises the importance of dealing with reverse sensitivity impacts so that the area surrounding extractive sites is able to accommodate sounds and vibrations necessarily associated with the sector and that there are not incompatible land uses within the surrounding areas.	Accept	
FS1332.7	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	
330.59	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
419.65	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration, as notified.	A policy framework for methods for managing the location of sensitive land uses, particularly in relation to lawfully-established activities is supported.	Accept in part	
575.32	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.3.15 (a)(iii) Noise and vibration, as follows (or words to similar effect): (iii) Maintaining appropriate buffers between high noise environments and noise sensitive activities <u>insofar as that is practicable</u> ... AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Supports the principal of policy but seek amendments as quarrying and aggregate extraction create large amounts of noise and vibration from time to time which may make compliance with the policy challenging. Amendment will ensure that existing quarry sites (such as the Fulton Hogan quarries) can continue their operations without additional requirements insofar as noise and vibration buffers are concerned.	Accept in part	

FS1292.54	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	McPherson acknowledge the need to consider noise and vibration effects, but note that in the case of extraction activities, which have a legitimate need to be located in the rural environment, high levels of noise and vibration are generated on occasion. Therefore the policy should recognise this operational need.	Accept in part	
FS1332.40	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1027.6	Peter Ayson on behalf of Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated	Oppose	Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. NAG opposes this submission because Ngaruawahia residents do not want more noise and vibration from quarrying, when extra care can be taken to reduce this. This is of increasing importance as the town grows and as more people will be affected.	We seek to disallow the whole of this submission because Ngaruawahia residents do not want more noise and vibration from quarrying, when extra care can be taken to reduce this. This is of increasing importance as the town grows and as more people will be affected.	Accept in part	
FS1319.14	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	NZS support the inclusion of the proposed wording, recognising practicalities.	Accept in part	
680.71	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.15 (a) (ii) Noise and vibration, as follows: (ii) Limiting the timing and duration of noise-generating activities which are not anticipated within rural areas; AND Delete Policy 5.3.15 (a) (viii) Noise and vibration. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	In relation to 5.3.7, submitter considers plan provisions should acknowledge the issue of 'reverse sensitivity' when addressing 'noise and vibration effects' and that there must be provision to allow for a reasonable level of noise associated with agricultural activity within the rural zone - both in daylight hours and through the night. There will be situations for example where farm machinery will be used for making hay or harvesting crops outside the hours prescribed in Rule 22.2.1.1 (P2); newly weaned animals will also be making noise outside of any specified hours. Such noises and vibrations must legitimately be expected in a rural zone. There is concern that the policy	Reject	

				as currently worded will create unreasonable expectations of the amenity of the Rural Zone, and perpetuate reverse sensitivity issues with people unaccustomed to the rural environment complaining about normal farming activities and expecting those effects to controlled in every instance.		
FSI 340.108	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission 680.71 in that it appears to be an unnecessary level of restriction for activities which could occur within the rural zone but are not rural activities as such. The submitter considers that any activity that complies with noise limits shouldn't have any other restrictions.	Accept	
FSI 168.63	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	In relation in 5.3.7, submitter considers plan provisions should acknowledge the issue of 'reverse sensitivity' when addressing 'noise and vibration effects' and that there must be provision to allow for a reasonable level of noise associated with agricultural activity within the rural zone - both in daylight hours and through the night. There will be situations for example where farm machinery will be used for making hay or harvesting crops outside the hours prescribed in Rule 22.2.1.1 (P2); newly weaned animals will also be making noise outside of any specified hours. Such noises and vibrations must legitimately be expected in a rural zone. There is concern that the policy as currently worded will create unreasonable expectations of the amenity of the Rural Zone, and perpetuate reverse sensitivity issues with people unaccustomed to the rural environment complaining about normal farming activities and expecting those effects to controlled in every instance.	Reject	
FSI 171.77	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission seeks to amend Policy 5.3.15 (a) (ii) Noise and vibration. The proposed amendments acknowledge that certain noise generating activities are anticipated within rural areas. This submission is supported in so far as noise generated by horticultural activities are considered and anticipated within the rural environment.	Reject	

691.14	McPherson Resources Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain the intent of Policy 5.3.15 Noise and Vibration, except for the amendments sought below; AND Amend Policy 5.3.15 (a)(iii) Noise and vibration, as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) Adverse effects of noise and vibration are minimised by: ... (iii) Maintaining appropriate buffers between high noise environments and noise sensitive activities <u>insofar as that is practicable</u> ; This relief is sought in the event that any part of the submission from point 691.1 to 691.15 is not adopted by WDC. AND Any consequential amendments or additional relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	McPherson supports the principle and intent of this policy in relation to noise and vibration. With quarrying and aggregate extraction, a large amount of noise and vibration is occasionally generated as the aggregate is extracted from the ground. As such, compliance with the policy as currently worded may prove challenging. To ensure that existing quarry sites such as the McPherson Quarry can continue its operations without additional requirements insofar as noise and vibration buffers are concerned.	Accept in part	
FS1319.27	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Seek that the submission point be allowed.	NZS supports the inclusion of the proposed wording.	Accept in part	
FS1334.54	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	Fulton Hogan acknowledge the need to consider noise and vibration effects, but note that in the case of extraction activities, which have a legitimate need to be located in the rural environment, high levels of noise and vibration are generated on occasion. Therefore the policy should recognise this operational need.	Accept in part	
695.53	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration to include earthworks within residential setbacks of adjoining property.	This can have potential to vibrate adjoining building structures where close by.	Reject	
723.12	Tyler Sharratt on behalf of Winstone Aggregates	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.15 Noise and Vibration.	Reasons not provided.	Accept in part	
742.40	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibrations, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.15(a)(vi) Noise and vibrations 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> , the Airport Noise ... AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports the intent of Policy 5.3.15 to manage the adverse effects of noise and vibration. Vehicles on 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 state 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	Accept in part	



				health effects. The submitter therefore seeks recognition of state highways within this policy.		
FS1062.95	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	Disallow submission point 742.40 unless infrastructure mitigation is stipulated first.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>It is important that infrastructure into the rural environment is mitigated with the same application as mitigating other adverse effects.</li> <li>First responsibility must be with the infrastructure provider.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
797.14	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.15 (a) (vi) Noise and vibration to include "the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Facility" (or words to similar effect). AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	Supports the policy subject to the inclusion of reference to development within the noise control boundary associated with the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Facility.	Accept in part	
827.47	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration as notified.	Supports the policy direction to minimise the adverse effects of noise and vibration through maintaining buffers (iii) and managing the location of sensitive land uses (v). This policy is consistent with the Aggregate Extraction Area Overlay provisions.	Accept in part	
860.10	Aggregate and Quarry Association (AQA) and Straterra	Not Stated	Retain Policy 5.3.15 (a)(vii) Noise and vibration.	No reason provided.	Accept in part	
FS1332.10	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1285.17	Terra Firma Mining Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.15(a)(vii) Noise and Vibration.	This provision is appropriate in relation to extractive industries and more sensitive activities.	Accept in part	
330.134	Andrew and Christine Gore	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration to mitigate adverse effects of large-scale roading developed next to urbanisation at the source, and the ecological management area must be considered in the mitigation as future proofing.	This policy does not go far enough. The submitters' property is a Future Urban Zone. The submitters' property is under the overlay of ecological area. The NZTA/Alliance roading is not sufficiently noise mitigated in the mitigating plan for this type of development. Urbanisation will be sensitive to noise effect. This is proven throughout the North Island where housing and large expressways intersect.	Accept in part	

				To plan an ecological area should have excellent noise management. Lower noise is essential for the movement of any wildlife who rely on acoustic vibration. By allowing extensive roading into this proposed ecological area, the ecosystem has been irreparably altered. It is noted that noise being experienced currently in the proposed ecological area is unacceptable for an ecological management area. All effort should be made to minimize any more effect into the environment by noise. Noise policy needs to directly address the potential traffic noise effect from the unfinished road projects, and finished road projects to ensure the basin area can be promoted as ecological. Noise levels should be subject to tighter environmental control.		
330.143	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	Add a clause to Policy 5.3.15- Noise and Vibration addressing roading project noise.	No reasons provided.	Reject	
986.27	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.15 Noise and vibration except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.15(a)(vi) as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): (vi) Requiring acoustic insulation where sensitive <u>land use</u> activities are located within high noise environments, including <u>near the railway corridor</u> the Airport Noise Outer Control Boundary, Huntly Power Station, the Gun Club Noise Control Boundary. AND Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.	KiwiRail supports the policy which recognises that reverse sensitivity effects occur and need to be managed through managing the location of sensitive land uses in relation to lawfully-established activities, including by maintaining appropriate buffers between high noise environments and noise sensitive activities. • The railway corridor operates 24/7 and can produce adverse effects that extend beyond the corridor boundary, such as noise and vibration, emissions, lighting/glare and dust. • Development near the railway corridor needs to take into account the potential for these effects to be experienced and should be designed to avoid/mitigate them. .	Accept in part	
Rule 22.2.1.1 – Noise – General						
349.7	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General.	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General.	Accept in part	
939.4	David Totman on behalf of Waipa District	Oppose	Add provisions to Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General for the Mystery Creek Event centre, to mirror that	Add provisions to Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General for the Mystery Creek Event	Reject	

	Council		contained in the Operative Waipa District Plan Rule 9.4.2.16(c).	centre, to mirror that contained in the Operative Waipa District Plan Rule 9.4.2.16(c).		
197.19	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise - General, as notified.	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise - General, as notified.	Accept in part	
302.23	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General as notified.	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General as notified.	Accept in part	
330.76	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General.	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General.	Accept in part	
378.32	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General, as notified.	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 Noise - General, as notified.	Accept in part	
FS1035.18	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Obtain statement of performance expectation (SPE) to allow submission to be accepted.	Accept in part	
419.17	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise - General, as notified.	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise - General, as notified.	Accept in part	
433.30	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise - General, as follows: Farming noise, and noise generated by <u>recreational hunting</u> , emergency generators and emergency sirens. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Amend Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise - General, as follows: Farming noise, and noise generated by <u>recreational hunting</u> , emergency generators and emergency sirens. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Accept	
466.13	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise - General as notified	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise - General as notified	Accept in part	
821.10	The Poultry Industry Association of New Zealand; I Brinks NZ Chicken; The Egg Producers Federation of on behalf of	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise General.	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise General.	Accept	
680.195	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise-General as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 PI Noise-General as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Accept	
FS1315.5	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null		Accept	

680.196	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.1 P2 Noise - General, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Strong support is extended to 22.2.1.1 (P2), the approach is consistent with the intent of Objectives 5.1.1 and 5.3.1 and related Policies, reverse sensitivity 5.3.7 in particular.	Accept	
680.197	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.1.1 P4 Noise - General. AND Add a new advisory note (4) under Rule 22.2.1, Noise-General as follows: <u>(4) (a) Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS 6801:2008 "Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound". (b) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS 6802:2008 "Acoustic Environmental noise".</u> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Support is extended to the inclusion of the standards as these help to provide certainty for plan users however submitter considers the information under P4 would be better placed under the 22.2.1 advisory section, not as a rule in and of itself.	Accept in part	
697.762	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.1.1 P3 and P4 Noise - General. AND Make consequential amendments as follows: RDI(a) Noise that does not comply with Rule 22.2.1.1 P1 or P2, P3 or P4. AND Amend Rule 22.2.1.1 P2 Noise - General, as follows: (a) Noise measured at the notional boundary on any other site in the Rural 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 (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day. <u>(b) Noise measured within any site in any other zone, other than the Rural Zone, must meet the permitted noise levels for that other zone. (c) Noise levels must be measured in accordance with the requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS 6801:2008 Acoustics Measurement of Environmental Sound. (d) Noise levels must be assessed in accordance with the requirements of New Zealand Standard NZS 6802:2008 Acoustic Environmental noise.</u>	P3 and P4 need to be conditions of P2 as they are the standards which need to be met.	Accept in part	
923.157	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.1.1 P2, P3, P4 and D1- Noise General as follows: <u>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</u>	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	Accept in part	

			<p>any point within a notional boundary on any other site in the Rural Zone must not exceed: (i) 50dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq); 7am to 7pm, everyday; (ii) 45dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq); 7pm to 10pm, every day; (iii) 40dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq); and 65 dB (LAmax), 10pm to 7am the following day; (iv) 65dB LAFmax, 10pm to 7am the following day; (b) 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 Rural Zone, must meet the permitted noise levels for that zone. P4 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 22.2.1.1 P1, or P2, P3 or P4.</p>	<p>location. However, the following issues have been identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Incorrect terminology has been used in conflict with the standards specified,</li> <li>- No provision has been made for sound sources outside the scope of NZS 6802,</li> <li>- The measurement and assessment standards are an integral part of the noise limits and cannot be a separate permitted activity standard.</li> </ul>		
FS1062.109	Andrew and Christine Gore	Support	Allow submission point 923.157.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is important to plan for noise mitigation in the Rural zone.</li> <li>• It is important to ensure noise limits are adhered to and the standards understood.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
280.1	Peter Nation for New Zealand National Fieldays Society Inc	Not Stated	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.1 Noise to align with the Waipa District Plan and implement the Environment Court Consent Order with regards to Mystery Creek Events Centre (see submission for copy of Consent Order).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the zoning to align with Waipa District Council's Operative District Plan to manage the Mystery Creek Events Centre and noise generation.</p>	<p>Mystery Creek Event Zone is identified as a specific zone in the operative Waipa District Plan. Refer to Appendix B in submission for corresponding Map. Waipa District Plan specifies a noise contour specific to Mystery Creek Events Centre. Careful restrictions placed on noise and event activity within the operative Waipa District Plan's Mystery Creek Events Zone and Mystery Creek Noise Contour, including limits on the number of events per year. Main basis of noise controls is the Mystery Creek Noise Contour. Contour extends across event platform to the centreline of the Waikato River adjacent to the Eastern boundary of the MCRC events Zone. Refer to Appendix B in submission for corresponding map.</p>	Reject	
330.75	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.1 Noise.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	

697.761	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.1(1) Noise.	Reduces duplication - this noise rule is adequately covered by points (2) and (3).	Accept
FS1387.683	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Reject
575.16	Fulton Hogan Limited		<p>Add a new rule to Section 22.2.1 - Noise, (22.2.1.4), as follows (or words to similar effect):</p> <p><b>NOISE - MINERAL AND AGGREGATE EXTRACTION ACTIVITIES</b> Any noise created by a mineral or aggregate extraction activities is permitted provided that if measured at the notional boundary of any dwelling which existed at [insert date of plan becoming operative], does not exceed:</p> <p>55dBA (L10) 7am to 7pm Monday to Friday;  55dBA (L10) 7am to 6pm Saturday;  50dBA (L10) 7pm to 10pm Monday to Friday;  50dBA (L10) 7am to 6pm Sundays and Public Holidays) e. 45dBA (L10) and 70dBA (Lmax) at all other times including Public Holidays.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>		Reject
FS1319.8	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part. As per its original submission, NZS supports specific noise limits for 'Extractive Activities' but in relation to WHN considers these should be contained in a special WHN zone.</p>	<p>NZS has sought specific provisions for WNH Mine in its original submission. However, NZS supports specific noise limits for mineral and aggregate extraction activities (for 'Extractive</p>	Reject

				Activities') that are consistent with the noise provisions of the operative district plan.		
FS1292.70	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow the submission point.	McPherson support the inclusion of noise provisions specifically related to extraction activities. Such a rule defines what effects are anticipated and accepted from these sorts of activities and are intended to safeguard both the industry as well as the surrounding properties.	Reject	
FS1377.145	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater clarity and flexibility for extractive industries.	Reject	
FS1332.30	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	
691.21	McPherson Resources Limited	Not Stated	Add a new rule Rule 22.2.1.4 Noise - Mineral and Aggregate Extraction as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>22.2.1.4 NOISE – MINERAL AND AGGREGATE EXTRACTION</u> Any noise created by mineral or aggregate extraction activities is permitted provided that if measured at the notional boundary of any dwelling, which existed at [insert date of plan becoming operative], does not exceed: a) 55dBA (L10) 7am to 7pm Monday to Friday; b) 55dBA (L10) 7am to 6pm Saturday; c) 50dBA (L10) 7pm to 10pm Monday to Friday; d) 50dBA (L10) 7am to 6pm Sundays and Public Holidays e) 45dBA (L10) and 70dBA (Lmax) at all other times including Public Holidays. AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	The McPhersons oppose the removal of the provisions specifically related to aggregate extraction activities in the Operative District Plan, particularly when dealing with effects generally created by the aggregate industry. It is proposed that rules specific to mineral and aggregate extraction activities are added which specifically defines what effects are anticipated from these sorts of activities. The proposed rules intend to safeguard both the industry as well as the surrounding properties (insofar as reasonable and practicable). This is particularly important in relation to effects relating to noise, dust and vibration, as these are key elements of an activity of this kind.	Reject	
FS1334.74	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	Fulton Hogan support the inclusion of noise provisions specifically related to extraction activities. Such a rule defines what effects are anticipated and accepted from these sorts of activities and are intended to safeguard both industry as well as the surrounding properties.	Reject	
FS1319.28	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow in part (subject to NZS's original submission point seeking a specific zone for WNH).	NZS has sought specific provisions for WNH Mine in its original submission. However, NZS supports specific noise limits for mineral and aggregate extraction activities (or 'Extractive Activities') that are consistent with the noise provisions of the operative district plan.	Reject	
Rule 22.2.1.2 – Noise – Frost Fans						

330.77	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.1.2 Noise - Frost Fans.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
419.18	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.1.2 PI Noise - Frost Fans, as follows: Noise generated by a frost fan must not exceed 55 60dB (LAeq) when measured at the notional boundary on any site in the Rural Zone and within any site in the Country Living Zone, Village Zone or Residential Zone. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The 55dB (LAeq) limit is too restrictive and unrealistic. Frost fans are a key means to protect crops and ensure high quality produce that meets strict market standards. The Proposed Opotiki District Plan permits a 60dB (LAeq) limit. This limit has not been opposed by submitters, is more realistic and allows for effective and efficient use of frost fans.	Reject	
FS1171.16	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Support submission 419.18	This submission is supported. The noise restriction stated for frost free fans in so far as provision should be made to accommodate the noise of frost-free fans within the rural environment given the importance of such devices to the growth of crops and the nature of activities that should be permitted within rural zones.	Reject	
419.19	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.1.2 DI Noise- Frost Fans to become restricted discretionary activity rather than a discretionary activity AND Add the following matters of discretion to Rule 22.2.1.2 Noise- Frost Fans: <u>Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: 1. Location of frost fan 2. Noise sound levels at any point within at the notional boundary of any dwelling on another site</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The jump from a permitted activity to a discretionary activity is too onerous and there is limited guidance in the objectives and policies on how noise effects might be assessed. The submitter seeks that this be amended to a restricted discretionary activity. This approach has been adopted in the Proposed Opotiki District Plan following submissions from Horticulture New Zealand and in Hurunui and Western Bay of Plenty. The submitter recommends that discretion be restricted to the same matters as proposed in the Opotiki District Plan.	Accept in part	
FS1171.17	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Support submission 419.19	This submission is supported. For those reasons stated above, where frost free fans cannot meet the required noise standard such an infringement should be considered as a restricted discretionary activity.	Accept in part	
923.158	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.1.2 PI Noise- Frost Fans, as follows: PI (a) <u>Sound</u> Noise-generated by a frost fans <u>measured in accordance with NZS 6801:2008 and assessed in accordance with NZS 6802:2008</u> must not exceed 55 dB LAeq(15min) dB (LAeq) <u>when measured at the at any point within a notional boundary on any other site in any zone in the Rural Zone and within any site in the Country Living Zone, Village Zone or Residential Zone.</u>	The proposed noise limit for frost fans is reasonable, but only if the usage of the frost fans is limited. A measurement and assessment stand should be specified. Locations should be "at any point within" not "at" a notional boundary.	Reject	



			(b) Frost fans must be at least 300m from any notional boundary on any other site. (c) Frost fans must only be operated for: (i) Protection of crops on the site from bud burst to harvest, when wind speeds are not greater than 8 km/h and the local air temperature measured at the lowest height above ground of the buds being protected is less than 1 degree Celsius; (ii) Maintenance and testing during the daytime between 8am and 5pm; (iii) Compliance testing by the Council. (d) A log must be kept of the usage of each frost fan and made available to the Council on request, including dates, times, durations, wind speeds and temperatures.			
Rule 22.2.1.3 Noise - Construction						
302.24	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.1.3 Noise - Construction as notified.	Standards are appropriate for construction noise.	Accept	
330.78	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.1.3 Noise - Construction.	No reasons provided.	Accept	
697.763	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.1.3 P1(a) Noise - Construction, as follows: (a) Construction noise generated from a construction site must meet not exceed the limits in New Zealand Standard NZS 6803:1999 (Acoustics - Construction Noise).	Additional clarity that the rule. Construction noise should not exceed the limits, rather than meet the limits in the NZS.	Accept	
Definitions – Farming Noise						
419.121	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Farming noise" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: <del>Farming</del> <u>Primary production noise</u> Means noise generated by <u>primary production agricultural vehicles, machinery or equipment</u> , any aircraft used for aerial spraying <u>or fertiliser application</u> , <del>agricultural machinery or equipment</del> and farm animals, including farm dogs. It does not include bird scaring devices and frost fans. AND  Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The definition of "farming noise" is supported but the submitter notes that aircraft are used for both spraying and fertiliser application. To be consistent with the change of farming to primary production, the terms should be amended to "primary production noise". The term should not be limited by 'agricultural' activities as these are only one type of primary production activity.	Accept in part	
FS1342.93	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.121.	FFNZ supports the proposed amendments to "farming noise".	Accept in part	
697.386	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Farming noise" as follows: Means noise generated by agricultural vehicles, any	Recognises that bird scaring devices and frost fans are legitimate parts of farming.	Accept in part	

			aircraft used for aerial spraying, agricultural machinery or equipment and farm animals, including farm dogs. It does not include bird scaring devices and frost fans.			
FS1168.97	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Seeks an amendment to include bird scaring devices and frost fans in the definition of Farming Noise to recognise that bird scaring devices and frost fans are legitimate parts of farming. HortNZ supports that approach.	Accept in part	
923.138	Waikato District Health Board	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Farming Noise" in Chapter 13: Definitions as follows: Means noise generated by agricultural vehicles, any aircraft used for aerial spraying, agricultural machinery or equipment and farm animals, including farm dogs. It does not include fixed equipment or facilities, bird scaring devices and frost fans.	The definition excludes farming noise sources from noise limits in some zones. Whilst there is justification for making this exclusion for some farming activities, it would be unreasonable with respect to fixed equipment (such as pumps) and facilities (such as dairy sheds). Unless properly designed and attenuated the sound from such sources could cause adverse health effects.	Accept in part	
FS1342.248	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 923.138.	FFNZ prefers reference to agricultural machinery or equipment to remain in the definition of Farming noise. It would be unreasonably onerous to burden farmers with a requirement to have to obtain resource consent for operation of farm machinery and equipment as part of normal day-to-day farming. Farming should not be constrained by sensitive activities encroaching into rural areas	Accept in part	
680.135	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain the definition of "Farming noise" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The submitter supports the definition.	Accept in part	
197.33	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain the definition of "Farming noise" in Chapter 13 Definitions as notified.	The definition is supported. Farming noise must not be subject to regulatory constraints for activities that are a typical and necessary part of the rural production environment.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
Rules 22.2.2 – Glare and artificial light						
197.20	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.2 PI Glare and Artificial Light Spill, as notified.	The submitter supports the Permitted Activity status for vehicles used in farming activities and agricultural equipment.	Accept in part	
330.79	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.2 - Glare and Artificial Light Spill.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
330.137	Andrew and Christine Gore	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.2 Glare and Artificial Light Spill to specify the type of lighting to comply with low glare and low light spill</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.2.2 Glare and Artificial Light Spill to ensure that lighting into an ecological area will meet standards for dark sky.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.2.2 Glare and Artificial Light Spill to lower lux standards.</p>	<p>This rule is not comprehensive enough</p> <p>With an ecological management zone the rules around lighting to be more comprehensive. The lux should be lower. The mitigation measures should be stipulated.</p>	Reject	
680.198	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Retain Rule 22.2.2 PI (b) Glare and Artificial Light Spill</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Delete Rule 22.2.2 PI (c) Glare and Artificial Light Spill.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.</p>	<p>The submitter supports the intent of Rule PI(b) which is consistent with the stated policy approach and gives effect to reverse sensitivity principles. However, PI(c) is inconsistent with this approach and fails to appreciate the temporary nature of any adverse effects created from vehicles working at night and the necessity of the operation. The submitter accepts that where possible unacceptable nuisance effects such as light spill should be contained within the property boundary. However, farming requirements and weather conditions mean that even with the best intention it is not always possible to avoid a level of nuisance effect. In such instances (which are generally intermittent and temporary) it is imperative that the Plan clearly allows for this to ensure the farm business is not unduly impacted upon. An example is harvesting contractors and farmers working through the night to harvest crops due to short weather windows. Such effects are not unreasonable to expect in a rural area, and therefore this renders Rule 22.2.2PI(c) inappropriate. Submitter considers that it could result in creating unreasonable expectations of the amenity of the Rural Zone, and perpetuate reverse sensitivity issues with people, who are unaccustomed to a rural environment, complaining about normal farming activities and expecting those effects to be avoided or mitigated in every instance. Farming in a rural area should be a permitted activity.</p>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
742.223	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.2 P1 Glare and Artificial Light Spill as notified. AND Retain Rule 22.2.2 RD1 Glare and Artificial Light Spill as notified.	The submitter supports all rules in this section.	Accept in part	
<b>Rule 22.3.4.1 Height – Building General</b>						
471.8	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.4.1 P2 Height - Building General, as follows: P2 The <u>maximum</u> height of any <del>dwelling or</del> building must not exceed 7.5m in a Significant Amenity Landscape. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	A dwelling is a building.	Accept in part	
481.9	Bruce and Kirstie Hill for Culverden Farm	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.1 P2 Height - Building General, to increase the maximum height limit to 10 metres for buildings within a Significant Amenity Landscape for permitted farming activities and buildings. OR Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape overlay from the Proposed District Plan, if the amendments sought to Rule 22.3.4.1 P2 Height- Building General above are not accepted.	Large parts of some properties containing Significant Amenity Landscapes will render land incapable of reasonable use for activities that are expected in the Rural Zone. If an existing farming activity is located within a Significant Amenity Landscape, that activity has been assessed as not having an adverse effect on the amenity landscape.	Accept in part	
482.4	Kirstie Hill on behalf of Hill Country Farmers Group	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.4.1 P2 Height - Building General, to increase the maximum height limit to 10 metres for buildings within a Significant Amenity Landscape for permitted farming activities and buildings. OR Delete the Significant Amenity Landscape overlay from the Proposed District Plan if the amendments sought to Rule 22.3.4.1 P2 Height Building General as sought above are not accepted.	Large parts of some properties containing Significant Amenity Landscapes will render land incapable of reasonable use for activities that are expected in the Rural Zone. If an existing farming activity is located within a Significant Amenity Landscape, that activity has been assessed as not having an adverse effect on the amenity landscape.	Accept in part	
FS1377.118	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support submission 482.4	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater development potential.	Accept in part	
FS1340.83	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support submission 482.4	The submitter supports the increase in height limit to 10 metres for buildings within a SAL. This provides a more appropriate permitted height which is in keeping with typical rural buildings.	Accept in part	
302.26	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.4.1 Height - Building General as notified.	Standards are appropriate for building height in the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
378.34	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.1 Height - Building General, to include the following: 22.3.4.1 Height - Building General The maximum height of any building must	Fire and Emergency New Zealand supports the height standard in Rule 22.3.4.1, however an inclusion of a specific	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			not exceed 10m, <u>except hose drying towers up to 15m associated with emergency service facilities.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make further or consequential amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	exemption 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 and is consistent with the typical height of similar network utility structures.		
FS1035.140	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	
419.26	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.1 P1 Height - Building General, as follows: " <del>The maximum height of any building must not exceed 10m.</del> <u>The maximum height of any building associated with (a) A residential activity must not exceed 10m (b) A farming or rural industrial or services activity must not exceed 15m.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	A 10m height limit is not sufficient for horticultural sheds. Horticultural sheds require additional height for bin storage and air flow for drying produce such as onions. The Auckland Unitary Plan appropriately provides a 15m height threshold for buildings other than dwellings.	Accept in part	
FS1171.21	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Support submission 419.26	This submission seeks to enable additional height for those buildings related to farming and rural industry where this additional height will better provide for the type of building (i.e. sheds that are associated with those rural land uses). This submission is supported in so far as it relates to buildings associated with rural production and associated activities ie pack houses, and greenhouses.	Accept in part	
FS1370.4	Aztech Buildings for Zeala Limited	Support	Support submission 419.26	Support in part for the reasons given in the submission, but also note that changes in farming activities such as cut and carry operations, which often need clearance for large feed out vehicles moving within buildings adds weight to the suggested 15-metre max height for farm buildings other than dwellings proposed in the submission.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
466.19	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.1 Height - Building General so that the height of any building associated with a farming or rural services activity must not exceed 15m.	The submitter supports having a height restriction on buildings within the Rural Zone, however, consider that a 10m restriction is not practical for sheds/buildings associated with commercial vegetable production storage activities. A 15m height restriction would be more realistic.	Accept in part	
FS1171.111	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Support submission 466.19	Support in so far as this submission seeks to increase the height allowed for rural buildings in the rural zones.	Accept in part	
FS1308.55	The Surveying Company	Support	Support submission 466.19	We agree that a 10m restriction is not practical for farm sheds/buildings such as those associated with commercial vegetable production. A 15m height restriction would be more realistic.	Accept in part	
FS1168.75	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Support submission 466.19	The submitter supports having a height restriction on buildings within the Rural Zone, however, considers that a 10m restriction is not practical for sheds/buildings associated with commercial vegetable production storage activities. A 15m height restriction would be more realistic.	Accept in part	
761.20	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.4.1 P2 Height- Building-General insofar as it excludes the property at 180 Horsham Downs Road, Horsham Downs, which is not identified as having a Significant Amenity Landscape. AND Retain the property at 180 Horsham Downs Road, Horsham Downs as not having a Significant Amenity Landscape identified on it.	Rule P2 permits a maximum building height of 7.5m in a Significant Amenity Landscape. Property at 180 Horsham Downs not identified as an Significant Amenity Landscape Location of property at 180 Horsham Downs Road outside of a Significant Amenity Landscape is supported Any proposal to identify 180 Horsham Downs Road within a Significant Amenity Landscape would compromise the plans for the proposed Retirement Village and would therefore be opposed.	Accept in part	
943.16	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.4.1 P2 Height - Building General, as follows: The height of any dwelling or building must not exceed 7.5m in a Significant Amenity Landscape.	A dwelling is a building.	Accept in part	
680.222	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.4.1 P1 Height - Building General, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter supports this rule.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1387.216	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	
FS1275.17	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Oppose	Disallow and amend the rule to 15 metres.	The maximum height of a building within the Rural zone should be increased from 10 metres as notified in the PWDP to a maximum of 15 metres. Changing farming practices, including covered dairy pads and loafing barns etc., have resulted in buildings which often have a large foot print and which require higher clearance for the large farm vehicle access/egress or for improved ventilation. In addition increasing the pitch of a roof of these often large structures to make the installation of solar panels viable will often result in a higher maximum building height. The effects of the increased height in terms of shading are negated by compliance with the daylight admission standards in Rule 22.3.5 as drafted.	Accept in part	
680.223	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.4.1 (P2) Height - Building General. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	This relief is required to give effect to submission points raised in relation to Policy 3.4.3.	Accept in part	
697.800	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4(1) Height, as follows: (1) Rule 22.3.4.1 - Height - Building general provides permitted height levels across the entire Rural Zone for buildings, structures or vegetation. This rule does	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that the rules in 22.3.4.2 - 22.3.4.4 apply to the areas or activities specified in	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			not apply in those areas specified in Rules 22.3.4.2 - 22.3.4.4. (i) ...	those rules instead of the height building general rule.		
330.90	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.3 Land Use - Building.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
591.10	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new height rule within Rule 22.3.4 Height, as follows: <u>22.3.4.5 Building Height for extractive industry in industry in the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps PI Building height must not exceed 20m. RDI Building height that does not comply with above standard. Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) effects on amenity values; (ii) extent and visibility of non-compliance from adjacent zones; (iii) building form, location, external cladding and colour.</u>	Provision should be made for buildings up to 20 metres in height in association with extractive industry in the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps as a permitted activity.	Accept in part	
FS1146.18	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited on behalf of	Support	The submission amendment will buildings required as part of the extractive industries to have specific limits within the Aggregate Extractive Areas and Aggregate Resource areas.	We seek that the whole submission is allowed as the Aggregate Extractive Areas and Aggregate Resource overlay should enable specific limits and provide some relief to extractive industries in this overlay.	Accept in part	
330.150	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.3.4 Height, and/or all other rules sitting under Rule 22.3.4 Height.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
Rule 22.3.4.2 Height – Frost Fans						
419.27	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.4.2 Height - Frost Fans, as notified.	The submitter supports the proposed height and blade height thresholds.	Accept in part	
FS1171.22	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Support submission 419.27	This submission is supported to the extent that if artificial crop protection structures are not excluded from the definition of buildings, then provision should be made to address those structures in relation to the rule for daylight admission.	Accept in part	
Rule 22.3.4.4 Height - Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface						
697.453	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.2 Buildings, structures and vegetation within an airport obstacle limitation surface, to include a calculation to determine the permitted height with the airport obstacle limitation surface.	This rule needs to be able to be clearly interpreted by customers in relation to the Waikato Regional Airport.	Reject	
FS1253.17	Waikato Regional Airport Ltd	Oppose	Oppose submission 697.453	The clarification/calculation sought is provided for already in Appendix N of the Proposed District Plan. Using the defined coordinates	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>and elevations from this Appendix architects, drat person etc. can work out whether the development is within or outside of the OLS.</i>		
697.801	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.4.2 PI(b) Height Frost Fans, as follows: (b) The fan blades must not rotate higher than 13.5m <u>above ground level</u> .	Inserting the words "above ground level" clarify where the measurement for the frost fan blades must be taken from.	Accept	
<b>Rule 22.1.2 – Permitted Activities (Artificial Crop Protection Structures)</b>						
419.10	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>Artificial crop protection structures that meet the following conditions: (a) Green or black cloth shall be used on vertical faces within 30m of the site boundary (b) Green, black or white cloth shall be used on horizontal surfaces.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	If the exclusions sought to the definition of "building" are rejected, the submitter seeks the insertion of a suite of rules to address effects specific to these structures. The standards proposed in this submission have been adopted in the Proposed Opotiki District Plan and are similar to controls in Western Bay of Plenty District Plan. Restricting colours to green and black along the vertical surfaces will assist in reducing glare and minimising potential amenity effects.	Accept in part	
FS1306.5	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	<i>The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to non-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1171.13	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	<i>This submission seeks the provision of artificial crop protection structures as a permitted activity, subject to conditions. This submission is supported to the extent that if crop structures are not provided for as ancillary activities and are not excluded from building coverage, provision should be made to enable these as a permitted activity.</i>	Accept in part	
419.13	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new restricted discretionary activity to Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities, as follows:	The submitter seeks the insertion of a suite of rules to address effects specific to these	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p><u>Artificial crop protection structures that do not comply with Rule 22.3.X Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: i) Amenity values; ii) Effects of glare on traffic</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.</p>	structures, although no reasons have been provided.		
FS1171.15	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission seeks the provision of restricted discretionary status for artificial crop protection structures where these do not meet the proposed permitted activity standards. This submission is supported to the extent that should the relief sought in T & G Global's submission or other such similar submissions not be accepted, provision should be made to restrict the matters of discretion when considering artificial crop protection structures	Accept in part	
FS1388.182	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	This submission seeks the provision of restricted discretionary status for artificial crop protection structures where these do not meet the proposed permitted activity standards. This submission is supported to the extent that should the relief sought in T & G Global's submission or other such similar submissions not be accepted, provision should be made to restrict the matters of discretion when considering artificial crop protection structures	Accept in part	
419.28	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Amend the definition of "Building" in Chapter 13: Definitions, in terms of artificial crop protection structures (specific amendments sought are addressed elsewhere in the submission)</p> <p>OR</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.3.5 PI Daylight admission to specifically exclude artificial crop protections structures as follows: A building (<u>excluding artificial crop protection structures</u>) must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of 37 degrees commencing at an elevation of 2.5m above ground level at every point of the site boundary.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new permitted activity to Rule 22.3.5 Daylight admission, as follows: <u>PX Artificial crop protection structures that comply with Rule 22.1.2 PX Artificial crop protection structures.</u></p>	The submitter has made a submission on the definition of building as it relates to artificial crop protection structures. The submitter seeks that artificial crop protection structures be excluded from Rule 22.3.5. In order to be economically viable, cultivation and planting often occur right up to the site boundary. To ensure high quality production, it is necessary that these structures cover the entire crop. As such, it would be impossible for these structures to meet the permitted standards. The submitter seeks that a new rule be inserted to address effects specific to artificial crop protection structures. The permitted standards proposed in this submission have been	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter		Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	adopted in the Proposed Opotiki District Plan.		
FS1171.23	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission seeks to specifically exclude artificial crop protection structures from Rule 22.3.5 Daylight admission. This submission is supported to the extent that this submission is consistent with the concerns raised in T & G Global's submission, with respect to the definition of building coverage provided for within the Proposed Plan is not appropriate for accommodating buildings associated with rural production activities.	Accept in part	
419.115	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Not Stated	Add a definition for "Artificial crop protection structures" to Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: <u>Artificial crop protection structures Means structures with material used to protect crops and/or enhance growth (excluding greenhouses).</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	HNZPT is concerned regarding the extensive amendments proposed to this definition, as ancillary earthworks appears to be a permitted activity in Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance and could therefore result in adverse effects on Maaori sites and areas that contain archaeological sites as the activity would not be assessed.	Accept in part	
FS1350.49	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Support	Allow the submission point.	As the term artificial crop protection structure is used in the Plan, it should be defined.	Accept in part	
FS1388.226	Mercury New Zealand Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	The term Artificial Crop Protection Structures is used in the National Grid provisions within Chapter 14.4. The provision of a definition would assist in plan interpretation and application, and on this basis is supported.	Accept in part	
Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
<b>Rule 22.3.5 – Daylight admission</b>						
746.82	The Surveying Company	Support	Amend Rule 22.3.5 P1- Daylight admission to allow the rule to be infringed where written consent of the land owners and occupiers of the abutting sites(s) have been obtained.	A daylight admission infringement is that similar to a yard infringement which only affects the adjoining neighbouring property.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
761.21	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain the height to boundary requirement (37 degrees at 2.5m above ground level) in Rule 22.3.5 Daylight admission. AND Amend Rule 22.3.5 PI Daylight admissions so the height control plane only applies to the external boundaries of Retirement Villages and not to any internal boundaries for individual certificate of title boundaries. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.	Retention of existing height to boundary provision is supported. Height to boundary requirement should only be applicable to the external boundaries of a retirement village, not the boundaries of individuals titles within a Retirement Village.	Accept in part	
761.22	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.5 RD1 -Daylight admission as notified.	Restricted Discretionary Activity status is supported.	Accept in part	
330.151	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.3.5 Daylight admission.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
695.214	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.5 PI Daylight admission as follows: A building must not protrude through a height control plane rising at an angle of <del>37</del> <sup>45</sup> degrees commencing at an elevation of <del>2.53</del> <sup>3</sup> m 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	
697.804	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.5 RDI (b) Daylight admission, as follows: (b) Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) Height of <u>the</u> building; (ii) 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) Amenity values of the locality.	Additional words in this rule provide clarity.	Accept	
<b>Rule 22.3.6 – Building coverage</b>						
252.1	Heather Andrews	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage. OR Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI (a)(ii) Building coverage from 500m2 to at least 750m2.	The main reason for buying a rural block is to have room to build a good house and have a shed as well. If a person wants to cover more than 500m2 they will be compelled to buy a block in excess of 3ha and have excess land that they may not have wanted. It will make blocks of less than 3ha worth less and encourage subdivision of larger blocks, which is a waste of land. It is not unusual for a good house to be in excess of 500m2 these days.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1386.257	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 in part	
FS1171.112	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow to the extent consistent with this further submission.	Oppose in so far as this submission seeks a maximum building coverage of 750m <sup>2</sup> within the rural zones which is not considered to be adequate to provide for the proper establishment of horticultural activities and related accessory buildings.	Accept in part	
418.6	Ethan Findlay	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.6 P1(a)(i) and (ii) - Building coverage, so that the permitted building coverage is increased to 850m <sup>2</sup> . AND Amend other parts of the district plan as necessary to give effect to the relief sought.	A building coverage of 850m <sup>2</sup> would provide for a dwelling, minor dwelling and sufficient ancillary buildings (such as implement sheds, storage sheds, workshops and farm buildings) on the submitter's property. The notified limits (the larger of 2% of the site area or 500m <sup>2</sup> ) are not logical and have been carried over from previous district plan reviews. The rules for boundary setbacks and building height are sufficient to manage adverse effects for smaller properties where a large building coverage is not achievable.	Accept in part	
FS1388.164	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	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
654.2	Ngaakau Tapatahi Trust	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.6 Building Coverage, to exempt the Tamahere Hospital and Healing Centre (104A Duncan Road, Tamahere) from this provision; OR Amend Rule 22.3.6 Building Coverage, to allow more permissive building coverage which recognizes the on-site activity and need for development flexibility and any other amendments to provide the relief sought.	Subsequent to the hospital's initial construction, Ngaakau Tapatahi Trust, applied for, and obtained, multiple resource consents to accommodate the hospital's expansion. Consents triggered because the hospital exceeded the maximum site coverage permitted in the Rural Zone (2% of the site area, or 500m2, whichever is the larger, and/or because non-residential buildings are limited to a maximum of 400m2 (hospital already around 1400m2). Thus any form of physical development will trigger a resource consent requirement, irrespective of whether the hospital operates in accordance with original consent conditions. Inability to avoid RMA consent triggers is time-consuming and costly. Over-development of the site will not occur due to philosophy and management by the Trust.	Accept in part	
676.7	T&G Global Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage to increase the limit, so that the maximum limit of building coverage within a Rural Zone enables proper establishment of horticulture activities and facilities and related accessory buildings, worker accommodation, etc. AND Any further or consequential amendments necessary to address the concerns raised in the submission.	The limit is too restrictive to enable the proper establishment of horticulture activities and related accessory buildings, worker accommodations and the like. The proposed limits therefore do not achieve the objectives and policies as discussed above.	Accept in part	
FS1168.77	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	The limit is too restrictive to enable the proper establishment of horticulture activities and related accessory buildings, worker accommodations and the like. The proposed limits therefore do not achieve the objectives and policies as discussed above.	Accept in part	
FS1348.18	Perry International Trading Group Limited	Support	Null	PITGL supports the increase in building coverage on the basis that PITGL recognises that rural activities such as commercial horticulture have differing building coverage requirements and suitable provision for a diverse range of ancillary	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>activities and associated accessory buildings in the Rural Zone is important.</i>		
FS1387.142	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	
814.3	Jenny Goodwright for Awaroa Farm Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.6 Rural Zone - Building Coverage - PI (a)(ii), as follows: (ii) <del>500</del> 7000m <sup>2</sup> .	500m <sup>2</sup> for total building coverage is unacceptable for a possible dairy farm herd home. Like to see this changed to 7000m <sup>2</sup> , especially for possible expansion.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1301	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Oppose submission 814.3	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
197.24	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage.	Building coverage standards are utilised to control stormwater, character and amenity effects. Other technical standards can be adopted to effectively manage stormwater. It is considered that Rural Buildings irrespective of their size are an accepted element of rural character and amenity.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				The building coverage limitation and subsequent discretionary activity status for non-compliance is a constraint for rural production activities and will not encourage reinvestment or expansion in the Waikato. Rural producers will look elsewhere for more supportive planning frameworks.		
FSI 386.205	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	
FSI 308.6	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	There is no need to restrict building coverage for permitted and controlled farming activities for the reasons given in our original submission. We agree that rural buildings irrespective of their size are an accepted element of rural character and amenity. The building coverage limitation and subsequent discretionary activity status for non-compliance is a constraint for rural production activities and will not encourage reinvestment or expansion in the Waikato District.	Accept	
FSI 168.76	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Building coverage standards are utilised to control stormwater, character and amenity effects. Other technical standards can be adopted to effectively manage stormwater. It is considered that Rural Buildings irrespective of their size are an accepted element of rural character and amenity. The building coverage limitation and subsequent discretionary activity status for non-compliance is a constraint for rural production activities and will not encourage reinvestment or expansion in the	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>Waikato. Rural producers will look elsewhere for more supportive planning frameworks.</i>		
197.24	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage.	Building coverage standards are utilised to control stormwater, character and amenity effects. Other technical standards can be adopted to effectively manage stormwater, It is considered that Rural Buildings irrespective of their size are an accepted element of rural character and amenity. The building coverage limitation and subsequent discretionary activity status for non-compliance is a constraint for rural production activities and will not encourage reinvestment or expansion in the Waikato. Rural producers will look elsewhere for more supportive planning frameworks.	Reject	
302.27	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	A restriction on building coverage and particularly one as low as the proposed 500m2 is not consistent with a working rural environment which requires storage sheds, hay barns, milking sheds and dwellings etc.	Reject	
FS1386.345	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FS1308.10	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	For the reasons given in submission point 197.24.	Reject	
418.11	Ethan Findlay	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage.	No reasons provided.	Reject	
FS1171.113	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Oppose	Disallow to the extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission seeks to increase building coverage to 850m2 which is opposed in so far as is not considered to be adequate to provide	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>for the proper establishment of horticultural activities and related accessory buildings.</i>		
FS1388.168	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
419.29	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of 'Building' in Chapter 13 Definitions, to exclude artificial crop protection structures (the specific amendments sought are addressed elsewhere in the submission) AND Add a new clause (iii) to Rule 22.3.6 PI Building Coverage, as follows: (a) The total building coverage must not exceed the larger of: ... (iii) <u>except that this rule shall not apply to buildings associated with rural production activities or rural industries and services and shall not apply to artificial crop protection structures.</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter has sought that artificial crop protection structures be excluded from the definition of building. Should this be rejected, the submitter seeks that artificial crop protection structures be excluded from the building coverage rule. Artificial crop protection structures are open structures - any materials used are necessarily permeable to allow water through and to control temperature. As such, these structures do not impact on stormwater run-off. It is considered that the proposed limits are too restrictive for the rural environment. A number of large scale buildings are required to support ordinary farming activities. This is particularly relevant for rural industry activities such as pack houses and cool stores. The submitter purports that the presence of large scale buildings in the rural environment forms part of the rural character and amenity. The section 32 report comments that controls of height, setbacks and daylight admission are necessary to control the dominance of buildings on the landscape. However the report does not provide sufficient explanation for why a 500m2 limit is	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				applicable in this instance. The submitter contends that large scale buildings, such as storage sheds, cool sheds and packhouses are activities that are anticipated in the rural landscape.		
FS1342.113	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.29.	FFNZ support the submitter's relief in conjunction with its own relief sought for this rule for the same reasons as the FFNZ submission on this rule.	Accept in part	
FS1171.24	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this T &G Global's submission.	This submission seeks to exclude artificial crop protection structures and buildings associated with rural production activities or rural industries and services from Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage. T & G Global seeks that the building coverage standard should be increased to provide for those buildings associated with rural activities. This submission is supported in so far as it is consistent with the submission by T & G Global.	Accept in part	
419.30	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.6D1 Building coverage, from a discretionary activity to a restricted discretionary activity AND Add the following matters of discretion to Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage: <u>Matters of discretion: a) Effects on character and amenity b) Management of effects of stormwater run-off</u> AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	A discretionary activity status is a further disincentive for rural production activities to locate and expand in the Waikato District.	Reject	
FS1388.188	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Support	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
466.20	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Oppose	Delete reference to 500m2 maximum or 2% of site area from Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage.	The submitter understands the need to manage building coverage but consider that the outlined parameters are too prescriptive for buildings commonly associated with commercial vegetable production, such as pack houses or cool stores. The submitter needs to retain the ability to provide buildings appropriate to the rural production and servicing. The submitter needs to ensure that soil removed to enable building and yard cover, is utilized to add to the versatility of existing production land in the same locality.	Accept in part	
FS1388.409	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1308.56	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<i>For the reasons given in submission point 197.24</i>	Accept in part	
466.21	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Oppose	Delete reference to 500m2 maximum or 2% of site area from Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage.	The submitter understands the need to manage building coverage but consider that the outlined parameters are too prescriptive for buildings commonly associated with commercial vegetable production, such as pack houses or cool stores. The submitter needs to retain the ability to provide buildings appropriate to the rural production and servicing. The submitter needs to ensure that soil removed to enable building and yard cover, is utilized	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				to add to the versatility of existing production land in the same locality.		
FS1388.410	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
466.70	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage to specify that buildings associated with farming activities are a permitted activity.	The submitter understands the need to manage building coverage but consider that the outlined parameters are too prescriptive for buildings commonly associated with commercial vegetable production, such as pack houses or cool stores. The submitter needs to retain the ability to provide buildings appropriate to the rural production and servicing. The submitter needs to ensure that soil removed to enable building and yard cover, is utilized to add to the versatility of existing production land in the same locality.	Accept in part	
696.10	Brenda and Gavin Butcher for Parkmere Farms	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI Building coverage, by increasing 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.	Accept in part	
746.83	The Surveying Company	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI-Building Coverage to exclude buildings associated with permitted and controlled farming activities (including free range poultry farming and poultry hatcheries). AND	The proposed rule could unduly restrict someone wanting to use the land for a productive purpose (e.g greenhouses). Consider whether a building coverage rule in the Rural Zone is necessary at all given there is no such requirement in the Franklin Section of the District Plan.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI (a) (i)-Building Coverage to increase the 2% building coverage limit. OR Delete Rule 22.3.6 PI Building Coverage			
FSI 168.79	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	The proposed rule could unduly restrict someone wanting to use the land for a productive purpose (e.g greenhouses). Consider whether a building coverage rule in the Rural Zone is necessary at all given there is no such requirement in the Franklin Section of the District Plan.	Accept in part	
FSI 387.955	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	
FSI 265.64	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow the amendment of the rule.	Support intent of the submission to provide for greater building coverage, particularly for poultry activities which by nature require large buildings.	Accept in part	
751.26	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI Building coverage to exclude buildings associated with permitted and controlled farming activities (including free range poultry farming and poultry hatcheries). AND Amend Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage after considering whether a building coverage rule in the Rural Zone is necessary given there is no such requirement in the Waikato District Plan - Franklin Section. OR Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI Building coverage to increase the 2% limit.	Buildings associated with permitted and controlled farming activities should be exempt from this rule. This rule will restrict someone wanting to use the land for a productive purposes Overall, the 2% building coverage is too low.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1387.1080	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	
FS1265.65	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow amendment of this rule.	Support the intent of the submission to provide for greater building coverage, particularly for poultry activities which by nature require large buildings.	Accept in part	
761.23	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.6- Building coverage so that the building coverage requirements do not apply to a Retirement Village. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.	The rule relating to building coverage in Rule 22.3.6(P1) should not be applicable to a Retirement Village. Larger sized buildings form an integral part of a retirement village development, therefore are necessary to accommodate the shared services and specialized medical facilities essential for a retirement village. LFL are opposed to any restrictions regarding building coverage for a retirement village.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1123	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Oppose submission 761.23	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
766.51	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.6 Building Coverage. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	A restriction on building coverage and particularly one as low as the proposed 500m2 is not consistent with a working rural environment, requiring storage shed, hay barns etc.	Reject	
FS1387.1157	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
FS1308.126	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	For the reasons given in submission point 302.28.	Reject	
877.17	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI Building coverage to exclude buildings associated with permitted and controlled farming activities (including free range poultry farming and poultry hatcheries).	Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI Building coverage to exclude buildings associated with permitted and controlled farming activities (including free range poultry farming and poultry hatcheries).	Accept in part	
FS1387.1461	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Oppose submission 877.17	Null	Accept in part	
FS1265.66	Mainland Poultry Limited	Support	Allow the amendment of the rule.	Support the intent of the submission to provide for greater building coverage, particularly for poultry activities which by nature require large buildings.	Accept in part	
877.18	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI Building coverage after considering whether a building coverage rule in the Rural Zone is necessary. OR Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI (a)(i) Building coverage to increase the 2% site area coverage limit.	The 2% building coverage is too low. The rule would unduly restrict someone wanting to use the land for a productive purpose (like greenhouses).	Accept in part	
FS1387.1462	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Oppose submission 877.18	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
330.152	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1386.413	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Oppose submission 330.152	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
680.224	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the title of Rule 22.3.6 Building coverage as follows: 22.3.6 Building coverage (excluding buildings ancillary to farming purposes). AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intent of this rule but considers the amendment is necessary for clarity sake and to increase certainty. The submitter is concerned if covered yards, woolsheds, implement sheds or milking platforms were interpreted as being subject to this rule.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
FSI 168.78	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	The submitter understands the intent of this rule but considers the amendment is necessary for clarity sake and to increase certainty. The submitter is concerned if covered yards, woolsheds, implement sheds or milking platforms were interpreted as being subject to this rule.	Accept in part	
FSI 171.92	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission seeks to exclude buildings ancillary to farming purposes from the standard provided for building coverage. T & G Global submitted that this standard was too restrictive to adequately provide for horticultural activities within the rural zones, and therefore supports the exclusion of buildings ancillary to farming purposes from this rule in so far as that would exclude buildings relating to horticultural activities.	Accept in part	
FSI 387.217	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	
697.805	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.6 PI (a) Building coverage, as follows: (a) The total building coverage must not exceed the larger of: (i) ...	Word 'total' not necessary. Also need consistency of wording across zone chapters	Accept in part	
FSI 387.692	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
697.806	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.6 DI Building coverage, as follows: A building <u>coverage</u> that does not comply with Rule 22.3.6 PI	This is to keep consistency of wording across zone chapters.	Accept in part	
FS1387.693	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Oppose submission 697.806	<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	
302.25	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Oppos	Amend Section 22.3 Land Use - Building to make non-residential buildings or structures a permitted activity outside Landscape and Natural Character Areas. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The Operative Plan provides for non-residential buildings as a permitted activity in the Rural Zone. The proposed plan should include the same provision to ensure farm buildings and similar structures are provided for.	Accept in part	
FS1386.344	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</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<b>Rule 22.3.7.1 – Building setbacks – all boundaries</b>						
171.2	Louis (Luke) Faesenkloet	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building setbacks -all boundaries to reduce the setbacks from the road which apply to the submitter's three titles at McWatt Road, Pokeno, that have frontages to paper roads. OR Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building setbacks -all boundaries so that the building setbacks only apply to one of the road boundaries for the submitter's three titles on McWatt Road, Pokeno.	Development of site is difficult as a permitted activity due to the paper roads adjoining the submitter's site. Achieving 7.5m setback from road boundaries is unachievable.	Accept in part	
177.2	Nick Hill	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P1 (a) (iii) Building Setbacks - all boundaries, from 25m to 12m.	The 25m proposed setback is unreasonable and will unnecessarily limit the submitter's building and development options on their lifestyle property and consented subdivision.	Reject	
261.4	Rita Carey	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, to reduce the setback for a habitable building to 10m.	A 25m setback from all boundaries means submitter will need to build towards the middle of a flat paddock and makes utilizing for farming difficult. The Paddock would become a section unless the paddock is ring fenced at a huge cost and inconvenience to the submitter. Better able to utilize the existing boundary fences for the residence section by leaving the rest of the property for grazing/cropping etc.	Reject	
FS1353.25	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Oppose	Null	TPL wish to retain setbacks from boundaries for habitable buildings.	Accept	
276.7	Ted and Kathryn Letford	Support	Retain 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as notified. AND Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P2 (a) Building Setbacks - all boundaries, which sets out non-habitable building setbacks on a title less than 1.6ha.	Non-habitable buildings should be permitted to be setback closer than 25m from every boundary other than a road.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			AND Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P4 (a) Building Setbacks - All boundaries, which sets out non-habitable building setbacks on a title greater than 1.6ha.			
418.7	Ethan Findlay	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, so that the setbacks of the 1.6ha or smaller neighbouring lots apply to both sides of a boundary to optimise land use where the larger neighbouring lot is 4ha or less. AND Amend other parts of the district plan as necessary to give effect to the relief sought.	A 25m setback from boundaries, other than a road boundary, is unreasonable and would adversely impact on the ability for the submitter to use their land. Two boundaries for the submitter's property adjoin properties that are less than 1.6ha. These neighbouring properties are permitted to have 12 metre setbacks. Building setbacks should promote a more efficient use of land without prejudicing more intensive subdivision of non-productive land in the future.	Reject	
471.9	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, by deleting the term "Record of Title" and replacing with "site". AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	The term "site" is more appropriate and is defined in Chapter 13.	Reject	
489.7	Ann-Maree Gladding	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.7.1 P1 (iii) Boundary Setbacks - All boundaries; AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P1 (iv) Boundary Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: <del>(iv)(iii)</del> 12m from the boundary of an adjoining site. that is less than 6ha	10m has always worked well in the Franklin area. 25m is far too long and restrictive and there is no good reason for it to be this long. In large open rural properties, there is no difference to the naked eye between 25m and 12m but when picking appropriate building sites, a 25m no build area does restrict houses from being built on more appropriate sites.	Reject	
489.8	Ann-Maree Gladding	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P2 (iii) Boundary Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: <del>4m</del> 5m from every boundary other than a road boundary.	12m is far too long and restrictive for a non-habitable building. Many people move to rural blocks to have space for a garage or shed, having these 12m from the boundary is too restrictive.	Reject	
489.9	Ann-Maree Gladding	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P3 (iii) Boundary Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: <del>25m</del> 12m from every boundary other than a road boundary.	25m is far too long and restrictive, there is no good reason for it to be this long. These smaller sized rural blocks are usually created on more undulating and low class soils and a 25m boundary setback will greatly restrict where a dwelling can be built.	Reject	
683.4	Carolyn Watson	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, by allowing a reduced boundary	Infringement of this rule should be allowed where the written consents of the owners	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			setback if the written consent has been obtained from the affected neighbour.	and occupiers of the abutting site(s) have been obtained.		
782.7	Jack Macdonald	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, by deleting P1 (a)(iii) and amending P1 (a)(iv) as shown below: P1 (a) A habitable building located on a site less than 1.6ha must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) <del>25m from the boundary of an adjoining site that is 6ha or more;</del> (iv) 12m from the boundary of an adjoining site, <del>that is less than 6ha.</del>	The operative rule in the Franklin Section which requires a 10m setback has worked well. A 25m setback is too restrictive and not justified. There is no discernible difference between a 25m setback and 12m setback. A 25m setback restricts houses from being built on more appropriate sites.	Reject	
782.8	Jack Macdonald	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P2 (a)(iii) Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: P2 (a) A non-habitable building located on a Record of Title less than 1.6ha must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) <del>12m-5m</del> from every boundary other than a road boundary.	The proposed 12m setback is too restrictive for a non-habitable building and many people move to rural blocks so that they have space for a garage or shed.	Reject	
782.9	Jack Macdonald	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P3 (a)(iii) Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: P3 (a) A habitable building located on a Record of Title 1.6ha or more must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) <del>25m</del> 12m from every boundary other than a road boundary.	The proposed 25m setback is too restrictive and not justified. Small rural blocks are usually created on undulating land with low class soils and a 25m setback will restrict the location of a dwelling.	Reject	
838.8	Madsen Lawrie Consultants	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1(a)(iii) Building setbacks - all boundaries to reduce the required boundary setback from adjoining sites over 6ha.	There are a lot of titles in Franklin that are smaller than 8,000m2 specified in the Proposed District Plan as these have been approved under the Franklin Section of the Operative District Plan that allows subdivision to a lot size of 2,500m2. Implementing a 25m setback from adjoining sites that are over 6ha could be very challenging on such sites.	Reject	
922.7	John Rowe	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, by deleting P1 (a)(iii) and amending P1 (a)(iv) as shown below: P1 (a) A habitable building located on a site less than 1.6ha must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) <del>25m from the boundary of an adjoining site that is 6ha or more;</del> (iv) 12m from the boundary of an adjoining site, <del>that is less than 6ha.</del>	The operative rule in the Franklin Section which requires a 10m setback has worked well. A 25m setback is too restrictive and not justified. There is no discernible difference between a 25m setback and 12m setback. A 25m setback restricts houses from being built on more appropriate sites.	Reject	
922.8	John Rowe	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P2 (a)(iii) Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: P2 (a) A non-habitable building located on a Record of Title less than 1.6ha must be set back a	The proposed 12m setback is too restrictive for a non-habitable building and many people move to rural blocks so that they have space for a garage or shed.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			minimum of: ... (iii) <del>12m</del> <u>5m</u> from every boundary other than a road boundary.			
922.9	John Rowe	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P3 (a)(iii) Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: P3 (a) A habitable building located on a Record of Title 1.6ha or more must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) <del>25m</del> <u>12m</u> from every boundary other than a road boundary.	The proposed 25m setback is too restrictive and not justified. Small rural blocks are usually created on undulating land with low class soils and a 25m setback will restrict the location of a dwelling.	Reject	
197.25	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P1 Building setbacks - All boundaries, as notified.	The submitter supports setbacks for habitable buildings from site boundaries to manage reverse sensitivity. Physical separation achieved through a defined setback regime is supported by NZ Pork as an effective method to avoid, remedy or mitigate potential conflicts and reverse sensitivity issues.	Accept	
FS1353.23	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Support	Null	Agree with the retention of the setbacks to assist in managing reverse sensitivity.	Accept	
197.26	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P2 Building setbacks - All boundaries, as notified.	The submitter supports setbacks for inhabitable buildings. Physical separation achieved through a defined setback regime is supported by NZ Pork as an effective method to avoid, remedy or mitigate potential conflicts and reverse sensitivity issues.	Accept	
FS1353.24	Tuakau Proteins Limited	Support	Null	Agree with the retention of the setbacks to assist in managing reverse sensitivity.	Accept	
197.27	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P3 Building setbacks - All boundaries, as notified.	The submitter supports setbacks for habitable buildings from site boundaries to manage reverse sensitivity. Physical separation achieved through a defined setback regime is supported by NZ Pork as an effective method to avoid, remedy or mitigate potential conflicts and reverse sensitivity issues.	Accept	
197.28	Jeska McHugh for NZ Pork	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P4 Building setbacks - All boundaries, as notified.	The submitter supports setbacks for inhabitable buildings. Physical separation achieved through a defined setback regime is supported by NZ Pork as an effective method to avoid, remedy or mitigate potential conflicts and reverse sensitivity issues.	Accept	
372.17	Steve van Kampen for Auckland Council	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1. Building setbacks - All boundaries.	Building setbacks create separation for sensitive activities based on zone and site	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				size. Specific rules for sensitive activities are included.		
FS1308.24	The Surveying Company	Oppose	Null	For the reasons given in our original submission.	Reject	
418.12	Ethan Findlay	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks- All boundaries.	No reasons provided.	Reject	
418.14	Ethan Findlay	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building setbacks, to promote a more efficient use of land and not prejudice future (more intensive) subdivision of non-productive rural land, including setbacks of 12m for lot sizes 4ha or smaller with boundaries that neighbour 1.6ha or smaller lots.	A 25m setback from boundaries, other than a road boundary, is unreasonable and would adversely impact on the ability for the submitter to use their land. Two boundaries for the submitter's property adjoin properties that are less than 1.6ha. These neighbouring properties are permitted to have 12 metre setbacks. Building setbacks should promote a more efficient use of land without prejudicing more intensive subdivision of non-productive land in the future.	Reject	
471.10	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P1, P2, P3 and P4 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: P1 (a)(ii) 17.5m from the centre line of an indicative road <u>that has not yet been vested</u> ; P2 (a)(ii) 17.5m from the centre line of an indicative road <u>that has not yet been vested</u> ; P3 (a)(ii) 22m from the centre line of an indicative road <u>that has not yet been vested</u> ; P4 (a)(ii) 22m from the centre line of an indicative road <u>that has not yet been vested</u> ; AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	The requested amendments will avoid the need for resource consent when a road has been located in a different alignment to that shown on the planning maps.	Accept in part	
471.11	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries to rationalise building setbacks in the Rural Zone. All sites less than 1.6 ha shall have side and rear boundary setbacks of 12m and a road setback of 7.5m. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	A 25m setback on a small lot restricts development on a site. The intent of the rule traditionally relates to reverse sensitivity, however a landowner should be able to build where they like within reasons. The requested amendments bring the Proposed District Plan more in line with Permitted Boundary Activities.	Reject	
489.14	Ann-Maree Gladding	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P4 (iii) Boundary Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: <del>12m</del> 5m from every boundary other than a road boundary.	12m is far too long and restrictive for a non-habitable building. Many people move to rural blocks to have space for a garage or shed, having these 12m from the boundary is too restrictive.	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
695.91	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P3(a)(ii) Building setbacks - All boundaries, to be 12m rather than 25m.	A 12m setback would be adequate.	Reject	
746.84	The Surveying Company	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building setbacks - All boundaries to have a 12m setback from the boundary of an adjoining site. AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building setbacks - All boundaries to allow the setback to be reduced where written neighbours' consent has been obtained.	This rule should be allowed to be infringed where the written consent of the owners and occupiers of the abutting site(s) have been obtained. This should be specified as per the Franklin section without the need to pay Council \$350 to process a permitted boundary activity. A 25m boundary setback can be significant for a site under 1.6 hectares and can unduly restrict the use of the land. The 12m boundary setback referred to in other instances could be appropriate here as it is unclear as to what an extra 13m in an open rural landscape would achieve in relation to reducing reverse sensitivity effects from adjoining land. For example, 12m is still sufficient for a person on a property less than 1.6 hectares to establish screen planting or internal fencing to reduce potential effects. It is unclear as to why a habitable building on a property greater than 1.6 hectares needs to be 25m from every boundary other than a road boundary. While these properties are larger and have more room to accommodate the setback, we don't see why a 12m setback would not be adequate here similar to the reasons given above. Many existing dwellings, especially within the former Franklin District, will encroach into the new boundary setback. While these will have existing use rights it would mean any minor dwelling, extension to the existing dwelling or accessory building, within the curtilage area or the existing dwelling may not be able to comply with the permitted setback standards resulting in an increase in consents at additional costs to these land owners. The existing rural environment should be considered in the development appropriate boundary setbacks rather than applying the Operative Waikato	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				Section Waikato District Plan standards which don't adequately reflect the existing environment or building setbacks. Council's Section 32 report for the Rural Zone (pg 84) states that larger setback are required if the neighbouring lot is over 6 hectares for reverse sensitivity reasons. However, there is no justification as to why 25m is an appropriate distance.		
FS1342.204	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 746.84.	FFNZ support maximising use of the rural land resource, and minimising undue delay and cost in doing so. In this regard where the Proposed plan prescribes a 25m setback, this should be a 12m setback. 12m is ample side or rear yard for rural buildings.	Reject	
751.27	Chanel Hargrave and Travis Miller	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries to have a 10m setback from the boundary of an adjoining site (or this may be reduced where written consent is obtained from an affected neighbour).	This rule should be allowed to be infringed where the written consent of the owners and occupiers of the neighbouring sites have been obtained. A 25m boundary setback can be significant for a site under 1.6ha and can unduly restrict the use of the land. The s32 report for the Rural Zone states that larger setbacks are required if the neighbouring lot is over 6ha for reverse sensitivity reasons. There is no justification as to why 25m is appropriate. The 10m boundary setback referred to in the Franklin District Plan could be more appropriate. It is unclear as to why a habitable building on a property greater than 1.6ha needs to be set back 25m from every road boundary other than a road boundary. Many existing dwellings will encroach into the new boundary setback. It would mean that any minor dwelling, extension to an existing dwelling or accessory building may not be able to comply with the permitted setback standard, resulting in additional consent costs.	Reject	
761.24	Lyndendale Farms Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building setbacks- All boundaries as follows: Rules P1, P2, P3, P4 and RD1 do not apply to the proposed Retirement Village at 180 Horsham Downs Road; and Building setback requirements only apply to the external boundaries of a	The submitter opposes building setback provisions that are proposed in Rule 22.3.7.1. Proposed building setback provisions do not provide certainty with respect to the proposed Retirement Village Development at 180 Horsham Downs Road.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Retirement Village and there are no internal setback requirements; and there are no internal setback requirements; and The different rules for "habitable and non-habitable" buildings do not apply to a Retirement Village; and Site specific building setbacks are included for a Retirement Village. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make any consequential amendments that are required to give effect to the submission.	The provisions don't include a building setback from the Waikato Expressway. The provisions do not include any activity specific setbacks for a Retirement Village. Building setback provisions stated in Rule P1, P2, P3 and P4 and RD1 should not apply to a Retirement Village. Provisions in Rules P3 and P4 would currently apply to 80 Horsham Downs Road. The size and number of certificates of title is likely to change, as a result of the subdivision associated with the proposed Retirement Village. Existing building setback rules do not provide for Retirement village development. The building setbacks for a Retirement Village (P1-P4) should not refer to the size of the Record of Title. References to "habitable" and "non-habitable" buildings are not defined and not relevant to retirement villages.		
782.14	Jack Macdonald	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, so that P4 (a)(iii) reads as follows: P4 (a) A non-habitable building located on a Record of Title 1.6ha or more must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) <del>12m</del> <u>5m</u> from every boundary other than a road boundary.	The proposed 12m setback is too restrictive for a non-habitable building. Many people move to rural properties to have space for a garage or shed. Having these 12m from the boundary is going to be too restrictive.	Reject	
797.32	Fonterra Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 Building setbacks- All boundaries, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P1, P2, P3 and P4 Building setbacks - All boundaries to include (or words to similar effect): <u>Providing that the setback requirements shall not apply to any boundary with land held in common ownership.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.	Supports proposed setback requirements subject to them not applying in respect of land parcels held in common ownership.	Accept in part	
FS1168.80	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	Supports proposed setback requirements subject to them not applying in respect of land parcels held in common ownership.	Accept in part	
FS1342.225	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 797.32.	FFNZ support that where adjoining sites are in common ownership, there should be no	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>requirement to set buildings any minimum distance from the lot boundary.</i>		
922.15	John Rowe	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, so that P4 (a)(iii) reads as follows: P4 (a) A non-habitable building located on a Record of Title 1.6ha or more must be set back a minimum of: ... (iii) <del>12m</del> <u>5m</u> from every boundary other than a road boundary.	The proposed 12m setback is too restrictive for a non-habitable building. Many people move to rural properties to have space for a garage or shed. Having these 12m from the boundary is going to be too restrictive.	Reject	
943.17	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P2 (a) - Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows; (a) A non-habitable building located on a <del>Record of Title</del> <u>site</u> less than 1.6ha must be set back a minimum of: AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P3 (a) - Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows; (a) A habitable building located on a <del>Record of Title</del> <u>site</u> 1.6ha or more must be set back a minimum of: AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P4 (a) - Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows; (a) A non-habitable building located on a <del>Record of Title</del> <u>site</u> 1.6ha or more must be set back a minimum of:	The term "site" is more appropriate and is defined in Chapter 13 Definitions.	Reject	
943.18	McCracken Surveys Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P1 (a) (ii) Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows; (ii) 17.5m from the centre line of an indicative road <u>that has not yet been vested</u> ; AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P2 (a) (ii) Building Setbacks - All boundaries as follows; (ii) 17.5m from the centre line of an indicative road <u>that has not yet been vested</u> ; AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P3 (a) (ii) Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows; (ii) 22m from the centre line of an indicative road; <u>that has not yet been vested</u> ; AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P4 (a) (ii) Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows; (ii) 22m from the centre line of an indicative road; <u>that has not yet been vested</u> ;	Avoids the need for resource consent when a road has been located in a different alignment than shown on the planning maps.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
680.225	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intent of these rules and is supportive of the planning approach taken.	Accept	
<i>FS1308.97</i>	<i>The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>For the reason given in our original submission.</i>	<i>Reject</i>	
680.226	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P2 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intent of these rules and is supportive of the planning approach taken.	Accept	
680.227	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P3 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intent of these rules and is supportive of the planning approach taken.	Accept	
<i>FS1308.98</i>	<i>The Surveying Company</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>For the reasons given in our original submission</i>	<i>Reject</i>	
680.228	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 P4 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intent of these rules and is supportive of the planning approach taken.	Accept	
680.229	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 RD1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intent of these rules and is supportive of the planning approach taken.	Accept	
695.147	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Add to Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks - All boundaries a statement to say that where an indicative road is no longer relevant, or constructed and in use, the rule is no longer applicable.	No specific reasons provided.	Accept in part	
695.215	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 P1(a)(ii), P2(a)(ii), P3(a)(ii) and P4(a)(ii) Building setbacks - All		Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			boundaries, to include an exemption clause in the situation where an indicative road remains on the Planning Map but has been constructed and is open to the public, either in the same location or very near.			
695.216	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 PI(a)(iii) to change the setback requirement from 25m to 12m and remove the adjoining property size as follows: <del>125m from the boundary of an adjoining site that is less than 6ha.</del>		Reject	
697.809	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 PI(a) Building Setbacks - all boundaries, as follows: (a) A habitable building located on a <del>site</del> Record of Title less than 1.6ha must be set back a minimum of...		Accept	
697.810	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Add a new clause (iii) to Rule 22.3.7.1 RDI(b) Building Setbacks - all boundaries, as follows: (iii) <del>reverse sensitivity.</del>		Accept	
742.227	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 PI-P4 Building setbacks - All boundaries to require 35m setbacks from the Waikato expressway designation boundary and 15m setbacks from all other state highways. AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.		Reject	
FS1283.3	Parkmere Farms	Oppose	Oppose.	15m setback from all state highways or 35m from the Waikato expressway for all buildings (including those that are not habitable) does 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.	Accept	
FS1221.3	Cindy and Tony Young	Oppose	Null	15m setback from all state highways or 35m from the Waikato expressway for all buildings (including those that are not habitable) does not constitute an efficient use of the 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	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>be subject to an increased setback from a state highway.</i>		
742.228	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 RDI Building Setbacks- All boundaries, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.1 RDI matter of discretion (b)(ii) Building Setbacks - All boundaries as follows: <del>effects on traffic</del> <u>transport</u> network safety and efficiency; AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports matter of discretion (b)(ii) under Rule 22.3.7.1 RDI.	Accept	
742.239	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.1 Building Setbacks- All boundaries, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend matter of discretion (b)(ii) in Rule 22.3.7.1 RDI Building Setbacks - All boundaries, as follows: <del>Effects on traffic</del> <u>Transport</u> network safety and efficiency; AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports matter of discretion (b)(ii) under Rule 23.3.7.1 RDI.	Accept	
302.28	Jeremy Talbot for Barker & Associates Limited on behalf of EnviroWaste New Zealand Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7 Building setbacks to reduce the yard separation between sites (other than a road) to 12m or less in all instances. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential amendments or additional amendments to address the matters raised in the submission.	The submitter opposes the yard setbacks (of up to 22m) as they are too onerous. Setbacks could be reduced and still achieve sufficient separation between activities - and maintain an open landscape character.	Reject	
766.52	Nicky Hogarth for Holcim (New Zealand) Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7 Building setbacks by reducing the yard separation between sites (other than a road) to 12m or less in all instances. AND Any additional or consequential relief to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Opposes yard setbacks (of up to 22m) as they are too onerous. Setbacks could be reduced and still achieve sufficient separation between activities and maintain an open landscape character.	Reject	
FS1308.127	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<i>For the reasons given in submission point 302.28.</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
986.67	Pam Butler on behalf of KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Add new matters of discretion relating to non-compliance with the 5m Building setback - railway corridor (sought elsewhere in other submission points) in Rule 22.1 Land Use Activities as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>1. The size, nature and location of the buildings on the site.</u> <u>2. The extent to which the safety and efficiency of rail and road operations will be adversely affected.</u> <u>3. The outcome of any consultation with KiwiRail.</u> <u>4. Any characteristics of the proposed use that will make compliance unnecessary.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to link and/or accommodate the requested changes.</p>	<p>• 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.</p>	Reject	
330.153	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	<p>No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.3.7 Building setbacks, and/or all other rules siting under Rule 22.3.7 Building setbacks.</p>	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
697.807	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	<p>Add a new clause (f) into Rule 22.3.7 Land use - Building, as follows: <u>(f) Rule 22.3.7.7 Building setback - National Grid Yard</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new rule into Chapter 22, after Rule 22.3.7.7, as follows: <u>22.3.7.7 Buildings and structures within the National Grid Yard P1</u>  <u>(a) Within the National Grid yard, building alterations and additions to an existing building or structure must comply with the following conditions: (i) Not involve an increase in the building height or footprint; and (ii) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe</u></p>	<p>This is to replicate the rule regarding buildings and structure within the National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 22 for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.</p>	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p><u>Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions. P2 (a) Within the National Grid yard, the maximum height of fences are 2.5m within 5m from the nearest National Grid Pole or 6m from the nearest National Grid tower. P3 Within the National Grid yard, new buildings and structures that are not for a sensitive land use must comply with the following conditions: (i) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions; and (ii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless it is: A. A building or structure where Transpower has given written approval in accordance with clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663. P4 Within the National Grid yard, non-habitable buildings or structures for farming activities must comply with the following conditions: (i) Not include buildings for intensive farming buildings, commercial greenhouses or milking / dairy sheds; (ii) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions; and (ii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless it is: A. A building or structure where Transpower has given written approval in accordance with</u></p>			

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p><u>clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663.</u></p> <p><u>P5 Within the National Grid yard, yards for milking / dairy sheds must comply with the following conditions: (i) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions; and (ii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless it is: A. A building or structure where Transpower has given written approval in accordance with clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663. P6 Within the National Grid yard, artificial crop protection and support structures must comply with the following conditions: (i) Comply with the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663 under all National Grid transmission line operating conditions; and (ii) Locate a minimum 12m from the outer visible foundation of any National Grid tower and locate a minimum 12m from any pole and associated stay wire, unless it is: A. A building or structure where Transpower has given written approval in accordance with clause 2.4.1 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663; (iii) Artificial crop protection and support structures between 8m and 12m from a single pole support structure and any associated guy wire (but</u></p>			

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p>not tower) must also: A. Be maximum 2.5m high; B. Be removable or temporary, to allow a clear working space of at least 12 metres from the pole when necessary for maintenance and emergency repair purposes; C. Allow all-weather access to the pole and a sufficient area for maintenance equipment, including a crane. NCI Any building alterations or additions within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 22.3.7.7 P1. NC2 Any new buildings or structures within the National Grid Yard that does not comply with Rule 22.3.7.7 P2, P3, P4, P5, or P6. NC3 Intensive farming buildings within the National Grid Yard. NC4 Commercial greenhouses within the National Grid Yard. NC5 Milking and dairy sheds within the National Grid Yard.</p>			
FS1342.192	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 697.807.	FFNZ has concerns with the reasoning behind this submission point and doubt that replicating the rule from Chapter 14 into Chapter 22 "will result in increased clarity and usability of the Plan". If anything, replicating rules creates confusion. It is more appropriate to improve the 'road mapping' within the plan and utilise referencing options to ensure relevant or applicable parts of the plan are linked.	Accept in part	
FS1350.115	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.	Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<p>counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, 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>		
22.Rule 22.3.7.4 – Noise sensitive activities						
580.11	Andrew Feierabend for Meridian Energy Limited	Oppose	<p>Add to Rule 22.3.7.4 P1 Building - Noise Sensitive Activities a new clause (b), as follows: <u>(b) Construction of, or addition, or alteration to a building containing a noise-sensitive activity is permitted provided the building is set back from any authorised or lawfully established large-scale wind farm by a distance necessary to ensure wind turbine noise does not exceed 40 dBA measured at the noise-sensitive activity in accordance with NZS6808:2010.</u> AND Amend the Proposed District Plan as necessary to address the matters raised in</p>	<p>Non-compliance with this rule results in a discretionary activity status. The same reverse sensitivity effects relating to noise issues arise for lawfully established large-scale wind farms and they equally warrant the protection of a minimum setback distance. Inclusion of a setback distance of large-scale wind farms is necessary to give effect to Objective 6.1.6 and Policy 6.1.7 to address reverse sensitivity. Setback could be specified by reference to the relevant standard NZS 6808:2010 or as a minimum distance proxy to protect against reverse sensitivity effects.</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			the submission.			
581.33	Penny Gallagher for Synlait Milk Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.4 Building setback - Noise sensitive areas to include a requirement for noise sensitive activities to be setback from a Heavy Industrial Zone boundary.	The Proposed District Plan fails to protect noise sensitive activities for Heavy Industrial zones and/or prevent reverse sensitivity effects from encroaching housing and sensitive activities. Encroachment of housing and sensitive activities may result in restrictions on the efficient operation of heavy industrial activities within the Heavy Industrial Zone.	Reject	
FS1345.148	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission in part.	For the reasons provided in the Synlait Milk submission, subject to the exact nature of the setback requirement.	Reject	
FS1377.156	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater flexibility for development within the rural zone, in the event that its requested rezoning is not granted.	Accept	
FS1341.50	Hynds Pipe Systems Limited	Support	Null	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This submission supports the industrial strategic growth node along McDonald Road in particular the importance of appropriate land to enable heavy industrial use. Importantly the submission seeks to protect the location of Heavy Industrial Zone land from encroachment by sensitive activities and proposal for residential re-zoning.</li> <li>Hynds supports the submission as it relates to these matters because it is also concerned that rezoning of land adjacent to the Heavy Industrial land will create reverse sensitivity effects on the existing and proposed industrial business operations.</li> <li>Ensuring there is no encroachment by sensitive activities on the heavy industrial land is the most appropriate way for the Council to exercise its functions and to ensure the efficiency and effectiveness of the proposed plan provisions.</li> </ul>	Reject	
797.34	Fonterra Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.4 Building Noise sensitive activities except for the amendments sought below. AND Amend Rule 22.3.7.4 Building setbacks - Noise Sensitive Activities to include (or	Supports the Rule subject to the inclusion of reference to the Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Site Noise Control Boundary which extends into the District.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			words to similar effect): <u>The Te Rapa Dairy Manufacturing Facility Noise Control Boundary.</u> AND Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.			
742.230	Mike Wood for New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/ Amend	Retain Rule 22.3.7.4 Building- Noise Sensitive Activities, except for the amendments sought below AND Add to Rule 22.3.7.4 P1(a) Building - Noise sensitive activities a new clause as follows: <u>(iv) 100m of a state highway</u> AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports Rule 22.3.7.4, but seeks an additional standard to include a 100m set back from a state highway. The submitter notes the proposed setbacks will not be sufficient to avoid adverse effects on occupiers, and buildings will also require acoustic treatment. Relief sought in this respect assumes submission points regarding acoustic treatment are accepted.	Reject	
FS1221.5	Cindy and Tony Young	Oppose	Null	<i>The setbacks for noise sensitive activities in relation to a state highway are already addressed in Rule 22.3.7.2 and there is no need to duplicate this rule. The definition of "sensitive activities" includes activities sensitive to noise in any event. 100m setback is not an efficient use of the land resource and is not justified in terms of noise, vibration or amenity. The existing Rule 22.3.7.2 P1 (ii) and (iii) is sufficient and does not need to be increased.</i>	Accept	
FS1283.5	Parkmere Farms	Oppose	Oppose.	<i>The setbacks for noise sensitive activities in relation to a state highway are already addressed in Rule 22.3.7.2 and there is no need to duplicate this rule. The definition of "sensitive activities" includes activities sensitive to noise. In any event, 100m setback is not an efficient use of the land resource and is not justified in terms of noise, vibration or amenity. The existing Rule 22.3.7.2 P1 (ii) and (iii) is sufficient and does not need to be increased.</i>	Accept	
797.22	Fonterra Limited	Oppose	Add a definition of "factory wastewater irrigation farm" to Chapter 13 Definitions as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>The operation of wastewater irrigation on land at Bruntwood Road comprising Lots 2-4 DPS 14934.</u> AND	The term is referenced with Fonterra's proposals for further plan provisions. The term requires a definition.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.			
FS1387.1267	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	
<b>Rule 22.3.7.5 – Building setback – water bodies</b>						
747.6	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited on behalf of	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 Building setback - water bodies to exclude from the setback requirements for lakes and wetlands, buildings and structures with a recreation or functional need to be in close proximity to these water body, and specifically exclude maimai. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide other such relief and consequential amendments as to give effect to the relief sought in the submissions.	Maimai and other similar buildings are required to be in close proximity to lakes and wetlands and should be excluded from this requirement.	Accept in part	
FS1045.16	Auckland/Waikato Fish and Game Council	Support	We agree that maimai and other similar buildings are required to be in close proximity to lakes and wetlands and should be excluded from this requirement.		Accept in part	
FS1387.986	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.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1340.141	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter agrees with submission point 747.6 that maimai needs to be located close to lakes and wetlands, However, it is considered that without other examples provided by the submitter relating to recreation or functional buildings and structures that need to be within the setback area, that the rule should be amended to only exclude maimai, and that there should be permitted standards for the size and height of maimai.	Accept in part	
349.19	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Delete Rule 22.3.7.5 PI Building setback - water bodies. OR Delete Rule 22.3.7.5 PI (a)(ii) Building setback - water bodies.	Remove the requirement for a 23m building setback from a bank of a river. Neither river or water body is defined within the Proposed District Plan, and therefore the setback could apply to a water course of any size. This setback will also apply outside a SNA, landscape or natural character area.	Reject	
FS1386.500	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury C	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Accept	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
349.21	Kim Robison on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5D1 Building setback - water bodies, to be considered a restricted discretionary activity rather than discretionary activity and to read: <del>D1RDI</del>	Remove the requirement for a 23m building setback from a bank of a river. Neither river or water body is defined within the Proposed District Plan, and therefore the setback could apply to a water course of any size. This setback will also apply outside a Significant Natural Area, landscape or natural character area.	Accept	
FS1386.501	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	
378.35	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.3.7.5 Building setback - Waterbodies.	The standard will safeguard the wellbeing of communities in accordance with the purpose of the RMA and the purpose of Fire and Emergency New Zealand in the effective protection of lives, property and the surrounding environment.	Accept in part	
FS1388.36	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	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
<i>FS1035.141</i>	<i>Pareoranga Te Kata</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support submission 378.35</i>	<i>Fire safety and fire prevention to undertake training activities for fire fighters within the region.</i>	Accept in part	
419.33	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 P1 (a) Building setback - water bodies, as follows: (a) Any building must be set back a minimum of: (i) <del>32</del> 30m from the margin of any: A. Lake; and B. Wetland (ii) <del>23</del> 20m from the bank of any river (other than the Waikato River and Waipa River); (iii) <del>28</del> 20m from the banks of the Waikato River and Waipa River; and ... AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	The submitter has sought an exclusion of artificial crop protection structures from the definition of "building". Should this be rejected, the submitter seeks that artificial crop protection structures be excluded from this rule. These are permeable structures with materials consisting of fabric and poles. Minimal works are required so there would be minimal land disturbance and minimal risk of sediment in water bodies. Should the land be subdivided, the structures are easily removable such that the ability to take esplanade is not impeded. The section 32 reports do not seem to provide any explanation for the proposed setbacks from waterbodies. The Auckland Unitary Plan provides a setback of 30m from any lake and a 20m riparian setback and this is considered appropriate to incorporate in the Waikato District Plan.	Accept in part	
<i>FS1388.190</i>	<i>Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E</i>	<i>Oppose</i>	<i>Null</i>	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
<i>FS1340.51</i>	<i>TaTa Valley Limited</i>	<i>Support</i>	<i>Support.</i>	<i>The submitter supports submission point 419.33 in particular that amendment to (iii) which sees a change 1 setback distance from 28 metres to 20 metres from the banks of the Waikato River.</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				As it is currently drafted, requiring buildings to be set back 28 metres is overly restrictive, and makes development of properties which share a boundary with the Waikato River, difficult. A set back of 20 metres will still protect the banks of the Waikato River from development, whilst also enabling landowners to utilise land adjacent to the Waikato River.		
419.34	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5P2 Building setback - water bodies as follows: (a) A public amenity of up to 25m <sup>2</sup> , and a pump shed within any building setback identified in Rule 22.3.7.5P1 and (b) a pump shed must be setback a minimum of 5m from any waterbody. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	It is necessary and more efficient for pump stations to locate in close proximity to water bodies.	Accept	
FS1388.191	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	
FS1171.27	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. Enabling the provision for buildings such as pump sheds with a setback of 5m from a waterbody as opposed to the 25m setback under the Proposed Plan acknowledges the function, need, and efficiency, for such buildings to locate in closer proximity to water bodies.	Accept	
433.59	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 PI Building setback - water bodies, as follows: (a) Any building that is not a maimai must be set back a minimum of: ...	Supports an appropriate bugged between any development and freshwater bodies. Maimai are controlled by the Building Act 2004 and should be exempt from this rule.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	Consistency is required with the Waikato Regional Plan which permits maimai subject to them not exceeding an area of 10m <sup>2</sup> and a height of 2.5 metres measured from floor level.		
466.22	Brendan Balle for Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 PI Building setback to change the setback to 30m from a lake and 20m from a watercourse.	The submitter opposes the designated setbacks and consider that it would be more appropriate for these to align with existing setbacks of 30m from a lake and 20m from a watercourse. Wetland as described in the RMA includes permanently or intermittently wet areas, shallow water, and land water margins that support a natural ecosystem of plants and animals that are adapted to wet conditions. Without a size requirement or specification to indigenous vegetation it is considered that this could refer to any intermittently wet area that has plant life and therefore careful consideration should be given to required setback.	Accept in part	
FS1388.411	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury E	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1168.81	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	<i>The submitter opposes the designated setbacks and considers that it would be more appropriate for these to align with existing setbacks of 30m from a lake and 20m from a watercourse. Wetland as described in the RMA includes permanently or intermittently wet areas, shallow water, and land water margins that support a natural ecosystem of plants and animals that are</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>adapted to wet conditions. Without a size requirement or specification to indigenous vegetation it is considered that this could refer to any intermittently wet area that has plant life and therefore careful consideration should be given to required setback.</i>		
FS1340.78	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 466.22 as requiring a building setback of 30 metres is overly restrictive. A setback of 20 metres from a watercourse will result in more land being able to be utilised for development.	Accept in part	
471.12	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 PI Building setback - water bodies, as follows: P1 (a) Any building must be set back a minimum of <u>32m</u> : (i) <u>32m</u> from the margin of any: A. <u>Lake, with a bed area of 8ha or more or and</u> B. <u>Wetland with an area greater than 1ha; and (ii) <del>23m</del></u> from the <u>C. river bank of any river (other than the Waikato River and Waipa River whose bed has an average width 3m or more.); and</u> AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	There needs to be parameters as to when this rule applies. Existing parameters from the Operative District Plan are sought.	Accept in part	
FS1388.443	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	
FS1340.79	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	The submitter opposes submission 471.12 as requiring any building to be set back by a minimum of 32 metres is overly restrictive.	Accept in part	
662.14	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 PI Building setback - waterbodies as follows: (a) Any building must be set back a minimum of: (i) 32m from the margin of any; A. Lake <u>over 4ha</u> ; and B.	Opposes the use of the generic term "wetland" when requiring setbacks. Such all-encompassing terminology is inappropriate for use within the Proposed	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Wetland; ... (v) 10m from a managed wetland	District Plan as it will have a significant impact on land development that may not carry any reasonable environmental benefit. Seeks that setbacks for man-made stormwater infrastructure and/or modified waterbodies be identified under all applicable waterbody setback rules as 10m. Notwithstanding the above, as a "lake" can constitute a large array of waterbodies, a starting point of 4ha should be used in the Proposed District Plan before the setback applies.		
FS1340.104	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support submission 662.14	The submitter supports submission 662.14 in that a building setback of 10 metres from a managed wetland is deemed an appropriate setback distance. Development should be allowed to occur nearer to managed wetlands as often this is the purpose of the management of the wetland.	Accept in part	
FS1387.103	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	
794.18	Middlemiss Farm Holdings Limited on behalf of	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.7.5 Building setback - water bodies; AND Amend rules to relax the setback distances. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan consequential or additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the submission.	Relax the rules for setback distances.	Reject	
FS1387.1248	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Oppose submission 794.18	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
943.19	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 PI - Building Setbacks - water bodies, as follows; (a) Any building must be set back a minimum of: (i) 32m from the margin of any; A. Lake <u>with a bed area of 8ha or more or</u> ; and B. Wetland <u>with an area greater than 1ha</u> ; (ii) 23m from the bank of any river (other than the Waikato River and Waipa River) <u>whose bed has an average width 3m or more</u> ;...	There needs to be parameters as to when Rule 22.3.7.5 applies. Proposed parameters are from the Operative District Plan.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1570	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	
680.231	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 PI (a) Building setback - water bodies, as follows: (a) Any building <u>(unless there is a functional or operational need to be closer)</u> must be set back a minimum of:.. AND	The submitter understands the intent of the rule however the all-encompassing nature of the building definition could capture buildings with an operational or function need to be closer, such as pump sheds for example.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.			
FS1387.218	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	
FS1342.170	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow further clarification of submission point 680.231 so that an exercise of judgment as to compliance with the rule is avoided. In this regard, further types of structures and buildings that may need to be located closer to lakes and wetlands, include stock exclusion structures, stock bridges, culvert crossings, and retaining structures/ramparts for such, including for farm access tracks that may lead across lakes or wetlands.	In considering the relief sought in this submission point FFNZ also seek alternative relief by naming further types of structures and buildings that may need to be located closer to lakes and wetlands, e.g. stock bridges, culvert crossings, and retaining structures/ramparts for such, including for farm access tracks that may lead across lakes or wetlands.	Reject	
FS1340.112	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support in part.	The submitter supports in part submission 680.231 as some buildings do have a functional or operational need to be closer to water bodies (such as pump houses and wharf facilities and structures/shelters). These should be able to occur on the banks of a waterbody. However given this is a permitted activity rule, the submitter considers that the acceptable types of buildings should be listed.	Reject	
FS1198.49	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	There is the need to provide for buildings to be closer to Waterbodies as permitted activities e.g.	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				water monitoring equipment contained in a shed or a pump shed.		
FSI 171.94	Phoebe Watson for Barker & Associates on behalf of T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission seeks amendments to Rule 22.3.7.5 P1 (a) Building setback - water bodies. This submission is supported. It is recognised that there may be instances where buildings are required to be located in close proximity to water bodies to meet functional and operational requirements.	Reject	
697.467	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 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 in part	
FSI387.572	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	
FSI 139.15	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Accept in part	
FSI 108.16	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Unclear as to what is sought by the submission.	Accept in part	
697.812	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 P2 Building setback - waterbodies, as follows: A public amenity of up to 25m2, and or a pump shed (public or private) within any building setback identified in Rule 22.3.7.5 P1.	Additional word "or" in this rule provides clarity. The words "public or private" to clarify that the pump shed is both private and public.	Accept in part	
FSI387.694	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.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
697.813	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.3.7.5 Building setback - waterbodies, as follows: PI (a) Any building must be set back a minimum of: (i) 32m from the margin of any; A. Lake; and B. Wetland; (ii) <del>23</del> 32m from the bank of any river (other than the Waikato River and Waipa River); (iii) <del>28</del> 37m from the banks of the Waikato River and Waipa River; and (iv) <del>23</del> 32m from mean high water springs.	Amend the rule 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 in part	
FS1387.695	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	
FS1377.231	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	<i>HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater flexibility for development within the rural zone in the event that its requested rezoning is not granted.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1340.136	TaTa Valley Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	<i>The submitter opposes submission 697.813 as the distances proposed would require buildings to be set back an unnecessarily far away from water bodies, being unable to be developed which is overly restrictive on the landowner. In the instance of the Waikato River, requiring a setback of 37 metres would result in many</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>parcels of land on the banks of the Waikato being unable to be developed.</i>		
FSI 291.30	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	Oppose.	HVL supports amendments to the Plan that provide for a greater flexibility for development within the rural zone, in the event that its requested rezoning is not granted.	Accept in part	
FSI 139.26	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Clarity sought as to why setbacks would be reduced.	Accept in part	
FSI 108.27	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Clarity sought as to why setbacks would be reduced.	Accept in part	
<b>Rule 22.3.7.6 – Building setback – Environmental Protection Area</b>						
349.22	Kim Robinson on behalf of Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Delete references to Environmental Protection Area/EPA in Rule 22.3.7.6 Building setback	Environmental Protection Area is not defined. There doesn't seem to be any policies in the Proposed District Plan to support an Environmental Protection Area.	Reject	
FSI 386.502	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	
419.35	Jordyn Landers for Horticulture New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	No specific decision sought, but submission seeks clarification on how Rule 22.3.7.6 Building setback- Environmental Protection Area applies to the Environmental Protection Areas and the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area. If the Hamilton Basin Ecological Area is an Environmental Protection Area, then the submitter opposes this rule.	It is not clear on the planning maps where the Environmental Protection Areas are located. The submitter has been advised that the Hamilton Basic Ecological Management Area is an Environmental Protection Area, but this has a separate key notation on the planning maps. If the Hamilton Basin Ecological Management Area is an Environmental Protection Areas, the submitter opposes this rule as no building would be permitted.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1388.192	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	
680.232	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.7.6 PI Building setback - Environmental Protection Area. AND Delete Environmental Protection Areas from the planning maps, as a consequential amendment. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter is unsure what Environmental Protection Areas are and what the purpose of identifying them is. There is no mention of these areas within the policy framework and no definition provided in Chapter 13. Without knowing how they have been identified and what the purpose is they are unable to assess the merits or otherwise of this proposed rule.	Reject	
FS1315.17	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	Consistent with LFL's view that Environmental Protection Areas has not been defined and, as such, identified. Need further clarification.	Reject	
FS1108.76	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Oppose delegation but seek clarity as to the definition of the area.	Accept	
FS1198.50	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	For the reasons given in the original submission.	Reject	
FS1139.67	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Oppose deletion but seek greater clarity as to the definition of the area.	Accept	
FS1387.219	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	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
680.233	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.3.7.6 (D1) Building setback - Environmental Protection Area. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	This is a consequential amendment, as it is related to the concerns raised under Rule 22.3.7.6 (P1).	Reject	
FS1315.18	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	Consistent with LFL's view that Environmental Protection Areas has not been defined and, as such, identified. Need further clarification.	Reject	
FS1387.220	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	
433.60	Mischa Davis for Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.7.6 PI Building setback - Environmental Protection Area, as follows: Any building that is not a maimai must be set back a minimum of 3m from an	Supports building setbacks from Environmental Protection Areas to ensure the ecological health and functioning of these areas are protected. Maimai are controlled	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Environmental Protection Area identified on the planning maps. AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	by the Building Act 2004 and should be exempt from this rule. Consistency is required with the Waikato Regional Plan which permits maimai subject to them not exceeding an area of 10m <sup>2</sup> and a height of 2.5 metres measured from floor level.		

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendations	
<i>Ancillary Rural Earthworks/Rural Ancillary Earthworks</i>						
197.12	NZ Pork	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition for "Ancillary rural earthworks" in Chapter 13 Definitions to include the following activities: <u>burying of material infected by unwanted organisms as declared by Ministry for Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993.</u>	A permitted activity status and the exclusion of ancillary rural earthworks from the definition of earthworks is supported but should be amended to manage biosecurity responses.	Reject	
FSI 168.93	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	<i>Allow the submission.</i>	<i>The submitter seeks the amendment of the definition for "Ancillary rural earthworks" in Chapter 13 Definitions to include the following: burying of material infected by unwanted organisms as declared by Ministry for Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993. The plan should identify this to avoid delay in responding to a biosecurity threat.</i>	Reject	
FSI 323.99	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	<i>That the amendments sought are declined.</i>	<i>HNZPT is concerned regarding the extensive amendments proposed to this definition, as ancillary earthworks appears to be a permitted activity in Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance and could therefore result in adverse effects on Maaori sites and areas that contain archaeological sites as the activity would not be assessed.</i>	Accept	
466.53	Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend the definition for "Ancillary rural earthworks" in Chapter 13 Definitions to include the following activities: <u>burying of material infected by unwanted organisms as declared by Ministry for Primary Industries Chief Technical Officer or an emergency declared by the Minister under the Biosecurity Act 1993.</u>	A permitted activity status and the exclusion of ancillary rural earthworks from the definition of earthworks is supported but should be amended to manage biosecurity responses.	Reject	

FS1323.101	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned regarding the extensive amendments proposed to this definition, as ancillary earthworks appears to be a permitted activity in Maori Sites and Areas of Significance and could therefore result in adverse effects on Maori sites and areas that contain archaeological sites as the activity would not be assessed.	Accept	
466.56	Balle Bros Group Limited	Oppose	Delete the definition for "Rural ancillary earthworks" from Chapter 13 Definitions.	This is a duplication of the definition for Ancillary Rural Earthworks.	Accept	
797.23	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain the definition of "ancillary rural earthworks" in Chapter 13: Definitions as notified.	Supports inclusion of a specific definition for ancillary rural earthworks. The definition will assist understanding and interpretation of the Plan.	Accept in part	
81.192	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "ancillary rural earthworks" in Chapter 13: Definitions to provide for flood protection and drainage schemes managed by the Waikato Regional Council.	Earthworks associated with the flood and drainage schemes is not referenced under this definition.	Reject	



FS1041.2	Aka Aka Otatau Land Drainage Subcommittee	Support	Supports the submission point.	The Subcommittee supports the point for the primary reason that it will mean that flood and drainage works within their Land Drainage area, and other areas, will remain a permitted activity as provided for under the present Franklin Section (refer to Rule 23A.1.1.19 The on-going maintenance upgrade and repair of flood protection, land drainage and erosion control work). This operative permitted activity rule was introduced through the former Franklin District Council's Rural Plan Change 14 and has worked well to date, without having to carry out such necessary works through a resource consent process. Also support a district wide framework to provide for all the activities associated with flood and drainage activities throughout the district. The alignment of rules and policy between adjoining District and Regional Councils should be the same.	Reject	
FS1323.98	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned regarding the extensive amendments proposed to this definition, as ancillary earthworks appears to be a permitted activity in Maaori Sites and Areas of Significance and could therefore result in adverse effects on Maaori sites and areas that contain archaeological sites as the activity would not be assessed.	Accept	
81.195	Waikato Regional Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition for "Rural Ancillary Earthworks" in Chapter 13: Definitions to clarify the terminology and to be consistent.	The Plan refers to both 'Rural Ancillary Earthworks' and 'Ancillary Rural Earthworks'. Clarification is sought that these refer to the same activity, and consistency is sought in the terminology.	Accept in part	
419.134	Horticulture New Zealand	Oppose	Delete the definition for "Rural ancillary earthworks" from Chapter 13 Definitions. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	This is the same definition as "Ancillary Rural Earthworks". It is unnecessary repetition.	Accept	

FS1342.97	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 419.134.	FFNZ supports deletion of this definition as it is the same as the definition of 'Ancillary Rural Earthworks', and it isn't necessary to repeat such definition, provided that the defined term is referred to in a consistent manner throughout the plan.	Accept	
680.127	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Ancillary rural earthworks" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: (a) Means any earthworks or disturbance of soil associated with: cultivation, land preparation (including establishment of sediment and erosion control measures), for planting and growing operations of <u>crops and pasture</u> ; (b) harvesting of agricultural and horticultural crops (farming) and forests (forestry); <u>and planting trees, removing trees and horticultural root ripping</u> ; (c) maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with farming and forestry activities, including, but not limited to, farm/forestry tracks, roads, <u>vehicle manoeuvring areas and landings, stock marshalling yards, stock races, silage pits, offal pits, burying dead stock and plat waste</u> farm drains, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, <u>digging post holes, fencing and sediment control measures, drilling bores, installing and maintaining services such as water pipes and troughs, off-stream farm water storage dams, hard stand areas for stock, fertiliser storage pads, airstrips and helipads.</u> (d) <u>Farm quarries where quarry winnings are only used within the farm site</u> AND Any consequential amendments needed to give effect to this relief.	The definition of Ancillary Rural Earthworks should be congruent with a resource management policy framework which seeks to enable primary production in rural areas, and that it should be as clear as possible. The activities included in the submission point clearly be contemplated, including within any related definition. Off-stream farm water storage dams for stock and domestic water storage are commonplace on many farms. Farm quarries are certainly part of normal day to day farming operation and shouldn't need resource consent. Other district plans make allowance for permitted farm quarries at a scale which is appropriate in the context of the wide open spaces of the rural environment.	Accept in part	
FS1171.81	T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.	This submission proposes amendments to the definition of ancillary rural earthworks. This submission is supported in so far as this submission clarifies that earthworks for crops are included as ancillary rural earthworks.	Accept in part	

FS1353.102	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned regarding the extensive amendments proposed to this definition, as ancillary earthworks appears to be a permitted activity in Maori Sites and Areas of Significance and could therefore result in adverse effects on Maori sites and areas that contain archaeological sites as the activity would not be assessed.	Accept in part	
680.263	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain the definition of "Rural ancillary earthworks" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The submitter supports the definition.	Reject	
FS1323.107	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendment sought is declined.	HNZPT sought the deletion of the term "Rural ancillary earthworks" as it was similar to the term "ancillary rural earthworks."	Accept	
697.364	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Ancillary rural earthworks" as follows: Means any earthworks or disturbance of soil associated with: (a) cultivation, land preparation (including establishment of sediment and erosion control measures), for planting and growing operations; (b) harvesting of agricultural and horticultural crops (farming) and <del>forests</del> (forestry); and (c) maintenance and construction of facilities typically associated with farming and forestry activities, including, but not limited to, farm/ <del>forestry</del> -tracks, roads and landings, stock races, silage pits, farm drains, farm effluent ponds, feeding pads, fencing and <u>erosion and sediment control measures</u> .	Amendments to improve readability and remove references to forestry as this is covered by the National Environmental Standards for plantation Forestry.	Accept in part	
FS1323.103	Heritage New Zealand Pouhere Taonga	Oppose	That the amendments sought are declined.	HNZPT is concerned regarding the extensive amendments proposed to this definition, as ancillary earthworks appears to be a permitted activity in Maori Sites and Areas of Significance and could therefore result in adverse effects on Maori sites and areas that contain archaeological sites as the activity would not be assessed.	Accept in part	

FS1342.186	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 697.364 in part. Support amendments if our concerns re the catch all rule are addressed and NC 22.1.5 NCS is deleted.	FFNZ supports the intent to ensure there is no duplicated activity controls. However this could be an example, if our relief regarding rule 22.1.5 NCS is not successful, whereby unless expressly listed, the activity becomes non-complying.	Accept in part	
697.505	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Delete from Chapter 13: Definitions the definition for "Rural ancillary earthworks" AND Replace all references in the Plan to "Rural ancillary earthworks" to "Ancillary rural earthworks".	This term is defined twice as "rural ancillary earthworks" and "ancillary rural earthworks" – rationalise into a single defined term.	Accept	
FS1342.181	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 697.505.	For reasons stated by the submitter.	Accept	
559.286	Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Support	Retain the definition of "Ancillary rural earthworks" in Chapter 13: Definitions, subject to below. AND Amend rules to ensure Ancillary rural earthworks are being assessed as a restricted discretionary activity should they occur in a Maaori site or area of significance, or waahi tapu site or waahi tapu area, or the setting of a heritage item.	The submitter supports the definition of Ancillary rural earthworks in so far as they should be assessed at the time of works in a cultural site or area of significance, wahi tapu or wahi tapu area, or the setting of a heritage item or as recognised in the schedules of the plan, as the scale of some of the works within this definition have the potential for adverse effects.	Accept	
FS1342.135	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 559.286 in part. Disallow the part of the submission seeking to apply a restricted discretionary resource consent status to Ancillary rural earthworks.	FFNZ considers the notified restricted discretionary earthworks rules, incorporating the amendments we have sought, provide the appropriate degree of land use controls. There is concern that the level of accuracy with the mapping and identification of these sites does not support a more stringent planning approach. It is suggested the plan may benefit with the introduction of accidental discovery protocols, which would also help to address the submitters concerns.	Reject	
559.287	Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Oppose	Delete the definition of "Rural Ancillary Earthworks" in Chapter 13: Definitions.	The submitter considers that the definition of "Rural Ancillary Earthworks" replicates the definition for "ancillary rural earthworks".	Accept	

Definition – Farm quarry						
680.136	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain the definition of "Farm quarry" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as notified.	The submitter supports this definition.	Accept in part	
697.387	Waikato District Council	Neutral/ Amend	Amend the definition of "Farm quarry" as follows: Means the extraction of minerals or <u>aggregate</u> taken for use ancillary to farming and horticulture, and only used within the property of extraction. No extracted material (including any aggregate) shall be <del>exported or</del> removed from the property of origin and there shall be no retail or other sales of such material. <del>For example, farm quarries include the extraction of</del> <u>Common uses of aggregate include</u> material for farm and forestry tracks, access ways and hardstand areas <del>on the property of origin. This does not include extractive industry.</del>	Additional clarity of the definition.	Accept in part	
Policy 5.3.5 - Earthworks						
197.8	NZ Pork	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.5 - Earthworks activities.	The submitter supports policy support for a permitted activity range for ancillary farming earthworks.	Accept in part	
281.6	Zeala Ltd for Trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Amend Policy 5.3.5 (a) Earthworks activities as follows: (a) <del>Provide for</del> <u>Enable</u> earthworks where they support rural activities including: ...	Providing for earthworks "supporting" rural activities is not actually supportive if the rules unduly restrict such activities.	Accept in part	
723.3	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.5: Earthworks Activities, as notified.	Reasons not provided.	Accept in part	
297.17	Counties Manukau Police	Neutral/Amend	Add to Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities 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 victimization.</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	
FS1342.59	Federated Farmers	Oppose	<i>Disallow submission point 297.17.</i>	<i>Whilst FFNZ shares the submitter's goal for safer communities, it is difficult to understand the application of this approach to the earthworks related to rural activities. In our view, the desired outcomes could be better</i>	Accept	

				<i>achieved by using non-regulatory methods to help raise awareness and improve safety in rural communities. The key concerns of the submitter relates to development sites rather than rural activities.</i>		
FS1269.15	Housing New Zealand Corporation	Oppose	Oppose in part.	Housing New Zealand opposes the proposed amendment, to the extent it is inconsistent with its primary submission.	Accept	
419.61	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities, as notified.	The submitter supports the policy and methods proposed for ancillary rural earthworks, although no reasons have been provided.	Accept in part	
466.45	Balle Bros Group Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities as notified, except for the amendments outlined below AND Add a new point to Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities as follows: (a)(iv) Sustainable management and reuse of high class soils.	It is noted that commercial vegetable production requires cultivation of paddocks and redirection of water flow around the paddock under usual circumstances. High class soils are a valuable commodity and should be managed sustainably. The re-use of high class soils on sites should be encouraged.	Accept in part	
559.54	Heritage New Zealand Lower Northern Office	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities, except for the amendments sought below. AND Add a new clause 'v' to Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks as follows: <u>(v) Avoid adverse effects on historic heritage and cultural values.</u>	The submitter supports Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks in part as this policy does not reflect the need to provide for the protection of historic and cultural values at the time of earthworks. The policy needs to be amended to reflect the need to give effect to s6 of the Resource Management Act.	Accept	
680.64	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.5 (b) (iv) Earthworks activities as follows: <u>(iv) Adjoining properties and public services are protected from the adverse effects of inappropriate earthworks.</u> AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief.	The submission supports the enabling intent of this policy. However, the amendment is appropriate to provide necessary context to 5.3.5(b)(iv).	Reject	
742.36	New Zealand Transport Agency	Neutral/Amend	Retain Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Policy 5.3.5(b)(iv) Earthworks activities as follows: <u>Adjoining properties, and public services and infrastructure</u> are protected AND Request any consequential changes necessary to give effect to the relief sought in the submission.	The submitter supports Policy 5.3.5 but seeks infrastructure is included along with public services.	Accept	
FS1272.11	KiwiRail Holdings Ltd	Support	Null	<i>Earthworks can create stability and drainage issues for existing land transport networks. KiwiRail therefore supports the protection of</i>	Accept	

				<i>infrastructure from the adverse effects of earthworks.</i>		
FS1345.43	Genesis Energy Limited	Support	Accept submission point.	For the reasons provided in the NZTA submission.	Accept	
797.43	Fonterra Limited	Support	Retain Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities as notified.	The Policy provides appropriate recognition of the need to enable earthworks to support rural activities.	Accept in part	
827.45	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a clause (iv) to Policy 5.3.5 (a) Earthworks activities as follows (or words to similar effects): <u>(iv) Earthworks associated with mineral extraction activities.</u>	The extraction of mineral resources is a productive rural activity, and there is a need to provide for earthworks with those extraction activities within the rural environment.	Reject	
FS1198.26	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed.	It is appropriate that mineral extraction be provided for in the Rural zone.	Reject	
433.3	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities, as follows: (a) Provide for earthworks where they support rural activities <u>or are for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works</u> , including: ... (iv) <u>wetland enhancement work ...</u> AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	The notified policy does not provide for earthworks for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration works.	Accept in part	
FS1083.3	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Support	Allow the submission point in full.	The amendments sought in the submission to the policy properly provide for earthworks for ecosystem protection, rehabilitation or restoration work.	Accept in part	
FS1293.27	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Waikato District has a significant proportion of indigenous wetlands in the district. The Director-General considers that the proposed amendment identifies a practical intervention to restore values of wetlands. The Director-General also undertakes a variety of protection works at lakes and track maintenance for the purpose of ecosystem protection, rehabilitation and restoration. This amendment would ensure this is accounted for.	Accept in part	
FS1340.58	TaTa Valley	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 433.3 as activities which would result in a better ecological outcome for the environment should be encouraged.	Accept in part	
1342.119	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 433.3.	FFNZ supports the relief sought.	Accept in part	

585.5	Department of Conservation	Oppose	Amend Policy 5.3.5 Earthworks activities to address the management of kauri dieback and measures to prevent the spread of the disease.	The disease is threatening kauri and any land disturbance works within three times the radius of the canopy of a kauri dripline can cause potential contamination of an uninfected site. Seek that the provisions of the final decision of the Thames Coromandel District Plan as appropriate are adopted into the Proposed District Plan.	Reject	
FS1342.150	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point 585.5.	FFNZ understands the intent of this submission but until an appropriate risk assessment is undertaken, it is not appropriate for WDC to implement a planning response over and above what is being undertaken at the national and regional level. Further, it is not appropriate to just shoehorn rules from another district without any local analysis and consideration of other biosecurity responses that may be available. FFNZ understands that vector pests such as wild pigs could create a significant risk and look forward to better understanding how the Department is responding to that.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
<b>Rule 22.2.3.1 – Earthworks – General</b>						
349.8	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 P1(a)(i) Earthworks - General for ancillary rural earthworks as a permitted activity.	Support Rural ancillary earthworks as being permitted.	Accept in part	
FS1386.497	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>risk 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>		
349.9	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Add a provision in rule 22.2.3.1.PI Earthworks - General permitting earthworks for farm buildings.	Earthworks to create farm buildings are not included within the definition of Ancillary rural earthworks and therefore need to be added to the list of permitted earthworks.	Accept in part	
FS1386.498	Mercury NZ Limited	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	
437.5	KCH Trust	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 Earthworks - General.	These provisions are consistent with the purpose and principles of the Resource Management Act. These provisions meet the requirements to satisfy the criteria of section 32 of the Resource Management Act. These provisions will meet the reasonably foreseeable needs of future generations. These provisions are consistent with sound resource management practice.	Accept in part	
FS1388.264	Mercury NZ Limited	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	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
471.4	Andrew Wood for CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P4 (a)(i) Earthworks - General, as follows: (i) not exceed a volume of <del>200m3</del> 1000m3; AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	A maximum volume of 200m3 for fill material is too restrictive.	Accept in part	
FS1388.440	Mercury NZ Limited	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	
FS1302.10	Mercer Airport	Support	<i>Mercer Airport support submission point 471.4 and seek that the submission point is allowed.</i>	Seeks to increase the permitted volume of earthworks in the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
591.1	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity within Rule 22.2.3.1 Earthworks - General, as follows: <u>P5 Earthworks for extractive industry within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps provided that sediment resulting from the earthworks is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls. NB earthworks for extractive industry within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and</u>	Provision should be made for earthworks in association with extractive industry in the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps as a permitted activity.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<u>Aggregate Resource Areas shown are not subject to the conditions of P2 above.</u>			
FS1292.75	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow should the relief sought by submission point 691.9 be allowed, or make changes to Rule 22.2.3.1 as per submission point 691.8.	McPherson support the intent of this submission to include a rule which allows for earthworks that are ancillary to extraction activities to be undertaken as of right. It is noted that the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay has not been applied to McPherson's existing quarry operations. This relief is sought as per submission point 691.9. Therefore, as drafted, the proposed rule will not provide for ancillary earthworks at the McPherson quarry unless the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay is applied. Earthworks are a natural part of extracting minerals and aggregate. Without stripping the overburden/topsoil, you cannot extract the underlying aggregate.	Reject	
FS1319.15	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow in part (subject to NZS's original submission point seeking a specific zone for WNH).	NZS has sought specific provisions for the WNH Mine in its original submission. However, if the Rural Zone rules were to apply, NZS agrees that earthworks for mineral and aggregate extraction or Extractive Activities should be provided for as a permitted activity at WNH (consistent with its submission on Policy 5.3.5). The extraction of mineral resources is a productive rural activity, and there is a need to provide for earthworks associated with those extraction activities within the rural environment.	Reject	
FS1146.14	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited	Support	The submission identifies that there are general earthworks associated with extractive industries and by including it as permitted activity within Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource areas will limited it within this overlay area.	We seek that the whole of the submission is allowed in order to enable the continuous and sustainable management of extractive industries.	Reject	
FS1388.996	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
FS1334.78	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	<i>Allow or make changes to Rule 22.2.3.1 as per submission point 575.19.</i>	<i>Fulton Hogan support the inclusion of a rule which allows for earthworks that are ancillary to extraction activities to be undertaken as of right, particularly where the site has been identified as being with the Aggregate Extraction Overlay. Earthworks are a natural part of extracting minerals and aggregate. Without stripping the overburden/topsoil, you cannot extract the underlying aggregate.</i>	Reject	
FS1377.172	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	<i>As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater flexibility for extractive industries.</i>	Reject	
FS1333.15	Fonterra Limited	Support	<i>Allow the relief subject to additional reference to 'Coal Mining Area.'</i>	<i>The amendment is supported subject to the inclusion of additional reference to 'Coal Mining Area.'</i>	Reject	
637.6	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Neutral/ Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 PI(a)(iv) Earthworks - General as follows: (a) Earthworks for... ..(iv) A building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings identified on a building consent, or required outside the building platform to maintain stable slopes for the authorised construction work. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Rule 22.2.3.1(PI) provides for "ancillary rural earthworks", "farm quarry", "construction and/or maintenance of tracks, fences or drains" and "a building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings" as permitted activities which is supported by the submitter. The rule provides for earthworks associated with "A building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings" as a permitted activity. However there is no permitted activity provision for building platforms associated with non-residential activities (such as farm buildings, or in the case of the submitter, buildings associated with Agricultural Research Centres)	Accept in part	
FS1387.56	Mercury NZ Limited	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</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<p>management 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>		
637.7	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P2(b) Earthworks - General as follows: (b) <u>With the exception of earthworks for the activities listed in Rule 22.2.3.1 P1, e</u>Earthworks within a site must meet all of the following conditions...</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>Current permitted activity limits on earthworks in Rule 22.2.3.1(P2) could trigger resource consent for future development work either within the Campus area or on the Research Farm. Seeks to amend rule 22.2.3.1 P1 to permit earthworks incidental to an approved building consent. Would avoid unnecessary bureaucracy and cost associated with resource consent. Rule 22.2.3.1 (P2) applies various limits to earthworks within a site. The way the rule are written, the limits would apply to the list of permitted activities in Rule 22.2.3.1 (P1), which could unnecessarily trigger resource consent for typical and accepted farming activities. Amendment is required to ensure the various limits do not apply to the list of permitted activities in P1. These activities are a fundamental requirement for being able to undertake efficient farming operation and an accepted element in the rural landscape. Earthworks are already regulated by the Regional Plan. A requirement for resource consent would impose unnecessary duplication and compliance costs onto typical farming operations.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1387.57	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
639.6	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P1(a)(iv) Earthworks - General as follows: (a) Earthworks for... ..(iv) A building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings identified on a building consent, or required the building platform to maintain stable slopes for the authorised construction work. AND Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: P76 A staff facility that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research that includes: A dwelling located at least 200m from the site containing Inghams Feed Mill in Hamilton City Council's jurisdiction; A recreational facility; Social club; Cafeteria or café. AND Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.	Rule 22.2.3.1(P1) provides for "ancillary rural earthworks", "farm quarry", "construction and/or maintenance of tracks, fences or drains" and "a building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings" as permitted activities which is supported. The rule provides for earthworks associated with "A building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings" as a permitted activity. However there is no permitted activity provision for building platforms associated with non-residential activities (such as farm buildings, or in the case of the submitter, buildings associated with Agricultural Research Centres)	Accept in part	
FS1387.61	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.		
639.7	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P2(b) Earthworks - General as follows: (b) <u>With the exception of earthworks for the activities listed in Rule 22.2.3.1 P1</u>, eEarthworks within a site must meet all of the following conditions... Amend Rule 22.5.2 Permitted Activities - Agricultural and Horticultural Research as follows: P76 A staff facility that is incidental to agricultural or horticultural research that includes: A dwelling located at least 200m from the site containing Inghams Feed Mill in Hamilton City Council's jurisdiction; A recreational facility; <u>Social club; Cafeteria or café.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments and/or additional relief required to address the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>Current permitted activity limits on earthworks in Rule 22.2.3.1(P2) could trigger resource consent for future development work either within the Campus area or on the Research Farm. Seeks to amend rule 22.2.3.1 P1 to permit earthworks incidental to an approved building consent. Would avoid unnecessary bureaucracy and cost associated with resource consent. Rule 22.2.3.1(P2) applies various limits to earthworks within a site. The way the rule are written, the limits would apply to the list of permitted activities in Rule 22.2.3.1 (P1), which could unnecessarily trigger resource consent for typical and accepted farming activities. Amendment is required to ensure the various limits do not apply to the list of permitted activities in P1. These activities are a fundamental requirement for being able to undertake efficient farming operation and an accepted element in the rural landscape. Earthworks are already regulated by the Regional Plan. A requirement for resource consent would impose unnecessary duplication and compliance costs onto typical farming operations.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1387.62	Mercury NZ Limited for Mercury D	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury</p>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
691.8	McPherson Resources Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 PI (a)(i) Earthworks - General, as follows (or words to similar effect): Ancillary rural <u>and mineral/aggregate extraction</u> earthworks; AND Any consequential amendments or alternative relief to address the matters raised in the submission.	Earthworks are a natural part of extracting minerals and aggregate. Without stripping the overburden/topsoil, you cannot extract the underlying aggregate. It is important that the industry is able to carry out ancillary earthworks as a Permitted Activity to avoid the need to continuously having to apply for resource consent. With the imposition of appropriate conditions, Waikato District Council will still be able to ensure that the effects of permitted earthworks are appropriately managed.	Reject	
FS1334.77	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	<i>Fulton Hogan support the inclusion of a rule which allows for earthworks that are ancillary to extraction activities to be undertaken as of right. Earthworks are a natural part of extracting minerals and aggregate. Without stripping the overburden/topsoil, you cannot extract the underlying aggregate. With appropriate conditions in place, any effects created by these types of activities will still be able to be appropriately managed.</i>	Reject	
FS1319.25	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow in part (subject to NZS's original submission point seeking a specific zone for WNH).	NZS has sought specific provisions for the WNH Mine in its original submission. However, if the Rural Zone rules were to apply, NZS agrees that earthworks for mineral and aggregate extraction or Extractive Activities should be provided for as a permitted activity at WNH (consistent with its submission on Policy 5.3.5). The extraction of mineral resources is a productive rural activity, and there is a need to provide for earthworks associated with those extraction activities within the rural environment.	Reject	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
701.3	Steven & Theresa Stark	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P1 Earthworks - General, as follows: P1 (a) Earthworks for: (ii) (A) Farm quarry where the volume of aggregate does not exceed 1000m<sup>3</sup> per single consecutive 12 month period <u>on a property &lt;40ha</u> (B) Farm quarry where the volume of aggregate does not exceed 3000m<sup>3</sup> per single consecutive 12 month period on a property <u>≥40ha</u>. AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 Earthworks - General, as follows: P2 (a) Earthworks within a site must meet all of the following conditions: (i) (A) Do not exceed a volume of more than 1000m<sup>3</sup> and an area of more than 2000m<sup>2</sup> over any single consecutive 12 month period <u>on a property &lt;40ha</u> (B) Do not exceed a volume of more than 3000m<sup>3</sup> and an area of more than 6000m<sup>2</sup> over any single consecutive 12 month period <u>on a property ≥40ha</u>.</p>	<p>These rules are overly restrictive, especially for larger properties as regards the constraints on volume and area in a 12-month period. Due to finances, weather, maintenance requiring earthworks for maintaining/upgrading tracks, stock races, fencing etc. may be delayed for several years. When circumstances then allow, a larger than average volume and/or area may need be shifted in a year to bring infrastructure up to an acceptable standard. Other years no earthworks at all may get done. The proposed restrictions are too onerous, especially for larger farming properties. Many tracks were put in decades ago when tractors were smaller. With larger and wider modern tractors, many races and tracks may need to be upgraded for health and safety reasons.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1387.785	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	<p><i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i></p>	Accept in part	
757.7	Karen White	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 (a) (iii) P4 Earthworks- General to a maximum slope of 1:2.5.	<p>A 1:2 slope is on the limit of stability and is poor practice. Instability/risk of failure is higher, unless a geotechnical design is developed to minimize the risk. Steeper slopes are difficult to top soil and plant.</p>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
757.8	Karen White	Oppose	Add to Rule 22.2.3.1 P1 (a) Earthworks - General the following text: " <u>over any consecutive 12 month time period.</u> "	This would add limits to total development, consistent with maintaining the values of the site (topographical form, retaining vegetation, natural water flows). Manage accumulative effects to ensure character of area is maintained. Incremental annual changes can amount to significant destruction or visual changes resulting in adverse effects.	Accept	
838.7	Madsen Lawrie Consultants	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1(P2)(a) Earthworks - General with a threshold of 1000m3 for permitted earthworks on a site.	This is an appropriate volume for rural sites.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1370	Mercury NZ Limited	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	
197.21	NZ Pork	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 P1 Earthworks - General, as notified.	The submitter supports the Permitted Activity status for Ancillary Farming Earthworks.	Accept in part	
FS1386.202	Mercury NZ Limited	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</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
197.22	NZ Pork	Oppose	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 Earthworks- General, insofar as supporting the permitted and restricted discretionary activity thresholds (volume and area) for earthworks in the Rural Zone AND Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (iii) Earthworks - General requiring all earthworks to be setback 1.5m from all boundaries.	The Permitted and Restricted Discretionary Activity thresholds (volume and area) for earthworks in the Rural Zone are supported. The submitter would not support a more onerous activity status for earthworks, The submitter opposes the requirement that all earthworks are setback 1.5m from all boundaries.	Accept in part	
FS1386.203	Mercury NZ Limited	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	
FS1302.11	Mercer Airport	Support	Mercer Airport support submission point 197.22 and seek that the submission point is allowed.	Relates to the deletion of a rule requiring earthworks to be setback from boundaries in the Rural Zone.	Accept in part	
281.13	Zeala Ltd for Trading as Aztech Buildings	Neutral/Amend	Retain the permitted activity status for ancillary rural earthworks in Rule 22.2.3.1 RDI (a)(i) Earthworks General AND Add a new clause (v) to Rule 22.2.3.1 (a) Earthworks General as follows: <u>(v) for building works authorised by a building consent, and the area of earthworks is no more than 150% of the area of those building works and occurs on land with an average gradient no steeper than 1:8.</u>	While the 'permitted activity' status for ancillary rural earthworks is supported the definition of ancillary rural earthworks (point 3 of the definition) creates some uncertainty over the extent of works which could be deemed permitted (i.e. earthworks for structures associated with farm buildings). The Waikato Section of Operative District Plan included permitted activity status for earthworks necessary for building works authorized by	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				a building consent provided that the area of earthworks is no more than 150% of the area of those building works and occurs on land with an average gradient no steeper than 1:8.		
FS1035.19	Pareoranga Te Kata	Support	Support submission in full.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Council needs to partner with Kaitiaki, mana whenua or review strategies with Waikato Tainui to ensure preservation and restoration of the Waikato River.</li> </ul>	Accept in part	
330.81	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.3.1 Earthworks - General.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1386.449	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	
349.10	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Not Stated	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1P1 (a)(ii) Earthworks - General, to increase the volume of aggregate permitted for a farm quarry from 1000m <sup>3</sup> to 2500m <sup>3</sup> .	The permitted volume of earthworks for a farm quarry is too small (1000m <sup>3</sup> per 12 months).	Reject	
FS1342.62	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 349.10.	FFNZ supports enabling volumes of aggregate from farm quarries to be set at a threshold that meets usual and expected needs.	Reject	
349.11	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 Earthworks - General, to reflect the earthworks limits in the Thames Coromandel District Council's Proposed District Plan's Rural Zone, as follows: maximum area per site per calendar year is 10,000m <sup>2</sup> (1ha) maximum volume per site per calendar year is 2,500m <sup>3</sup> (1ha) maximum height of any fill and/or cut is 5m.	The volume of earthworks within the general standards under Rule 22.2.3.1P2 is too small and the slope will limit much of the hill country. The limit on importation of fill under rule 22.2.3.1P4 is too small for rural ancillary earthworks generally and the cut height is too low. The slope (1:2) is too hard to achieve in hill country. The earthworks limits in the	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				Thames-Coromandel Proposed District Plan are considered appropriate, due to the similar terrains held by the Waikato District and Thames-Coromandel District.		
FS1386.499	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
418.18	Ethan Findlay	Oppose	No specific decision sought, but submission opposes Rule 22.2.3.1 Earthworks- General.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1388.173	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
419.20	Horticulture Zealand	New Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 PI (a)(iv) Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks for: ... (iv) A building	The submitter supports the permitted activity status of ancillary farming earthworks noting the submission point	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			platform for a <u>permitted</u> residential activity, including accessory buildings. AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	seeks changes to the definition of "Ancillary Farming Earthworks". Creation of a building platform modifies the existing environment from which a resource consent will be assessed. It is likely to result in the land being stripped of its productive or high class soil. This is inconsistent with the objectives and policies of the Rural Zone which seek to protect High Class Soils. The submitter seeks that the rule specify that earthworks are permitted only for a building platform for a residential building and accessory buildings that could be undertaken as a permitted activity. This would prevent earthworks being undertaken for development that would otherwise require consent. This also provide greater protection of High Class Soils and land with productive potential.		
FS1388.183	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
FS1342.98	Federated Farmers	Oppose	Disallow submission point in part, but amend the definition of 'Farming' to otherwise capture the relief sought by the submitter. Definition of Farming be amended to include: (a) any agricultural, pastoral, horticultural, forestry or aquaculture activities for the purpose of commercial gain or exchange; and (b) includes any land and auxiliary buildings used for the production of the products, including storing, washing and packing of	FFNZ prefers a definition of 'farming' to remain as it is simple and relates to the plan rules. However, the types of activities described in submitters suggested definition of 'Primary Production' is worthy of incorporation into the definition of Farming.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<i>product for market, that result from the listed activities; but (c) does not include processing of those products into a different product.</i>			
419.21	Horticulture Zealand	New Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P3 (a) Earthworks - General , as follows: (a) Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform for <u>a permitted residential activity</u> purposes within a site, using imported fill material must meet the following condition: ... AND Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	Creation of a building platform modifies the existing environment from which a resource consent will be assessed. The submitter seeks that the rule specify that earthworks are permitted only for a building platform for a residential building and accessory buildings that could be undertaken as permitted activities. This would prevent earthworks for inappropriate development, or development that would otherwise require consent. This would also provide greater protection of High Class Soils.	Accept in part	
FS1388.184	Mercury NZ Limited	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	
419.22	Horticulture Zealand	New Neutral/Amend	Add a new permitted activity to Rule 22.2.3.1 Earthworks - General, as follows: <u>(a) Earthworks for purposes associated with horticultural activities using imported fill material or cleanfill must meet all of the following conditions: (i) sediment resulting from the filling is retained on the site through implementation and maintenance of erosion and sediment controls; and (ii) does not divert or change the nature of water bodies.</u> AND	The submitter supports the provision of cleanfill as a permitted activity and notes that the use of cleanfill can be managed through good management practice. The northern portion of the Waikato District typically has an undulating topography. It is also a significant location for horticultural activities. In order to maximise the productive potential of land in this area, it is common for fill to be imported to help	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Any consequential or additional amendments as a result of changes sought in the submission.	contour the land to a slope appropriate for horticultural activities. Cleanfill is also used for other land management purposes such as drainage or track creation and maintenance.		
FS1388.185	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
433.31	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause to Rule 22.2.3.1 PI (a) Earthworks - General, as follows: <u>(v) Ecosystem protection, restoration or enhancement (e.g. conservation covenants, works involved with wetland enhancement).</u> AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	The notified rule could severely curtail the size, construction, restoration, maintenance and enhancement of wetlands which would otherwise be permitted under the Waikato Regional Plan.	Accept in part	
FS1293.28	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Waikato District has a significant proportion of indigenous wetlands in the district. The Director-General considers that the proposed amendment identifies a practical intervention to restore values of wetlands. The Director-General also undertakes a variety of protection works at lakes and track maintenance for the purpose of ecosystem protection, rehabilitation and	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>restoration. This amendment would ensure this is accounted for.</i>		
FS1340.63	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 433.31, as earthworks required for ecosystem works, such as the described, should be a permitted activity.	Accept in part	
433.50	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (a) (v) and (vi) Earthworks - General AND Add a new Note to Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 Earthworks - General, as follows: <u>Note: Where earthworks are specifically for small dams and damming water as allowed by Rule 3.6.4.4 of the Waikato Regional Plan then (i) and (ii) do not apply. Where earthworks are specifically for the maintenance and enhancement of existing lawfully established damming of perennial water bodies, as allowed by Rule 3.6.4.5 of the Waikato Regional Plan, then (i) and (ii) above do not apply.</u> AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	The notified rule could severely curtail the size, construction, restoration, maintenance and enhancement of wetlands which would otherwise be permitted under the Waikato Regional Plan. Water flow is controlled by the Waikato Regional Council and is not a Waikato District Council function.	Accept in part	
FS1293.29	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General agrees that the proposed rule includes provisions that are part of the Regional council function and are not appropriate in a district plan.	Accept in part	
FS1083.11	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Support	The rule as notified does not properly provide for the maintenance and enhancement of wetlands as is otherwise provided for under the Waikato Regional Plan.	Allow the submission point in full	Accept in part	
433.51	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 RDI (B) Earthworks - General, as follows: ... (v) location of the earthworks to waterways, significant indigenous vegetation and habitat ... (x) flood risk, including natural water flows and established drainage paths; ... AND/OR Any alternative relief to address the issues and concerns raised in the submission.	The assessment matters requested to be deleted are considered by Waikato Regional Council rather than being a function of a district council.	Accept in part	
FS1083.12	Ryburn Lagoon Trust Limited	Support	It is inappropriate that the Council assesses waterflows and drainage paths which are a regional Council function	Allow the submission point in full	Accept in part	
FS1340.69	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission point 433.51 as these are matters of consideration for the Waikato Regional Council, not the Waikato District Council. Deletion of these	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>matters clarifies the jurisdiction for this assessment.</i>		
FS1293.30	Department of Conservation	Support	Seek that the submission point is allowed.	The Director-General agrees that the proposed rule includes provisions that are part of the Regional council function and are not appropriate in a district plan.	Accept in part	
433.64	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide for earthworks as permitted for ecosystem protection, restoration and enhancement.	The proposed rule framework dictates that any time an entity such as AWFG or individual wishes to put a small bund or dam in place as part of a wetland restoration project, or to mitigate loss of contaminants from a rural land use, even where this falls under the permitted activity rules of the Waikato Regional Plan, a Waikato District Council Restricted discretionary consent would be required as Permitted Activity Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (vi) would not be complied with.	Accept in part	
FS1377.97	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL's proposed development will require elements of ecosystem protection, restoration and enhancement and more flexible provisions will assist with this. Such amendments are consistent with HVL's amendments to the provisions about SNAs to provide greater flexibility and to enable development subject to appropriate mitigation, offsetting and compensation.	Accept in part	
FS1340.73	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 433.64 as this would enable landowners to carry out ecosystem enhancement, protection and restoration works without the need to obtain a resource consent which can often be a barrier to such works.	Accept in part	
FS1342.123	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 433.64.	FFNZ supports the amendments.	Accept in part	
466.14	Balle Bros Group Limited	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 PI Earthworks - General as notified.	The submitter supports the permitted activity status of Ancillary Farming Earthworks.	Accept in part	
FS1388.406	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from 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 in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
466.15	Balle Bros Group Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (iii) Earthworks - General.	The submitter questions the 1.5m setback for earthworks from all boundaries. Provided appropriate erosion and sediment controls are in place and all effects are mitigated, there should be no imposed setback for earthworks from the boundary.	Reject	
FS1388.407	Mercury NZ Limited	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	
FS1302.13	Mercer Airport	Support	Mercer Airport support submission point 466.15 and seek that the submission point is allowed.	Relates to the deletion of a rule requiring earthworks to be setback from boundaries in the Rural Zone.	Reject	
FS1168.68	Horticulture New Zealand	Support	Allow the submission.	The submitter seeks to Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (iii) Earthworks - General. The submitter questions the 1.5m setback for earthworks from all boundaries. Provided appropriate erosion and sediment controls are in place and all effects are mitigated, there should be no imposed setback for earthworks from the boundary.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
575.19	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 (i) Earthworks- General except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.2.3 (a)(i) Earthworks as follows (or words to similar effect): (i) Ancillary rural <u>and mineral and aggregate extraction</u> earthworks; AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.	Earthworks are a natural part of extracting minerals and aggregate. Without stripping the overburden/topsoil, you cannot extract the underlying aggregate. It is important that the industry is able to carry out ancillary earthworks as a Permitted Activity to avoid unnecessary cost and delay of expansion. With appropriate conditions in place, any effects created by these types of activities will still be able to be appropriated managed.	Reject	
FS1332.33	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Reject	
FS1292.74	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow the submission point.	McPherson support the inclusion of a rule which allows for earthworks that are ancillary to extraction activities to be undertaken as of right. Earthworks are a natural part of extracting minerals and aggregate. Without stripping the overburden/topsoil, you cannot extract the underlying aggregate. With appropriate conditions in place, any effects created by these types of activities will still be able to be appropriately managed.	Reject	
FS1319.10	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	Allow in part, subject to NZS's original submission point seeking a specific zone for WNH.	NZS has sought specific provisions for the WNH Mine in its original submission. However, if the Rural Zone rules were to apply to other Extractive Activities, NZS agrees that earthworks should be provided for as a permitted activity (consistent with its submission on Policy 5.3.5). The extraction of mineral resource is a productive rural activity, and there is a need to provide for earthworks associated with those extraction activities within the Rural environment.	Reject	
FS1377.146	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	HVL supports amendments to provide greater flexibility in addressing the potential effects arising from earthworks. In addition, as an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater flexibility for extractive industries.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
637.13	Livestock Improvement Corporation	Support	Retain the parts of Rule 22.2.3.1 (P1) relating to: Earthworks that provide for ancillary rural earthworks, Farm quarry construction and/or maintenance of tracks, fences or drains, and Building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.59	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
639.13	Dairy NZ Incorporated	Neutral/Amend	Retain the parts of Rule 22.2.3.1 (P1) relating to: Earthworks that provide for ancillary rural earthworks, Farm quarry construction and/or maintenance of tracks, fences or drains, and Building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.64	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
662.13	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 P3 Earthworks - General, except for the amendments sought below AND Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P3 (a) Earthworks - General as follows: (a) Earthworks for the purpose of creating a building platform <u>and</u> <u>accessway</u> for residential purposes within a site, using imported fill material must meet the following condition:	Supports the permitted activity rule for earthworks in part. Seeks that the permitted activity rule be amended to include earthworks associated with the construction of accessways to build platforms as this currently gets overlooked by many developers. Contends that earthworks for accessways is inherent in subdivision consent and has subsequently already been considered by Council on the basis of effects. Earthworks restrictions will still be required to comply with NZS 4431:1989.	Accept in part	
FS1387.102	Mercury NZ Limited	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	
FS1308.91	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<i>For the reasons given in submission point 471.2</i>	Accept in part	
746.78	The Surveying Company	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1- Earthworks-General as notified.	The submitter is generally supportive of this provision.	Accept in part	
FS1387.951	Mercury NZ Limited	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	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
797.25	Fonterra Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 Earthworks General except for the amendments sought below.  AND  Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (a)(i) Earthworks General as follows (or words to similar effect): Do not exceed a volume of more than 1000m<sup>3</sup> and an area of more than 2000m<sup>2</sup> over any single consecutive 12 month period.  AND  Any consequential amendments or further relief to give effect to the concerns raised in the submission.</p>	<p>Supports the rule subject to deletion of reference to volume limit. Adverse effects of earthworks within rural environment are appropriately addressed through controls over area and cut and fill heights, revegetation requirements and erosion and sediment control measures.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1139.30	Turangawaewae Trust Board	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate wording change.	Accept in part	
FS1108.31	Te Whakakitenga o Waikato Incorporated (Waikato-Tainui)	Oppose	Null	Inappropriate wording change.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1269	Mercury NZ Limited	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</p>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
877.15	Leigh Michael Shaw & Bradley John Hall	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 Earthworks - General as notified.	The submitter is generally supportive of this provision which provides for ancillary rural earthworks.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1459	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
943.23	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 PI (a) (iv) Earthworks - General, as follows; (iv) A building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings <u>and access.</u>	To include provision of access within the scope of permitted earthworks.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1573	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
FS1308.175	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<i>It should be clarified that garages are excluded from the area of a minor dwelling.</i>	Accept in part	
943.24	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (a) (iii) Earthworks - General.	Earthworks within 1.5m of a boundary are inevitable and even most minor activities such as digging a posthole would trigger a requirement for resource consent.	Reject	
FS1387.1574	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	<i>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Accept	
FS1308.176	The Surveying Company	Support	Null	<i>Given the definition of "earthworks" in the Proposed Plan, even the most minor activities such as digging a posthole would trigger a requirement for resource consent.</i>	Reject	
943.25	McCracken Surveys Limited	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P4 (a) (i) Earthworks - General, as follows: (i) not exceed a total volume of 200 1000m3;	No reason provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.1575	Mercury NZ Limited	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</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
FSI169.1	Te Kowhai Community Group	Support	<i>Return to 1000m3 under operative plan.</i>	Rule 22.2.3.1 P4(a)(i) Earthworks. Restricts earthworks in Rural Zone to 200m3. Potential to restrict to Te Atamanui walkway earthworks P2 activity.	Accept in part	
945.19	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (vii) to Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (a) Earthworks - General as follows: (vii) Earthworks to a depth of greater than 200mm are to be located a minimum of 12m from the centre line of a gas pipeline. 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 earthworks rule requiring a 12m setback from gas transmission pipelines where earthworks are proposed to a depth of greater than 200m.	Reject	
FSI305.22	Andrew Mowbray	Oppose	<i>Seek that the whole of the submission point be rejected.</i>	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	
FSI342.256	Federated Farmers	Support	<i>Allow in part submission point 945.19. Allow if FFNZ's original submission changes to Rule 22.2.3.1 P2(a) are adopted.</i>	FFNZ understand the need to be cautious undertaking earthworks around infrastructure, but are concerned about incremental restrictions, which intrude on farming operation, lest such restrictions result in inefficient use of privately owned farmland.	Reject	
FSI289.2	Mowbray Group	Oppose	<i>I seek that the sections referenced be maintained at 6 metres.</i>	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	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>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.</i>		
945.20	First Gas Limited	Neutral/Amend	Add a new matter of discretion to Rule 22.2.3.1 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	
680.199	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 PI Earthworks- General, except for the amendment sought below AND Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 PI Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks for: (i) Ancillary rural earthworks (ii) Farm quarry where the volume of aggregate does not exceed 1000m3 per single consecutive 12 month period; (iii) Construction and/or maintenance of tracks <u>and stock underpasses, fences or drains;</u> (iv) A building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings (v) <u>A building platform for farm buildings and sheds</u> (vi) <u>Land cultivation and pasture maintenance, including horticultural root ripping and shelterbelt maintenance</u> (vii) <u>Water supply lines, troughs, water tanks, off-stream dams</u> (viii) <u>Constructed wetlands, effluent ponds, stormwater detention ponds, and stormwater bunds</u> (ix) <u>Rural firebreaks</u> (x) <u>Airstrips, helipads, fertiliser storage areas</u> (xi) <u>Silage pits, and fodder storage hard-stand areas</u> (xii) <u>Offal pits, burying dead stock and plant waste.</u> (xiii) <u>For the purpose of pest and weed control or stock exclusion. This includes maintaining or constructing perimeter fencing and tracks for safe and efficient trap setting and earthworks for culvert crossings and stock bridges</u> AND	Strong support is extended to PI, the approach is consistent with the intent of Objectives 5.1.1 and 5.3.1 and related Policies. Earthworks for farming should be included as a permitted activity as there is little risk to the environment from undertaking such earthworks within the wide open spaces of rural areas. If these aren't provided for explicitly. The submitter is concerned that these sorts of earthworks could get caught by rules that trigger resource consent for certain types of other earthworks, which would put farmers through undue delay and cost hardship, for little or no environmental benefit. Earthworks associated with creating a building platform for non-residential purposes such as a farm implement shed within the rural zone should be permitted under this rule.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.			
FS1387.209	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
FS1275.16	Zeala Limited trading as Aztech Buildings	Support	Allow.	The addition to the list of permitted earthworks provides greater clarity as to the type of earthworks that can be undertaken. With regard to the requested point (v) this could be added to by amending the wording to: 'A building platform up to 150% of the building footprint for farm buildings and sheds and occurs on land with an average gradient no steeper than 1:8'. This is in keeping with the Operative District Plan provisions and allows for batter slopes to be created where the building platform may be required to be raised above existing ground levels.	Accept in part	
FS1114.22	Fire and Emergency New Zealand	Support	Null	FENZ supports the preventative mitigation of fire risk to property and life through construction of rural fire breaks being provided as a permitted activity. This is particularly important where property is located outside of a reticulated water network.	Accept in part	
FS1171.87	T&G Global	Support	Allow the submission.	This submission is supported. This submission proposes amendments to Rule 22.2.3.1 PI	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>Earthworks - General to specifically include a number of rural activities.</i>		
680.200	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (a) Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks within a site, <u>excluding ancillary rural earthworks which are permitted under 22.2.3.1 P1</u> , must meet all of the following conditions:... AND Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (a) (vi) Earthworks-General. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter supports the permitted activity status and accept that conditions may be required to manage potential adverse effects which may arise from certain earthwork activities. However, the conditions need to make sense within the context of the rural zone and fall within the jurisdiction of the district council. The relief sought for the earthworks definition will in part address the concerns, but for the sake of completeness that some of the conditions listed have been set at an inappropriately low threshold and will capture farming activities unnecessarily.	Accept in part	
FS1171.88	T&G Global	Support	<i>Allow the submission.</i>	<i>This submission proposes amendments to Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (a) Earthworks - General to exclude ancillary rural earthworks from the permitted standards.</i>	Accept in part	
680.201	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 P4 (a) (vii) Earthworks - General. AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The submitter understands the intention and purpose of this rule however, the conditions need to fall within the jurisdiction of the district council.	Accept	
FS1387.210	Mercury NZ Limited	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</i>	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>		
680.202	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Support	Retain Rule 22.2.3.1 RDI Restricted Discretionary Activities Earthworks - General, as notified. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	Submitter understands the purpose of Rule RDI and considers the matters of discretion appropriate.	Accept in part	
FS1387.211	Mercury NZ Limited	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	
695.204	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P1, P2 and P4 Earthworks general so that earthworks are based on the site area i.e. a 1:1 ratio so a 45m2 site would provide 450m3 of earthworks.	The Proposed District Plan penalizes bigger sites for no apparent outcome, especially when a bigger site is likely to be better able to absorb and diffuse effects. Earthworks totals should not cancel each other out, i.e. cut and fill add together.	Reject	
FS1387.357	Mercury NZ Limited	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</i>	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
695.205	Sharp Planning Solutions Ltd	Support	Retain the maximum area of earthworks in Rule 22.2.3.1 P1, P2 and P3 Earthworks - General.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	
FS1387.358	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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	
697.764	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3(1) Earthworks, as follows: (1)Rule 22.2.3.1 - Earthworks General, provides the permitted rules for earthworks activities for the Rural Zone. <u>This rule does not apply in those areas specified in Rules 22.2.3.1A, 22.2.3.2, 22.2.3.3 and 22.2.3.4.</u>	The wording of the rule does not make it clear that the rules specified in 22.2.3(2) apply instead of the general earthworks rule.	Accept	
697.765	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3(2) Earthworks, as follows: There are specific standards for earthworks within rules: (a) Rule 22.2.3.1A - Earthworks - within the National Grid Yard (a-b) Rule 22.2.3.2 - Maaori Sites and Maaori Areas of Significance; (b c) Rule 22.2.3.3 - Significant Natural Areas; (e-d) Rule 22.2.3.4 - Landscape and Natural Character Areas. AND Add new rule after Rule 22.2.3.1 Earthworks - General, as follows: <u>22.2.3.1A Earthworks within the National Grid Yard P1 (a) The following earthworks within the National Grid Yard: (i) Earthworks undertaken as part of domestic cultivation; or repair, sealing or resealing of a road, footpath or driveway; (ii) Vertical holes not exceeding 500mm in diameter that are more than 1.5m from the outer edge of the pole support structure or stay wire. (iii) Earthworks for which a dispensation has been granted by Transpower under New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663. P2 (a) Earthworks activities within the</u>	It must replicate the earthworks rule within the National Grid from Chapter 14 into Chapter 22 for increased clarity and usability of the Plan.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
			<p>National Grid Yard near National Grid support poles or any stay wires must comply with the following conditions: (i) Do not exceed a depth of 300mm within 2.2m of the pole or stay wire; and (ii) Do not exceed a depth of 750mm between 2.2m and 5m of the pole or stay wire. P3 (a) Earthworks within the National Grid Yard near National Grid support towers (including any tubular steel tower that replaces a steel lattice tower) must comply with all of the following conditions: (i) Do not exceed 300mm depth within 6m of the outer edge of the visible foundation of the tower; (ii) Do not exceed 3m between 6m and 12m of the outer edge of the visible foundation of the tower; (iii) Do not compromise the stability of a National Grid support structure; (iv) Do not result in the loss of access to any National Grid support structure; and (v) Must be less than the minimum ground to conductor clearance distances in Table 4 of the New Zealand Electrical Code of Practice for Electrical Safe Distances 34:2001 ISSN 0114-0663. RD1 (a) Earthworks within the National Grid Yard that do not comply with one or more of the conditions of Rules 22.2.3.1A P1, P2 or P3. (b) Discretion is restricted to: (i) Impacts on the operation, maintenance, upgrading and development of the National Grid; (ii) The risk to the structural integrity of the affected National Grid support structure(s); (iii) Any impact on the ability of the National Grid owner (Transpower) to access the National Grid; (iv) The risk of electrical hazards affecting public or individual safety, and the risk of property damage.</p>			
FS1350.99	Transpower New Zealand Limited	Oppose	<p>Disallow in terms of sought relocation of National Grid provisions. Notwithstanding the location of the provisions, Transpower seeks that all amendments sought in its original submission be included.</p>	<p>Related to the original submission by Waikato District Council seeking relocation/replicating of the National Grid earthworks provisions (submission point 697.6), Transpower's further submission point in response to Submission point 697.6 apply to the earthwork provisions listed. Transpower supports and prefers a standalone set of provisions (for the reason it avoids duplication and provides a coherent set of rules which submitters can refer to, noting that the planning maps clearly identify land that is subject to the National Grid provisions). A stand-alone set of provisions as provided in the notified plan is also consistent with the National Planning Standards. Irrespective that the proposed plan has not been drafted to align with the National Planning Standards, it would be counterproductive to amend the layout contrary to the intent of the Standards. Standard 7. District wide Matters Standard provides, as a mandatory direction, that 'provisions relating to energy, infrastructure and transport that are not specific to the Special purpose zones chapter or sections must be located in one or more chapters under the Energy, Infrastructure and Transport heading'. Clause 5.(c) makes</p>	Accept in part	



Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<p>specific reference to reverse sensitivity effects between infrastructure and other activities. It is not clear from the submission points as to the relationship between chapters 14, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24 and 25 and the National Grid provisions within 14.1.1 provides the zone provisions do not apply to infrastructure and energy activities. As such, any other network utility activities would appear to be subject to the National Grid provisions and this requires further clarification. If council wishes to pursue splitting the National Grid provisions into the respective chapters, supply of a revised full set of provisions would be beneficial to enable Transpower to fully assess the implications and workability of the requested changes. Notwithstanding the location of National Grid provisions relating to earthworks within the proposed plan, Transpower seeks the specific changes to earthwork provisions as sought in its original submission point 576.55. Note: It is not evident from the summary if there is a submission point applicable for Chapter 17. If so, this further submission covers that point.</p>		
FS1342.191	Federated Farmers	Support	Allow submission point 697.765.	FFNZ support earthworks for farming activities within the National Grid Yard where these are compatible with the operation of the National Grid Yard in order to promote efficient use of the rural land resource.	Accept in part	
697.766	Waikato District Council	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 PI (a)(iii) Earthworks - General.	The content of this rule is already contained within the meaning of ancillary rural earthworks.	Accept	
FS1387.684	Mercury NZ Limited	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	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
FS1315.7	Lochiel Farmlands Limited	Support	Null	Earthworks for the construction and/or maintenance of tracks, fences or drains is permitted under Rule 22.2.3.1 P1 (a)(i) and is covered by the definition of ancillary rural earthworks.	Accept	
697.767	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P1(a)(iv) Earthworks - General, as follows: (iv) A building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings. <u>carried out in accordance with NZS 4431:1989 Code of Practice for Earth Fill for Residential Development.</u>	For clarity of the rule, it makes sense that the NZS 4431:1989 Code of Practice for Earth Fill for Residential Development is applied within this rule instead of P3.	Accept	
FS1387.685	Mercury NZ Limited	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.</i> <i>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</i>	Reject	
697.768	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P2(a)(iii) Earthworks - General, as follows: (iii) Earthworks are setback <u>at least 1.5m</u> from all boundaries;	The words "at least" provide clarity to this rule.	Accept in part	
FS1387.686	Mercury NZ Limited	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 in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<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>		
697.769	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 P3 Earthworks - General; AND Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 RDI(a) Earthworks - General, as follows: (a) Earthworks that do not comply with Rule 22.2.3.1 P1, P2, P3 or P4.	P3 has been included in rule 22.2.3.1 P1(a)(iv). As a consequential amendment.	Accept	
FS1387.687	Mercury NZ Limited	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>	Reject	
697.770	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P4(a)(iv) Earthworks - General, as follows: (iv) Fill material is setback <u>at least</u> 1.5m from all boundaries;	The words "at least" provide clarity to this rule.	Accept in part	
697.862	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P1(a)(iii) Earthworks - General, as follows: (iii) A building platform for a residential activity, including an accessory building., <u>carried out in accordance with NZS 4431:1989 Code of Practice for Earth Fill for Residential Development.</u>	For clarity of the rule, it makes sense that the NZS 4431:1989 Code of Practice for Earth Fill for Residential Development is applied to this rule instead of P3.	Accept	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
986.104	KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Add a new clause (vii) to Rule 22.2.3.1 P2(a) Earthworks - General as follows (or similar amendments to achieve the requested relief): <u>(vii) 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.	KiwiRail supports that earthworks are required to be setback from services and network systems. The rail track itself is most susceptible from adverse effects if adjacent earthworks are not adequately set back. KiwiRail seeks that rule relating to setbacks in certain zones should be amended to reflect that there should be an earthworks setback of 1.5m from infrastructure, to ensure that the efficient and effective operation of the existing network is maintained.		
FS1171.108	T&G Global	Oppose	<i>Disallow the submission to extent consistent with this further submission.</i>	<i>This submission seeks to ensure that earth works are stabilized to avoid runoff within 1 month of the cessation. This is opposed in so far as it may be applied to horticultural activities such as cropping where vegetation may require longer periods to establish and where the other requirements for earthworks can be met.</i>	Reject	
FS1176.317	Watercare Services Ltd	Support	Null	Watercare supports the approach in principle, however is seeking additional changes to protect existing infrastructure.	Accept	
471.2	CKL	Oppose	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 P1 (a)(iv) Earthworks - General, as follows: (iv) A building platform for a residential activity, including accessory buildings <u>and access.</u> AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Include provision of access within the scope of permitted earthworks.	Accept in part	
FS1287.19	Blue Wallace Surveyors Ltd	Support	<i>Blue Wallace seek that the submission point be allowed in full.</i>	<i>The Submitter supports this submission point as it is appropriate for accessways to be included as a permitted activity considering that they are inherent to subdivision development.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1308.64	The Surveying Company	Support		<i>It makes sense to include the provision of access within the scope of permitted earthworks for residential building platforms.</i>	Accept in part	
FS1388.438	Mercury NZ Limited	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</i>	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
				<i>hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk 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>		
471.3	CKL	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (a)(iii) Earthworks - General. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	A maximum volume of 200m3 for fill material is too restrictive.	Accept	
FS1302.9	Mercer Airport	Support	Mercer support submission point 471.3 and seek that the submission point is allowed.	A maximum volume of 200m3 for fill material is too restrictive.	Accept	
FS1388.439	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure. Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.	Reject	
986.112	KiwiRail Holdings Limited (KiwiRail)	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.2.3.1 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 in part	
552.1	Stephanie Henderson	Neutral/Amend	Add a rule to Chapter 22 Rural Zone to ensure wetlands do not become a dam, stopping the flow of water and flooding neighbouring properties.	There is no rule to maintain effects from wetlands on neighbouring properties. Nearby wetland floods submitters property as the natural flow of water is hampered.	Reject	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
FS1388.783	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept	
330.80	Andrew and Christine Gore	Not Stated	No specific decision sought, however submission refers to Rule 22.2.3 Earthworks.	No reasons provided.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
433.65	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Not Stated	Amend the Proposed District Plan to provide that where earthworks are specifically for small dams and damming water and the maintenance and enhancement of existing lawfully established damming of perennial water bodies, as allowed by rules 3.6.4.4 and 3.6.4.5 of the Waikato Regional Plan, then restrictions as to volume, area and depth do not apply.	In regards to Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (vi), the submitter considers that Waikato District Council does not have authority to control water flow via rules relating to the taking, use, damming and diverting of water in the District Plan, and that it is in fact a matter reserved to the Regional Council. Similarly, the areas of discretion for Rule 22.2.3.1 RDI (v) location of earthworks to waterways is more appropriately managed as a Regional Council function, with the Council's discretion under the District Plan rule constrained to the maintenance of significant indigenous vegetation and habitat. Section 30 (c) of the RMA provides that Regional Councils have control of the use of land for the purpose of soil conservation (including large earthworks), the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of water in water bodies, the maintenance of the quantity of water in water bodies, and the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystems in water bodies. This is recognised in the RPS in method 8.3.2 and 14.1.1. Regional councils also control of the taking, use, damming and diversion of water, the control of the quantity, level or inflow of water in any water body, and the discharges of contaminants into or on to land, air or water and discharges of water into water. While section 31 provides territorial authorities with the control of effects of the use, development, or protection of land for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity and the control of any effects of activity in relation to the surface of water in rivers and lakes, these functions are significantly more constrained and should not impose standards above and beyond those required to conform to permitted activities under the relevant regional plan.	Accept in part	

Submission point	Submitter	Support Oppose	Summary of submission	Reasons	Recommendation	
433.66	Auckland Waikato Fish and Game Council	Not Stated	Amend the rules that duplicated a regional planning function such as to do with waterways, natural water flows and established drainage paths.	<p>In regards to Rule 22.2.3.1 P2 (vi), the submitter considers that Waikato District Council does not have authority to control water flow via rules relating to the taking, use, damming and diverting of water in the District Plan, and that it is in fact a matter reserved to the Regional Council. Similarly, the areas of discretion for Rule 22.2.3.1 RDI (v) location of earthworks to waterways is more appropriately managed as a Regional Council function, with the Council's discretion under the District Plan rule constrained to the maintenance of significant indigenous vegetation and habitat. Section 30 (c) of the RMA provides that Regional Councils have control of the use of land for the purpose of soil conservation (including large earthworks), the maintenance and enhancement of the quality of water in water bodies, the maintenance of the quantity of water in water bodies, and the maintenance and enhancement of ecosystems in water bodies. This is recognised in the RPS in method 8.3.2 and 14.1.1. Regional councils also control of the taking, use, damming and diversion of water, the control of the quantity, level or inflow of water in any water body, and the discharges of contaminants into or on to land, air or water and discharges of water into water. While section 31 provides territorial authorities with the control of effects of the use, development, or protection of land for the purpose of the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity and the control of any effects of activity in relation to the surface of water in rivers and lakes, these functions are significantly more constrained and should not impose standards above and beyond those required to conform to permitted activities under the relevant regional plan.</p>	Accept in part	



Extractive Industry/Aggregate Extraction Activities						
723.7	Winstone Aggregates	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend the definition of "Extractive Industry" in Chapter 13 Definitions, as follows: Means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand, and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface. The term includes the processing by such means as minerals at or near the site, where the minerals have been taken, won or excavated. The term also includes the removal, stockpiling and filling of overburden sourced from the same site and the following activities: <u>Blasting; Storing, distributing and selling mineral products; Accessory earthworks; Treating stormwater and waste water; Landscaping and rehabilitation of quarries; Clean fills and managed fills; Recycling or reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry, or asphalt; Accessory activities and accessory buildings and structures such as weighbridges, laboratories and site offices.</u> It includes all activities and structures associated with underground coal gasification, including pilot and commercial plants and distribution of gas. It excludes prospecting and exploration activities.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the definition of "Aggregate Extraction Activities" and "Mineral Extraction and Processing" in Chapter 13 Definitions to mean the same as "Extractive Industry."</p>	<p>Activities associated with extractive industry are defined separately three times, all with different wording (Aggregate extraction, Extractive Industry and Mineral Extraction and Processing). Term "extractive industry" needs defining, and then the terms "Aggregate extraction activities" and "Mineral Extraction and processing" means the same.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1377.232	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	<p>HVL supports amendments to provide greater flexibility in addressing the potential effects arising from earthworks. In addition, as an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater flexibility for extractive industries.</p>	Accept in part	

FS1292.15	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: (a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); (b) the storage, distribution and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; (c) ancillary earthworks; (d) the removal and deposition of overburden; (e) treatment of storm water and waste water; (f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; (g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including clean filling; (h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and (i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and (j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt (k) internal roads and access tracks. Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Support the submission as there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."</p>	Accept in part	
FS1319.34	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part. NZS seeks the deletion of the definitions for 'Aggregate Extraction Activities,' 'Extractive Industry' and 'Mineral extraction and processing' and the replacement with a definition for 'Extractive Activity,' as defined in NZS original submission point 827.50.</p>	<p>NZS's original submission (points 827.28, 827.29 and 827.50) has also sought amendments to these definitions to reduce duplication and inconsistency.</p>	Accept in part	

FS1387.799	Mercury NZ Limited	Oppose	Null	<p>At the time of lodging this further submission, neither natural hazard flood provisions nor adequate flood maps were available, and it is therefore not clear from a land use management perspective, either how effects from a significant flood event will be managed, or whether the land use zone is appropriate from a risk exposure.</p> <p>Mercury considers it is necessary to analyse the results of the flood hazard assessment prior to designing the district plan policy framework. This is because the policy framework is intended to include management controls to avoid, remedy and mitigate significant flood risk in an appropriate manner to ensure the level of risk exposure for all land use and development in the Waikato River Catchment is appropriate.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1334.15	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); b) the storage, distribution, and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; c) ancillary earthworks; d) the removal and deposition of overburden; e) treatment of storm water and wastewater; f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including cleanfilling; h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt k) internal roads and access tracks</p> <p>Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Support the submission as there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."</p>	Accept in part	

827.28	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	Delete the definition of "Aggregate Extraction Activities" in Chapter 13 Definitions AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to replace references to "Aggregate Extraction Activities" with "Extractive Activities." AND Any other further or consequential amendments required.	'Mineral extraction and processing', 'Aggregate Extraction Activities' and 'Extractive Industry' are all defined in the Proposed District Plan. There is overlap between the terms and creates potential for confusion and inconsistency. Definitions need to be streamlined. There is no clear reason for distinguishing between aggregate and mineral extraction activities and therefore it is considered that it is more efficient to regulate and assess those activities jointly.	Accept in part	
FSI198.41	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	The plan is confusing with several overlapping definitions for the same or similar activities. There needs to be a rationalisation of definitions into a single one for extractive activities.	Accept in part	
FSI292.16	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: (a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); (b) the storage, distribution and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; (c) ancillary earthworks; (d) the removal and deposition of overburden; (e) treatment of storm water and waste water; (f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; (g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including clean filling; (h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and (i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and (j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt (k) internal roads and access tracks. Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.	Support the submission as there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."	Accept in part	

FS1334.16	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); b) the storage, distribution, and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; c) ancillary earthworks; d) the removal and deposition of overburden; e) treatment of storm water and wastewater; f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including cleanfilling; h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt k) internal roads and access tracks</p> <p>Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Support the submission as there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."</p>	Accept in part	
827.29	New Zealand Steel Holdings Ltd	Oppose	<p>Delete the definition of "Mineral extraction and processing" in Chapter 13 Definitions</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to replace references of "Mineral extraction and processing" with "Extractive Activity."</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Any other further or consequential amendments required.</p>	<p>'Mineral extraction and processing', 'Aggregate Extraction Activities' and 'Extractive Industry' are all defined in the Proposed District Plan. There is overlap between the terms and creates potential for confusion and inconsistency. Definitions need to be streamlined. There are no clear reasons for distinguishing between aggregate and mineral extraction activities and therefore it is considered that it is more efficient to regulate and assess those activities jointly.</p>	Accept in part	

FS1292.17	McPherson Limited Resources	Support	<p>Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: (a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); (b) the storage, distribution and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; (c) ancillary earthworks; (d) the removal and deposition of overburden; (e) treatment of storm water and waste water; (f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; (g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including clean filling; (h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and (i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and (j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt (k) internal roads and access tracks. Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Support the submission as there if confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."</p>	Accept in part	
-----------	-----------------------------------	---------	---	---	----------------	--

FS1334.17	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); b) the storage, distribution, and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; c) ancillary earthworks; d) the removal and deposition of overburden; e) treatment of storm water and wastewater; f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including cleanfilling; h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt k) internal roads and access tracks</p> <p>Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Support the submission as there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."</p>	Accept in part	
-----------	----------------------	---------	---	---	----------------	--

575.1	Fulton Hogan Limited	Neutral/Amend	<p>Delete the definitions for 'Aggregate extraction activities', 'Extractive industry' and 'Mineral extraction and processing' in Chapter 13: Definitions; AND</p> <p>Add a new definition for 'Mineral and aggregate extraction activities' to Chapter 13 Definitions as follows (or words to similar effect): <u>Mineral and aggregate extraction activities mean those activities associated with mineral and aggregate extraction, including: a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, washing and blending); b) the storage, distribution and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; c) ancillary earthworks; d)the removal and deposition of overburden; e) treatment of stormwater and wastewater; f) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including cleanfilling; g) ancillary buildings and structures; and h) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>There are three different definitions in the PDP covering a range of extractive industries: aggregate extraction activities, mineral extraction and processing, and the extractive industry. Having three separate definitions adds unnecessary confusion which can be avoided by removing the superfluous definitions and retaining only one for 'mineral and aggregate extraction activities' as proposed.</p>	Accept in part	
FSI 19.3	New Zealand Steel Holdings	Support	<p>NZs seeks the deletion of the definitions for 'Aggregate extraction activities,' 'Extractive industry' and 'Mineral extraction and processing' and the replacement with a definition for 'Extractive Activity' as defined in NZS's original submission point 827.50.</p>	<p>NZS's original submission (827.28, 827.29 and 827.50) has also sought amendments to these definitions to reduce and inconsistency. 'Mineral extraction and processing,' 'Aggregate Extraction Activities' and 'Extractive Industry' are all defined in the Proposed District Plan. There is overlap between the terms and creates potential for confusion and inconsistency.</p>	Accept in part	
FSI 198.38	Bathurst Resources	Support	<p>The submission point be allowed in full.</p>	<p>The plan is confusing and inefficient with several overlapping definitions for the same or similar activities. There needs to be a rationalisation of definitions into a single one for extractive activities.</p>	Accept in part	



FS1292.11	McPherson Resources	Support	Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: (a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); (b) the storage, distribution and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; (c) ancillary earthworks; (d) the removal and deposition of overburden; (e) treatment of storm water and waste water; (f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; (g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including clean filling; (h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and (i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and (j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt (k) internal roads and access tracks. Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.	Support intent of submission to ensure there is a definition that provides for all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry. We note there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."	Accept in part	
FS1332.22	Winstone Aggregates	Support	Support.	The submission point reflects the matters that affect the aggregate industry as a whole.	Accept in part	
FS1377.141	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support.	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that the land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater clarity and flexibility for extractive industries.	Accept in part	
697.400	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete from Chapter 13: Definitions the definition for "Mineral extraction and processing" AND Replace the term "Mineral extraction and processing" in all chapters with "Extractive industry" where appropriate.	This term is covered by three definitions (aggregate extraction activities, extractive industry and mineral extraction and processing) which would be more efficiently rationalised into one.	Accept in part	

FS1292.13	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: (a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); (b) the storage, distribution and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; (c) ancillary earthworks; (d) the removal and deposition of overburden; (e) treatment of storm water and waste water; (f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; (g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including clean filling; (h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and (i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and (j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt (k) internal roads and access tracks. Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Support the submission as there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."</p>	Accept in part	
FS1319.31	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part. NZS seeks for the deletions in the submission point to be allowed, but for references to be replaced with the term "Extractive Activities" rather than "Extractive Industry" where appropriate, as defined in NZS's original submission point 827.50.</p>	<p>'Mineral extraction and processing,' 'Aggregate Extraction Activities' and 'Extractive Industry' are all defined in the Proposed District Plan. There is overlap between the terms and creates potential for confusion and inconsistency. Definitions therefore need to be streamlined.</p>	Accept in part	

FS1334.13	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); b) the storage, distribution, and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; c) ancillary earthworks; d) the removal and deposition of overburden; e) treatment of storm water and wastewater; f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including cleanfilling; h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt k) internal roads and access tracks Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.	Support the submission as there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."	Accept in part	
FS1377.221	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater clarity and flexibility for extractive industries.	Accept in part	
697.485	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	Delete from Chapter 13: Definitions the definition for "Aggregate extraction activities".	This term is covered by three definitions (aggregate extraction activities, extractive industry and mineral extraction and processing) which would be more efficiently rationalised into one.	Accept	
FS1291.22	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide clarity and flexibility for extractive industries.	Accept	

FS1292.14	McPherson Resources Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: (a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); (b) the storage, distribution and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; (c) ancillary earthworks; (d) the removal and deposition of overburden; (e) treatment of storm water and waste water; (f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; (g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including clean filling; (h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and (i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and (j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt (k) internal roads and access tracks. Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.</p>	<p>Support the submission as there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."</p>	Accept	
FS1319.32	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	<p>NZS seeks that this submission point be allowed, and a consequential amendment made to replace the term "aggregate extraction activities" in Policy 5.3.15.</p>	<p>In line with NZS's original submission point 827.28, definitions need to be streamlined.</p>	Accept	

FS1334.14	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part by providing one definition which includes all activities undertaken at a quarry or other extractive industry as follows: Extractive Industry means taking, winning or extracting by whatever means, the naturally-occurring minerals (including but not limited to coal, rock, sand and gravel) and peat from under or on the land surface and includes: a) excavation, blasting, processing (crushing, screening, chemical separation, washing and blending); b) the storage, distribution, and sale of minerals or aggregates by wholesale to industry or by retail; c) ancillary earthworks; d) the removal and deposition of overburden; e) treatment of storm water and wastewater; f) storage, management and disposal of tailings; g) landscaping and rehabilitation work, including cleanfilling; h) ancillary activities and ancillary buildings and structures; and i) residential accommodation necessary for security purposes; and j) recycling and reusing aggregate from demolition waste such as concrete, masonry or asphalt k) internal roads and access tracks</p> <p>Delete all other related definitions and replace "aggregate extraction activities" and "mineral extraction and processing" with the term "Extractive Industry" throughout the rules of the Proposed District Plan.</p>	Support the submission as there is confusion created by the overlap in the definitions for "Aggregate Extraction Activities," "Extractive Industry" and "Mineral and Extraction and Processing."	Accept	
FS1340.128	TaTa Valley Limited	Support	Support.	The submitter supports submission 697.485 as the definition is covered by three further definitions within the proposed plan (aggregate extraction activities, extractive industry and mineral extraction and processing). The submitter would support these definitions all being consolidated into one definition.	Accept	
FS1377.223	Havelock Village Limited	Support	Support	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater clarity and flexibility for extractive industries.	Accept	

680.185	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Not Stated	Add to Rule 22.1.2 a new permitted activity rule for farm quarries, as follows: <u>PXX Farm quarrying including aggregate excavation and ancillary earthworks</u> Activity specific conditions: Nil AND Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.	The new rule is considered consequential relief to address issues raised in previous submission points.	Accept in part	
FS1306.42	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support	<i>The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.</i>	Accept in part	
771.13	Alison Brown for Bathurst Resources Ltd and BT Mining Ltd	Neutral/Amend	Add provisions enabling exploration and prospecting in the Rural Zone as a permitted activity where effects are minor and restricted discretionary activity otherwise. AND Any consequential amendments necessary.	Prospecting and exploration are appropriately defined in the Proposed District Plan but do not appear to be any rules in the Rural Zone relating to these activities.	Accept in part	
FS1285.10	Terra Firma Mining Limited	Support	<i>Add provisions enabling exploration and prospecting in the Rural Zone as a permitted activity where effects are minor and restricted discretionary activity otherwise.</i>	<i>TFM agrees with the submitter's reasons.</i>	Accept in part	

591.9	Stevenson Waikato Ltd	Neutral/Amend	<p>Add a new permitted rule within Rule 22.1.2 Permitted Activities, as follows: <u>P13 Extractive Industry within the Aggregate Extractive Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend Rule 22.1.5 D8 Discretionary Activities, as follows: <u>An extractive industry outside the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning maps.</u></p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add new rules for noise and vibration specifically in relation to extractive industry activities (see the submission for specific amendments sought).</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Add a new provision within Rule 22.2.1 Noise to specifically address noise standards within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas, as follows: <u>22.2.1.4 Noise and Vibration - Extraction Industry within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on the planning map P1 Noise from extractive industry must not exceed the noise levels in Table 1 below at a notional boundary from any dwelling outside the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas and not in the ownership of the operator of the extractive industry. Noise must be measured and assessed in accordance with New Zealand Standard on Acoustics - Measurement of Environmental Sound (NZS 6801:2008) and New Zealand Standard on Acoustics - Environmental Noise (NZS 6802:2008). Table 1 Noise levels Times 7am-10pm, Monday to Saturday LAeq 55dB All other times and on public holidays LAeq 45dB LAFmax 75dB P2 Noise created from the use of explosives must not exceed a peak overall sound pressure of 128dB Lzpeak. P3 The measurement of blast noise (air blast) and ground vibration from blasting must be measured at the notional boundary of a dwelling outside the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas and not in the ownership of the operator of the extraction industry. P3 Vibration generated by blasting shall be measured within a building in accordance with Appendix J of Part 2 of Australian Standard AS 2187 2006. P4 All blasting is restricted to: (a) 9am-5pm, Monday to Saturday; (b) an average of two occasions per day over a calendar fortnight except where necessary because of safety reasons.</u></p>	<p>Agree that extractive industry should be a discretionary activity where it is not identified within the Aggregate Extraction Areas and Aggregate Resource Areas shown on planning maps. Where an Aggregate Extraction Area and Aggregate Resource Area is identified then extractive industry should be enabled subject to appropriate standards. This approach is adopted by the Franklin section of the Operative District Plan, Waipa District Plan and the Auckland Unitary Plan. There is no basis for adopting a more restrictive approach in the Proposed Waikato District Plan. The proposed amendment can be accommodated within the existing Rural Zone and there is no need to adopt a special purpose zone as asserted in the section 32 analysis. The duplication and inefficiencies from administering multiple zones as noted in the section 32 report as the only reason for rejecting this option does not exist.</p>	Reject	
-------	-----------------------	---------------	---	---	--------	--

			<p><u>P5 Blasting activities must be controlled to ensure any resulting ground vibration does not exceed the limits set out in German standard DIN 1503 1999: Structural vibration - Part 3 Effects of vibration on structures when measured on the foundation in the horizontal axis on the highest floor of an affected building. RDI Noise or vibration that does not comply with the above standards. Council's discretion is restricted to the following matters: (i) effects on amenity values; (ii) hours and days of operation; (iii) noise levels, location of noise source, frequency, duration or other special characteristics of noise; (iv) benefits derived from extracting the resource; and (v) mitigation measures.</u></p>			
FS1146.10	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited	Support	<p>The submission amendment will enable extractive industries to be established within Aggregate Extractive Areas and Aggregate Resource areas as a permitted activity. We agree that a noise and vibration limit should be specific to the extractive industry based on the type of activities which forms part of the extractive operations.</p>	<p>We seek that the whole submission is allowed as the Aggregate Extractive Areas and Aggregate Resource overlay should enable specific activities as permitted within these areas and provide some relief to extractive industries in this overlay.</p>	Reject	
FS1319.20	New Zealand Steel Holdings Limited	Support	<p>Allow in part (subject to NZS's original submission point seeking a specific zone for WNH).</p>	<p>NZS has sought specific provisions for the WNH Mine in its original submission. However, if the Rural Zone rules were to apply, NZS agrees that Extractive Activities should be provided for within Aggregate Extraction Areas. NZS supports specific noise limits for mineral and aggregate extraction activities (or 'Extractive Activities') that are consistent with the noise provisions of the operative district plan.</p>	Reject	
FS1377.171	Havelock Village Limited	Support	<p>Support.</p>	<p>As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL seeks that land it controls be rezoned as Aggregate Extraction Zone. HVL supports amendments that provide greater flexibility for extractive industries.</p>	Reject	



FS1292.68	McPherson Limited Resources	Support	Allow the submission point.	McPherson supports the inclusion of provisions which allow for extraction activities to occur as of right where the site has been identified as being within the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay. This overlay clearly signals that aggregate extraction is anticipated for such sites. It is noted that the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay has not been applied to McPherson's existing quarry operations. This relief is sought as per submission point 691.9. McPherson also support the inclusion of specific noise and vibrations standards to be applied to extraction activities. Such rule define the effects that are anticipated and accepted from these activities, providing protection to the industry as well as surrounding activities.	Reject	
FS1334.68	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow submission point.	Fulton Hogan supports the inclusion of provisions which allow for extraction activities to occur as of right where the site has been identified as being within the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay. This overlay clearly signals that aggregate extraction is anticipated for such sites. It is noted that the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay has been applied to all of Fulton Hogan's existing quarry operations. Fulton Hogan also supports the inclusion of specific noise and vibration standards to be applied to extraction activities. Such rules define the effects that are anticipated and accepted from these activities, providing protection to the industry as well as surrounding properties.	Reject	

FS1388.997	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	
Rule 22.1.3 – Restricted Discretionary Activities (Minerals and extractive industries)						
746.77	The Surveying Company	Neutral/Amend	Add a new restricted discretionary activity (RD3) to Rule 22.1.3 Restricted Discretionary Activities) for clean fill outside of an Outstanding Natural Landscapes, Outstanding Natural Feature, Outstanding Natural Character Area and a High Natural Character Area, with matters of discretion including: Waste acceptance Design and construction Site operation procedures Response to natural hazards Management of non-complying material Landscape Dust Noise Biodiversity Water quality Traffic effects Monitoring.	Cleanfill (as per the WasteMINZ definition) involves the depositing and handling of non-contaminated material. This material does not generate objectionable odour, contamination or high dust emissions, unlike other activities that involve disposal of material to land. With matters of discretion and assessment criteria restricted to waste acceptance, design and construction, site operation procedures, response to natural hazards, management of non-complying material, landscape effects, dust, noise, traffic effects and monitoring.	Reject	

FS1306.53	Hynds Foundation	Support	Support.	The current Proposed Plan provisions would result in a number of activities that are anticipated within rural areas defaulting to con-complying activities. Hynds Foundation supports the inclusion of activities that are compatible within a rural setting as permitted, controlled, restricted discretionary and discretionary activities. Activities such as rural tourism, rural commercial services, emergency management, and veterinary centres are generally anticipated and have functional, operational and economic benefits of siting within the Rural Zone. Refer to the Auckland Unitary Plan which has further definition of these activities.	Reject	
395.4	Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment for New Zealand Petroleum and Minerals	Neutral/Amend	Amend Rule 22.1.5(l) (D8) (a) - Extractive activities within Rural Zones so that prospecting and exploration activities are classed as a more lenient activity status, for example Restricted Discretionary. AND Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential or similar amendments as necessary to address the matters raised in submission.	NZPM does not oppose discretionary activity status for extractive activities in the Rural Zone to allow all potential effects and relevant matters to be assessed through the resource consent process. Consideration however should be given to a more lenient status for prospecting and exploration activities given these activities are of a smaller scale and have less adverse effects than extraction. NZPM notes prospecting and exploration are a permitted activity in the Rural Zone in Thames-Coromandel District Plan and there is no reason why these activities should have a much more stringent activity status under the Proposed Waikato District Plan.	Accept in part	
FS1198.46	Bathurst Resources Limited and BT Mining Limited	Support	The submission point be allowed in full.	The plan lacks any specific rules for prospecting and exploration and these should be provided for as permitted, restricted discretionary and discretionary depending on the scale of activities proposed and potential effects. Other rules appropriately control the effects of those activities.	Accept in part	
Rule 22.1.5 – Non-complying Activities (Minerals and extractive industries)						

575.15	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	<p>Amend Rule 22.1.5 NC2 Non-Complying Activities, as follows (or words to similar effect): (a) <u>A new or not yet lawfully existing (as at the date this plan became operative) extractive industry proposed to be located</u> within all or part of any of the following:...</p> <p>(i) Outstanding Natural Feature; (ii) Outstanding Natural Landscape; (iii) High Natural Character Area; (iv) Outstanding Natural Character Area.</p> <p>AND</p> <p>Amend the Proposed District Plan to make consequential and additional amendments as necessary to give effect to the matters raised in the submission.</p>	<p>Fulton Hogan opposes Rule 22.1.5 as it restricts their operations from growing in the future and seeks amendments so that existing extraction activities (like the Waingaro Quarry) are not unreasonably hindered should the overlay remain. It will still ensure that no new quarries are established in Outstanding Natural Feature; Outstanding Natural Landscape areas, which is presumed to be the key intent of the Rule. Submission notes that there are separate relief sought to have the respective overlays removed, elsewhere in the submission.</p>	Reject	
FS1146.13	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited	Support	<p><i>Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited which is an existing established extractive industry will also be limited for future expansion based on this Rule.</i></p>	<p><i>We seek that the whole submission is allowed as it is interpreted that the intention of the rule is that no new quarries are established in these identified sensitive areas.</i></p>	Reject	
FS1027.7	Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated	Oppose	<p><i>Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. We oppose this submission because non-complying activities potentially encroach on the daily life activities of community members.</i></p>	<p><i>We oppose this submission because non-complying activities potentially encroach on the daily life activities of community members.</i></p>	Accept	

FS1027.2	Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated	Oppose	Ngaruawahia Action Group Incorporated has been in existence for 21 years, and has the following objectives: a) to work for the protection of Ngaruawahia, the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas from mining or extraction of mineral resources in inappropriate places and of inappropriate scale b) to support and promote careful planning for the economic, social and spiritual well-being of the lands, water and communities of Ngaruawahia and the Hakarimata ranges and surrounding areas. As such, Ngaruawahia Action Group (NAG) has a special interest in this submission, because the Fulton Hogan site is a quarry in Ngaruawahia and on the Hakarimata ranges. NAG opposes this submission because the submission seeks to remove outstanding natural features and outstanding natural landscapes and significant natural area overlays in an area for which these values are of national and regional importance. With regards to this submission, the extractive industry should be treated no differently here as other land-users are treated.	We seek to disallow the whole of this submission including other submissions which seek to remove natural heritage and landscape overlays, as if those values didn't exist.	Accept	
771.12	Bathurst Resources Ltd and BT Mining Ltd	Oppose	Delete Rule 22.1.5 NC2 Non-Complying Activities, thus making all extractive industries in the Rural Zone a discretionary activity (Rule 22.1.5 D8 Discretionary Activities).  AND  Any consequential amendments necessary to address the matters raised in the submission.	Do not support the classification of extractive activities in the rural zone as non-complying activity. This would make all extractive industries in the Rural Zone discretionary as Rule 22.1.5 D8 Discretionary Activities.	Reject	
FS1334.70	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	Allow and amend rules as per Fulton Hogan's original submission.	Fulton Hogan supports the removal of new extraction activities from the list of non-complying activities, particularly where the site has been identified as being within the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay.	Reject	

680.192	Federated Farmers of New Zealand	Oppose	<p>Delete Rule 22.1.5 NC2 Non-Complying Activities. AND</p> <p>Add to Rule 22.1.5 Discretionary Activity a new rule as follows: <u>Dxx (a) A new extractive industry excluding farm quarries which are permitted under 22.1.2 PXX, located within all or part of any of the following: (i) Outstanding Natural Feature; (ii) Outstanding Natural Landscape; (iii) High Natural Character Area (iv) Outstanding Natural Character Area</u> AND</p> <p>Any consequential changes needed to give effect to this relief. AND</p> <p>Any consequential amendments to Chapter 23: Country Living Zone to address areas of existing farmland zoned as Country Living Zone.</p>	The proposed amendment is required to provide better consistency with the planning approach prescribed in Objective 5.4.1 and Policy 5.4.2. Further the rule contains drafting flaws which render it unworkable. There are no areas identified in the planning map legend as High Natural Character Areas or Outstanding Natural Character Areas. The submitter wants to be clear that Farm Quarries are not to be subject to triggering resource consent under such provisions.	Reject	
FS1334.72	Fulton Hogan Limited	Support	<p>Allow and amend rules as per Fulton Hogan's original submission.</p>	Fulton Hogan supports the removal of new extraction activities from the list of non-complying activities, particularly where the site has been identified as being within the Aggregate Extraction Area overlay.	Reject	
697.758	Waikato District Council	Neutral/Amend	<p>Amend Rule 22.1.5 NC2 Non-Complying Activities, as follows: (a) An extractive industry located within all or part of any of the following <u>landscape and natural character areas</u>: (i) Outstanding Natural Feature; (ii) Outstanding Natural Landscape; (iii) High natural character area; (iv) Outstanding Natural Character area.</p>	Including the wording "landscape and natural character areas" provides clarity to the rule.	Accept	
FS1334.73	Fulton Hogan Limited	Oppose	<p>Reject and amend Rule 22.1.5 NC2 as per submission point 575.15.</p>	Fulton Hogan considers that the growth of existing extractive activities should not be restricted despite being located in an area that includes an ONFAL overlay.	Reject	
FS1377.229	Havelock Village Limited	Oppose	<p>Oppose.</p>	As an alternative to residential zoning, HVL supports the proposed zone interface noise limits to ensure a reasonable level of noise between industrial and other activities.	Reject	

548.15	Murray & Cathy McWatt for Grander Investments Limited	Oppose	<p>Delete Rule 22.1.5 D4 Waste Management facilities as a Discretionary Activity; AND Add a new Restricted Discretionary activity for Cleanfill outside of an Outstanding Natural Landscape; an Outstanding Natural Feature, an Outstanding Natural Character Area; and a High Natural Character Area in Rule 22.1.5 Discretionary Activities; AND Add the following matters of discretion: <u>Waste acceptance</u> <u>Design and construction</u> <u>Site operation procedures</u> <u>Response to natural hazards</u> <u>Management of non-complying material</u> <u>Landscape</u> <u>Dust</u> <u>Noise</u> <u>Biodiversity</u> <u>Water quality</u> <u>Traffic effects</u> <u>Monitoring</u></p>	<p>Cleanfill facility should be a Restricted Discretionary Activity. Refer to submission for full suggestion. Activities within the Waste Management Facility definition are appropriate within the Rural Zone without Resource Consent. Cleanfill does not generate objectionable odour, contamination or high dust emissions unlike other activities that involve disposal of material to land. Activity status for Cleanfill should be Restricted Discretionary in the Rural Zone. With matters of discretion and assessment criteria restricted to waste acceptance, design and construction, site operation procedures, water quality, response to natural hazards, management of non-complying material and monitoring. See full submission for Assessment of Ecological Effects report for 62 Bluff Road, Pokeno.</p>	Accept in part	
FS1146.12	Gleeson Quarries Huntly Limited	Support	<p><i>From the definition of Clean fill it is clear that it does not generate objectionable odour, contamination or high dust emissions unlike other activities that involve disposal of material to land and can therefore be regarded as a Restricted Discretionary in a Rural Zone.</i></p>	<p><i>We seek that the whole of the submission is allowed as the matters of discretion will provide a clear indication of the effects associated with clean fill.</i></p>	Accept in part	
FS1308.76	The Surveying Company	Support	<p>Null</p>	<p><i>The submission aligns with the original submission of The Surveying Company.</i></p>	Accept in part	
FS1049.5	Craig Hall	Oppose	<p><i>Waste management facilities should remain a Discretionary activity due to the very nature of the business. Cleanfill can most certainly generate odour, contamination and high dust emissions.</i></p>		Accept in part	